



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

September 8th, 2026

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD **MEMBERS**

Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair
Diana Cyganovich
Edwin Moore
Glenn Parker III
Billy Sharp

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL **STANDARDS**

Jeff Wenninger, OPS Administrator
Jessyca Watson, OPS General Manager
Art Bowker, Senior Investigator
Allison Davis, Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
Hamza Khabir, Investigator

LEGAL COUNSEL

Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order** **Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair**
YouTube Timestamp: 0:00:25 – 0:00:35
1. Vice Chair Miller called September 8th, 2026, hearing to order at 9:21 am EST.
 2. Roll Call
 - a. Board Member Willis, Gatian, and Chair Brown had an excused absence.
 - b. A quorum was present.

- II. **Approval of Minutes** **CPRB**
YouTube Timestamp: 0:00:35– 0:01:46

A. August 11th Meeting Minutes – In- person | City Hall

Motion: Approve August 11th, 2026, CPRB Meeting Minutes

Motion By: Sharp

Second By: Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

Abstention: Cyganovich- Did not attend the August 11th, 2026, CPRB Meeting

B. August 26th Meeting Minutes – Special | Virtual

Motion: Approve August 26th, 2026, CPRB Meeting Minutes



Motion By: Sharp
Second By: Parker III
Motion Status: Carried

III. Public Comment

Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 0:01:46 – 0:02:40

- Officer Commendation
 - There was an issue accessing Officer A. Waters Commendation therefore, Vice Chair Miller will address Officer Commendations later in the agenda.
- No individuals were present for public comment

**IV. Presentation of Investigations with Citizen
Or CDP Subject Employee Present**

Jeff Wenninger
OPS Administrator

- No individuals were present for their case presentation

V. Presentation of Investigations

Jeff Wenninger
OPS Administrator

New Cases

OPS2024-0183

Timestamp: 0:02:40 – 0:07:28

Complainant: Chris Maji

Presented by: Davis

Dispatcher Shantinea Patrick, #119

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On August 1, 2024, Mr. Chris Maji reported insufficient service against Police Radio Dispatcher Shantinea Patrick, stating that she mishandled his 911 call and failed to properly transfer him to EMS. The complaint included allegations concerning call-taking procedures and dispatching.

OPS reviewed dispatch recordings, event chronology reports, CAD entries, and documented attempts to contact the complainant. The evidence showed that Dispatcher Patrick answered promptly, followed call-taking procedures, asked the required triage question, and transferred the caller to EMS without delay. Chronology logs confirmed she created and prioritized the call correctly and that officers were dispatched appropriately. OPS determined that the dispatcher acted fully within CCS procedures and provided proper service.



OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Insufficient Service against Dispatcher Patrick, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows she identified herself, followed call-taking procedures, promptly transferred the caller to EMS, and properly created and prioritized the call in accordance with CCS 1.1.17 and 1.1.18.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Dispatcher Shantinea Patrick, #119	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in Bureau Communication & Property Communications 1.1.17 and 1.1.18.</i>	Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0054

Timestamp: 0:07:58 – 0:11:44

Complainant: Joanna Demarco

Presented by: Davis

P.O. Lawrence McGervey, #2352

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On March 24, 2025, Ms. Joanna Demarco reported unprofessional conduct against P.O. Lawrence McGervey, stating that he was rude to her over the phone, took her mother's side during a family dispute, and made her sons uncomfortable. The complaint included allegations concerning officer conduct and professionalism.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage from both responding officers, two 911 calls made by the complainant's mother, incident reports, CAD entries, and interviews with the complainant and P.O. McGervey. The evidence showed that the officer spoke firmly but did not raise his voice, allowed both parties to explain their concerns, and attempted to mediate a volatile family dispute. WCS confirmed that the officer's tone remained controlled and that he provided guidance consistent with domestic conflict response. OPS determined that the officer's conduct did not violate Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, or 5.09.



OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Unprofessional Conduct against P.O. McGervey, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officer attempted to mediate a volatile family situation, spoke firmly but respectfully, and acted within policy while addressing both parties' concerns.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Lawrence McGervey, #2352	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0065

Timestamp: 0:11:44 – 0:15:09

Complainant: Paul Barry

Presented by: Davis

Sgt. Stephanie Maye, #9272

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Principal Clerk Sandra Vecchio, #3413

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct-Retaliation

P.O. Ladell Trotty, #1765

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On April 7, 2025, Mr. Paul Barry reported lack of service, unprofessional conduct, and retaliation against Sgt. Stephanie Maye, P.O. Ladell Trotty, and Principal Clerk Sandra Vecchio, stating that his public records request was mishandled, delayed, and improperly processed after he submitted it verbally. The complaint included allegations concerning service, professionalism, and retaliation.

OPS reviewed text messages between the complainant and P.O. Trotty, public records policies, GovQA routing documentation, incident reports, CAD entries, and interviews with all involved personnel. The evidence showed that patrol officers are not responsible for fulfilling public records requests and that the Records Unit accepted and processed the complainant's request according to City procedure. Delays occurred because portions of the request required review by



HR and the Law Department. OPS found no evidence of discourtesy or retaliation and determined that personnel acted within policy when assisting and routing the request.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Lack of Service against all three employees, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the request was accepted and routed appropriately, though delays occurred outside their control. OPS recommends a finding of Insufficient Evidence for Unprofessional Conduct against Sgt. Maye, concluding that conflicting statements and lack of recordings prevent determining whether misconduct occurred. OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Retaliation against Principal Clerk Vecchio, concluding that delays were due to inter-departmental processing, not retaliatory behavior.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Stephanie Maye, #9272 P.O. Ladell Trotty, #1765 Principal Clerk Sandra Vecchio, #3413	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.11 and Ohio Revised Code 149.43</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Stephanie Maye, #9272	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct – Retaliation

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Principal Clerk Sandra Vecchio, #3413	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried



OPS2025-0147

Timestamp: 0:15:09– 0:20:32

Complainant: Abraham Delgado

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. James Garnett Jr., #1357

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On July 2nd, 2025, Mr. Abraham Delgado reported that CDP failed to provide him with a police report documenting an assault committed against him. He stated that although a detective contacted him, he was not given any explanation or instructions on how to obtain the report. The complaint included an allegation of lack of service, specifically concerning the officer's failure to assist him in accessing the incident documentation.

OPS reviewed the officer's body worn camera recordings and related documentation to determine whether the officer acted in accordance with Division policy and whether the alleged conduct occurred as reported. The review focused on whether the officer properly advised the complainant on how to obtain the police report and whether the officer fulfilled required duties under applicable General Police Orders, including providing business cards, reference information, and guidance on accessing records.

OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Allegation A against Officer James Glennett, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officer's actions were consistent with Division policy. The investigation determined that the police report had been created, and OPS staff were able to obtain it directly for the complainant. Body-worn camera footage and policy review indicated that the officer fulfilled required duties under General Police Orders 1.07 and 4.18, and that the alleged failure to provide service did not occur.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James Garnett Jr., #1357	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried



	<i>Manual Rule 4.18 and General Police Order 1.07.11[D].</i>	
--	--	--

OPS2025-0191

Timestamp: 0:20:32 – 0:26:57

Complainant: Jessica Betancourt

Presented by: Khabir

P.O. Erik Melendez, #1748

Sgt. Emmanuel Velez, #9251

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 12, 2025, Ms. Jessica Betancourt reported allegations of Improper Procedure and Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against Sergeant Emmanuel Velez and P.O. Erik Melendez, stating that both members improperly influenced or facilitated criminal charges against her following two neighborhood parking disputes on June 2 and June 8, 2024. She believed the officers were involved in her receiving a court summons for aggravated menacing and disorderly conduct and alleged their association with the Hispanic Police Officers Association contributed to biased involvement.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera recordings from the responding officers, CDP incident reports for both dates, Daily Duty Assignment records, CAD entries, the complainant's timeline, and interviews with Ms. Betancourt and all involved CDP personnel. The evidence showed that neither Sgt. Velez nor P.O. Melendez appeared on any WCS footage, were listed in any incident reports, or were assigned to either call for service. Daily Duty Assignment records confirmed both members were not working or assigned to the incidents. Interviews with responding officers consistently indicated they had no knowledge of either member being involved, and both Sgt. Velez and P.O. Melendez denied any interaction with Ms. Betancourt or involvement in the investigation or charges. OPS discovered no documentation, video, or witness information linking either member to the incidents or subsequent criminal proceedings. These findings justified the conclusion that the allegations were based solely on third-party information and not supported by any evidence.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Improper Procedure and Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against Sgt. Velez and P.O. Melendez, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows neither member responded to the incidents, participated in the investigation, influenced charging decisions, or engaged in any conduct related to the complainant. The evidence demonstrated that the alleged conduct did not occur.



Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Erik Melendez, #1748 Sgt. Emmanuel Vele, #9251	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Erik Melendez, #1748 Sgt. Emmanuel Vele, #9251	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0182

Timestamp: 0:26:57 – 0:29:29

Complainant: Joel Tucker

Presented by: S.I. Bowker

P.O. Thomas Smith, #2117

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Joel Tucker alleging Lack of Service by P.O. Thomas Smith #2117 after an August 19, 2025, contact in which Mr. Tucker believed the officer failed to properly document an employment-related issue and was dismissive for not reviewing his full packet of documents. Mr. Tucker told OPS he provided a twenty-page packet and expected more thorough documentation; he also said he did not receive follow-up from detectives after being directed to the 3rd District. WCS shows Mr. Tucker explaining his employment concern. Officer Smith told him the matter appeared to be civil in nature but agreed to complete a basic report.

OPS reviewed P.O. Smith's WCS recording, the incident report, follow-up emails from the 3rd District, and the complainant's intake interviews. The WCS and incident report show Officer Smith listened to Mr. Tucker, documented the allegation in Incident Report 2025-00251718, provided Mr. Tucker a report number, made a copy of the first page of his documentation, and



gave him the detective bureau contact for follow-up; Mr. Tucker acknowledged he did not wait to be seen at the 3rd District. The 3rd District later determined the matter to be civil in nature and noted reports of that type are typically routed to the prosecutor's office for review.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS recommended **Exonerated** for the Lack of Service allegation against P.O. Thomas Smith #2117, finding the officer documented the complaint and provided appropriate guidance consistent with CDP Manual Rule 4.18. The investigation concluded Officer Smith's actions—taking a report, providing a report number, and directing Mr. Tucker to the appropriate follow-up channel—were consistent with Division policy and did not constitute a failure to provide service.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Thomas Smith, #2117	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.18.</i>	Motion by: Parker III Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0193

Timestamp: 0:29:29 – 0:35:36

Complainant: Anonymous

Presented by: S.I. Bowker

P.O. Christopher Bush, #220

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 15, 2025, an anonymous complainant reported unprofessional conduct against P.O. Christopher Bush, stating that the officer yelled profanities and continued verbal engagement while the complainant's husband briefly stopped at the airport curb to load children and luggage. The complaint included allegations concerning officer conduct and professionalism.



OPS reviewed the complaint form, airport unit rosters, CAD entries, and the officer interview. No WCS or surveillance footage existed, and no witnesses were identified. The evidence confirmed that Officer Bush was working overtime in the area at the time of the alleged incident but did not establish whether the interaction occurred as described. OPS determined that the allegation could not be proven or disproven due to the absence of corroborating evidence.

OPS recommends a finding of Insufficient Evidence for Unprofessional Conduct against P.O. Bush, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence does not establish whether the alleged conduct occurred due to the absence of video, witnesses, or corroborating documentation.

Board Discussion Summary: Member Cyganovich asked whether the airport had surveillance cameras that could have captured the interaction described in the complaint. S.I. Bowker answered noting that airport video typically does not include audio, but visual footage could still confirm whether any interaction occurred. S.I. Bowker further explained that they attempted to locate relevant surveillance but were unable to find any footage showing the officer and the family at the time of the alleged incident. The Board acknowledged that even if footage existed, it would not have captured profanity, only visual activity, and accepted OPS's clarification that no usable video was located.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Christopher Bush, #220	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

OPS2026-0005

Timestamp: 0:32:51 – 0:35:36

Complainant: Angela Burgos

Presented by: S.I. Bowker

Det. Joseph Edwards, #1940

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On December 17, 2025, Ms. Angela Burgos reported allegations of Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct and Lack of Service/No Service against Detective Joseph Edwards, stating that he mishandled her sexual assault investigation and



behaved aggressively, hostilely, and dismissively during multiple interviews and phone calls between January 2022 and July 2024. She alleged that he dragged his feet, discouraged her, and failed to properly investigate her case. The complaint included allegations concerning investigative diligence and officer conduct.

OPS reviewed all available body-worn camera recordings from the three interviews, multiple audio recordings of follow-up calls, the complainant's statements, Detective Edwards' interview, the Detective Clean-Up Report, the Felony Review Form, the County Prosecutor's declination letter, and related case documentation. The evidence showed that during each recorded interaction, Detective Edwards remained calm, procedural, and did not display hostile or aggressive behavior. WCS footage did not support Ms. Burgos' claims that he yelled, leaned aggressively, or acted in a threatening manner. OPS also discovered that Detective Edwards documented his investigative steps, submitted the case for municipal and county review, conducted follow-up visits after the prosecutor's declination, and maintained communication with the complainant. The County Prosecutor's Office declined prosecution due to insufficient evidence and lack of cooperation, not due to investigative failure. These findings justified OPS's conclusion that the alleged conduct did not occur and that the detective's investigative actions were consistent with Division policy.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct and Unfounded for Lack of Service/No Service against Detective Edwards, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the alleged conduct did not occur and that the detective acted within Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, 5.09, and investigative responsibilities outlined in the Detective Manual. The evidence demonstrated that Detective Edwards conducted a thorough investigation, communicated with prosecutors, and maintained professionalism throughout all recorded interactions.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Joseph Edwards, #1940	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service



OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Joseph Edwards, #1940	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0072

Timestamp: 0:35:36 – 0:41:13

Complainant: Rodney Montgomery

Presented by: Eisen

Sgt. Michael Urbania, #9207

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation This case involves a complaint filed by Rodney Montgomery alleging Lack of Service by Sgt. Michael Urbania #9207 regarding the OH-1 traffic crash report for a January 19, 2024, collision involving a city snowplow. Mr. Montgomery reported that after being involved in a multi-vehicle collision on January 19, 2024, the responding officers did not take his statement, documented the crash inaccurately, and later refused to correct the report or allow him to add his account. He stated that Sgt. Urbania released the parties without interviewing him, later produced a report containing incorrect directions of travel, and repeatedly declined his requests to submit a proper statement despite multiple follow-up attempts. Mr. Montgomery asserted the original report mischaracterized his direction of travel and that Sgt. Urbania did not fully correct the record despite his requests and references to GPS data. Body-worn camera footage from the scene and subsequent interactions shows Sgt. Urbania speaking with involved parties, asking if anyone was injured, and later meeting with Mr. Montgomery to address his concerns.

OPS reviewed WCS footage, the original and supplemental OH-1 reports, the incident report, Motor Vehicle Review Committee findings, and witness and officer interviews. The evidence shows the initial OH-1 reflected witness statements that Mr. Montgomery turned without signaling and that Sgt. Urbania later prepared a supplemental OH-1 adding Mr. Montgomery's statement after reviewing the matter and speaking with the plow supervisor. A Motor Vehicle Review Committee report assigned an A-2 finding (failure to yield) consistent with the physical evidence and witness accounts. OPS also interviewed a witness who described the plow making a wide turn and the other vehicle losing control.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS concluded Sgt. Urbania's actions were consistent with General Police Order 8.1.02 regarding OH-1 reports and supplements and recommended a finding of Exonerated for the Lack of Service allegation. OPS determined Sgt. Urbania addressed the reporting error by preparing a supplement, followed appropriate



procedures for documenting the incident, and acted within policy when resolving the dispute over fault.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Additional Information to Note: The agenda incorrectly listed the OPS Recommendation as Unfounded, the correct OPS Recommendation was Exonerated for Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service against Sgt. Michael Urbania, #9207.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Michael Urbania, #9207	The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 8.01.02.	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0170

Timestamp: 0:41:13 – 0:57:26

Complainant: Brandi Jones

Presented by: Eisen

Lt. Albert Oliver, #8586

P.O. Abel-Minem Asfour, #905

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Miranda Warning & Wavier Violation

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Brandi Jones alleging an improper arrest by Sgt. Albert Oliver #9220 and lack of service and Miranda violations by P.O. Abdel-Minem Asfour #905 following a July 17, 2024, domestic incident at 4428 Turney Road. Ms. Jones and her son, Baron Morris, called police to retrieve property; both Mr. Morris and the other party, Devin Price, alleged the other had committed violence. Body-worn camera footage shows officers detaining both parties, speaking with witnesses, and officers offering EMS. Sgt. Oliver, after consulting with responding officers by phone, directed that Mr. Morris be arrested and Ms. Price released; Ms. Jones asked to speak with a supervisor on scene but was not connected to one.



OPS reviewed WCS footage, officer interviews, incident and field reports, and follow-up detective documentation. The WCS shows P.O. Asfour and P.O. Brightharp detaining both subjects, taking statements, and advising that statements would be recorded and included in reports. P.O. Asfour relayed the sergeant's decision to release Ms. Price and arrest Mr. Morris; while Mr. Morris was handcuffed and transported to jail he was questioned multiple times and was not provided with a Miranda warning. The record also shows the incident was referred to the Domestic Violence Unit for follow up and that officers documented the event consistent with GPO guidance on domestic incidents.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS recommended an Exonerated finding for the Improper Arrest allegation against Sgt. Oliver, concluding his supervisory decision complied with GPO 3.04.01 and GPO 5.05.01. OPS recommended Sustained findings for P.O. Asfour for Lack of Service, for failing to respond to the complainant's request for a supervisor in violation of GPOs 1.07.04/1.07.08, and for a Miranda Warning and Waiver violation, finding Mr. Morris was questioned while in custody without being Mirandized in violation of GPO 2.02.03.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board sought clarification from the OPS Administrator about how the new administrative-dismissal directive applies when a CDP member is no longer employed by the Division. Vice Chair Miller asked whether a former officer, referenced in the discussion as P.O. Bright-Harp, would normally be listed as administratively dismissed, and whether the Board would still need to act or make a motion acknowledging that officer's role in the case. The Administrator explained that the case in question had already been reviewed under the Board's August 26 directive and that there were no allegations filed against that officer. Because the investigation did not identify any misconduct or any allegation specific to him, no administrative-dismissal action or Board motion was required.

For Allegation C, Board members discussed the appropriate group level classification for P.O. Abel-Minem Asfour's failure to Mirandize the complainant before questioning him while enroute to the county jail. Members initially considered whether the violation should fall under Group Level 1 (Training & Tactics) or Group Level 2 (Mishandling or Improper Preparation of a Criminal Case Resulting in Declination or Dismissal). The Board noted that no charges were ever filed, meaning the Miranda violation did not impact prosecution. Because the lack of Miranda warnings did not result in a declined or dismissed case, members agreed that Group Level 2 was not appropriate.

Board members also discussed the officer's experience level, noting that P.O. Asfour had been on the force less than one year at the time of the incident. This fact weighed heavily in favor of corrective training rather than formal discipline. Members debated whether the appropriate corrective measure should be retraining or a letter of reinstruction, acknowledging that a letter of reinstruction becomes part of the officer's disciplinary record, whereas retraining does not. Considering the officer's limited tenure, the nature of the violation, and the absence of prosecutorial impact, the Board reached consensus that Group Level 1 was the appropriate classification and that retraining was the most suitable corrective action.



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Arrest

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Lt. Albert Oliver, #9220	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in General Police Order 3.04.01 and 5.05.01.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Amend previous Motion of Allegation A: Improper Procedure against Lt. Oliver to include the updated Badge # 8586.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Abel-Minem Asfour, #905	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.01, 4.18, General Police Order 1.07.04, 1.07.08, and 5.05.01.</i> <i><u>Explanation:</u> Officer Asfour did not respond to the complainant's request to speak with a supervisor.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Training Violation & Tactics Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Miranda Warning & Wavier Violation

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



P.O. Abel-Minem Asfour, #905	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 2.02.03.</i> <i><u>Explanation:</u> Officer Asfour never stated the Miranda's Warning to Mr. Mooris before being asked to provide a statement. Furthermore, Mr. Morris was also questioned while handcuffed at the scene and while in route to the county jail. This constitutes a Group Level 1 violation, and the Board issued a Letter of Reinstruction.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Training Violation & Tactics w/ Letter of Reinstruction Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried
---	--	---

OPS2024-0185

Timestamp: 0:57:26 – 1:00:54

Complainant: Matthew Mayforth

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Chae Simpson, #455

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Matthew Mayforth alleging Lack of Service by P.O. Chae Simpson #455 after Mr. Mayforth reported observing vehicles lined up on Scranton Road that he believed were preparing to race. Mr. Mayforth said he called multiple Cleveland Division of Police numbers during the early morning hours but was only able to reach someone on one line; after waiting on hold he became frustrated and ended the call. He reported that he attempted to report the activity but did not receive the response he expected.

OPS reviewed the written complaint, Mr. Mayforth's recorded interview, dispatch audio for the relevant time frame, duty reports, and a brief officer interview. P.O. Simpson did not recall taking the call but stated she typically provides the non-emergency number and transfers callers to dispatch when appropriate. Dispatch tracking for the district phones was not available to corroborate the complainant's account, and there were no WCS or other video sources documenting the reported activity.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence and the available records, OPS recommended a finding of Insufficient Evidence for the Lack of Service allegation against P.O. Chae Simpson #455. The investigation concluded that the evidence fails to establish whether the alleged failure to respond occurred.



Board Discussion Summary: Member Sharp asked how the investigation identified Officer Simpson as the officer involved. Investigator Eisen explained that they reviewed the Daily Duty Assignment (DDA) roster and determined she was the only female officer working during the relevant shift. The Board also discussed why the officer may not have remembered the call, noting that district-level phone calls are not consistently recorded, an ongoing issue that affects OPS's ability to verify certain interactions. The exchange highlighted both the limitations in available documentation and the investigative steps OPS used to determine officer involvement.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Chae Simpson, #455	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0197

Timestamp: 1:00:54 – 1:11:00

Complainant: Ben Rosolowski

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Kenneth Kirk, #572

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: This case involves a complaint filed by Ben Rosolowski alleging Unprofessional Conduct and Lack of Service by P.O. Ken Kirk #572 after a phone call on August 3, 2024, regarding a welfare concern at one of Mr. Rosolowski's rental properties. Mr. Rosolowski reported that P.O. Kirk laughed at him on the phone and told him not to call the district again, directing him instead to contact 216-621-1234. He said officers later responded to the address and found several deceased animals, prompting an APL investigation; Mr. Rosolowski said he felt dismissed and upset by the interaction with the district line.

OPS reviewed the written complaint, the complainant's recorded interview, the CDP incident report, dispatch audio for the relevant timeframe, and a video-recorded interview with P.O. Kirk. There is no recording of the specific phone call between Mr. Rosolowski and P.O. Kirk, and P.O. Kirk stated he provided the dispatch number and did not recall transferring the call; he also said he did not laugh at the caller and that any remark could have been misinterpreted given background noise and the caller's agitated tone. The incident report shows officers were dispatched to the address within minutes of the time listed on the complaint, and no WCS or



other contemporaneous audio corroborates the complainant's claim that the officer laughed or told him not to call again.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, OPS recommended a finding of Insufficient Evidence for the Unprofessional Conduct allegation because the available record does not establish whether P.O. Kirk laughed or made the alleged remark. OPS recommended a finding of Exonerated for the Lack of Service allegation, noting officers did respond to the reported concern and P.O. Kirk's actions in providing the dispatch number or attempting to transfer the call were consistent with CDP procedures.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Kenneth Kirk, #572	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Kenneth Kirk, #572	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.11.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Parker III Motion Status: Carried

OPS2024-0198

Timestamp: 1:11:00 – 1:39:15

Complainant: Judith Wilson

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Massai Fluker, #1098

Allegation A: Property: Damage

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF

P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766

Allegation A: Property: Damage

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF



Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Failure to Follow De-escalate Tactics, Techniques, & Procedures

Summary of Case Presentation: On June 6, 2024, Judith Wilson filed a complaint alleging Property Damage, The complaint alleged that she was assaulted by P.O. Massai Fluker and P.O. Vickie Phillips and that the officers damaged her cell phone during an interaction related to a mental health and medical crisis response. The incident occurred after officers and EMS responded to a residence where Ms. Wilson was observed outside without clothing, exhibiting signs of distress, and refusing medical treatment. According to the complaint, she sustained injuries to her finger, knee, and back during the encounter, and her cell phone was left cracked and inoperable following the incident.

OPS reviewed body-worn camera footage, officer interviews, EMS records, incident reports, and complainant interviews. The evidence showed that Ms. Wilson's clothing and cell phone were already located in the street and damaged before officers recovered the property. As a result, allegations that either officer damaged Ms. Wilson's property were determined to be unfounded. The investigation further established that officers used physical force while attempting to secure Ms. Wilson for transport to the hospital after she actively resisted efforts to place her on a gurney. Both officers characterized their actions as de minimis force and did not complete the required Use of Force reporting. Investigators determined that the force used met the definition of a Level 1 Use of Force and should have been reported under Division policy. Accordingly, allegations that both officers failed to report a Level 1 Use of Force were sustained.

The investigation also examined the actions of P.O. Vickie Phillips, who was the senior officer and a certified Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) officer on scene. Body-worn camera footage and investigative review found that required crisis intervention and de-escalation practices were not fully utilized. Investigators determined that Ms. Wilson was not an immediate threat, yet officers moved to physically restrain and handcuff her within minutes of arriving on scene. The investigation found that Phillips did not identify herself as a CIT officer, did not adequately employ de-escalation techniques such as slowing the encounter, advising Ms. Wilson of available options, explaining the intended actions, or requesting additional resources and supervisory assistance before resorting to force. Consequently, the allegation that Phillips failed to follow de-escalation tactics and CIT procedures was sustained.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members began by clarifying confusion caused by differences between the agenda and the investigator's written report. The agenda grouped multiple allegations together, while the investigative report separated them, leading to uncertainty about which findings applied to each allegation. After confirming that the property-damage allegation was unfounded for both officers and referred to the same conduct and the board members agreed to follow how the agenda lists the allegations. Then members shifted their focus to the substance of the case and the rationale behind each finding.

A significant portion of the discussion centered on whether any use of force occurred at all. Several members expressed that, based on the video and the circumstances, the officers appeared to act reasonably. They noted that the woman was unclothed, in crisis, actively resisting, and the conditions were difficult due to rain and limited visibility. Members emphasized that the sustained finding was not for improper force, but for failure to report force-related contact as required by policy. Even so, one member questioned whether there was any force to report,



arguing that the officers' actions were necessary to safely restrain the woman and did not appear to rise to the level of a reportable use of force.

The Board then turned to Allegation C, which concerned the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) responsibilities of Officer Phillips. Members expressed concern that, as the CIT-trained and senior officer on scene, Phillips did not take primary responsibility for the encounter or direct other officers to step back, as CIT protocols require. They noted that she did not identify herself as a CIT officer, did not slow the pace of the interaction, and did not use CIT-approved communication strategies such as asking questions rather than issuing commands or explaining the purpose of handcuffing. Members emphasized that the decision to go hands-on occurred within minutes, despite no crime being alleged and despite Ms. Wilson not posing an immediate threat. They discussed that Phillips' questioning could have been perceived as threatening to someone in crisis and that she did not request a supervisor or additional resources, despite CIT policy requiring such steps when feasible.

Members also considered whether Phillips' CIT certification should be treated as an aggravating factor. They agreed that her specialized training heightened the expectation that she would recognize signs of crisis, avoid unnecessary escalation, and employ CIT-specific strategies. Several members stated that her failure to apply CIT training made the violation more serious, even without considering her prior sustained finding for unprofessional conduct. They acknowledged that while her prior case had not yet completed the full disciplinary loop, her CIT status alone justified elevating the seriousness of the violation.

Additional Information to Note: The agenda combined Allegation A and Allegation B into a single Allegation A (Property Damage) because both allegations involve the same alleged action, apply to the same officers, and carry the same OPS recommendation. As a result, the Board can address both officers within one unified motion.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Property: Damage

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Massai Flunker, #1098 P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF

OPS Recommendation: Sustained

CPRB Decision: Sustained

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Massai Flunker, #1098 P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp



	<i>alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in General Police Order 2.01.05.</i> <i>Explanation: Both officers used reportable Level 1 force during their interaction with Ms. Wilson but failed to complete the required Use of Force documentation as mandated by GPO 2.01.05.</i>	Opposed: Moore – Believe there was no excessive force to report Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Failure to Report/ Timeliness Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp Opposed: Moore - Believe there was no excessive force to report Motion Status: Carried
--	--	--

Motion: In OPS case 2024-0198, for P.O. Massai Fluker, #1098, regarding Allegation B: Improper: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF the board move for a finding of sustained as the preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur, was inconsistent with Division standards, and violated GPO 2.01.05. Specifically, Officer Fluker used a reportable Level 1 during their interaction with Ms. Wilson but failed to complete the required Use of Force documentation. Additionally, the previous combined joint sustained motion for Allegation B against both officers.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Cyganovich

Opposed: Moore - Believe there was no excessive force to report.

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: In OPS case 2024-0198, for P.O. Massai Fluker, #1098, regarding Allegation B: Improper: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF the board move for a Group Level I- Failure to Report and Timeliness.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Cyganovich

Opposed: Moore - Believe there was no excessive force to report

Motion Status: Carried

Motion: In OPS case 2024-0198, for P.O. Vickie Phillips, # 1766 regarding Allegation B: Improper: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF the board move for a finding of sustained as the preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, WCS footage, and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur, was inconsistent with Division standards, and violated GPO 2.01.05. Specifically, Officer Fluker used a reportable Level 1 during their interaction with Ms. Wilson but failed to complete the required Use of Force documentation.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Sharp



Motion Status: Carried

Motion: In OPS case 2024-0198, for P.O. Vickie Phillips, # 1766, regarding Allegation B: Improper: Failure to Report Level 1 UOF the board move for a Group Level I- Failure to Report and Timeliness.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Cyganovich

Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Failure to Follow De-escalation Tactics, Techniques, & Procedures

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was inconsistent with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rule 4.01 and General Police Orders 2.01.02, 5.11.02, and 5.11.03.</i> <i>Explanation: Officer Phillips did not follow required de-escalation tactics and Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) procedures during her interaction with Ms. Wilson. Although P.O. Phillips was the senior officer on scene and a CIT-certified officer, she did not identify herself as a Specialized CIT Officer, did not slow the pace of the encounter, and did not use CIT-approved communication strategies such as asking questions rather than issuing commands, advising the subject of available options, or explaining the purpose of handcuffing. Within approximately six minutes of arriving on scene, officers moved to handcuff Ms. Wilson despite no crime being alleged and despite Ms. Wilson not presenting an immediate threat. The decision to use handcuffs was made without first attempting additional de-escalation techniques or requesting a supervisor, as required under GPOs 2.01.02, 5.11.02, and 5.11.03.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried Group Level: I- Violation of Training & Tactics w/ recommendation of 1-Day Suspension based on aggravating factors Motion by: Cyganovich Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0074

Timestamp: 1:39:15 – 1:45:05

Complainant: Ashley Nichols

Presented by: Watson



Det. Nichole Corea, #2597

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, #1598

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

P.O. Deangelo Rembert, #1574

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On April 11, 2025, Ms. Ashley Nichols reported allegations of Lack of Service/Insufficient Service against Det. Nicole Corea, P.O. Brandyn Jones-Parks, and P.O. DeAngelo Rembert, stating that Det. Corea failed to investigate her domestic violence case or take her statement, and that P.O. Jones-Parks and P.O. Rembert improperly assisted her spouse in retrieving property despite an active warrant. The complaint included allegations concerning investigative diligence, service provision, and officer response to domestic violence-related calls.

OPS reviewed all available body-worn camera recordings from each officer's interaction with Ms. Nichols, multiple 911 call recordings, incident reports, CAD chronologies, domestic violence documentation, and interviews with Ms. Nichols and responding officers. The evidence showed that officers responded promptly to Ms. Nichols' domestic violence report on February 11, 2025, documented her injuries, took her written statement, and referred the case to the Domestic Violence Unit. WCS confirmed that Det. Corea contacted Ms. Nichols multiple times, attempted to arrange an in-person meeting, and ultimately presented the case to the prosecutor, who issued a warrant for Ms. Pernell's arrest in February. OPS discovered that Ms. Nichols never appeared for her scheduled statement, despite telling Det. Corea she was enroute. Regarding the March 31 property retrieval call, WCS showed that Ms. Nichols did not request service from the responding officers, did not inform them of the active warrant, and refused entry. Officers facilitated a civil standby and left without incident. OPS found no evidence that officers acted improperly, failed to provide required service, or mishandled the domestic violence investigation. These findings justified OPS's conclusion that the alleged conduct did not occur.

OPS recommends a finding of Unfounded for Lack of Service/Insufficient Service against Det. Corea, P.O. Jones-Parks, and P.O. Rembert, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows the officers responded appropriately, documented the domestic violence incident, pursued charges through the prosecutor, and provided all required follow-up. The evidence demonstrated that the alleged failure to investigate or provide service did not occur.

Board Discussion Summary: There were further questions, comments, or concerns raised by the Board after case presentations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service



OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Nichole Corea, #2597 P.O. Brandyn Jones- Parks, #1598 P.O. Deangelo Rembert, #1574	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Parker III Second by: Cyganovich Motion Status: Carried

OPS2025-0082

Timestamp: 1:45:05 – 1:53:08

Complainant: Warren Robinson

Presented by: Watson

P.O. Robert Langley, #1930

Det. Tonya Redding, #2248

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On April 21, 2025, Mr. Warren Robinson reported allegations of Lack of Service/Insufficient Service and Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against P.O. Robert Langley and P.O. Tonya Redding, stating that P.O. Langley incorrectly documented his hit-and-run accident and refused to update the OH-1, and that P.O. Redding failed to investigate the hit-skip case and spoke to him rudely. The complaint included allegations concerning report accuracy, investigative diligence, and officer professionalism.

OPS reviewed body worn camera footage from both officers, the original and supplemental OH-1 reports, the hit-skip investigation letter, 911 chronology records, incident reports, and interviews with Mr. Robinson and both officers. The evidence showed that during the initial report on March 12, 2025, Mr. Robinson struggled to clearly describe the sequence of events, resulting in an incorrect narrative and missing license plate information. Because the license plate was not provided, P.O. Langley could not complete a Field Based Report, and the Hit-Skip Unit was not notified. OPS discovered that once Mr. Robinson obtained the license plate and provided it to P.O. Redding, she initiated an investigation, interviewed the vehicle owner, attempted to locate the driver, and searched for damage. The investigation was partially closed when the driver could not be identified and no damage consistent with a collision was found. OPS also discovered that P.O. Langley updated the OH-1 on April 10, 2025, once Mr. Robinson returned with corrected information. Regarding the conduct allegation, OPS found no recordings of the phone conversations between Mr. Robinson and P.O. Redding, and WCS footage of her investigative interview showed professional demeanor. These findings justified OPS's conclusion that both officers provided appropriate service and that the conduct allegation could not be substantiated.



OPS recommends a finding of Exonerated for Lack of Service/Insufficient Service against P.O. Langley and P.O. Redding, concluding that the preponderance of the evidence shows both officers acted within policy, documented the incident, initiated investigation when information became available, and provided appropriate follow-up. OPS recommends a finding of Insufficient Evidence for Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct against P.O. Redding, concluding that the available evidence does not establish whether the alleged conduct occurred.

Board Discussion Summary: Board members focused on whether Detective Readings was required to activate her WCS while making phone calls to members of the public from inside the police building. Members questioned whether the policy's definition of "in the field" applied to phone-based interactions occurring in an office setting. Several members noted that the Board has historically interpreted WCS activation requirements as applying only to field encounters, and that prior discussions established that inside the office is not considered "in the field."

Board members recalled that they previously made a recommendation, approximately a year earlier, that officers should record public interactions occurring inside police facilities, including phone calls. That recommendation was forwarded to the Community Police Commission (CPC), but members stated they had never received an update or confirmation that the recommendation was adopted or implemented. Because no policy change had been issued, members agreed they were required to apply the current policy, which does not mandate WCS activation for phone calls made inside the station.

Members acknowledged that although the Board may believe recording such calls would improve transparency, they must base their findings on the policy as written. With no update from CPC and no change to the WCS policy, the Board concluded that Detective Readings' failure to record the phone calls did not violate current WCS requirements.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Robert Langley, #1930 Det. Tonya Redding, #2248	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was carried out in alignment with the standards outlined in CDP Manual Rules 4.01, 4.03, 4.06, and 9.05.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
---------	-----------	--------



Det. Tonya Redding, #2248	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Miller Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried
----------------------------------	--	--

VI. Executive Session

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 1:53:08 – 2:42:08

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting in CPRB Legal, OPS Administrator Wenninger, OPS General Manager Watson, and CPRB Admin Assistant.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Parker III

Roll Call Vote: All Present Board Members said “AYE”.

Board Members: Vice Chair Miller, Cyganovich, Moore, Sharp, Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 11:15 a.m. EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 12:04 p.m. EST

VII. OPS Status Report

Elizabeth Bagley

YouTube Timestamp: 2:43:05 – 3:02:05

OPS Data Analyst

August 2026 Monthly Report

By: Elizabeth Bagley

Key Topics	Summary	Questions & Answers
Introduction/ Monthly Report	Data Analyst Bagley opened the presentation by noting that all OPS data is point-in-time and subject to change daily. The snapshot presented reflects information current as of September 3, 2026 . Because OPS staff manually enter all case information, minor delays or discrepancies may occur between monthly reports. The Analyst also explained that OPS conducted data cleanup during August, including auditing how cases are tagged in IAPro and reviewing how frequently investigators update case statuses. This cleanup may cause some numbers to shift compared to prior months.	Q: Why might some numbers look different from last month or appear unexpected? A (Data Analyst): Because OPS data is point-in-time and changes daily. The snapshot is accurate as of September 3, 2026 , but numbers may shift due to case updates or delays in data entry.



		Q: Why do month-to-month complaint totals sometimes appear inconsistent? A: OPS has only one staff member entering complaints at month-end, so some complaints may not be entered before the data pull. Q: Has OPS done any data cleanup? A: Yes. The Analyst and Senior Investigator conducted a data hygiene audit to improve tagging accuracy and update frequency in IAPro.
Data Covered/ Agenda	Analyst Bagley reviewed the agenda for the presentation. The report would begin with a case status overview covering cases from 2022–2026. The allegations overview would summarize the frequency of allegation types received in 2026. The district overview would show how active cases are distributed across Cleveland’s five police districts. The sources of complaints section would explain how complainants contacted OPS. The Analyst would then review CPRB hearing results for August and year-to-date. Productivity trends would compare cases opened and closed in 2025 and 2026. Finally, the Analyst would present data on the length of investigations, including historical averages and current backlog.	None
Case Status Overview	She reported that the final remaining case from 2022 had one sustained allegation and was forwarded to CDP for discipline in June	None



	2026, where it remains pending. In August 2026, OPS: • Received 29 new cases, • Administratively closed 3 cases (two involving unidentifiable officers and one involving a non-CDP employee), • Completed 8 investigations, which are now pending CPRB hearings (1 from 2023, 2 from 2024, and 5 from 2026), and • Moved 4 cases into “submitted for review.” The Analyst emphasized that case movement continues across multiple years, reflecting ongoing backlog and workload pressure.	
Case Status Overview (Graph + Narrative)	OPS currently has 400 active investigations from 2023–2026. This total includes 22 referred cases. There are 102 cases awaiting CPRB hearings, and 22 sustained cases awaiting discipline. The Analyst clarified that “active investigation” includes cases that are: • pending assignment, • under investigation, • submitted for review, or • referred to IA or another agency. Most cases awaiting CPRB hearings originate from 2025, and each of the years 2024–2026 has roughly 100 cases under investigation, showing consistent case volume across recent years.	None
Allegation Category Overview	OPS investigators have recorded 162 allegation categories so far in 2026. The most common allegation types remain: • Lack of Service (36%),	None



	• Improper Procedure (30%), and • Unprofessional Behavior (20%). The Analyst noted that allegation counts do not immediately reflect all complaints received, because investigators often record allegation types after initial intake. Since early August, OPS added 22 new allegations, including increases in Lack of Service, Improper Procedure, Unprofessional Behavior, Bias Policing, and Harassment.	
District Overview	Cases are distributed relatively evenly across Cleveland's five police districts. District 3 continues to have the highest number of active cases (78), while District 5 has the fewest (45). The Analyst highlighted that 76 cases list the district as "Unknown," which typically occurs when complainants cannot identify the officer's district assignment or when incidents occur outside district boundaries.	None
Sources of Complaints	OPS received 29 complaints in August . Approximately half were initiated either with a CDP officer or via email. Phone calls remain the most common method of filing complaints, with 53 phone-initiated complaints year-to-date and 6 in August . The Analyst clarified that "initiated with an officer" may occur either in the field or at a district station.	Q: Does "initiated with an officer" mean only in the field? A: No. It includes complaints initiated with an officer either in the field or at a district station.
CPRB Hearing Results (August 2026 + Year-to-Date)	Across 15 cases heard in August, CPRB adjudicated 52 allegations . Over 60% of these allegations were found unfounded , and 30% were either dismissed or exonerated. Year-to-date, CPRB has adjudicated 460 allegations across 115 cases . The majority of allegations have resulted in exonerated or unfounded dispositions. The Analyst clarified that 10% of adjudicated allegations in 2026 were sustained, noting that this percentage	None



	reflects adjudicated allegations—not total allegations received.	
OPS Productivity Trends	OPS has averaged 23 new cases per month and 11 closures per month in 2026. Case intake increased steadily from January through May, then rose sharply in June, July, and August, each month exceeding 29 new cases. Closures slowed significantly in April but recovered in May and have remained steady. Comparing 2026 to 2025, OPS averaged more closures in 2025 due to higher staffing levels (10 investigators versus 7 currently). The Analyst emphasized that staffing remains the strongest predictor of productivity. OPS expects improvements with recent hires and planned process enhancements.	Q: What does “negative 92 cases back” mean? A (Data Analyst): It means OPS has received 92 more cases than it has closed in 2026. Q: What is causing the gap between cases opened and cases closed? A: Staffing shortages. OPS is currently short four full-time investigators, and the Senior Investigator is carrying both a caseload and review duties. In 2025, the Senior Investigator did not carry a caseload, and OPS had more investigators overall. Q: Will productivity improve? A: Yes. OPS recently hired two new investigators and is revising investigation processes. Leadership expects productivity to increase.
CPRB Productivity Trends	CPRB adjudicated 50% more cases in August 2026 compared to August 2025. Year-to-date adjudications increased 64% compared to January–August 2025. The Analyst explained that the 15 cases heard in August were spread across two meetings, including a special virtual	None



	meeting scheduled to ensure timely adjudication and reduce backlog.	
Length of Investigations	The average investigation length across 2022–2026 is 294 days. Active cases have been open an average of 340 days, and cases awaiting CPRB hearings have been pending an average of 316 days. There are 39 cases that have been waiting for more than one year. The Analyst noted that investigation lengths for 2025 (108 days) and 2026 (56 days) appear significantly lower, but these averages should be interpreted cautiously because many cases from those years remain open. The Analyst explained how investigation length is calculated—from complaint receipt through senior investigator approval or administrative dismissal—and noted that referred cases may temporarily pause the timeline.	Q: Are weekends included in the calculation of investigation length? A (Data Analyst): Yes, weekends are included. OPS can explore calculating business-day averages but must also consider that complainants wait regardless of weekends. Q: Why are 2025 and 2026 averages so low? A: Many cases from those years are still open, so the averages reflect quicker cases (including administrative dismissals) rather than full-year complexity.
Thank you/ Closing	Analyst Bagley concluded the presentation and invited questions, comments, and feedback. They encouraged CPRB members to suggest additional reporting or data visualizations that would be helpful in future monthly reports.	Q: Is OPS data shared with Urban AI or available on the Open Data Portal? A (Data Analyst): Yes. OPS shares data with Urban AI, and a public dashboard exists on the Open Data Portal. It is not yet fully robust, but OPS is working on expanding it. Q: Can OPS track how often the Chief departs from CPRB decisions? A: The Analyst will check IAPro to see if this information



is captured. If not, OPS will explore ways to track and report Chief departures.

Q: Can OPS track how often the City's Use-of-Force expert disagrees with CPRB?

A: OPS will research who the expert is and determine how to track this information.

Additional Questions:

Q: Why is tracking Chief departures useful?

A (Administrator Wenninger): It allows OPS and CPRB to monitor the full lifecycle of a complaint, ensure transparency, and evaluate whether complainants and officers are treated fairly throughout the process.

Q: Is OPS exploring better data systems?

A: Yes. OPS is evaluating two companies that offer systems capable of capturing OPS-specific data needs. Staff will attend a conference in Florida to assess one of the systems.

Q: Is OPS capturing demographic data such as sexual orientation or gender identity?

A: Not consistently. Online forms include a dropdown, but paper forms do not. OPS will update complaint forms and phone intake procedures to capture this data to identify trends and ensure equitable treatment.

Q: How will expanded demographic data help?

A (Administrator): It will allow OPS to identify whether certain groups experience disproportionate complaint patterns and help inform City Council and community stakeholders.

VIII. Old Business

Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 3:02:05 – 3:02:21

- There were no Old Business Topics to Discuss



IX. **New Business**

Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 3:02:21 – 3:09:34

A. Investigator Davis Resignation

Motion: Accept Investigation Davis' Resignation effective as September 9th, 2026.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

B. OPS 2026-0029 Subpoena Request

Motion: Issue an administrative subpoena to Ohio Bureau of Motor Vehicles to obtain video footage relevant to OPS2026-0029.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

C. OPS 2026-0175 Subpoena Request

Motion: Issue an administrative subpoena to registered agent of JACK's Casino to obtain video footage relevant to OPS2025-0175.

Motion By: Vice Chair Miller

Seconded By: Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

X. **Public Comment**

Chenoa Miller, Vice Chair

YouTube Timestamp: 3:09:34 – 3:19:54

- No individuals were present for public comment.
- Officer Commendations
 - **Officer A. Waters Commendation:** A community member commended Officer Arius Waters for his exceptional mentorship and support in encouraging aspiring Black law enforcement candidates, noting that he personally motivated the individual's son to attend a recruiting event and continued offering guidance, resources, and encouragement even after the young man struggled on his initial



exam; his commitment to fostering opportunity, representation, and confidence in future officers reflects exemplary community-oriented policing and is deeply appreciated.

- **Officer B. Haill Commendation:** A community member praised Officer Brizillio Haill for his outstanding professionalism while directing heavy, chaotic traffic in the Hopkins Airport Arrivals area, noting that he managed vehicles and pedestrians with skill, authority, and calm awareness while maintaining a friendly and gracious demeanor; the citizen sought his name specifically to commend his courteous conduct, and Officer Haill responded with humility and appreciation.

The Admin Wenninger expressed its intention to formalize a process to provide official certificates for such commendations to be included in the officers' personnel files.

XI. Adjournment

CPRB

YouTube Timestamp: 3:19:54 – 3:20:31

Motion: Adjourn September 8th, 2026, CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Moore

Seconded By: Parker III

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB September 8th, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 3:07 pm EST.
- The following CPRB Meeting will be held in-person at City Hall, Room 514 on October 13th, 2026, at 9:15 a.m. EST.