



CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD

December 9th, 2025

MEETING MINUTES

CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

Brandon Brown, Chair
Kenneth Mountcastle, Vice Chair
Chenoa Miller
Edwin Moore
Billy Sharp
Waverly Willis

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Kristen Traxler, Interim Administrator
Art Bowker, Investigator
Adam Eisen, Investigator
LJ Green, Investigator
James Ouk, Investigator
Joseph Szymanski, Investigator

LEGAL COUNSEL

Michael Hess, Asst. Director of Law
Dalya Oprian, Asst. Director of Law

MEETING AGENDA

- I. **Call to Order** (Part 1 6:30-7:06) **Brandon Brown, Chair**
1. Chair Brown called December 9, 2025 hearing to order at 9:15 am EST.
 2. Roll Call
 - a. Members Diana Cyganovich, David Gatian, and Glenn Parker III had an excused absence.
 - b. A quorum was present
- II. **Approval of Minutes** (Part 1 7:12 - 7:43) **CPRB**
1. **November 11th Meeting Minutes – City Hall**

Motion: Approve November 11th, 2025 CPRB Meeting Minutes
Motion By: Member Sharp
Second By: Vice Chair Mountcastle
Motion Status: Carried
- III. **Public Comment** (Part 1 7:48 - 12:46) **Brandon Brown, Chair**
1. No individuals were present for Public Comment
 2. Chair Brown Statement
 - a. Motion Consolidations



- i. Chair Brown explained that the monitoring team, through Chief Meyers, has given guidance allowing the board to consolidate motions. Previously, each allegation against each officer required a separate motion, even when the findings were identical. Moving forward, if a single allegation applies to multiple officers and the finding is the same for all, one motion can cover them collectively. This change is intended to save significant time during meetings. To support this process, Chair Brown and the CPRB Administrative Assistant prepared a CPRB motion template to help board members craft motions that are succinct yet thorough. The template ensures clarity of rationale, makes it easier for the administrative assistant to record motions in written form, and encourages board members to participate more actively in motion-making.
- b. Case Reviews in SharePoint
 - ii. Chair Brown also highlighted the board's transition to SharePoint for case review. General Manager Jessyca Watson has set up an acknowledgement form system to ensure compliance with the manual requiring members to review cases before meetings. Board members are expected to check the acknowledgement box if they feel confident they have thoroughly reviewed the cases and are prepared to make decisions. Chair Brown emphasized using discretion similar to recusal standards, noting that it is not necessary to re-watch identical WCS footage multiple times when officers are at the same scene. Investigators already highlight key points in their reports, so members can rely on those summaries to supplement their review. He concluded by encouraging efficiency, clarity, and confidence in preparation as the board moves into the formal presentation of investigations.

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

Kristen Traxler
Interim Administrator

1. No Citizen Complainants or CDP Subject Employee
were present for case presentation

V. Presentation of Investigations

Kristen Traxler
Interim Administrator

OPS2022-0214

Timestamp: Part 1 (12:47 - 41:21)



Complainant: Awilda Martinez

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Colin Gill, #171

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Excessive Force

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

P.O. Molly Madaras, #1754

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Excessive Force

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

P.O. Ryan Sowders, #1103

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Excessive Force

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Summary of Case Presentation: On August 27, 2022, Ms. Awilda Martinez filed a complaint against Cleveland Division of Police Officers Colin Gill, Molly Madaras, and Ryan Sowders. She alleged unprofessional conduct, excessive force, and improper procedure during their response to her son's suicide attempt at her residence. Ms. Martinez stated that her son was unresponsive after ingesting pills, yet the officers treated him as a criminal rather than as someone experiencing a mental health crisis. She further alleged that one officer pulled her son's braids, another displayed a Taser, and that she herself was detained in a patrol car where she was denied access to her asthma inhaler.

The Office of Professional Standards investigated these allegations. Due to the deletion of body-worn camera footage under retention policies, there was insufficient evidence to determine whether unprofessional conduct or excessive force occurred. Regarding the allegation of improper procedure, the investigation concluded the claim was unfounded, as Ms. Martinez was detained and released in accordance with General Police Orders 2.01.02 and 2.01.03. The findings of the investigation are as follows: unprofessional conduct – insufficient evidence; excessive force – insufficient evidence; and improper procedure – unfounded.

Investigator Addendum: The case assignment history was complex. It was first assigned in August 2022 to a male investigator who later left OPS. It was reassigned in January 2023 to another investigator, who also resigned. In July 2024, the case was assigned to a female investigator who had only recently transitioned from a temporary hire to a city employee. She conducted her first officer interview nine days after assignment, about 84 days after being hired, without the oversight of a senior investigator. Because of these circumstances, her interviews were discounted. Although interviews were later redone, OPS determined that the initial flaws compromised the integrity of the evidence. As a result, OPS concluded that the allegations of unprofessional conduct and excessive force could not be sustained, and recommended findings of insufficient evidence.

Board Discussion Summary: The board focused heavily on the problematic officer interview conducted by a former OPS investigator. Members agreed that the interview was biased, leading,



and essentially pro-police, with the investigator complimenting officers and suggesting defenses rather than remaining neutral. This raised concerns about the integrity of the evidence, since officers' responses may have been shaped by the investigator's framing rather than their own recollections.

Board members asked whether newer investigators are now paired with senior staff to prevent similar issues. The administrator explained that a structured onboarding program exists, but the former investigator had not completed it, and their conduct was inconsistent with OPS standards. The administrator confirmed that all of that investigator's past cases are being audited—nine in total—with some reassigned due to similar concerns.

Retention of WCS (body camera) footage was another major issue. Some 2022 footage was lost due to retention limits or technical problems, which limited the board's ability to fully evaluate the case. Members emphasized that this should be tracked as an area of concern, though OPS noted that new systems like SharePoint should prevent similar problems going forward.

Deliberation then turned to whether the flawed interview could be salvaged. Some members felt that even though the interview was inappropriate, officers' comments while watching video might still hold value. Others argued that the bias was so severe that the interview should be disregarded entirely, likening it to inadmissible evidence in court. The administrator explained that interviews were redone, but without preserved WCS footage, the case ultimately became a "he said, she said" situation.

The consensus leaned toward insufficient evidence as the proper finding. Members acknowledged that this outcome is frustrating for the complainant, since investigative missteps and lost evidence undermine their case, but they agreed it was the most prudent and objective resolution. The deliberation closed with recognition that the board must remain critical of how interviews are conducted and ensure neutrality in future investigations.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, 5.09)

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Colin Gill, #171 P.O. Molly Madaras, #1754	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, lack of WCS footage and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Member Sharp- H as issue with the way the investigation was done Abstention: Member Miller- Had issues accessing SharePoint



Allegation B: Excessive Force (Manual Rule 4.05, GPO 2.01.03, 2.01.04)

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Colin Gill, #171 P.O. Molly Madaras, #1754	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews, lack of WCS footage and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Member Sharp- same rationale as Allegation A Abstention: Member Miller- same rationale as Allegation A

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest (GPO 2.01.02, 2.01.03)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Colin Gill, #171 P.O. Molly Madaras, #1754	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Second by: Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Member Sharp- same rationale as Allegation A Abstention: Member Miller- same rationale as Allegation A

P.O. Ryan Sowders, #1103

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rules 5.01, 5.08, 5.09)

Allegation B: Excessive Force (Manual Rule 4.05, GPO 2.01.03, 2.01.04)

Allegation C: Improper Procedure: Arrest (GPO 2.01.02, 2.01.03)

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/20/2023

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 11/20/2023

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 11/20/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2022-0307

Timestamp: Part 1 (41:29 – 50:01)

Complainant: Nathaniel Blevins
 Alexis Brown

Presented by: Ouk



Det. Timothy Hannon, #2065

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

Det. Demetrius Madison, #612

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

P.O. Alexander Parker, #1567

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

P.O. Thomas Pavlik, #2395

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop

Allegation B: Excessive Force

Summary of Case Presentation: On December 13, 2022, Mr. Nathaniel Blevins filed a complaint alleging excessive force and improper procedure during an encounter with Cleveland Division of Police officers on December 10, 2022. He reported that while working on his car, officers approached, struck him in the face, and slammed him to the ground. A co-complainant, Ms. Alexis Brown, alleged she was detained without cause and not read her rights. The identified officers were Detectives Tim Hannon and Demetrius Madison, and Officers Alexander Parker and Thomas Pavlik. The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage, which showed officers approaching calmly, explaining the stop, and using only minimal physical contact after Mr. Blevins attempted to flee. The footage also captured Ms. Brown being read her rights and consenting to a vehicle search. The investigation determined that the officers acted with reasonable suspicion based on the vehicle's match to one involved in a recent shooting and followed proper procedures under General Police Orders. The findings concluded that the allegations of excessive force and improper procedure were unfounded.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate further on this case. No questions, comments, or concerns were raised.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Stop (GPO 2.02.02, 2.02.05)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Timothy Hannon, #2065 Det. Demetrius Madison, #612 P.O. Alexander Parker, #1567 P.O. Thomas Pavlik, #2395	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Excessive Force (GPO 2.01.01)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Thomas Pavlik, #2395	<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: Willis Motion Status: Carried



OPS2023-0025

Timestamp: Part 1 (50:07 – 1:05:00)

Complainant: Chris Norek

Presented by: Szymanski

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service	Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Failure to Investigate)
P.O. Owen Johnson, #1373 P.O. Jazlyn Carson, #979 P.O. Trevor Smith, #1615 P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 Sgt. Gary Bartell, #9292 P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766 P.O. Rochelle Gamble, #170 P.O. Lakisha Harris, #958 P.O. Michael Cox, #163 P.O. Brittan Jackson, #824 P.O. Sierra Morris, #1258 P.O. Patrick Wells, #556 P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940 P.O. Peter Sains, #497 P.O. Christian Crane, #50 P.O. Cody Hutchinson, #2238 P.O. Nicholas Foster, #156 P.O. Johnathan Jereb, #1204	P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766 P.O. Rochelle Gamble, #170 P.O. Lakisha Harris, #958 P.O. Michael Cox, #163 P.O. Brittan Jackson, #824 P.O. Sierra Morris, #1258 P.O. Patrick Wells, #556 P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940 P.O. Peter Sains, #497 P.O. Christian Crane, #50 P.O. Cody Hutchinson, #2238 P.O. Nicholas Foster, #156 P.O. Johnathan Jereb, #1204

Summary of Case Presentation: On February 7, 2023, Mr. Chris Norek filed a complaint alleging lack of service by 5th District patrol officers in response to recurring disturbances and gun-related activity at the Lady Luck Bar. He reported issues dating back to January 2021, including loud music, suspected drug activity, illegal parking, and gunfire, and claimed officers often delayed or failed to act on his noise complaints. He further alleged that after shootings, officers did not properly search for shell casings or review his surveillance footage, and on several occasions declined to document evidence he offered. In later interviews, Mr. Norek described additional incidents of gunfire near his home and alleged inadequate follow-up by responding officers, though one road sergeant did review and document his video. He also reported a bar security guard firing at suspects in April 2023 and another shooting in October 2023 where officers allegedly failed to fully investigate.

The OPS investigation concluded during the April 26, 2023 incident, officers acted appropriately by collecting shell casings, reviewing and documenting surveillance video, and issuing reports. Allegations that officers refused to view video or failed to investigate were not supported, as



body-worn camera footage and documentation showed proper dispatch, scene assessment, and follow-up consistent with CDP manual rules. For other alleged incidents, such as the June 19, 2022 defecation event and claims that officers ignored surveillance after hearing gunshots, OPS found no corroborating evidence. Searches of WCS, CAD, and reports from 2021 through 2023 revealed no records, and the complainant could not provide specific dates, officer names, badge numbers, or unit identifiers. Based on this, OPS recommended that allegations of insufficient service and failure to investigate be unfounded, since officers' actions aligned with policy and supervisory standards. In some cases, officers were exonerated because their WCS showed they remained on scene, coordinated with supervisors, reviewed video, and issued reports, with no crime scene processing obligations triggered. OPS also recommended administrative dismissal for allegations involving non-CDP employees who had resigned and for incidents tied to unidentified officers where no evidence or records could be located. Overall, OPS concluded that the complainant's allegations were either unfounded, exonerated, or administratively dismissed due to proper officer conduct, lack of corroborating evidence, or inability to identify the officers involved.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate on this case, there were no further question, comments or concerns raised.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

(GPO 4.05.02, 5.10.01, Manual Rules 4.06, 4.11, 7.04, 7.05)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Owen Johnson, #1373 P.O. Jazlyn Carson, #979 P.O. Trevor Smith, #1615 P.O. Justin Longstreet, #2061 Sgt. Gary Bartell, #9292 P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766 P.O. Rochelle Gamble, #170 P.O. Lakisha Harris, #958 P.O. Michael Cox, #163 P.O. Brittan Jackson, #824 P.O. Sierra Morris, #1258 P.O. Patrick Wells, #556 P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940 P.O. Peter Sains, #497 P.O. Christian Crane, #50	<p><i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i></p>	<p>Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried</p>

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Failure to Investigate)



(GPO 5.10.01, Manual Rules 4.06, 4.11, 4.18, 9.05)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Vickie Phillips, #1766 P.O. Rochelle Gamble, #170 P.O. Lakisha Harris, #958 P.O. Michael Cox, #163 P.O. Brittan Jackson, #824 P.O. Sierra Morris, #1258 P.O. Patrick Wells, #556 P.O. Nathan Dawson, #940 P.O. Peter Sains, #497 P.O. Christian Crane, #50	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

P.O. Cody Hutchinson, #2238

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Failure to Investigate)

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 06/29/2023

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 06/29/2023

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 06/29/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

P.O. Nicholas Foster, #156

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Failure to Investigate)

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 04/19/2023

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 04/19/2023

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 04/19/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

P.O. Johnathan Jereb, #1204

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Failure to Investigate)

OPS Action: ADMINISTRATIVELY

CPRB Recommendation: ADMINISTRATIVELY

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 09/28/2023

DISMISSED – CDP Separated 09/28/2023



Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 09/28/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

OPS2023-0082

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:05:06 – 1:10:23)

Complainant: Rodell Golphin

Presented by: Ouk

Det. Kevin McCarthy, #283

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Det. Bolivar Villafuerte, #1608

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

P.O. Deonte White, #437

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Sgt. Ian Lower, #9248

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest

Summary of Case Presentation: On April 16, 2023, Mr. Rodell Golphin filed a complaint alleging lack of service and improper procedure involving Officers Bolivar Villafuerte, Deonte White, Sergeant Ian Lower, and Detective Kevin McCarthy. He reported that police responded to a domestic situation between himself and Ms. Jakeya Roserie, with whom he shares a child. Mr. Golphin alleged that officers failed to take his statement or consider his side of the incident, and that his arrest was improper since Ms. Roserie did not request that he be taken into custody.

OPS reviewed Mr. Gin's allegations that officers failed to take his side of the story and improperly arrested him despite the victim not wanting charges. Body-worn camera footage showed that Officer Vilforte remained with Mr. Gin during the investigation and listened to his account. Based on the evidence, Mr. Gin was determined to be the primary aggressor, and CDP policy (GPO 5.0501) requires arrest of the primary aggressor even if the victim does not request it. The officers consulted their supervisor, Sergeant Lower, who confirmed the arrest decision. The case was then assigned to Detective McCarthy, who completed the investigation and issued charges for domestic violence and aggravated menacing to the prosecutor.

OPS concluded that the allegation of lack of service was unfounded, since the officers did take Mr. Gin's statement and followed proper procedures. The allegation of improper arrest procedure was exonerated, as the arrest did occur but was consistent with CDP policy and Ohio law.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate on this case, there were no further question, comments or concerns raised.



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rules 4.03)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Kevin McCathy, #283 Det. Bolivar Villafuerte, #1608 P.O. Deonte White, #437 Sgt. Ian Lower, #9248	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Arrest (GPO 5.05.01, 4.05.01)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Bolivar Villafuerte, #1608 P.O. Deonte White, #437 Sgt. Ian Lower, #9248	<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 Orders 5.05.01 & 4.05.01.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0097

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:10:30 – 1:23:41)

Complainant: Samone Moore

Presented by: Ouk

Sgt. Andre Bays, #9300

Allegation A: Property: Damage

Det. Tia Hargrove, #1560

Allegation A: Property: Damage

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Det. Bryan Gron, #2063

Allegation A: Property: Damage

P.O. Daniel McCandless, #644

Allegation A: Property: Damage

Det. Tywon Little, 2177

Allegation A: Property: Damage

P.O. Braden Jerrel, #2076

Allegation A: Property: Damage

Det. Brian Sabolik, #1021

Allegation A: Property: Damage



Summary of Case Presentation: On May 4, 2023, Ms. Samone Moore filed a complaint alleging property damage and unprofessional conduct during the execution of a search warrant at her home. She reported damage to her door, windows, furniture, and ceiling, and further alleged that Detective Tia Hargrove acted unprofessionally toward a minor present. The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage and determined that the property damage was consistent with the lawful execution of the warrant and therefore exonerated. However, the footage confirmed Detective Hargrove used inappropriate language and profanity toward the minor, and the allegation of unprofessional conduct was sustained.

Board Discussion Summary: The board separated discussion into two parts. For Allegation A (property damage), members noted the damage was significant since officers used a battering ram to knock down a door. However, there was consensus that the action was justified because it was carried out in furtherance of serving a valid warrant. With no questions or objections raised, the recommendation of exoneration stood without debate.

For Allegation B (unprofessional conduct) involving Detective Hargrove's interaction with a minor on scene, the board engaged in deeper discussion. Members acknowledged that the officer's language was inappropriate, but some felt her overall demeanor was not excessively unprofessional given the teenager's attempts to escalate the situation. It was noted that the minor's uncle, himself an officer, described her as disrespectful, which added context. Several members reflected on whether cultural differences or community expectations should influence how such interactions are judged, while others emphasized that officers must always be held to a higher professional standard regardless of context or family involvement. The board recognized the gray area between human interactions and professional expectations, but ultimately stressed that officers, by virtue of their training and role, should be held to stricter standards of conduct.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Property: Damage (GPO 2.02.03)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Sgt. Andre Bays, #9300 Det. Bryan Gron, #2063 Det. Tywon Little, 2177 Det. Brian Sabolik, #1021 Det. Tia Hargrove, #1560 P.O. Daniel McCandless, #644 P.O. Braden Jerrel, #2076	<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 Orders 2.02.03.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried



Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rules 5.01, 5.02, 5.08, 5.09, 5.11)

OPS Recommendation: **Sustained**

CPRB Decision: **Sustained**

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Tia Hargrove, #1560	<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 Manual Rules 5.01, 5.02, 5.08, 5.09, and 5.11.</i>	<p>Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p> <p>Group Level: Group Level I Explanation: Detective Hargrove use of cursing toward a minor on scene constituted discourtesy and rudeness Group I. Officers should be held at a higher standard by virtue of their training and role.</p> <p>Motion by: Willis Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried</p>

OPS2023-0149

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:23:49 – 1:30:05)

Complainant: Anonymous

Presented by: Green

P.O. Chaze Henderson, # 1533

Allegation A: Improper Procedure

Summary of Case Presentation: On June 22, 2023, the Office of Professional Standards received an anonymous complaint alleging improper procedure by Cleveland Division of Police Officer Chaze Henderson. The complainant reported that on June 21, 2023, at approximately 11:30 p.m., Zone Car #247 was observed running a red light at West 25th Street and Wade Avenue without the use of lights or sirens. OPS later identified Officer Henderson as the driver of the vehicle.

OPS explained that they reviewed the complaint by checking Google Maps for travel distance and AL history showing the officer's vehicle in the area. However, they could not determine whether the officer ran a red light without lights or sirens in violation of emergency response driving rules. Because the available evidence did not establish whether the alleged conduct occurred, OPS recommended that the allegation of improper procedure against Patrol Officer Chase Henderson be classified as insufficient evidence.



Board Discussion Summary: The board focused on whether sufficient evidence existed to confirm the complainant's allegation that the officer ran a red light without lights or sirens. Members questioned the investigator about the absence of camera footage at the intersection of West 25th and Wade Avenue. The investigator explained that they did not request footage because they were unsure if a camera even existed there, and by the time the case was reviewed in 2025, any 2023 footage would no longer have been retained. Instead, the investigator relied on zone car records and AL history to track the officer's location between 11:20 and 11:35 p.m., noting that the officer arrived at the residence at 11:31, which made it unlikely he was at the intersection at the time alleged. Board members acknowledged that without camera evidence, the investigation could not definitively establish whether the violation occurred, and discussion centered on the limits of available evidence and the resulting inability to reach a conclusive finding.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure (GPO 4.01.01)

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Chaze Henderson, # 1533	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0153

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:30:10 – 1:35:11)

Complainant: Tiffany Allen

Presented by: Szymanski

P.O. Louis Broschk, #1510

P.O. James Brooks, #1014

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On June 27, 2023, the Office of Professional Standards received a complaint from Ms. Tiffany Allen alleging harassment, lack of service, and misconduct by Cleveland Division of Police officers. She described dispatchers refusing to send police to her calls, being hung up on by an officer-in-charge, officers refusing to complete reports, and even claimed CDP hacked her Uber account to send her to unsafe pick-ups. However, many of her allegations lacked specific dates, officer names, or identifiable CDP members, which limited OPS's ability to investigate.

OPS reviewed the specific incidents. Allegations against Officer Louis Broschk were administratively dismissed under Section 703a because he is no longer a CDP employee.



Allegations against Officer James Brooks were found unfounded, as CAD entries, incident reports, and subject activity records showed he complied with Manual Rule 4.18 by creating the required case detail report. The remaining allegations—including harassment, dispatcher refusals, and the Uber account claim—were administratively dismissed under Section 703b because they involved unidentified officers or were directed broadly at the entire division.

In conclusion, OPS determined that no misconduct could be substantiated. Allegations were either administratively dismissed due to jurisdictional limits or lack of identifiable officers, or found unfounded based on documented compliance with CDP policy. This outcome underscores the importance of providing specific details—such as officer names, dates, or report numbers—when filing complaints, so OPS can fully investigate and hold members accountable when appropriate.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate on this case, there were no further question, comments or concerns raised.

Case Findings:

P.O. Louis Broschk, #1510

Allegation A: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service

OPS Action: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 06/22/2023

CPRB Recommendation: **ADMINISTRATIVELY DISMISSED** – CDP Separated 06/22/2023

Administratively dismissed due to the individual no longer being employed by the Cleveland Division of Police (CDP) as of 06/22/2023. As such, the matter falls outside the jurisdiction of the Civilian Police Review Board's Office of Professional Standards (OPS).

Allegation B: Lack of Service: No Service (Manual Rule 4.18)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. James Brooks, #1014	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0160

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:35:17 – 1:44:19)

Complainant: Cynthia Long

Presented by: Szymanski



P.O. Nicholas Conn, #1526

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Biased Policing

P.O. Matthew Ratti, #2318

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Allegation C: Biased Policing

Summary of Case Presentation: On July 3, 2023, Officers Matthew Ratti and Nicholas Conn responded to a residence on East 56th Street to assist Ms. Cynthia Long in retrieving her property. The officers de-escalated a dispute between Ms. Long and the involved parties, separated those present, and facilitated the safe recovery of her belongings. They further offered transportation assistance, helping her load items into an Uber vehicle. Throughout the encounter, the officers demonstrated professionalism and impartiality, acting in full compliance with CDP Manual Rules and General Police Orders.

Board Discussion Summary: The board did not deliberate on this case, there were no further question, comments or concerns raised.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.01, 4.11, 4.18, GPO 2.01.02)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Nicholas Conn, #1526 P.O. Matthew Ratti, #2318	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was consistent with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 4.01, 4.11, 4.18 and General Police Orders 2.01.02.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried Opposed: Chair Brown recommends a finding of unfounded

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.08, 5.09)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Nicholas Conn, #1526 P.O. Matthew Ratti, #2318	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried



Allegation C: Biased Policing (GPO 1.07.08)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Nicholas Conn, #1526 P.O. Matthew Ratti, #2318	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Willis Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0192

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:44:31– 1:56:48)

Complainant: Yuliana Molina

Presented by: Bowker

P.O. Adam Hayes, #2163

P.O. Lamar Heath, #817

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On January 3, 2023, Ms. Yuliana Molina Villanueva, a Limited English Proficient individual, alleged lack of service by Officers Adam Hayes and Lamar Heath during their response to a traffic accident. She stated that the officers did not listen to her version of events, failed to provide a report number, and did not inform her where her vehicle was being towed. The Office of Professional Standards reviewed body-worn camera footage, incident reports, and interviews, and found that Ms. Villanueva did not request an interpreter and that exigent circumstances required immediate action before language assistance could be provided. The officers nevertheless obtained accurate accident information, later confirmed by the complainant, and provided her with a report number and towing details. OPS recommended findings of exonerated for both officers, noting the complaint was filed outside the six-month window for disciplinary action. The Board may also consider recommending updates to GPO 5.12.04 to reflect current translation technologies.

Board Discussion Summary: The board's deliberation centered on when officers must seek interpreters for limited-English speakers and how current policy applies in hazardous situations. Members confirmed that under CDP policy (5.12.04), officers should provide an interpreter when requested, but scene safety and exigent circumstances take priority—relevant here because the incident occurred on a highway exit ramp where clearing the scene quickly was necessary. The investigator noted emerging translation capabilities tied to Axon's wearable camera system that can facilitate real-time communication, prompting board discussion about the need for clear regulation on using AI translation tools: which systems are approved, accuracy standards, and limits on relying on AI for investigative determinations, given the risk that mistranslations could affect cases. The board also addressed a badge number discrepancy for PO Hayes, weighing



exhibit references showing 2376 against other materials listing 2163, and asked the CPRB Administrative Assistant to verify and finalize the correct badge number from the exhibits. Administrator Traxler confirmed the badge number for P.O. Adam Hayes was correctly listed on the agenda.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.01, 4.18, GPO 5.12.04)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Adam Hayes, #2163 P.O. Lamar Heath, #817	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was consistent with the standards outlined in Manual Rules 4.01, 4.18 and General Police Orders 5.12.04.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

Motion: Instruct Civilian Police Review Board CPRB Administrative Assistant, Mrs. Fair, to draft a letter to the Cleveland Police Commission (CPC) to update General Police Order 5.12.04 as it relates to Wearable Body Camera System (WCS), cellphone, and other technology to include AI generated language translation for Cleveland Department of Police encounters.

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Sharp

Motion: Carried

OPS2023-0219

Timestamp: Part 1 (1:56:55– 2:00:48)

Complainant: Andrea Rhoades

Presented by: Eisen

Det. Andrew Hayduk, #349

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Search

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 7, 2023, Ms. Andrea Rhoades filed a complaint alleging improper procedure against Detective Andrew Hayduk after her phone was taken as evidence during the execution of a search warrant at her home. The Office of Professional Standards determined that officers were acting under a signed warrant, and Ms. Rhoades voluntarily provided her phone and password. Body-worn camera footage confirmed the conduct occurred in compliance with law and CDP Detective Unit Manual Responsibility #9. OPS therefore recommended a finding of exonerated for the allegation of improper procedure.



Board Discussion Summary: The Board did not have further deliberation on this case. There were no questions, comments, or concerns raised.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Search (Detective Responsibilities, #9)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Andrew Hayduk, #349	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur and was consistent with the standards outlined Detective Responsibilities, #9.</i>	Motion by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0221

Timestamp: Part 1 (2:01:02 – 2:04:06)

Complainant: Myisha Gonzalez

Presented by: Ouk

P.O. Neil Pesta, #981

P.O. Joseph Fitchwell, #134

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 9, 2023, Ms. Myisha Gonzalez filed a complaint alleging lack of service after officers declined to take her report regarding what she believed was an unlawful eviction from her apartment. She stated that her belongings were removed and locks changed despite her rent being paid in full through EDEN housing assistance. The Office of Professional Standards reviewed the matter and found that the eviction process was improperly handled by the landlord, but noted that evictions are civil matters overseen by the Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Department, not the Cleveland Division of Police. OPS therefore recommended findings of exonerated for Officers Neil Pesta and Joseph Fitchwell, concluding their actions were consistent with law and General Police Orders. This case was consolidated with a related complaint, OPS2023-0230, and finalized under OPS2023-0221.

Board Discussion Summary: The Board did not have further deliberation on this case. There were no questions, comments, or concerns raised.



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: No Service (Manual Rule 3.02)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Neil Pesta, #981 P.O. Joseph Fitchwell, #134	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was consistent with the standards outlined Manual Rule 3.02.</i>	Motion by: Moore Second by: Sharp Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0242

Timestamp: Part 1 (2:04:12 – 2:12:12)

Complainant: Nastassia Davis
Zyion Davis

Presented by: Eisen

P.O. Jose Garcia, #2168

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Tow

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On September 29, 2023, Ms. Nastassia Davis filed a complaint alleging improper citation, improper tow, and unprofessional conduct by Officer Jose Garcia. She claimed her vehicle was wrongly cited for a hit-skip, improperly towed, and that the officer threatened her son. The investigation found that Ms. Davis's son was driving the vehicle when it struck a parked car and then moved down the street, which met the definition of a hit-skip. Body-worn camera footage and witness statements confirmed Officer Garcia followed proper procedure in issuing the citation and authorizing the tow under CDP policy and city ordinance. There was no evidence to substantiate the allegation of a threat. OPS recommended findings of exonerated for the citation and tow, and insufficient evidence for unprofessional conduct.

Board Discussion Summary: The board's deliberation focused on two main issues: the complainant's refusal to make her son available for interview and the interpretation of the alleged "hit skip" incident. Members noted that although the son was a direct witness, the complainant declined to provide access even after he turned 18, limiting the investigation to her own statements.

Discussion then turned to the vehicle's movement. The complainant's car was driven down the street and parked in front of another house, raising questions about whether this constituted an attempt to avoid detection. Officer Garcia explained that once the vehicle left the immediate scene, it qualified as a hit skip, though he did not issue a citation and only documented the call.



Board members considered whether the car's poor condition meant it could not travel farther, and acknowledged conflicting accounts, including WCS footage showing the complainant on the phone while her son remained with the vehicle.

Ultimately, the board recognized that officer discretion played a role and that the evidence did not clearly establish misconduct. Members agreed there was not enough in the record to challenge the officer's handling of the situation.

Case Findings:

Allegation A: Improper Procedure: Citation (GPO 8.01.04, CCO 405.02)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Jose Garcia, #2168	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was consistent with the standards outlined General Police Orders 8.01.04 and Cleveland Codified Ordinance 405.02.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Improper Procedure: Tow (GPO 8.01.04, CCO 405.02)

OPS Recommendation: Exonerated

CPRB Decision: Exonerated

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Jose Garcia, #2168	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written reports, supports that the alleged conduct did occur but was consistent with the standards outlined General Police Orders 8.01.04 and Cleveland Codified Ordinance 405.02.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

Allegation C: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
P.O. Jose Garcia, #2168	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Chair Brown Second by: Vice Chair Mountcastle Motion Status: Carried

OPS2023-0263

Timestamp: Part 1 (2:12:19 – 2:21:40)

Complainant: Thomasina Thomas

Presented by: Eisen



Det. Shane Bauhof, #1637

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct

Summary of Case Presentation: On October 31, 2023, Ms. Thomasina Thomas filed a complaint alleging lack of service and unprofessional conduct by Detective Shane Bauhof, the lead investigator in her niece's homicide case. She stated that he only spoke with her by phone and was rude during those conversations. The investigation found that Detective Bauhof had met with the victim's parents and key witnesses on scene, obtained statements, and followed investigative procedures consistent with Manual Rule 4.18 and Detective Manual Rules 1, 4, 5, and 6. Regarding the allegation of unprofessional conduct, OPS noted conflicting accounts of the phone conversations and no recordings were available to verify the claims. OPS therefore recommended a finding of unfounded for lack of service and insufficient evidence for unprofessional conduct.

Board Discussion Summary: The board's deliberation began with acknowledgment of the graphic body-worn camera footage showing the murder scene, which members noted was difficult to view but necessary for context. They clarified that the allegations themselves did not directly relate to the footage and confirmed the matter was still part of an ongoing investigation.

The main discussion focused on whether officers should be required to record phone conversations with complainants or witnesses. Members recognized recurring challenges when allegations arise from phone calls—such as claims of rudeness—that cannot be corroborated without recordings. Current policy requires recording only if a conversation is contentious or directly tied to an investigation, but board members debated whether this standard is sufficient. They considered whether to recommend that the Community Police Commission (CPC) review and potentially update the manual to address modern practices, including retention policies and the use of department phones versus body-worn cameras.

Ultimately, the board acknowledged the difficulty of legislating every phone interaction, noting that without recordings many such cases default to insufficient evidence. Members agreed that while they could ask CPC to examine the issue further, their immediate role was to adjudicate the case at hand, recognizing the limits of current policy and evidence.



Case Findings:

Allegation A: Lack of Service: Insufficient Service (Manual Rule 4.18, Detective Rules #1, #4, #5, #6)

OPS Recommendation: Unfounded

CPRB Decision: Unfounded

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Shane Bauhof, #1637	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Allegation B: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct (Manual Rule 5.01)

OPS Recommendation: Insufficient Evidence

CPRB Decision: Insufficient Evidence

Against	Rationale	Motion
Det. Shane Bauhof, #1637	<i>The preponderance of the evidence, including interviews and written documentation, fails to establish whether the alleged conduct did or did not occur.</i>	Motion by: Sharp Second by: Moore Motion Status: Carried

Chief Departures

OPS2024-0254

Timestamp: Part 1 (2:21:35 – 2:40:11)

Complainant: Chad Mayse

Presented by: Admin Traxler

P.O. Michael Januszczak, #1967

Allegation: Unprofessional Behavior/Conduct & lack of Service

CPRB Recommendation: Sustained

Chief's Departure Recommendation: Allegations Merged and Group Level reduced to Group I Violation – Written Reprimand

CPRB Recommendation: The Civilian Police Review Board recommended sustaining both allegations. The Board found that Januszczak refused to assist a visibly injured complainant following an assault, violating Manual of Rules 5.01, 5.02, 5.08, and 5.09 (Group I Violation – Lack of Service). The Board also found that threatening to handcuff the complainant constituted unprofessional behavior inconsistent with Division standards, violating the same rules (Group II Violation – Unprofessional Conduct).

Chief's Departure Justification: Chief Todd concurred that Januszczak's conduct was outside of policy and inconsistent with standards requiring courtesy and respect. However, she noted that Januszczak was not the primary officer but assisting in a chaotic scene while guarding a suspect.



His directive for the complainant to return across the street, including the statement about handcuffs, was determined to more closely comport with a Group I violation rather than Group II.

Board Discussion: The board discussed the Chief's departure from their original recommendation. The Chief acknowledged that the officer's conduct was improper but argued that the two specifications: lack of service and unprofessional conduct should be merged into a single violation. She recommended it be classified as a Group I violation with a written reprimand, rather than a Group II violation, which would carry a more serious penalty.

Board members revisited their earlier reasoning. They had elevated the case to Group II because the complainant was visibly injured and the officer threatened handcuffs instead of offering assistance, which they viewed as both a denial of service and rudeness. Several members emphasized that these were distinct actions: failing to provide aid and using threatening language. Others noted the chaotic circumstances on West 6th Street and considered whether the officer was focused on crowd control rather than ignoring the injured person.

Ultimately, the board weighed whether the Chief's rationale provided "clear and convincing" grounds to change their original finding. Some found the argument persuasive, seeing the incident as one continuous act that could be merged into a single violation. Others maintained that the officer's behavior involved two separate wrongs. The discussion closed with recognition that the board had two options: adopt the Chief's recommendation for a Group I violation and written reprimand, or reaffirm their original Group II finding.

Motion: To Adopt the Chief's Departure as Chief Todd provided clear and convincing evidence to merge the two allegations into a singular Group Level I violation with a written reprimand.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

Opposed: Member Sharp & Vice Chair Mountcastle- Do not believe chief provided clear and convincing evidence to overturns the board's original findings and group level.

Motion: Instruct CPRB Administrative Assistant to include the Chief's Rationale for combining the allegations in Amended Findings Letter.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Sharp

Motion Status: Carried



Motion: OPS to issue subpoenas in case 2025-0195 to obtain the names and contact information of all personnel involved in the alleged incident, including off-duty Cleveland Division of Police officers and security staff present at the business.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Second by: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

Meeting Recess:

Chair Brown called for a 30- minute meeting recess starting at 12:00pm EST.

Meeting Resumed promptly at 12:39 pm EST.

(Interrupted by Alarm System; all attendees evacuated the building; As a result there is a Part 2)

VI. Executive Session (Part 2 – 00:00:01- 2:17:48)

CPRB

- **Motion:** To enter executive session for personnel, Employment and discipline Matters will be considered. Inviting Legal Michael Hess, Dayla Oprian, Human Resources, Administrator Traxler, and Community Engagement Officer Samantha Monatez.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Seconded by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

- Executive Session began at 12:40 pm EST
- Adjourn back into open session at 2:57 pm EST

VII. OPS Status Report (Part 1- 2:43:17 – 2:43:23)

Kristen Traxler

In November, OPS received a total of 20 new complaints. Of those, 6 were administratively dismissed, resulting in 14 new cases being retained for investigation.

Interim Administrator

VIII. Old Business

Brandon Brown, Chair

A. No old business was discussed

IX. New Business (Part 2 – 2:17:52- 2:25:45)

Brandon Brown, Chair

A. Case Reviews in SharePoint

- i. Chair Brown addressed this matter during Public Comment



B. OPS Dashboard

Motion: Approve OPS Dashboard as constructed to be presented to Data/IT team.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Seconded by: Vice Chair Mountcastle

Motion Status: Carried

C. Winter Virtual CPRB Meeting Scheduling

- i. January, February, and March will be held virtually instead of in-person.
- ii. Additional CPRB Virtual CPRB Meetings will be held on Tuesday, January 27th and Wednesday, February 25th of 2026.

D. OPS Senior Investigation Resignation

Motion: Accept Vince Funari resignation from the OPS Senior Investigation Position effective November 17, 2025.

Motion by: Chair Brown

Seconded by: Miller

Motion Status: Carried

X. Adjournment

CPRB

Motion: To Adorn December 9th CPRB Meeting

Motion By: Chair Brown

Seconded By: Moore

Motion Status: Carried

- The CPRB December 9, 2025 meeting was adjourned at 3:01 pm EST.
- The CPRB Meeting will be held virtually January 13th, 2026 at 9:15 am EST.