



Board

Present Brooke Burns, Chair
Absent Dr. Chenelle Jones, Vice Chair
Present Dr. James Ford
Present Pastor Richard Nathan
Present Kellye Pinkleton
Present Kyle Strickland
Absent Josue' Vicente
Present Mary Younger

Guests

Present Jacqueline Hendricks
Present Richard Blunt II
Present Stephanie Brock
Absent Robert Tobias
Absent Tiara Ross
Present Chief Elaine Bryant
Present Assistant Chief Nick Konves

WELCOME

Chair Burns called the meeting to order at 2:00PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Dr. James Ford made a motion; Crystal Jackson seconded to approve the June 4, 2024 meeting minutes. Minutes approved unanimously.

UPDATE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Inspector General Hendricks gave the Civilian Police Review Board a Summary of Complaints and Investigation Data for the month of July.

UPDATE FROM CHIEF OF POLICE

Chief Bryant received a memo from the CPRB containing a list of questions. Chief Bryant went through the questions and responded. Below are the questions that were sent to Chief Bryant. Chief Bryant's responses and additional questions from the CPRB are listed under the "*Questions and Recommendations*" section at the end of these minutes.

- What is the process for reviewing the final reports and recommendations that come from the Board to the Chief of Police?
- What are the outcomes of the cases that have already been sent to the Chief?
- What are the outcomes of the policy recommendations that have been sent to the Chief by the Board? And is anyone tracking those policy recommendations?
- Can we create a process whereby the Board receives periodic reports back on the progress and/or final outcome of the recommendations that were made of the Chief of Police?
- What are benefits that the Chief has noticed- if any- following the CRB creation? What feedback does she hear from officers on a review board? What is the general feeling from CPD on having such a board/process?



- What does the Chief feel are the biggest challenges in Columbus for police-citizen relations? What are the opportunities? How can the CRB better engage?
- Are there plans to integrate implicit bias and/or cultural competence training into the use of force training module at the police academy?
- Are there or should there be different policies or procedures regarding use of force when it comes to mental health crisis?
- Does CPD have a system for tracking cases that have been considered by the Board/DIG and IAB?
- What is the process for CPD to contact a civilian when CPD has items in custody that are not being retained for a case (e.g., a driver's license)?
- Can you please explain the policy reason for special duty officers not wearing BWC?
- What is the corrective action for police officers who repeatedly do not turn on their BWC?

Break at: 2:58p

Return: 3:10p

REVIEW OF INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

REVIEW OF PENDING CASES FROM JUNE:

Committee #2: 24-0009, 24-0024, 24-0106, 24-0130, 24-0145, 24-0229, 24-0272 and 24-0287

2024-0009:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged on December 28, 2023, he called 911 about his house being shot and no one ever came to make a report.
2. The complainant alleged on January 1, 2024, shots were fired at his neighbor's house, and when officers responded an officer stated "This is the west side what do you expect?"

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded
2. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous



2024-0024:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged an officer who responded to a call to her home was aggressive, abrasive, and pushy.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0106:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged that during the 11:00 PM hour on January 22, 2024, a police officer driving police cruiser 9171, without lights and sirens on, was driving northbound on 315 at 90 mph in a marked 65 mph zone.
2. The complainant alleged that during the 11:00 PM hour on January 22, 2024, a police officer driving police cruiser 9171, without lights and sirens on, made a left turn onto Henderson Road during a red light.

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated
2. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0130:

Allegation:

1. The complainant stated he approached a parked police unit to request assistance and found the officer asleep.
2. The complainant alleged after he explained the situation to the officer, the officer advised him, there was nothing he could do because they were on private property.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded
2. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0145:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged her son's father was violating their court order by not returning the child and officers failed to make him return the child back to her.
2. The complainant alleged when she went to the police station for further assistance, the officer stated there was nothing further that could be done.



3. The complainant alleged when she went to the police station for further assistance the officer lacked compassion for her situation and snatched a brochure from her.

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated
2. Exonerated
3. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0229:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the officer informed him he could either walk away or be arrested for a warrant. The complainant alleged he did not have a warrant.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

Additional DIG Allegation/Recommendation:

Allegation:

1. The Officer failed to activate his body worn camera during this interaction with the complainant.

Recommendation:

1. Sustained

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0272:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the officer told him, "If we catch him out and about in a car, we will pull up on him with guns drawn, and if he reaches for anything we will shoot to kill him."

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous



2024-0287:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged, in summary, a police officer is in violation of CPD policy regarding social media and civic engagement with their LinkedIn account being physically linked to the Columbus Division of Police's LinkedIn account.

Recommendation:

1. Sustained

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

REVIEW OF CASES ASSIGNED IN JUNE:

Committee #1: 24-0054, 24-0220, 24-0239, 24-0309, 24-0379, 24-0381 and 24-0519

Committee #3: 24-0260, 24-0307, 24-0336, 24-0387, 24-0412 and 24-0594

Committee #2: 24-0066, 24-0214, 24-0259, 24-0298, 24-0477 and 24-0588

2024-0054:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the Officer engaged in online harassment toward him on a social media platform.

Recommendation:

1. Sustained

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0024:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged an officer who responded to a call to her home was aggressive, abrasive, and pushy.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0239:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the Sergeant followed her vehicle with his police cruiser.

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan

Second: Dr. James Ford



Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0309:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged a CPD officer came up on him and pointed his weapon at him.
2. The complainant alleged the officer detained and searched him without consent.
3. The complainant alleged the officer slammed him into a police car.
4. The complainant alleged the officer was rude to him.

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated
2. Unfounded
3. Unfounded
4. Unfounded

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0379:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the Officer did not file a traffic crash report.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0381:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged he was involved in an accident and the officer did not provide him with the other driver's information.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan

Second: Dr. James Ford

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0519:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged that during the course of a search of the complainant's property, involved CPD officers did "excessive" damage to his property.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Pastor Rich Nathan



Second: Dr. James Ford
Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0260:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged he was stopped twice and cited for multiple citations without an explanation.
2. The complainant alleged the officer was rude.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded
2. Unfounded

Motion: Mary Younger

Second: Pastor Rich Nathan

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0307:

Allegation:

1. The responding officers did not conduct a proper investigation of the incident by not completing a police report.
2. The officers did not perform a “road side test” on the driver that struck her daughter’s vehicle.

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated
2. Exonerated

Motion: Mary Younger

Second: Pastor Rich Nathan

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0336:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged on January 16, 2024 after declining a CPD officer for a date in person, he again asked her on a date via text message later that day.
2. The complainant alleged that a CPD officer referred to her as a “bitch” on February 18, 2024.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded
2. Sustained

Motion: Mary Younger

Second: Pastor Rich Nathan

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous



2024-0387:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged on February 23, 2024, the complainant made a call to 911 for assistance to report telephone harassment and the responding officer did not complete a report.

Recommendation:

1. Sustained

Motion: Mary Younger

Second: Pastor Rich Nathan

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0412:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the officer threw him on the ground and “beat him up.”

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Mary Younger

Second: Pastor Rich Nathan

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0594:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged she was treated like a “criminal” during the encounter where she was pink slipped.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Mary Younger

Second: Pastor Rich Nathan

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0066:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the officers were speeding through his neighborhood 40-50 mph.
2. The complainant alleged the officers were not wearing seatbelts and when he asked why they were speeding, the officers drove off.

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated
2. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

Additional DIG Allegation/Recommendation:

Allegation:



1. The Officer failed to activate their BWC units prior to or during the contact with the resident.

Recommendation:

1. Sustained

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0214:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the Officer(s) pointed his service weapon at him and pulled him from out of his residence.
2. The complainant alleged the Officer(s) conducted an illegal search

Recommendation:

1. Exonerated
2. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0259:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged the Officers did not conduct a proper investigation of a theft incident by not completing a police report.

Recommendation:

1. Sustained

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0298:

Allegation:

1. The complaint alleged the officer used excessive force by spraying pepper spray only at her granddaughter and not at other participants in the fight.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous



2024-0477:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged a female officer was rude, discourteous and berated her stating, “You’re homeless, your stuff doesn’t matter and is over there in the dumpster.”

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

2024-0588:

Allegation:

1. The complainant alleged that she was pushed down to the ground by the officer and the officer put his knee in her face. The complainant believed the force was excessive.

Recommendation:

1. Unfounded

Motion: Kyle Strickland

Second: Crystal Jackson

Motion carried: Approved, unanimous

Questions and Recommendations from the Civilian Police Review Board

- Kyle Strickland: Does there need to be a change in the structure of the CPRB Meetings?
- Chair Burns is going to follow up with the Attorney’s Office about what restrictions there are with co-occurring recommendations from the CPRB and CPD.
- Is there a public database that the CPRB can have access to or created?
- Interested in reports that have Officers that have had more than 2 complaints and what those outcomes are.

Update from Chief of Police

- **What is the process for reviewing the final reports and recommendations that come from the Board to the Chief of Police?**
 - Cases go to Chief Bryant then to the Assistant Chief
 - Packets are sent through the chain of command for review; once they make their findings, they are adjudicated through discipline or whatever another recommendation is
 - Chain of command determines discipline in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement
- **What are the outcomes of the cases that have already been sent to the Chief?**
 - There are a wide range of outcomes. Some disciplines have been taken with the Sustained recommendation.
- **What are the outcomes of the policy recommendations that have been sent to the Chief by the Board? And is anyone tracking those policy recommendations?**



- Some policies have been changed based on some Civilian Police Review Board recommendations
- Some policies are not capable of being changed
- Rigorous review process: including Franklin County Prosecutor's Office, SWAT, Mental Health, OVI, Medical Emergency – external recommendations
- **Can we create a process whereby the Board receives periodic reports back on the progress and/or final outcome of the recommendations that were made of the Chief of Police?**
 - Outcomes and recommendations are tracked; quarterly reports are prepared
 - They will start to provide the Board with the report
 - The case report is excel based – it will share what type of discipline was handed down
- **What are benefits that the Chief has noticed- if any- following the CPRB creation? What feedback does she hear from officers on a review board? What is the general feeling from CPD on having such a board/process?**
 - The residents feel freer to make complaints against the CPD Officers; they have a voice
 - Providing independent oversight, the community feels more encouraged or free to make complaints about officers and misconduct
 - IAB opportunities to focus on other areas of concern outside of citizen complaint
 - Feedback they receive (from officers): excessive amount of time it takes to review complaints (sounds like they were referring to first six months of operations) as it relates to IG's office – cases built on feelings and no actual policy or law
 - Thinks it is important/a benefit
 - Thinks there is room for improvement as it relates to how cases are processed and communications
 - Over the past three years, community relations have been a central focus and CPD has made great strides – there is still a ways to go but they will continue to make progress, transparency is key and important to get information and do so expeditiously. Without compromising the integrity of the office. Continue to encourage the public to use the process.
- **What does the Chief feel are the biggest challenges in Columbus for police-citizen relations? What are the opportunities? How can the CRB better engage?**
 - The CPRB can engage by:
 - Attending the Citizens Police Academy
 - Doing ride alongs with the Police Officers
 - Attend community events where officers are engaged
 - Give the community information about what we do and what our purpose is
- **Are there plans to integrate implicit bias and/or cultural competence training into the use of force training module at the police academy?**
 - Implicit bias, cultural competence, and use for force are already in use and that CPD exceeds the OPATA requirements; Required is 740 hours, CPD does 1250 hours)
 - They also receive Mental Health training as well



- **Are there or should there be different policies or procedures regarding use of force when it comes to mental health crisis?**
 - They're constantly reviewing policies to stay up to date on best practices.
 - Policies are constantly reviewed for CALEA accreditation
 - Mobile Crisis Team continuing to try and grow that program and other likes it
 - They are always looking toward best practices

- **Does CPD have a system for tracking cases that have been considered by the Board/DIG and IAB?**
 - Yes, in their Records Management System

- **What is the process for CPD to contact a civilian when CPD has items in custody that are not being retained for a case (e.g., a driver's license)?**
 - A letter is sent every 90 days if contact information is available Sometimes follow ups are sent multiple times. If the property is forfeited, they dispose of it as governed by Revised Code

- **Can you please explain the policy reason for special duty officers not wearing BWC?**
 - We all want the same thing – they would love for special duty officers to wear BWC.
 - If they're going to mandate it, they'll need to be able to supply it.
 - The right amount of BWCs will cost a significant amount but they are already working on securing those funds – working with public safety and the Mayor's office
 - It should happen soon

- **What is the corrective action for police officers who repeatedly do not turn on their BWC?**
 - Retraining
 - Positive Corrective Action
 - Discipline increases with the more incidents an officer has
 - Discipline ratchets upwards
 - Collective bargaining agreement requires following those disciplinary processes
 - There is also a tracking system as it relates to ensuring equity as it relates to officers

What room for improvement would you like to see? Acknowledges that we are all learning and growing. Specifically, in regards to investigations. They have a timeframe when investigations should be completed. She thinks we need to have a way to expedite and complete them in a timelier manner. IAB investigations are also 90 days. So are ours...not sure that we are the ones who aren't turning cases around within 90 days. IG says they are being submitted to the board within 90 days. New cases submitted the first year. IAB processes go straight to the chain of command after the 90. IAB is the next step from us to the chain of command. Final resolution comes at the conclusion of the chain of command. They would like to discipline as soon as possible to fix the behavior.

Are there alternative suggestions they have for timeliness concerns? If there was a way to do it concurrently, not sure what that looks like - that could speed up the process. Another suggestion - minor saving of time.



If training/counseling/discipline is recommended, will it become more specific than training or counseling? Will we know what type of training is given to the officer who was disciplined?

The way reports work now. There is a report management system - they must work within those parameters. Difficult to create different things at the drop of a hat - they can now document recommended finding and then the final disposition. Their training/retraining comes in various forms...comments on the routing sheet.

Can we do something to let community members know about the outcomes? Chain of command = supervisor - Sergeant, Lt., Commander, etc. Kyle's question - it's a little confusing. Not sure what he's actually asking. If there are concerns with investigations or things that have been missed. Sometimes supervisors say "I wish this would have been asked." they will communicate that with the IG's office. They're able to work through those with future cases. The way it looks now is really different from the way it started. Always a work in progress.

Are you seeing any patterns where you disagree with the Board? Sometimes there's case law that governs interactions (i.e., consensual encounters) and they are required to comply with that. Legal updates are given to them every couple of months. They'd like for us to be immersed in case law so that we aren't making recommendations that are anti-precedent. Repeated the question and then he repeated his answer. Review case law. Chief Bryant is willing to track those things to see if there is a pattern relating to specific policy or action.

What is the cost estimate for BWC on everyone, including special duty officers? They're working on it - and actually did an analysis on several options on how to get it done. They've presented that to the safety director and they're in the process of purchasing the significant number of cameras. Then they can write policy and change it.

Is it common in other cities of the same size that they wear BWC on special duty? Unsure.

Can the system track specific officers/tracking complaints? Yes. They have a Master ID database which allows them to track through employee review system. They track officers who have high complaints. Action plans developed for each officer.

What does CPD think about us now? Are we doing something here? It's getting better. Improved from the beginning and slowly getting better.

Anything we can do to assist with decreasing suspicion/increase support in the process? Going through citizens academy, engaging with the officers so they can get an opportunity to engage with us and we them.

CASE ASSIGNMENTS:

Investigation Review Committee #1 (Pastor Rich Nathan, Chair): 24-0312, 24-0390, 24-0405, 24-0418, 24-0445, 24-0485, 24-0511, 24-0533 and 24-0700

Investigation Review Committee #2 (Kyle Strickland, Chair): 23-0153, 24-0419, 24-0431, 24-0447, 24-0456, 24-0492, 24-0521, 24-0527 and 24-0793

Investigation Review Committee #3 (Mary Younger, Chair): 24-0411, 24-0443, 24-0451, 24-0467, 24-0487, 24-0496, 24-0543, 24-0565 and 24-0646



AUGUST MEETING

August 6, 2024 at 2:00 pm at the 111 N Front Street, Hearing Conference Room

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn. Pastor Rich Nathan moved and Kyle Strickland seconded motion. All in favor, passes unanimously and meeting adjourned at 4:46PM.