

Date: March 6, 2026
To: Lieutenant Colonel Adam D. Hennie, Interim Police Chief
From: Captain Dennis L. Swingley, Internal Investigations Section Commander
Subject: **Responses to 2024's Citizen Complaint Authority (CCA) recommendations**

**Recommendation: R2401 (CCA #23063) Presented at February 2024 Board Meeting
(Originally R2318 (CCA #22130) Presented at July 2023 Board Meeting)**

CCA recommends CPD revise its use of force policies to define a "choke hold" and clarify what qualifies as a "choke hold" under its Procedure Manual, including by stating what kinds of neck restraints or neck holds qualify as "choke holds," "similar type of holds," or are otherwise prohibited. CCA recommends that such a revision incorporate standardized language such as from the National Consensus Policy on Use of Force or another comparable source that clearly defines the kind of force or techniques that constitute a chokehold. In CPD Procedure §12.545 Use of Force, the definition section provides the following with respect to choke holds: "The courts could consider a choke hold or other similar type of holds as deadly force. Choke holds are prohibited unless a situation arises where the use of deadly force is permissible under exhibiting law and Department policy." However, the section does not define with specificity what a "choke hold" or "similar type of hold" would be. Neither does Procedure §12.545 say, on its face, whether other neck holds or neck restraints that CPD does not consider to be "choke holds" are permitted. In this case, CCA was unable to determine whether an officer who wrapped his arm around the neck area of a citizen applied pressure to the carotid artery, or pressure to the neck generally. However, even if CCA had made such a determination, it is not clear whether the choke hold ban in CPD's Procedure Manual would have prohibited that officer's conduct, since the Procedure Manual does not clearly ban carotid holds. A standardized definition of "choke hold" that includes carotid holds would clarify the standard for officers, citizens, and investigators.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-091/IIS#2022-155): CPD does not agree that Procedure 12.545 lacks sufficient clarity or requires revision. The policy clearly prohibits choke holds except in circumstances where deadly force would otherwise be authorized under law and Department policy. This standard is consistent with the National Consensus Policy on Use of Force and CPD policy goes further to specifically ban the use of choke holds to prevent the swallowing of evidence.

Procedure 12.545 defines the carotid arteries and their anatomical location. Under CPD policy, carotid restraint techniques fall within the category of choke holds and are therefore subject to the same deadly-force limitation. The IIS investigation in this case determined that the officer did not apply a choke hold or carotid restraint as defined by policy. The officer's arm placement, while near the arrestee's neck, did not involve the application of prohibited pressure and complied with Department policy and applicable law.

Recommendation: R2402 (CCA #23127) Presented at March 2024 Board Meeting

While the dissemination of information after the felony charging and arrest of a minor is generally not against the laws of the United States and is allowed under certain circumstances in CPD policy, the release of information related to a juvenile arrest and charging can limit and impede successful transition for a juvenile into adulthood. The release of this information can create obstacles for youth seeking future employment, scholarships, housing, higher education, and multiple other opportunities. Many juveniles do not understand the severity nor the consequences of their actions. Historically, protecting and assisting juveniles in their transformation to adulthood has been a bedrock principle of American values and laws. The National Juvenile Justice Network (NJJN) recommends that law enforcement with related information associated with juveniles that encounter the justice system be kept from all public disclosure. Some organizations, have gone so far as to adopted internal policies to never name minors in public, unless they are charged as adults. Therefore, CCA recommends that CPD more heavily weigh the importance of the release of information related to juvenile arrest. As suggested by the Poynter Institute these factors could include:

- *Who is served by identifying the juvenile?*
- *Strength of the evidence?*
- *Severity of the alleged crime?*
- *Who will be impacted and how will they be impacted if the name is released?*
- *Would others be harmed if the minor was not named or if rumors were allowed to circulate unchecked?*
- *Will the juvenile be charged as an adult?*
- *How immediate would identification be after arrest?*
- *What is the juvenile's history?*
- *How newsworthy is the story? How will you explain the decision to identify to the newsroom? The weighty decision to identify a juvenile offender to the media can be a hard one to make. Ultimately, to release the information, while generally legal, is an ethical choice.*

CPD Response (IIS#2023-172): CPD recognizes that portions of this recommendation have merit, and the Planning Section is currently reviewing the proposal for further consideration.

CPD handles the release of a juvenile's identity with deliberate care and evaluates each case individually. As a general practice, a juvenile's identity is released only after formal charges have been filed. In limited circumstances, identifying information may also be released when investigators have probable cause to believe a juvenile committed a violent offense and public assistance is necessary to safely and promptly identify or apprehend the individual.

CPD does not support adopting a blanket prohibition on releasing the name of a charged juvenile solely based on age, without consideration of the seriousness of the offense, the presence of probable cause, and the immediate interests of public safety. In certain cases, timely identification is critical—not only to protect the community, but also to ensure the safety and due process rights of the juvenile involved.

Recommendation: R2403 (CCA #23104) Presented at March 2024 Board Meeting

Through the adoption of Administrative Regulations 25 and 55, the city of Cincinnati has signaled that the behavior of city employees must reflect the values of the city, a city where all citizens are treated with dignity and respect regardless of race. A city that strives to provide the best service

for residents and visitors. The officers' interaction with Mr. Ramsey while in their custody stays from the city's vision and values. CCA recommends that Officers Stanton and Peterson receive Diversity and Customer Service training as a reminder of their actions, which did not align with CPD's policies, procedures, and training.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-147): IIS thoroughly reviewed the comments attributed to Officers Thomas Stanton and Emily Peterson and determined that their statements did not violate any department rules, policies, or standards of conduct. While the comments have been characterized as discourteous or discriminatory, the investigation did not substantiate that conclusion.

Both the CCA and IIS investigations identified multiple articulable factors that led the officers to reasonably believe Mr. Ramsey was armed and posed an imminent threat to officers and the public.

A review of the officers' Axon supervisory records for the preceding three years revealed no documented pattern of similar language, behavior, or citizen complaints. Additionally, the Department conducts quarterly performance analysis designed to identify potential patterns of negative conduct. Neither officer has been identified for intervention or monitoring based on that review process.

In light of the absence of a sustained policy violation, the lack of any documented pattern of similar conduct, and the passage of nearly three years since the incident, IIS does not find a basis to mandate remedial diversity or customer service training in this matter.

**Recommendation: R2404 (CCA #23255) Presented at May 2024 Board Meeting
Originally R2311 (CCA #21149) Presented at May 2023 Board Meeting)**

CCA recommends that CPD include in Procedure § 12.540, Body Worn Camera System, a provision requiring officers who are assigned to work the front desk of police districts to activate their BWC's, or another comparable video and audio recording device, for contact with citizens, regardless of whether the officer is engaged in "self-initiated activity." Over the years, CCA has received numerous complaints regarding contact that citizens have had at the front desk of police districts, and recording these encounters via BWC is likely to either confirm or refute such complaints.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-346/CCRP): CPD Agreed. The policy has been formally revised to require desk officers to activate their body-worn cameras (BWCs) during all interactions with members of the public. This directive was issued in the Staff Notes dated January 16, 2026. The Planning Section is currently revising Procedure 12.540, Body Worn Camera System, to reflect this change.

Recommendation: R2405 (CCA #23115) Presented at June 2024 Board Meeting

Addressing recurring allegations of excessive force is paramount and crucial for maintaining trust within the community. Considering six out of the last fourteen CCA cases associated with Officer Scalf, within three years, have involved excessive force allegations and out of those six all involved Officer Scalf utilizing leverage displacement, CCA strongly recommends implementing mandatory remedial training tailored to enhance the officer's proficiency in de-escalation techniques and appropriate levels of use of force. This strategic intervention aims not only to address the specific concerns but also to foster a safer and more respectful policing environment, ensuring better outcomes for both law enforcement and the community at large.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-160): Agreed - Officer Scalf was placed on a CPD imposed intervention plan that included the following:

- ***Officer Scalf was mandated to be partnered with veteran officers with proven track records of professionalism, integrity and excellent customer service skills. That time period lasted from March 7, 2024, until July 2, 2024, at which time they advised Officer Scalf was receptive to advice and guidance provided during their tours of duty and that he was ready for solo patrol.***
- ***Effective July 21, 2024, through January 5, 2025, Officer Scalf was assigned to a non-uniform assignment in District Four's Investigative Unit. The purpose was to give officer Scalf a different perspective of policing, sharpen his investigative skills, report writing, interview skills, and make him more knowledgeable about the finer points of law and probable cause. While detailed to this assignment, Sergeant Mark Weston, Investigative Unit Assistant Commander, and Lieutenant Timothy Lanter, Investigative Unit Commander, closely monitored his cases and proactive efforts, especially those that could potentially result in search warrants and arrests, and the monitoring included reviews of Officer Scalf's Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage.***
- ***Two District Four lieutenants conducted a minimum of weekly audits of Officer Scalf's BWC footage to ensure standards were being met. In addition, both Lieutenants had bi-weekly conversations ensuring Officer Scalf was receptive and responded positively to the intervention plan.***
- ***The Cincinnati Police Department's Training Section conducted remedial training with Officer Scalf to cover topics such as Search and Seizure, Establishing Probable Cause, De-escalation techniques and Proper Tactics.***
- ***All of Officer Scalf's activity was closely scrutinized on an on-going basis which was reviewed and documented at a minimum, on a quarterly basis in conjunction with the Employee Tracking Solution (ETS) review.***

It should be noted that Officer Scalf was receptive during conversations and recognized that the incident precipitating the intervention was problematic and he accepted full accountability for his actions. Officer Scalf has since been assigned to the PIVOT Squad.

Recommendation: R2406 (CCA #23253) Presented at July 2024 Board Meeting

Officer Johnson's interaction with Mr. Collins and unknown citizens has raised concerns regarding his use of inappropriate language and discourtesy. It is imperative that Officer Johnson undergoes remedial training in customer service and disability discrimination to ensure that all members of the community are treated with respect and dignity. Specifically, addressing the use of inflammatory words is crucial in fostering an inclusive and respectful environment. By providing Officer Johnson with the necessary training, CPD would share commitment to fair and equitable treatment for all individuals.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-345): For this incident in 2023, Officer Johnson received supervisory counseling, which was documented via an Employee Supervisory Log (ESL) in Axon (EVT-00034933) regarding the use of coarse language during an encounter.

A review of Officer Johnson's Axon supervisory records for the preceding three years does not reflect a pattern of similar language or conduct.

Additionally, Extensive Analysis is conducted on a quarterly basis with sole purpose to identify officers who may be exhibiting negative patterned conduct. Based on the result of the analysis, officers are potentially placed into one of two categories, Intervention or Monitoring.

Recommendation: R2407 (CCA #23118) Presented at July 2024 Board Meeting

CCA recommends Officer Zumaita receive Customer Service training. This recommendation comes after the review of Officer Zumaita's BWC which showed him struggle to gain verbal control of his conversation with Mr. Stevens after his attempted use of de-escalation techniques failed. Customer Service training may provide Officer Zumaita with other options in any future encounters with people who are compliant but are argumentative.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-157): *Considering the absence of a sustained policy violation by CPD, the lack of any documented pattern of similar conduct, and the passage of nearly three years since the incident, IIS does not find a basis to mandate additional customer service training in this matter.*

At the time of this incident, Officer Zumaita was a relatively new officer with approximately three years of service. The Department believes that the experience he has gained in the nearly three years since this incident has further developed his ability to manage encounters with argumentative individuals.

A review of Officer Zumaita's Axon records for the preceding three years revealed no documented pattern of similar conduct. Additionally, the Department conducts quarterly performance analyses designed to identify potential patterns of negative conduct requiring supervisory intervention. Officer Zumaita has not been identified for intervention or monitoring through that review process.

Recommendation: R2408 (CCA #23035) Presented at September 2024 Board Meeting

During CCA's interviews of Specialist Byrne and Officer Birch, both stated that they never received any training on animal control, containment, nor neutralization. Both also added that they did not have access to animal control equipment and expressed the need for more backup in the form of animal control officers. Under CPD Procedure § 12.115 (G)(1), Officers must exhaust all reasonable means to confine the dog, notify Cincinnati Animal Care to pick up the dog, and at a minimum require Officers to consider the use of chemical irritant (such as Mace) or TASER™ on the dog. However, Officers do not have access to equipment to confine a dog, Cincinnati Animal Care is not always available to respond within a short time frame, and chemical irritants and TASER™ are grossly ineffective at dog confinement. The National Animal Care & Control Association has acknowledged there are situations when a TASER™ may be used to protect life and safety of an animal control officer, the public, and other animals. However, the National Animal Care & Control Association guidelines, also state in-part, "The use of any Electro-Muscular Disruptive Devices (EMDD) (more commonly known by the trade name "Taser™") is not recommended by NACA for use on animals for routine capture or restraint. The CCA highly recommends a two-pronged approach to better prepare officers to respond more effectively to incidences involving an aggressive canine. The first prong is Equipment. The Cincinnati Police Department should equip cruisers with specialized tools designed to control aggressive dogs safely and effectively, such as catch poles, dog snares, or bite sleeves. Unlike mace and a TASER™, which can cause significant harm or provoke a more aggressive response from the animal, these tools allow officers to manage and capture aggressive dogs in a non-lethal and more controlled manner. A TASER™ is particularly problematic because hitting a small

target like a dog can be extremely difficult which reduces their effectiveness. Mace, on the other hand, poses the risk of back spray, which can potentially blind the officer and further complicate

the situation. With a lack of proper tools, Offices often must resort to using firearms when dealing with aggressive or vicious dogs, which is also highly problematic for several reasons. Firstly, discharging a firearm in a residential or urban area poses significant safety risks to bystanders, as stray bullets can cause unintended injuries or fatalities.

Secondly, the use of a firearm often results in the death of the animal and potentially damages community relations. Thirdly, the traumatic nature of such incidents can have lasting emotional effects on both the officers and the community members involved. The second prong, training, CPD officers should partake in training programs, possibly with animal control officers, to educate them on the proper use of non-lethal devices and techniques for de-escalating aggressive dog encounters. Such training will not only enhance the safety of the officers and the community but also ensure the humane treatment of animals. Investing in appropriate equipment and training is crucial for fostering a more effective and compassionate approach to emergency animal control.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-053): CPD has already taken steps consistent with CCA's two-pronged recommendation addressing both equipment and training.

In 2024, CPD purchased four-foot standard Ketch-All animal control poles to provide officers with additional tools when responding to calls involving aggressive animals at large, particularly in circumstances where Animal CARE has been delayed in responding. The use of the animal control pole remains discretionary and voluntary.

In August 2025, CPD, in collaboration with Animal CARE, offered "Officers Encountering Dog Situations" training to officers. The training covered canine behavior and body language, safe approach techniques, scene assessment and information gathering, public education, available resources, and a question-and-answer session to reinforce practical application.

These measures demonstrate CPD's commitment to equipping officers with both appropriate tools and training to promote safe animal containment while minimizing the need for force whenever possible.

Recommendation: R2409 (CCA #23038) 24038 R23118 Presented at 10/24 meeting

CCA recommends Officer Bohn receive Customer Service training. This recommendation comes after the review of Officer Bohn's BWC which showed him being unprofessional and using profane language to address a citizen. Customer Service training may provide Officer Bohn with other options in any future encounters with citizens who are compliant but are argumentative.

CPD Response (INFO CASE/CCRP): See CPD's Form 17 titled Responses to 2025's CCA Recommendations #R2409.

CCA's concern regarding unprofessional or antagonistic communication with citizens has been reviewed in conjunction with the investigative and disciplinary process. Officer Bohn's conduct was addressed through the Department Level Hearing (DLH) process.

On February 11, 2026, Captain Amanda Caton presided over Officer Matthew Bohn's Department Level Hearing (DLH). The DLH documentation includes Officer Bohn's prior rule violations. Captain Caton is currently preparing written findings and corrective action recommendations for submission to Interim Police Chief Adam Hennie.

Any corrective action determined through the DLH process may include training, counseling, or other remedial measures consistent with Department policy and the nature of the sustained findings.

Recommendation: R2410 (CCA #23262) Presented at October 2024 Board Meeting

For several years, CPD has implemented the Citizen Complaint Resolution Process as a means for citizens to have their concerns directly and immediately reviewed by command staff. It promotes communication and feedback between the officers and consumer, while allowing for grievances to be addressed and redressed as needed. Furthermore, it ensures command staff are aware of their employees' behaviors in the community. However, as seen in the course of this investigation, there are several problems within the CCRP:

- The command staff are not trained mediators.*
- The command staff are not an impartial party.*
- Meetings are held at the local district, not in a neutral location.*
- Witnesses/support are not eligible to be present. In the current CCRP model, participants may not feel comfortable or even capable of expressing their genuine concerns related to their interaction. In recent months, CCA spoke with several law enforcement oversight agencies across the country who have employed mediation models with their local police departments to positive effect, from both officers and community members. While the individual models may have minor variances in their structures and design, the overwhelming consequence is positive resolutions and improved community-police relations. After significant research into modern methods that would best apply to Cincinnati, CCA recommends CPD restructure the CCRP to resemble a mediation-based model.*

CPD Response (INFO CASE): The Police Department acknowledges CCA Recommendation R2507 and the concerns raised regarding the Citizen Complaint Resolution Process (CCRP). However, CPD does not agree that the identified issues constitute structural flaws requiring the use of a neutral third-party facilitator.

The CCRP was established pursuant to the Collaborative Agreement and is grounded in the Department's vision, mission, and core values. The process is designed to provide a timely, accessible, and restorative opportunity for dialogue between officers and community members. Supervisory staff oversee these meetings as part of their responsibilities and are expected to remain objective and professional.

The Department's chain-of-command structure provides multiple layers of review above the subject officer, ensuring oversight and accountability. Allegations that warrant formal investigation are not resolved through mediation but are referred to the appropriate investigative process. Accordingly, CCRP does not replace discipline or formal review mechanisms; it serves as an early-resolution option for appropriate complaints.

CCRP Meetings are conducted in police districts to promote accessibility and convenience for complainants. While district facilities are not "neutral" in the traditional sense, they are professional environments equipped to ensure safety, documentation, and supervisory presence. The meeting locations at the districts do not compromise the integrity of the process.

Supervisors receive leadership, communication, and conflict-management training consistent with their supervisory roles. The Department does not believe that the absence of formal third-party mediation certification undermines the fairness of the CCRP process.

For these reasons, CPD does not find it necessary to implement a neutral third-party facilitator at this time. The Department will continue to monitor the effectiveness of the CCRP and make adjustments as appropriate to maintain public confidence and procedural fairness.

Additionally, CPD will assess updates to Procedure 15.100, Citizen Complaints and Reports of Favorable Police Conduct, to clarify that complainants may request the presence of a support person or one witness, subject to reasonable procedural guidelines.

Recommendation: R2411 (CCA #23176) Presented at October 2024 Board Meeting (Originally R2133 (CCA #19135) Presented at November 2021 Board Meeting)

CCA recommends CPD incorporate standardized language (such as from the National Consensus Policy on Use of Force or another comparable source) to clarify what qualifies as a “choke hold” under its Procedure Manual, preferably by including carotid holds in the definition for “choke hold.” In CPD Procedure §12.545 Use of Force, the definition section of the policy provides that “the courts could consider a choke hold or other similar type of holds as deadly force. Choke holds are prohibited unless a situation arises where the use of deadly force is permissible under exhibiting law and Department policy.” The policy separately identifies and defines carotid arteries.

However, the section does not clearly define what a “choke hold” or “similar type of hold” would be. Neither does the policy say, on its face, that carotid restraints or holds targeting the carotid artery constitute “choke holds” under CPD policy, and the Procedure Manual does not clearly ban carotid holds. A standardized definition of “choke hold” that includes carotid holds would clarify the standard for officers, citizens, and investigators.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-241/IIS#2019-157): *The Planning Section is currently reviewing this recommendation for consideration. As noted in the above response to Recommendation R2401 (Page 1), CPD has evaluated the policy language regarding choke holds and believes the existing standard is consistent with applicable law and national guidance.*

Recommendation: R2412 (CCA #23268) Presented at October 2024 Board Meeting (Originally R2209 (CCA #21217) Presented at August 2022 Board Meeting)

CCA recommends CPD reconsider and clarify the language in CPD Procedures §12.205 (Traffic Enforcement) and CPD Procedure §12.555 (Arrest/Citation) to ensure the regulation provides unambiguous and congruous guidelines for officers on the question of what enforcement action should apply to violators of pedestrian offenses (such as jaywalking or playing in the street) who refuse to identify themselves or are unable to do so. A review of CPD Procedure Manual showed crucial incongruities and ambiguities pertaining to policy-produced guidance for officers encountering pedestrian violators. Specifically, CPD Procedure §12.555 Arrest/Citation: Processing of Adult Misdemeanor and Felony Offenders states that, regarding violations that are minor misdemeanors, officers must issue citations rather than physically arrest individuals unless the situation meets specific requirements. Among those exceptions, the policy stipulates that a physical arrest would be necessary if “the individual cannot or does not offer satisfactory proof of identity, except pedestrian violations (refer to Procedure 12.205) (emphasis added)” CPD Procedure §12.205 Traffic Enforcement instructs officers to “make every effort to obtain proof of identification from a [pedestrian violator].” The policy continues that “if the pedestrian violator does not possess some kind of identification, the officer shall attempt to obtain accurate information in order to properly complete the citation, through careful and courteous questioning.”

Accordingly, under the most logical reading of those policies, while an officer may be able to physically arrest an individual under the ORC for failing to disclose information to be used in writing a jaywalking ticket, such an arrest would be outside Department policy. However, the policy does not provide further instruction for officers or citizens on what must occur if the officers have made “every effort” to obtain proof of identification but are still unable to obtain “accurate information in order to properly complete the citation.” Instead, officers must refer back to CPD Procedure §12.555, which does not allow the officer to make a physical arrest for failure to identify. This vagueness is problematic and leaves several questions unanswered for officers and the community. For example, what must occur if a citizen fails to provide identification or is unable to do so during an extensive attempt to get the information for purposes of completing a citation for jaywalking or playing in the street? Must a warning be given in lieu of a citation, or should some other process apply? For purposes of completing a citation, must the officer rely on other information proving identity that is readily ascertainable in spite of the citizen’s refusal to speak or provide certain pieces of information? The language of CPD Procedure §§12.555 and 12.205 should be revised to provide greater clarity with respect to these issues.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-357/INFO CASE): This recommendation has been assigned to the Planning Section for review. CPD recognizes the concerns raised regarding the contradiction between Procedures 12.205 (Traffic Enforcement) and 12.555 (Arrest/Citation), particularly as they relate to enforcement options when a pedestrian violator refuses or is unable to provide identifying information.

CPD is currently awaiting a formal legal opinion from the City Law Department before determining whether clarification or revision of the Procedures is warranted.

Recommendation: R2413 (CCA #23204) Presented at November 2024 Board Meeting

During CCA’s interviews of Specialist Byrne and Officer Birch, both stated that they never received any training on animal control, containment, nor neutralization. Both also added that they did not have access to animal control equipment and expressed the need for more backup in the form of animal control officers. Under CPD Procedure § 12.115 (G)(1), Officers must exhaust all reasonable means to confine the canine, notify Cincinnati Animal Care to pick up the canine, and at a minimum require Officers to consider the use of chemical irritant (such as Mace) or TASER™ on the canine. However, Officers do not have access to equipment to confine a canine, Cincinnati Animal Care is not always available to respond within a short time frame, and chemical irritants and TASER™ are grossly ineffective at canine confinement. The National Animal Care & Control Association has acknowledged there are situations when a TASER™ may be used to protect life and safety of an animal control officer, the public, and other animals. However, the National Animal Care & Control Association guidelines, also state in-part, “The use of any Electro-Muscular Disruptive Devices (EMDD) (more commonly known by the trade name “Taser™”) is not recommended by NACA for use on animals for routine capture or restraint. The CCA highly recommends a two-pronged approach to better prepare officers to respond more effectively to incidences involving an aggressive canine. The first prong is Equipment. The Cincinnati Police Department should equip cruisers with specialized tools designed to control aggressive canines safely and effectively, such as catch poles, canine snares, or bite sleeves. Unlike mace and a TASER™, which can cause significant harm or provoke a more aggressive response from the animal, these tools allow officers to manage and capture aggressive canines in a non-lethal and more controlled manner. A TASER™ is particularly problematic because hitting a small target like a canine can be extremely difficult which reduces their effectiveness. Mace, on the other hand, poses the risk of back spray, which can potentially blind the officer and further complicate the situation. With a lack of proper tools, Offices often must resort to using firearms when dealing with aggressive or vicious canines, which is also highly problematic for

several reasons. Firstly, discharging a firearm in a residential or urban area poses significant safety risks to bystanders, as stray bullets can cause unintended injuries or fatalities. Secondly, the use of a firearm often results in the death of the animal and potentially damages community relations. Thirdly, the traumatic nature of such incidents can have lasting emotional effects on both the officers and the community members involved. The second prong, training, CPD officers should partake in training programs, possibly with animal control officers, to educate them on the proper use of non-lethal devices and techniques for de-escalating aggressive canine encounters. Such training will not only enhance the safety of the officers and the community but also ensure the humane treatment of animals. Investing in appropriate equipment and training is crucial for fostering a more effective and compassionate approach to emergency animal control. Currently under CPD Procedure § 12.115 (G)(1), Officers must exhaust all reasonable means to confine the canine, notify Cincy CARE to pick up the canine, and at a minimum require Officers to consider the use of chemical irritant (such as Mace) or TASER™ on the canine. However, Officers do not have access to equipment to confine a canine, Cincy CARE is not always available to respond within a short time frame, and chemical irritants and TASER are grossly ineffective at confining a canine after it is controlled.[1] The National Animal Care & Control Association has acknowledged there are situations when a TASER™ may be used to protect life and safety of an animal control officer, the public, and other animals. However, the National Animal Care & Control Association guidelines, also state in-part, “The use of any Electro-Muscular Disruptive Devices (EMDD) (more commonly known by the trade name “Taser™”) is not recommended by NACA for use on animals for routine capture or restraint.[2] The CCA highly recommends a two-pronged approach to better prepare officers to respond more effectively to incidences involving an aggressive canine. The first prong is Equipment. The Cincinnati Police Department should equip officers with specialized tools designed to control aggressive canines safely and effectively, such as catch poles, canine snares, and bite sleeves. Unlike mace and a TASER™, which can cause significant harm or provoke a more aggressive response from the animal, these tools allow officers to manage and capture aggressive canines in a non-lethal and more controlled manner.[3] A TASER™ is particularly problematic because hitting a small target like a canine can be extremely difficult which reduces their effectiveness. Mace, on the other hand, poses the risk of back spray, which can potentially blind the officer and further complicate the situation. With a lack of proper tools, Offices often must resort to using firearms when dealing with aggressive or vicious canines, which is also highly problematic for several reasons. Firstly, discharging a firearm in a residential or urban area poses significant safety risks to bystanders, as stray bullets can cause unintended injuries or fatalities. Secondly, the use of a firearm often results in the death of the animal and potentially damages community relations. Additionally, the traumatic nature of such incidents can have lasting emotional effects on both the officers and the community members involved. The second prong, training, CPD officers should be provided with training programs to educate them on the proper use of non-lethal devices, and techniques, for de-escalating aggressive canine encounters. Such training will not only enhance the safety of the officers and the community but also ensure the humane treatment of animals. Investing in appropriate equipment and training is crucial for fostering a more effective and compassionate approach to emergency animal control. [1] See On 5/24/2024, at 2:30 PM, (Investigator Vesper called (513) 541-7487 to talk to an employee at Cincinnati Animal CARE. When asked, in a recent phone call 5/24/2024 when asked, “What should I do if a canine is loose and biting people?” the employee responded, “Contact the police and have the police confine it, our role is mainly to investigate animal abuse, and our response time would be too long.”) [2] NACA Guidelines, National Animal Care & Control Association. (October 9, 2019). Pg. 58. [3] See Increase in police tasing of canines prompts concern from SPCA, SAFE as new disturbing footage is released, <https://www.1news.co.nz/2018/02/21/exclusive-increase-in-police-tasing-of-canines-prompts-concern-from-sPCA-safe-as-new-disturbing-footage-is-released/> (February 22, 2018). Luke Appleby. 1News

CPD Response (INFO CASE-HANDLED BY DISTRICT): *CPD has already taken steps consistent with CCA's two-pronged recommendations addressing both equipment and training.*

In 2024, CPD purchased four-foot standard Ketch-All animal control poles to provide officers with additional tools when responding to calls involving aggressive animals at large, particularly in circumstances where Animal CARE has been delayed in responding. The use of the animal control pole remains discretionary and voluntary.

In August 2025, CPD, in collaboration with Animal CARE, offered "Officers Encountering Dog Situations" training to officers. The training covered canine behavior and body language, safe approach techniques, scene assessment and information gathering, public education, available resources, and a question-and-answer session to reinforce practical application.

These measures demonstrate CPD's commitment to equipping officers with both appropriate tools and training to promote safe animal containment while minimizing the need for force whenever possible.

Recommendation: R2414 (CCA #23045)

It is recommended that Officer Cornacchione undergo customer service training to address the inappropriate use of profanity during interactions with the public. Specifically, the use of the term "fuck" is unprofessional and undermines the department's commitment to respectful and courteous communication. Such training will enhance Officer Cornacchione's ability to engage with the community in a manner that reflects the values and standards of the Cincinnati Police Department, fostering positive relationships and promoting public trust.

CPD Response (INFO CASE): *CPD disagrees. This single incident involved the use of profanity by Officer Cornacchione while transporting arrested persons to the Hamilton County Justice Center. Following the incident, Officer Cornacchione received a verbal counseling session from his shift commander, Lieutenant Gerald Hodges. This counseling was documented in his Employee Supplement Log (ESL) in Axon (EVT-00052056).*

Considering the absence of any additional sustained policy violations, the lack of a documented pattern of similar conduct, and the passage of more than 15 months since the incident, IIS does not find a basis to mandate additional customer service training in this matter.

Additionally, the Department conducts quarterly performance analyses designed to identify potential patterns of negative conduct requiring supervisory intervention. Officer Cornacchione has not been identified for intervention or monitoring through that review process.

Recommendation: R2415 (CCA #23201) Presented at November 2024 Board Meeting

CCA recommends CPD create a specific definition and policy for "harassment" in order to clarify the line between persistent contact initiated by police that is permissible (such as necessary contact that might occur during an ongoing investigation focused on a person of interest), and impermissible patterns of contact that either have no legitimate purpose, are not tailored to a legitimate purpose, or that otherwise violate policy.

CPD Response (IIS#2023-276): *CPD declines to create a separate definition of “harassment” within the Procedure Manual. Existing policies governing professionalism, bias-free policing, investigatory standards, and supervisory oversight already address improper or unjustified patterns of contact. These standards require that all enforcement and investigatory actions be supported by a legitimate law enforcement purpose and conducted in a manner consistent with constitutional protections.*

Recommendation: R2416 (CCA #24090) Presented at January 2025 Board Meeting
CCA #24090 (R2416) CCA recommends CPD revise its use of force policies to define an “elevated surface” and clarify what qualifies as an “elevated surface” under its Procedure Manual. Procedure §12.545 Use of Force, “Officers should avoid using a CEW on individuals who are on an elevated surface or are operating or riding any moving device or vehicle when a fall from such surface, or interrupted operation of such moving device or vehicle would likely cause serious injury or death, unless the encounter rises to the level of a deadly force situation.” However, the section does not define what an elevated surface is. In this particular case the CEW was deployed while the subject was running towards a doorway that led down a flight of steps.

CPD Response (IIS#2024-143): *CPD agreed. Planning Section will consider the following definition for “elevated surface” to be incorporated in Procedure 12.545 Use of Force and the Tactical Patrol Guide.*

“Any location where a person is positioned above an adjacent lower level and where a fall could reasonably result in injury.”

Recommendation: R2417 (CCA #24117) Presented at December 2024 Board Meeting

CCA recommends Officer Landrum receive Customer Service training. This recommendation comes after the review of BWC footage which showed her being unprofessional and addressing a citizen in an aggressive manner. Customer Service training may provide Officer Landrum with other options in any future encounters with citizens who are compliant but are argumentative.

CPD Response (IIS#2024-183): *CPD has reviewed this recommendation and does not find a basis to mandate additional customer service training in this matter.*

During her IIS interview, Officer Jamie Landrum explained that she had just been involved in a physical altercation with Ms. Corbin, the theft suspect, and was attempting to maintain control of the scene. Officer Landrum stated that the bystander continued to argue with officers and interject during the arrest, which created a distraction while officers were attempting to take Ms. Corbin into custody.

Based on IIS interviews and a review of the BWC footage, IIS determined that the bystander repeatedly argued with officers and contributed to the disruption during the arrest. While Officer Landrum raised her voice during the encounter, she did not use any coarse, violent, or profane language.

IIS concluded that Officer Landrum’s actions did not rise to the level of discourtesy under Department policy. However, the matter was addressed at the command level. In his Command Review of the incident, Lieutenant Colonel Hammer (District One Commander at the time) noted that District One supervision reminded Officer Landrum of the importance of maintaining professionalism when interacting with members of the public.

A review of Officer Landrum’s Axon records for the past two years revealed no documented pattern of similar conduct. The Department nonetheless continues to

emphasize professional communication and de-escalation techniques through regular training and supervisory oversight.

Recommendation: R2418 (CCA #24080) Presented at January 2025 Board Meeting

The strategic decision to use force is the result of the consideration of multiple complex factors in a short period of time. The purpose of the Tactical Patrol Guide is to instruct an officer with options to ensure officer safety and minimize the risk to all involved people during potentially violent or dangerous encounters. Earlier, CCA cited the Tactical Patrol Guide regarding the appropriate time for CEWs to be displayed and/or targeted at individuals by officers. However, as previously discussed, the wording of the text, and the placement of it in the Tactical Patrol Guide as opposed to CPD Procedure § 12.545 Use of Force, makes the Tactical Patrol Guide's statement and its objective ambiguous. CCA recommends this aspect of CEW usage be clarified and updated as needed in the Tactical Patrol Guide and Use of Force procedure for the safety and understanding of officers and the community.

CPD Response (IIS#2024-117): CPD agrees with this recommendation. The Planning Section will conduct a review of the language addressing CEW display and targeting in both Procedure 12.545 (Use of Force) and the Tactical Patrol Guide to ensure the provisions are clear, consistent, and properly aligned. Any necessary revisions will be implemented to eliminate ambiguity and provide clearer guidance to officers.

Recommendation: R2419 (CCA #24094) Presented at January 2025 Board Meeting

It is recommended that Officer Shack undergo customer service training to address the inappropriate use of profanity during interactions with the public. Specifically, the use of the term "fuck" is unprofessional and undermines the department's commitment to respectful and courteous communication. Such training will enhance Officer Shack's ability to engage with the community in a manner that reflects the values and standards of the Cincinnati Police Department, fostering positive relationships and promoting public trust.

CPD Response (IIS#2024-142): CPD agrees (in part). Following the incident that precipitated CCA's recommendation, Officer Shack received a verbal counseling session from his supervisors. This counseling was documented in his Employee Supplement Log (ESL) in Axon (EVT-00036478).

On December 23, 2023, Officer Shack utilized balance displacement and a form of verbal stunning to effect the arrest of Mr. Maxberry after CPD officers responded to a report of a shooting at the Hamilton County Courthouse. The use of verbal stunning by Officer Shack was objectively reasonable to gain compliance and place the uncooperative and combative Mr. Maxberry into custody.

However, IIS determined that the additional profane statements made by Officer Shack toward Mr. Maxberry after he was already in custody did not constitute verbal stunning and were not necessary to gain compliance. As a result, supervisors addressed the matter through the documented counseling session.

A review of Officer Shack's Axon supervisory records since this incident identified one additional entry on October 17, 2024, in which supervisors conducted a best-practices discussion with Officer Shack regarding the importance of maintaining professional bearing and refraining from statements that could escalate citizen interactions. This discussion was documented in Axon (EVT-00050867).

The Department also conducts quarterly performance analyses designed to identify potential patterns of negative conduct. Officer Shack has not been identified for intervention or monitoring through that review process.

DLS, C-4