

Date: November 21, 2025
To: John Kennedy, CCA Director
From: Kaitlyn Streicher, CCA Investigator
Subject: **CCA Case No. 25053 - Review of Harassment, Excessive Force, and Excessive Force (Taser) Allegations by Monica Brandy and Garry Black**

CCA completed an investigation of CCA Complaint No. 25053 by Monica Brandy (F/B/54) and Garry Black, (M/B/35), alleging Harassment against Officer Grant Perry #P0382 (M/W/43) (CPD Hire Date: 12/04/2016); Excessive Force against Officers Mikhale Buck #P0317 (M/B/28) (CPD Hire Date: 10/03/2021), Dae'Shawn Lewis #P0457 (M/T/29) (CPD Hire Date: 08/07/2022), Myles Abt #P0076 (M/W/28) (CPD Hire Date: 11/05/2017), and Grant Perry; and, Excessive Force (Taser) against Officer Grant Perry. This memorandum is intended to convey the conclusions resulting from that investigation and the basis for those conclusions. This memorandum does not intend to summarize all evidence uncovered during the investigation, nor is it intended to summarize the entirety of CCA's file on this matter.

Complaint Summary:

Date of Incident: March 21, 2024

Date Complaint Received: March 31, 2025

Time: 9:04 p.m.

Date Records Requested: March 31, 2025

Location: 615 Maple Avenue

Date Records Received: May 15, 2025

Ms. Brandy alleged that on Thursday, March 21, 2024, police officers, later identified by CCA to be Officers Buck, Lewis, Abt, and Perry used excessive force on her paralyzed son, Garry Black. Though Ms. Brandy was not present during the encounter, she alleged that they pulled Mr. Black out of his vehicle and "tased him excessively, at least three times." She also alleged that they "harassed him" based on his prior criminal history.

CCA spoke with Mr. Black on April 2, 2025, and he alleged that the officers "snatched me out the car, threw me straight on the ground." He explained that he is paralyzed from the chest down and frequently has muscle spasms as a result. When he was face down on the ground during this incident, his body "tensed up" and his "legs started shaking," at which point the officers deployed their Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW) at "point blank range straight in my back."

Mr. Black stated that he had prior contact with some of the officers involved and indicated that Officer Perry was the officer with whom he had the most prior contact. He stated, "they call it a justifiable harassment" since 2022.

Investigation Summary:

CCA interviewed Ms. Brandy and Mr. Black, as well as Officers Buck, Lewis, Abt, Perry, Tyler Mitchell #P0028 (W/M/27) (CPD Hire Date: 07/25/2021), and Colin Vanderyt #P0493 (W/M/36) (CPD Hire Date: 01/13/2019). CCA reviewed relevant body-worn camera (BWC) recordings, Mobile Video Recording (MVR) footage, relevant police records, records from the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts, use of force reports, Axon Taser10 Log, and computer aided dispatch (CAD) records.

Allegation 1: Harassment

Ms. Brandy alleged that officers “harassed” Mr. Black based on his prior criminal history. Mr. Black stated that he had prior contact with some of the officers involved and named Officer Perry as the officer with whom he had the most prior contact. He stated, “they call it a justifiable harassment” since 2022.

Officer Perry could not recall any contact with Mr. Black prior to this incident. During his CCA interview, Officer Perry indicated that he and Officer Abt observed a vehicle parked in front of an apartment complex known for high criminal activity. When they queried the license plate, it returned an active warrant for Mr. Black. Officers Buck and Lewis then initiated the traffic stop due to being in a marked police cruiser, as opposed to Officers Perry and Abt’s covert vehicle, and they identified the sole occupant and driver as Mr. Black.

All other officer interviews corroborated Officer Perry’s statement on how they encountered Mr. Black, and they all indicated that this was their first interaction with him.

CCA verified that the warrant was issued on October 25, 2023, through Lockland Mayor’s Court. The warrant was for a charge of Contempt of Court, for original charges of Speeding 79/55 and No Driver’s License in C#2023 TRD 287.

BWC footage and Officer Perry’s CCA interview statement provided no evidence to support the complainant’s assertion that he was being harassed by Officer Perry.

It should be noted that in Mr. Black’s CCA interview, he named three officers with whom he had the most contact: Officer Perry, Officer Dylan Scalf #P0388 (W/M/26) (CPD Hire Date: 12/01/2019), and Officer Carl Reed #P0003 (W/M/38) (CPD Hire Date: 11/05/2017). Officers Scalf and Reed were not involved in the incident on March 21, 2024.

CCA reviewed contact cards for Mr. Black from March 21, 2021, until March 21, 2024, of which there were two. Those two contact cards were completed by officers unrelated to the incident on March 21, 2024:

- On November 24, 2021, a contact card was completed by Officer Victoria Williams #P0420 (W/F/31) (CPD Hire Date: 01/13/2019). During that interaction, Mr. Black was a passenger in a vehicle (2012 Maroon Nissan Altima) that was stopped for “dark tint all around including windshield.” He was recited for a capias, marijuana was seized, and he was released on scene;
- On January 5, 2022, a contact card was completed by Officer Dylan Scalf. During that interaction, Mr. Black was a passenger in a vehicle (2012 Maroon Nissan Altima), and he was arrested for having a loaded firearm “ready at hand” in the vehicle.

CCA also reviewed records from the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts within the same timeframe. Those records revealed an additional two contacts, also involving officers unrelated to the incident on March 21, 2024:

- On March 8, 2023, charges of Failure of Comply with Order or Signal of Police Officer and Driving Under Suspension were filed by Officer Cole Dunahay #P0263 (W/M/30) (CPD Hire Date: 11/05/2017) after Mr. Black failed to stop for a traffic stop and a stop stick was deployed;
- On December 17, 2023, a charge of Driving Under Suspension was filed by Officer Dylan Scalf.

CCA also reviewed two contact cards for Mr. Black that have occurred since the incident on March 21, 2024:

- On August 14, 2024, a contact card was completed by Officer Jeremy Chitwood #P0049 (W/M/35) (CPD Hire Date: 12/01/2019). During that interaction, officers with the Violent Crimes Squad were investigating two individuals who were found to be in possession of suspected illegal drugs, firearms, and large amounts of cash. While officers searched their vehicles, the trunk of a nearby vehicle (2012 Maroon Nissan Altima) “popped open” and officers found Mr. Black attempting to hide in the trunk. Mr. Black was arrested for firearm-related offenses, as well as a Drug Paraphrenia offense;
- On January 29, 2025, a contact card was completed by Officer Casey Carver #P0233 (W/F/30) (CPD Hire Date: 11/05/2017). During that interaction, officers with the Crime Gun Intelligence Unit stopped a vehicle (2012 Maroon Nissan Altima) due to an expired license plate. Mr. Black was the driver of that vehicle. Officers gained consent to frisk each passenger and search the vehicle and trunk. No contraband was located, and Mr. Black was released with a warning to renew the license plate.

During his CCA interview, Officer Perry stated that he was present during the encounter with Mr. Black on August 14, 2024. According to records from the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts, Officer Perry filed charges of Having Weapons While Under Disability, Carrying Concealed Weapons, Improperly Handling Firearms in a Motor Vehicle, and Illegal Use or Possession of Drug Paraphernalia against Mr. Black due to that encounter. No charges were filed for Mr. Black by Officer Perry prior to the incident on March 21, 2024.

While CPD does not currently define “harassment,” CCA has defined it as follows: “A pattern of unwelcome or intrusive words or actions initiated by law enforcement toward an individual or group which serves no legitimate purpose and alarms or causes substantial distress in the person or group. This conduct by law enforcement can vary in severity, frequency, and offensiveness but will be evaluated objectively and take into account what a reasonable person would feel in the circumstances. Although harassment normally consists of a pattern of conduct, there may be circumstances when one interaction initiated by law enforcement for no legitimate purpose can constitute harassment. Nothing in this definition shall be seen to limit legitimate police action in any way.”

While Mr. Black had prior contact with CPD officers, and his contacts even involved the same vehicle (2012 Maroon Nissan Altima), there is no evidence to suggest a pattern of actions that served “no legitimate purpose.” Additionally, the reasons for the stop and subsequent arrest of Mr. Black on March 21, 2024, were legitimate.

Therefore, there is no information establishing that Officer Perry harassed Mr. Black, as alleged.

Allegations 2-5: Excessive Force

Ms. Brandy alleged that officers used excessive force on Mr. Black when they pulled him out of his vehicle. Mr. Black alleged that officers “snatched me out the car, threw me straight on the ground.”

A review of Officers Buck, Lewis, and Perry’s BWC revealed the following. Officers Buck and Lewis approached Mr. Black’s vehicle at 21:05:15 and asked him to roll the windows down; Mr. Black’s window was cracked a few inches, but he did not roll it down further. Mr. Black provided his name, and Officer Buck informed him there was an active warrant for his arrest. He asked Mr. Black if there were any weapons in the vehicle, which Mr. Black denied. Officer Buck asked Mr. Black to exit the vehicle, and Mr. Black responded that he was in a wheelchair and could not exit. Officer Buck acknowledged that information and told him that he was going to open the driver’s door. At that time, Officer Lewis stated, “Did you just lock the door?” and Mr. Black replied “Yeah.” Officer Buck provided multiple commands for Mr. Black to unlock the door and step out of the vehicle. Mr. Black stated that he could not do that due to him being in a wheelchair, and Officer Buck stated that he would assist him in exiting the vehicle. Mr. Black failed to comply with multiple commands to unlock the door.

At 21:07:12, Officer Buck displayed his firearm and pointed it at Mr. Black. He verbalized that Mr. Black had a firearm in plain sight, located between the driver’s door and seat. Officer Lewis also displayed his firearm at that time, as did Officers Abt and Perry, who arrived on scene and approached the vehicle at 21:07:28. Multiple officers continued to give commands for Mr. Black to unlock the door, but he refused to comply. He was also instructed not to reach around. Officer Perry holstered his firearm and displayed his CEW at 21:08:07. Mr. Black ultimately unlocked the door, and officers opened it at 21:08:26.

When the door was opened, Officer Perry took control of Mr. Black’s left arm. Officer Perry provided multiple commands for Mr. Black to “step out,” and Mr. Black responded, “I’m in a wheelchair.” At 21:08:35, Mr. Black turned his torso and reached his right arm toward the back of the vehicle while stating, “I’m in a wheelchair, my chair is in the back.” Officer Perry grabbed onto the front of his jacket, while Officer Buck grabbed onto Mr. Black’s right arm. Officers Abt and Lewis grabbed onto the back of Mr. Black’s jacket, and Mr. Black was removed from the vehicle while Officer Perry stepped back with his CEW still displayed. Mr. Black was placed on his side on the ground and was rolled onto his stomach at 21:08:44 as he stated, “Bro I’m in a fucking wheelchair.”

During Officer Buck’s CCA interview, he indicated that he observed a vehicle parked in a violent area, outside of an apartment building that had a history of firearm recoveries. When he queried the license plate information, he discovered an active warrant for Mr. Black, and flags that indicated that Mr. Black had a violent history and a history of firearms charges. When Officer Buck approached the vehicle, Mr. Black identified himself, but was verbally combative, refused to roll the window down fully, refused to exit the vehicle, and failed to keep his hands within view. Officer Buck observed a firearm on the floor of the vehicle near Mr. Black’s left hand, easily within his reach. Officer Buck drew his firearm, pointed it at Mr. Black, and ordered him to keep his hands away from the firearm. Officer Buck explained that he pointed his firearm at Mr. Black, with his finger outside the trigger guard, due to him previously lying about having a weapon in the vehicle and due to the firearm being within easy reach of Mr. Black. Officer Buck indicated that just prior to being removed from the vehicle, Mr. Black began reaching towards the center console of the vehicle. Multiple involved officers then grabbed onto Mr. Black’s hands to prevent him from gaining access to the firearm, and he was pulled out of the vehicle.

Officer Lewis' CCA interview corroborated Officer Buck's statement. Officer Lewis stated that he observed Mr. Black press the lock button on the door after he was told to exit the vehicle. When Officer Buck observed the firearm, the situation became a "high risk stop," as the firearm was tucked beside the driver side door and was within Mr. Black's reach. Officer Lewis drew his firearm and pointed it at Mr. Black, with his finger outside the trigger guard. He explained that Mr. Black was "essentially barricaded" in the vehicle, and it was a high-risk situation. When they were able to open the driver's side door, multiple officers grabbed Mr. Black to remove him from the vehicle and place him on the ground.

During Officer Abt's CCA interview, he indicated that he and Officer Perry only approached Mr. Black's vehicle when Officers Buck and Lewis drew their firearms. Mr. Black was not complying with police orders and had lied about having a weapon in the vehicle. Officer Abt also drew his firearm upon approach and pointed it at Mr. Black, with his finger outside the trigger guard, due to Mr. Black's access to a weapon and his noncompliance. Officers gave Mr. Black multiple commands to open the door and gave him an ample amount of time to comply, "well over a minute." When the door was opened, Mr. Black was still resistant, held onto the steering wheel, and reached towards the middle console. Mr. Black "was not surrendering to police." When officers grabbed onto Mr. Black, he "tensed up" and attempted to pull back into the vehicle. Officer Abt then assisted in removing Mr. Black from the vehicle. Mr. Black was placed on the ground face down.

Officer Perry's CCA interview corroborated Officer Abt's statement. He stated that when he approached the vehicle, he had his firearm drawn with his finger outside the trigger guard, due to hearing Officer Buck state that Mr. Black had a firearm next to him and was not compliant with commands. Since multiple officers had their firearms drawn, Officer Perry holstered his firearm and displayed his CEW to gain compliance. Mr. Black was noncompliant with commands but was able to be removed from the vehicle and placed onto the ground on his stomach.

CPD Procedure Manual § 12.545 Use of Force (Revised date 02/17/2022) defines "actively resisting arrest" as "when the subject is making physically evasive movements **to defeat the officer's attempt at control**, including fleeing, bracing, tensing, pushing, or verbally signaling an intention to avoid or prevent being taken into or retained in custody." It defines force as "any physical strike, instrumental contact with a person, or any significant physical contact that restricts movement of a person," including "hard hands" and "the taking of a subject to the ground." It also defines hard hands as "the use of physical pressure to force a person against an object or the ground, use of physical strength or skill that causes pain or leaves a mark, leverage displacement, joint manipulation, pain compliance, and pressure point control tactics."

Additionally, it states, "A police officer's right to make an arrest or an investigatory stop necessarily carries with it the right to use some degree of physical coercion, or threat thereof, to effect it." Further, the decision to use force "requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officer or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight."

CPD Procedure Manual § 12.545 Use of Force (Revised date 02/17/2022) also listed the following factors that may be taken into consideration to evaluate whether an officer used objectively reasonable force:

- “The conduct of the person being confronted as reasonably perceived by the officer at the time, including the level of threat or resistance presented by the subject.”
- “The proximity of weapons. “
- “The potential for injury to citizens, officers and suspects.”
- “The prior knowledge of the subject’s propensity for violence.”

Further, it states that “the suspect should be allowed to submit to arrest before force is used unless this causes unnecessary danger to the officer or others,” and “officers must avoid using unnecessary violence. Their privilege to use force is not limited to that amount of force necessary to protect themselves or others, but extends to that amount reasonably necessary to enable them to effect the arrest of an actively resistant subject.”

CPD Procedure Manual § 12.550 Discharge of Firearms by Police Personnel (Revised date 06/22/2017) states, “At such time as a police officer perceives what he interprets to be a threat of loss of life or serious physical harm to himself or others at the hands of another, he has the authority to display a firearm, **with finger outside the trigger guard** and have it ready for self-defense.”

When CCA applied CPD Procedure Manual § 12.545 Use of Force (Revised date 02/17/2022) and CPD Procedure Manual § 12.550 Discharge of Firearms by Police Personnel (Revised date 06/22/2017) to the facts of this case, it was evident that Officers Buck, Lewis, Abt and Perry were within CPD Policy when they pointed their firearms at Mr. Black and removed him from his vehicle. Mr. Black actively resisted arrest throughout the encounter, as shown when he locked the door, ignored commands to unlock it, and barricaded himself in his vehicle. Further, the proximity of the firearm and the flags in the system regarding his history of violence and firearms charges were factors taken into consideration by the officers. Just prior to being removed from the vehicle, Mr. Black reached towards the back of the vehicle, and Officer Abt stated in his CCA interview that Mr. Black was still resistant once the door was opened, and he “tensed up” and attempted to pull back into the vehicle when officers grabbed onto his person. Due to Mr. Black’s noncompliance for over three minutes and the proximity of the firearm, officers were within CPD policy when they pulled Mr. Black out of the vehicle.

Therefore, the actions of Officers Buck, Lewis, Abt, and Perry were consistent with CPD policy, procedure, and training.

Allegation 6: Excessive Force (Taser)

Ms. Brandy alleged that officers “tased (Mr. Black) excessively, at least three times.” Mr. Black alleged that when he was on the ground, his body “tensed up” and his “legs started shaking” because of his paralysis, and officers deployed their CEW at “point blank range straight in my back.”

A review of Officers Buck, Lewis, and Perry’s BWC revealed the following. Mr. Black was placed on his side on the ground and was rolled onto his stomach at 21:08:44. Officers gave commands for him to put his hands behind his back and for him to stop resisting. When Mr. Black was rolled onto his stomach, Officers Buck, Abt, and Perry held onto his wrists and arms and attempted to place his hands behind his back. Officer Lewis placed his hands on Mr. Black’s waist and maintained control of his lower body. Mr. Black’s right arm was underneath his body initially, but Officer Buck was able to control his right arm and place it behind his back. At the same time, Officer Perry was holding Mr. Buck’s left arm. Despite multiple commands given

to Mr. Black to “put your hands behind your back” and to “stop resisting or you’re going to get tased,” Mr. Black failed to place his left arm behind his back. He repeatedly stated, “I’m not,” when he was told to “stop resisting.” Officer Perry then deployed his CEW on Mr. Black’s back at 21:08:55. Mr. Black was handcuffed and was subsequently rolled onto his side and moved to a seated position.

During Officer Perry’s CCA interview, he indicated that Mr. Black’s hands were underneath his body when they were on the ground. Officer Perry noted officer safety concerns regarding the possibility of Mr. Black having additional weapons on his person. Mr. Black would not provide his hands to be handcuffed, and Officer Perry deployed his CEW. He explained that the trigger must be pulled at least twice to achieve Neuromuscular Incapacitation (NMI). He could not recall how many times he pulled the trigger. He explained that he used the CEW to gain compliance to effectuate the handcuffing because Mr. Black failed to provide his hands, and due to the safety concerns regarding his potential access to additional weapons. Officer Perry provided Mr. Black with verbal commands, but he failed to comply with orders. The CEW had the desired effect, and Mr. Black was able to be handcuffed. Officer Perry had no further contact with Mr. Black after deploying his CEW.

Officers Buck, Lewis, and Abt’s CCA interviews corroborated Officer Perry’s statement. Mr. Black continued his noncompliance until Officer Perry deployed his CEW. Mr. Black complied after the CEW was deployed and was placed in handcuffs. Mr. Black was evaluated by the Cincinnati Fire Department (CFD) prior to being taken to the Hamilton County Justice Center (HCJC).

According to the Axon Taser10 Log, four cartridges were deployed for a total of 6.566 seconds of energizes. The Axon T10 Deployment Information report on EVT indicated that the CEW was deployed on Mr. Black’s upper back, lower back, and buttocks.

CPD Procedure Manual § 12.545 Use of Force (Revised date 02/17/2022) defines a CEW as “an electronic control device that is a non-lethal force alternative used to assist officers in the performance of their duties. A CEW is designed for self-defense or to temporarily immobilize a subject who **is actively resisting arrest**. It generates electricity in a small, hand-held, battery operated unit about the size of a handgun.” It states, “when properly used, a CEW generates electrical impulses that cause Neuro Muscular Incapacitation (NMI). NMI occurs when the CEW causes involuntary stimulation of both the sensory nerves and the motor nerves. Subjects become physically incapacitated and unable to control muscle movement, allowing officers to gain control.” Further, “a CEW may be used in situations where time and conditions permit. It can be an extremely effective control device for close range incapacitation.” It also states that “frontal shots are prohibited except in situations of self-defense or defense of another. The preferred target area is the back of the individual **actively resisting arrest**.”

Additionally, it states that “a CEW may be deployed on a suspect **actively resisting arrest** when there is probable cause to arrest the suspect, or to defend one’s self or another from active aggression.” It also states that “officers shall consider the following prior to utilization of a CEW as a force option: 1) The severity of the crime at issue. 2) The risk of danger posed to others if the suspect is not promptly apprehended. 3) The potential risk of secondary injury to the suspect due to environmental conditions.” Further, “when possible, give the subject a verbal warning before a CEW is deployed unless exigent circumstances exist that would make it imprudent to do so.”

It also states that “use of a CEW should be combined with physical restraint techniques to minimize the total duration of the struggle and CEW use. Additional officers on the scene of a CEW deployment should attempt to restrain and handcuff a subject during an active CEW cycle.” Finally, it states, “officers will obtain appropriate medical treatment for suspects when necessary. Request Cincinnati Fire Department (CFD) respond to evaluate the subject under the following circumstances: 1) After a CEW deployment that immobilized or partially immobilized the subject. 2) After a CEW deployment where **at least one** probe made contact with the suspect’s skin or clothing.”

When CCA applied CPD Procedure Manual § 12.545 Use of Force (Revised date 02/17/2022) to the facts of this case, it was evident that Officer Perry was within CPD Policy when he deployed his CEW on Mr. Black. Mr. Black actively resisted arrest when he was on the ground, evidenced by BWC footage and CCA interview statements from all involved officers, and officers had probable cause to arrest Mr. Black due to his active warrant. Mr. Black was given multiple commands to put his hands behind his back, which he failed to comply, and was given warnings prior to the CEW being deployed. Additionally, Officer Perry indicated that they were unsure whether Mr. Black had additional firearms on his person, which was an officer safety concern. While the CEW was discharged, other officers successfully handcuffed Mr. Black, and the CFD was called to the scene prior to him being transported to the HCJC.

Therefore, the actions of Officer Perry were consistent with CPD policy, procedure, and training.

Findings:

Based on my investigation and review of the evidence uncovered, I recommend the following findings for your endorsement (findings are defined in the attachment to this memorandum):

Allegations

No.	Allegation	Involved Officer	Involved Citizen	Finding
1	Harassment	Grant Perry	Garry Black	Unfounded
2	Excessive Force	Mikhale Buck	Garry Black	Exonerated
3	Excessive Force	Dae’Shawn Lewis	Garry Black	Exonerated
4	Excessive Force	Myles Abt	Garry Black	Exonerated
5	Excessive Force	Grant Perry	Garry Black	Exonerated
6	Excessive Force (Taser)	Grant Perry	Garry Black	Exonerated

Recommendation:

#R2515

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) states a common problem that people with disabilities have with law enforcement is that “unexpected actions taken by some individuals with disabilities may be misconstrued by officers or deputies as suspicious or illegal activity or uncooperative behavior.”¹ When Officer Buck initiated contact with Mr. Black, he advised Officer Buck of his physical circumstances, but Officer Buck did not relay the information to other officers as they

¹ Commonly asked questions about the ADA and law enforcement. (2020, February 8). *ADA.gov*. <https://www.ada.gov/resources/commonly-asked-questions-law-enforcement/#interacting-with-people-with-disabilities>

arrived on scene. As his limited mobility impacted his ability to respond to the officers' orders, Mr. Black was concerned the officers' limited awareness and/or failure to understand his condition affected their overall response to him (as detailed above).

The remaining officers confirmed to CCA they were unaware of Mr. Black's physical condition until after he was handcuffed. BWC footage showed the officers physically carried Mr. Black to the cruiser rather than used a wheelchair and considered, but ultimately decided against, bringing Mr. Black's wheelchair to the HCJC.

The officers' acts, combined with officers' confirmation that they had not received training specific to working with and/or arrests involving individuals with disabilities, suggest a gap in the officers' training. Currently, CPD Procedure Manual § 12.600 Prisoners: Securing, Handling, and Transporting (Revised date 01/20/2023) advises officers to use "a vehicle appropriate for providing the necessary care for the prisoner," but does not provide further guidance. An expansion of CPD's policy regarding the transport of individuals with disabilities would be beneficial, while also considering the implications of an individual being released from custody without access to their personal mobility device.

The ADA offers substantial recommendations and guidance for officer-led interactions with individuals with physical disabilities, with consideration for the safety of all involved. CPD should consider providing officers with training courses to include:

- sensitivity and awareness;
- distinguishing behaviors that may be demonstrated because of an individual's disability;
- how to identify if an individual requires alternate transportation for safety reasons; and,
- how to communicate with individuals about their disability.

This additional training would not only improve both officer and community safety, but ensure the person is treated with respect and dignity throughout the law enforcement process.



Kaitlyn Streicher, Investigator



John Kennedy, Director