

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT ADVISORY BOARD

AD HOC AUDIT COMMITTEE

Zander Bolyanantz, Member

Eduardo Budanauro, Member

Diane McDermott, CPOA Executive Director

Ali Abbasi, CPOA Deputy Director

Monday, August 11, 2025, at 10 a.m.
City Hall Annex, 501 Tijeras NW, Suite 2E
CPOA Conference Room

Members Present:

Zander Bolyantz
Eduardo Budanauro

Members Absent:

Others Present

Diane McDermott, CPOA
Ali Abbasi, CPOA
Katrina Sigala, CPOA
Valerie Barela, CPOA
Omotayo Olubiyi, CCO

Minutes

- I. Welcome and Call to Order.** Zander Bolyanantz called the Ad hoc Audit Committee meeting to order at approximately 10:02 a.m.
- II. Approval of the Agenda**
 - a.** The agenda was approved.
- III. Approval of the Minutes from May 13, 2025**
 - a.** The Minutes from May 13, 2025, were approved.
- IV. Discussion and Possible Action:**
 - a. Audit of CPC 231-24**
 - i. The Ad Hoc Audit Committee reported its CPC 231-24 Audit findings, noting that no issues were identified and that they utilized a Case Audit Checklist for Board Members as a tool to complete their audit (*see attached*).
 - ii. The Ad Hoc Audit Committee reviewed minor changes to the Case Audit Checklist, and CPOA Executive Director Diane McDermott suggested developing an Audit Report Form for the committee.

- iii. Zander Bolyanantz confirmed with the Compliance Contract Officer (CCO) that the Ad Hoc Audit Committee processes established for the semi-annual audits were in compliance with the Police Oversight Ordinance.
- iv. The Audit Committee will report its findings at the next regularly scheduled Civilian Police Oversight Advisory Board meeting.

V. Next Meeting TBD

- a. The next Ad Hoc Audit Committee meeting will be on October 14, 2025, at 10 a.m.

VI. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:17 a.m.

APPROVED:



Eduardo Budanauro
Ad Hoc Audit Committee Member

10/31/2025
Date

CC: Isaac Padilla, City Council Staff
Ethan Watson, City Clerk
Brook Bassan, City Council President (via email)

Minutes drafted and submitted by:
Valerie Barela, Administrative Assistant

ATTACHMENT

Case Audit Checklist for Board Members

Purpose: This checklist is intended to assist board members of the audit subcommittee in conducting quality assurance audits. These audits focus on whether standard investigative procedures were followed and whether the documentation supports the findings, not to reinvestigate the case.

Note: Not every item will apply to every case. Use professional judgment when reviewing the checklist.

1- Intake and Initial Review

- a. Was the initial focus of the complaint appropriately identified? (SOPs in question)
- b. Was preliminary evidence submitted by the complainant reviewed and acknowledged (if any)?

2- Investigation Steps

- a. Were subject of investigation letters issued to involved APD employees within 15 days (per CBA)?
- b. Was relevant evidence collected and included in the file (if applicable)?
 - i. CAD Reports
 - ii. OBRD Footage
 - iii. Mark43 Reports
 - iv. Other, if any
- c. Was all relevant OBRD footage reviewed and summarized?
- d. Were other related reports retrieved (crash reports, supplements, time cards, etc.)?
- e. Were interviews conducted with:
 - i. Complainant(s) (if applicable)?
 - ii. Involved Officer(s)?
 - iii. Witnesses (if known)?
- f. Were interviews summarized?
- g. Were appropriate follow-ups conducted where needed?

3- Conclusion and Findings

- a. Are the conclusions supported by the evidence?
- b. Does the file indicate the findings of each allegation?
- c. Was there a clear rationale explaining each finding?
- d. Were policy violations (if any) cited?

4- Internal Review and Quality Control

- a. Does the file indicate a supervisory review occurred? (director's form)
- b. If a sustained finding is made, does the file have a disciplinary action packet explaining the recommended discipline?

5- Case Closure and Communication

- a. Was a finding letter sent to the complainant?
- b. Was there a documented rationale in cases of non-concurrence with APD?

6- Additional Observations

- a. Were there any delays in the process? If so, are they explained?
- b. Does the investigation demonstrate neutrality and professionalism throughout?
- c. Are all documents properly labeled, dated, and easy to follow?