



City of Milwaukee – Fire and Police  
Commission (FPC)

# MPD Squad Accident Audit

Audit #2026 - 0101



## Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
Purpose .....	3
Prior Audits / Background.....	3
Audit Timeframe .....	4
Audit Population .....	4
Current Recommendations.....	5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	6
Objective 1 – Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Number .....	6
Objective 2 – Crash Report (DT4000) .....	6
Objective 3 – Vehicle Pursuit .....	7
Objective 4 – Type of Activity (Officer).....	7
Objective 5 – Squad Vehicle Type.....	8
Objective 6 – Photographs.....	9
Objective 8 – Driver Action (Citizen).....	11
Objective 9 – Injury (Officer/Citizen) .....	12
Objective 10 – Squad Accident Damage .....	12
Objective 11 – Sergeant Tracking (Supervision) .....	13
Objective 11.1 – Sergeant Requested an AIM Number Prior to Securing .....	13
Objective 11.2 – Sergeant Completed within 8 Days.....	14
Objective 12 – Lieutenant Tracking (Supervision) .....	15
Objective 12.1 – Lieutenant Completed within 10 days of Receipt.....	15
Objective 12.2 – Lieutenant Completed within 18 Days of Squad Accident .....	15
Objective 13 – Commanding Officer (Supervision).....	16
Objective 13.1 – Commanding Officer Completed within 17 days of Receipt .....	16
Objective 13.2 – Commanding Officer Completed within 35 days of the Squad Accident .....	17
Objective 14 – Commanding Officer Recommendations .....	18
Objective 15 – Internal Affairs Division (IAD) Review of Squad Accidents.....	18
Objective 16 – Member’s Rank and Prior Squad Accidents .....	19
Objective 16.1 – Member’s Rank.....	19
Objective 16.2 – Prior Squad Accidents.....	19

Objective 17 – Accountability .....	20
Other Related Matters .....	22
APPENDIX .....	23
Summary of Findings.....	23

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Milwaukee Police Department Squad Accident audit is part of the 2025 City of Milwaukee Fire and Police Commission (FPC) audit plan. The audit is intended to review MPD's compliance with policies and procedures related to squad accidents. This is the FPC's first audit for this topic. The goal of the audit is to determine the compliance rate for the squad accidents. The [MPD Standard Operating Procedures \(SOP\) 650 – Vehicle Crashes](#) is the foundational document for testing compliance.

SOP 650 provides department members with instructions for properly investigating, reporting, and tracking squad accidents. According to the SOP, when a member is involved in an accident, a supervisor of a higher rank from the member's work location conducts an investigation. A DT4000 (Crash Report), including supplemental information, is filed on all crashes involving department vehicles. Additionally, the supervisor files a squad accident report via the Administrative Investigations Management (AIM) system detailing the facts of the investigation. It should be noted at the time of this audit, MPD now uses Benchmark Analytics to document its squad accidents.

### Purpose

As part of the FPC's 2025 Annual Audit Schedule, an audit of squad accidents will be conducted to review compliance with the Milwaukee Police Department's SOP 650—*Vehicle Crashes*.

### Prior Audits / Background

This is the first vehicle pursuit audit conducted by the FPC's Audit Unit. This audit comprised 17 objectives.

1. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) - Documentation
2. DT4000 (Crash) Report - Documentation
3. Squad Accident Related to a Vehicle Pursuit (VP)
4. Driver Activity (Officer)
5. Squad Vehicle Type
6. Photographs of the Squad Accident
7. Video of the Squad Accident
8. Driver Action (Citizen)
9. Injuries (Officer/Citizen)
10. Damage
11. Sergeant (Supervision)
12. Lieutenant (Supervision)
13. Commanding Officer (Supervision)
14. Recommendations for Further Action of Investigation
15. Internal Affairs Division (IAD)
16. Prior Squad Accidents
17. Accountability

## Audit Timeframe

The Audit Unit reviewed squad accidents for the Q1–Q2 2025 timeframe.

## Audit Population

The audit population was obtained through the MPD’s AIM system. While using the AIM system, the squad accidents were selected under the Incident Type field. The incident dates from January 1st through June 30th, 2025, were then selected. The AIM system generated 88 total reports. The Audit Unit then reviewed the 88 reports, both open and closed. During the review process, 18 squad accidents were removed. The removed samples and the reason for the removal are in Table #1. This resulted in a total population of 70 squad accidents. Table #2 lists the 70 squad accidents reviewed for this audit.

*Table 1 – Deselected Squad Accidents (18):*

<b>AIM Squad Accident Report Number:</b>	<b>Reason for Deselection:</b>
PA-2025-0015	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0019	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0032	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0035	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0036	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0038	File still Open / Lieutenant Tracking
PA-2025-0047	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0045	File still Open / Under Investigation
PA-2025-0050	Report Voided
PA-2025-0075	File still Open / Waiting on Corrections
PA-2025-0101	File still Open
PA-2025-0079	File still Open / Pending Action
PA-2025-0081	File still Open / Lieutenant Tracking
PA-2025-0084	File still Open
PA-2025-0059	File still Open
PA-2025-0064	File still Open
PA-2025-0078	File still Open
PA-2025-0070	File still Open

*Table 2 – Squad Accident AIM Population (70):*

PA-2025-0001	PA-2025-0002	PA-2025-0005	PA-2025-0003	PA-2025-0004	PA-2025-0006	PA-2025-0007	PA-2025-0008	PA-2025-0009	PA-2025-00010
PA-2025-00011	PA-2025-0013	PA-2025-0012	PA-2025-0014	PA-2025-0016	PA-2025-0017	PA-2025-0018	PA-2025-0020	PA-2025-0021	PA-2025-0024
PA-2025-0022	PA-2025-0023	PA-2025-0025	PA-2025-0027	PA-2025-0026	PA-2025-0028	PA-2025-0031	PA-2025-0029	PA-2025-0030	PA-2025-0033
PA-2025-0034	PA-2025-0037	PA-2025-0041	PA-2025-0040	PA-2025-0039	PA-2025-0043	PA-2025-0042	PA-2025-0053	PA-2025-0046	PA-2025-0044
PA-2025-0051	PA-2025-0049	PA-2025-0048	PA-2025-0052	PA-2025-0054	PA-2025-0055	PA-2025-0057	PA-2025-0056	PA-2025-0058	PA-2025-0069
PA-2025-0061	PA-2025-0060	PA-2025-0062	PA-2025-0063	PA-2025-0065	PA-2025-0066	PA-2025-0067	PA-2025-0068	PA-2025-0074	PA-2025-0073
PA-2025-0072	PA-2025-0071	PA-2025-0076	PA-2025-0077	PA-2025-0080	PA-2025-0082	PA-2025-0083	PA-2025-0087	PA-2025-0085	PA-2025-0086

### Current Recommendations

Table #3 presents the current recommendations, based on the audit findings. They offer an opportunity for improvement in MPD’s squad accidents.

*Table 3 – Current Recommendations:*

Recommendations	Due Date	Objective Number
<b>Recommendation 1:</b> MPD should ensure that supervisors complete the Squad Accident report within the timeframes required by SOP 650.	03/01/2026	11 -13
<b>Recommendation 2:</b> IAD should ensure members are held accountable for squad accidents. This ensures equity and fairness with its members.	03/01/2025	17
<b>Recommendation 3:</b> MPD should remind its supervisors not to approve reports in which they are directly involved. This ensures the investigation is impartial and fair.	03/01/2026	Other Related Matters

<b>Recommendation 4:</b> MPD should provide this audit to the Academy. The Academy can use the audit findings for Emergency Vehicle Operations Control (EVOC) and Supervisor Training.	03/01/2026	All
--	------------	-----

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### Objective 1 – Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Number

#### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Details Tab contains the CAD# field.

The Audit Team used the AIM system to determine if the supervisor completed the Details Tab and listed a CAD number.

#### Results

After reviewing the 70 squad accident reports in the AIM system, 69 passed, one (1) failed, and zero were not applicable, for a success rate of **98.57% (69/70)**. The 69 squad accident reports that passed Objective 1 had a CAD number listed in the Details Tab of the AIM Squad Accident report. The one (1) failed report is listed in Table #4.

*Table 4 – Failed for Objective 1:*

Sample Number:	Reason for Failure:
50 / PA-2025-0069	No CAD number listed in AIM.

### Objective 2 – Crash Report (DT4000)

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (A) (2), “A DT4000 (Crash Report), including supplemental information shall be filed on crashes involving department vehicles.”

The Audit Unit used the AIM system to determine if the supervisor completed the Details Tab and listed the crash report (DT4000) in the TraCS Tab. The Audit Unit then cross-referenced the number listed in AIM and confirmed a report was in the TraCS system.

#### Results

After reviewing the 70 squad accident reports in the AIM system, 67 passed, two (2) failed, and one (1) was not applicable, for a success rate of **97.10% (67/69)**. The 67 squad accident reports that passed Objective 2 had a TraCS number listed in the Details Tab of the AIM Squad Accident report, and a report was located in the TraCS system. The one (1) applicable report is listed in Table #5. The two (2) failed reports are listed in Table #6.

*Table 5 – Not Applicable for Objective 2:*

<b>Sample Number:</b>	<b>Reason for Not Applicable</b>
50 / PA-2025-0069	The squad accident occurred in Washington, D.C., and that agency does not use TraCS to document its crash reports.

*Table 6– Failed for Objective 2:*

<b>Sample Number:</b>	<b>Reason for Failure:</b>
14 / PA-2025-0014	Unable to locate a crash report in TraCS. The failure was due to the wrong TraCS report number listed in AIM*.
41 / PA-2025-0051	No Report Filed.

\*It should be noted that the Audit Unit worked with IAD and located the TraCS report for Sample #14. IAD then updated the AIM Squad Accident report.

### Objective 3 – Vehicle Pursuit

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (D), “If a crash occurs during a motor vehicle pursuit, in addition to the DT4000, supervisors shall file a motor vehicle pursuit report via the Aim system.”

The Audit Unit used the AIM system to determine if the supervisor filed a vehicle pursuit report when a crash occurred as a result of a vehicle pursuit.

#### Results

After reviewing the 70 squad accident reports in the AIM system, 11 passed, zero (0) failed, and 59 were not applicable, for a success rate of **100% (11/11)**. The 11 squad accident reports that passed Objective 3 had a vehicle pursuit report in AIM. The 59 not applicable reports were squad accidents that were not vehicle pursuit related.

### Objective 4 – Type of Activity (Officer)

#### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Employee Details Tab has a Type of Activity field. This field has the following selections:

- On Patrol
- In Pursuit
- Legal Intervention
- Making Conveyance
- Other Police Business
- Parking Maneuver
- Responding as Emergency Vehicle
- Under Cover

The Audit Team used the AIM system to determine the member's activity at the time of the squad accident.

Results

The results of this objective did not measure compliance, but reviewed the type of activity selected in the AIM system. The results are listed in Table #7.

Table 7– Type of Activity:

Type of Activity:	Total:
On Patrol	26
In Pursuit*	9
Legal Intervention	1
Making Conveyance	0
Other Police Business	14
Parking Maneuver	10
Responding as Emergency Vehicle	7
Under Cover	3
<i>Grand Total:</i>	<i>70</i>

\*It should be noted in Objective 3 (Vehicle Pursuit), the total was 11, and the Type of Activity in AIM for this objective had a total of nine (9).

Objective 5 – Squad Vehicle Type

Methodology

Per MPD's Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Employee Details Tab has a Type of Vehicle Involved field. This field has the following selections:

- Motorcycle
- Marked Squad
- Wagon
- Unmarked Squad
- Undercover Car
- Bicycle
- Other
- Jeep
- Semi

The Audit Team used the AIM system to determine the type of vehicle involved at the time of the squad accident. The Audit Unit also reviewed photographs and video to determine whether the selected vehicle type was correct.

### Results

After reviewing the vehicle involved in the 70 squad accidents, 68 passed, two (2) failed, and zero (0) were not applicable, for a success rate of **97.14% (68/70)**. Table #8 summarizes the types of vehicles involved. Table #9 has the failed samples.

*Table 8– Type of Vehicle Involved:*

Type of Vehicle Involved:	Total:
Motorcycle	3
Marked Squad	44
Wagon	7
Unmarked	10
Under Cover Car	5
Bicycle	0
Jeep	0
Other (MPD Command Post)	1
Semi	0
<i>Grand Total:</i>	70

*Table 9 – Type of Vehicle Involved Failures:*

Sample No. Squad Accident Report:	Reason for Failure:
3 / PA-2025-0005	Was selected as Marked Squad, but was a Wagon and included in Wagon Total in Table 8.
32 / PA-2025-0037	Was selected as Marked Squad, but was a Wagon and included in Wagon Total in Table 8.

## Objective 6 – Photographs

### Methodology

Per SOP 10.55(E), “For all city property accidents and when third-party negligence is indicated (e.g., an officer trips on a defective stairway, auto accidents), the investigating supervisor shall ensure photographs of the accident scene are taken and denote the date, time, location, and number of photographs.

Per SOP 740.10 (B), “Original images shall be imported in an unaltered state to Evidence.com (Axon).

The Audit Unit used the AIM system to determine whether the supervisor had completed the required number of photographs in the field, as documented in the Details Tab. The Audit Unit then cross-referenced the photographs documented in AIM with the Axon system (Evidence.com).

### Results

After reviewing the 70 squad accident photographs in the AIM system and Evidence.com, 59 passed, 11 failed, and zero (0) were not applicable, for a success rate of **84.29% (59/70)**. The 59 squad accident reports that passed Objective 6 had photographs documented in the AIM and Evidence.com systems. The failed samples are listed in Table #10.

*Table 10– Failed for Objective 6:*

<b>Sample Number:</b>	<b>Reason for Failure:</b>
16 / PA-2025-0017	The supervisor indicated in AIM that over 10 photographs were taken. However, there are only six (6) photographs in Evidence.com.
21 / PA-2025-0022	The photographs were documented in Evidence.com with the wrong CAD number.
23 / PA-2025-0025	Unable to locate photographs in Evidence.com.
30 / PA-2025-0033	The supervisor indicated in AIM that eight (8) photographs were taken. However, there are only seven (7) photographs in Evidence.com.
33 / PA-2025-0041	The photographs were documented in Evidence.com with the wrong CAD number.
38 / PA-2025-0053	The supervisor indicated in AIM that three (3) photographs were taken. However, no photographs were located in Evidence.com.
41 / PA-2025-0051	The photographs were combined with Domestic Violence photographs. The squad accident and domestic violence were not related and should have been uploaded separately.
48 / PA-2025-0056	The supervisor indicated in AIM that five (5) photographs were taken. However, there were six (6) photographs in Evidence.com. Additionally, there are no photographs showing the squad car. The photographs are of the citizen’s vehicle (moped).
63 / PA-2025-0076	Unable to locate photographs in Evidence.com.
68 / PA-2025-0087	Unable to locate photographs in Evidence.com.
69 / PA-2025-0085	Unable to locate photographs in Evidence.com.

### **Objective 7 – Video of Squad Accident**

#### Methodology

Per SOP 730.10 (B), “The in-car camera system may be used to record the following:

1. Circumstances at crime and vehicle crash scenes.”

Per SOP 747.25 (C) (2) (c) (8), “Crash scenes (may be turned off if member is waiting on tow truck and no additional enforcement activity is likely.”

The Audit Unit reviewed the Details Tab of the AIM Squad Accident report. This field has a Video Exists (Yes/No) Tab. The Audit Unit then reviewed Evidence.com (Axon) to verify whether a body-worn camera (BWC), in-car video, or any other video captured the squad accident.

### Results

After review of the Evidence.com (Axon) for the 70 squad accident videos, 40 passed, 28 were not applicable, and two (2) failed for a success rate of **95.24% (40/42)**. The stops that were not applicable did not have squad video, BWC, or any other video of the squad accident. The 40 squad accidents that passed Objective 7 had a video in Evidence.com (Axon) and were noted in the AIM squad accident report. The failed samples and their reasons are listed in Table #11.

*Table 11– Failed for Objective 7:*

<b>Sample No. Squad Accident Report:</b>	<b>Reason for Failure:</b>
30 / PA-2025-0033	The member’s BWC was not activated. The BWC should have been recording since the member was making a conveyance at the time of the squad accident.
41 / PA-2025-0051	The member turned their camera off early during the squad accident. (PO Brandi Poort video 1 minute and 44 seconds.)

## Objective 8 – Driver Action (Citizen)

### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Subject Details Tab contains the Citations Issued (Yes/No) Tab.

The Audit Unit discovered that the AIM system lacks an arrest tab. The Audit Unit then reviewed the Subject Details Tab and the Notes (Narrative) section to determine the law enforcement action for the squad accident.

### Results

This objective was a review of law enforcement actions only, not a measurement of compliance. Table #12 summarizes the type of law enforcement action taken in response to the squad accident.

*Table 12– Summary of Law Enforcement Action:*

<b>Law Enforcement Action:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
Arrested	8
Cited (Issued a Traffic Citation)	14
Subject Fled the Scene	4
No Law Enforcement Action and/or No Citizen Involved.	44
<i>Grand Total:</i>	<b>70</b>

## Objective 9 – Injury (Officer/Citizen)

### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Subject Details Tab contains the Injury Type (Pain/Minor/Major/Fatal) Tab. The Employee Details Tab also contains a Member Injured (Yes/No) Tab.

The Audit Unit reviewed the Subject Detail and the Employee Detail Tabs for documentation of injuries. The Audit Unit also reviewed the Notes (Narrative) section of the AIM Squad Accident report for any other documentation of injuries.

### Results

The results of this objective did not measure compliance but instead reviewed the types of injuries documented in the AIM system. Table #13 summarizes the injuries involved in the squad accidents.

Table 13– Summary of Injuries:

<b>Injuries:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
Officer	7
Citizen	4
No Injuries reported on the AIM Squad Accident Report	59
<i>Grand Total:</i>	<i>70</i>

## Objective 10 – Squad Accident Damage

### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Details Tab contains the Reportable (over \$1000) Yes/No Tab. This field documents the total damage. If the accident is reportable (over \$1000), then Yes is selected. If the accident is non-reportable (under \$1000), select No.

The Audit Unit reviewed the Reportable Tab for documentation of damage. The Audit Unit also reviewed the Notes (Narrative) section of the AIM Squad Accident report for any other documentation of damage. Additionally, the Audit Unit reviewed photographs of the damage under Objective 6 of this audit.

### Results

The results of this objective did not measure compliance, but reviewed the type of damage selected in the AIM system. Table #14 summarizes Reportable Damage related to squad accidents.

*Table 14– Summary of Damage:*

Damage	Total:
Over \$1000	47
Under \$1000	23
<i>Grand Total:</i>	70

## Objective 11 – Sergeant Tracking (Supervision)

### Objective 11.1 – Sergeant Requested an AIM Number Prior to Securing

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (a), “The supervisor responsible for filing the report shall obtain a number in the AIM system prior to securing from duty on the date in which the incident occurred.”

The Audit Unit compared the Squad Accident Incident Date with the Supervisor assigned date in the Tracking Tab of the AIM Squad Accident report. This is the date the supervisor obtained a number in the AIM system.

#### Results

After review of the AIM tracking for the 70 squad accidents, 54 passed, five (5) were not applicable, and 11 failed for a success rate of **83.08% (54/65)**. The five (5) samples not applicable were a higher-ranking member (Lieutenant) filing the squad accident. The 54 squad accidents that passed Objective 11.1 had a tracking date prior to the supervisor securing. The 11 failed samples are listed in Table #15.

*Table 15– Failed for Objective 11.1:*

Sample No. Squad Accident Report:	Accident Date:	AIM Tracking Date:	Days Late:
24 / PA-2025-0027	02/26/2025	03/02/2025	<b>4</b>
27 / PA-2025-0031	03/09/2025	03/13/2025	<b>4</b>
33 / PA-2025-0041	04/08/2025	04/10/2025	<b>2</b>
34 / PA-2025-0040	04/08/2025	04/10/2025	<b>2</b>
38 / PA-2025-0053	04/16/2025	04/27/2025	<b>11</b>
39 / PA-2025-0046	04/18/2025	04/21/2025	<b>3</b>
41 / PA-2025-0051	04/23/2025	04/25/2025	<b>2</b>
50 / PA-2025-0069	05/11/2025	05/29/2025	<b>18</b>
53 / PA-2025-0062	05/13/2025	05/14/2025	<b>1</b>
69 / PA-2025-0085	06/29/2025	06/30/2025	<b>1</b>
70 / PA-2025-0086	06/30/2025	07/01/2025	<b>1</b>

## Objective 11.2 – Sergeant Completed within 8 Days

### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (b), “Reports to be completed and tracked to the designated supervisor or shift commander within 8 days of the incident.”

The Audit Unit compared the Squad Accident Incident Date with the Supervisor (Sergeant) completed date in the Tracking Tab of the AIM Squad Accident report.

### Results

After review of the AIM tracking for the 70 squad accidents, 42 passed, five (5) were not applicable, and 23 failed for a success rate of **64.62% (42/65)**. The five (5) samples not applicable were a higher-ranking member (Lieutenant) filing the squad accident. The 42 squad accidents that passed Objective 11.2 completed the AIM Squad Accident report within eight (8) days. The 23 failed samples are listed in Table #16.

*Table 16– Failed for Objective 11.2:*

Sample No. Squad Accident Report:	Accident Date:	AIM Completed Date:	Days Completed:	Days Late (-8):
4 / PA-2025-0003	01/10/2025	02/05/2025	26	18
5 / PA-2025-0004	01/10/2025	02/03/2025	24	16
6 / PA-2025-0006	01/13/2025	02/12/2025	31	23
7 / PA-2025-0007	01/21/2025	02/01/2025	12	4
10 / PA-2025-0010	01/26/2025	02/08/2025	14	6
11 / PA-2025-0011	02/02/2025	03/03/2025	30	22
24 / PA-2025-0027	02/26/2025	03/09/2025	12	4
25 / PA-2025-0026	03/01/2025	03/12/2025	11	3
29 / PA-2025-0030	03/12/2025	03/24/2025	12	4
33 / PA-2025-0041	04/08/2025	04/21/2025	14	6
34 / PA-2025-0040	04/08/2025	04/24/2025	16	8
38 / PA-2025-0053	04/16/2025	4/27/2025	12	4
39 / PA-2025-0046	04/18/2025	05/09/2025	22	14
43 / PA-2025-0048	04/23/2025	05/20/2025	28	20
48 / PA-2025-0056	05/03/2025	05/30/2025	27	19
49 / PA-2025-0058	05/05/2025	05/29/2025	24	16
50 / PA-2025-0069	05/11/2025	06/05/2025	26	18
51 / PA-2025-0061	05/12/2025	05/30/2025	18	10
58 / PA-2025-0068	05/21/2025	05/30/2025	9	1
61 / PA-2025-0072	06/02/2025	06/14/2025	12	4
65 / PA-2025-0080	06/18/2025	07/01/2025	13	5
66 / PA-2025-0082	06/23/2025	07/12/2025	19	11
69 / PA-2025-0085	06/29/2025	07/13/2025	14	6

## Objective 12 – Lieutenant Tracking (Supervision)

### Objective 12.1 – Lieutenant Completed within 10 days of Receipt

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (c), “The squad accident report shall be reviewed by the supervisor/shift commander within 10 days following the receipt from the supervisor who completed the report (within 18 days of the incident).”

The Audit Unit compared the assigned date of the supervisor who completed the Squad Accident report and the completed date in the Tracking Tab of the AIM system.

#### Results

After review of the AIM tracking for the 70 squad accidents, 56 passed, five (5) were not applicable, and nine (9) failed for a success rate of **86.15% (56/65)**. Lieutenants filed the five (5) not applicable samples, resulting in no receipt from another supervisor. The 56 squad accidents that passed Objective 12.1 completed the AIM Squad Accident report within 10 days. The nine (9) failed samples are listed in Table #17.

*Table 17– Failed for Objective 12.1:*

Sample No. Squad Accident Report:	Receipt Date:	Completed Date:	Days Completed:	Days Late (-10)
10 / PA-2025-0010	02/08/2025	02/20/2025	12	2
12 / PA-2025-0013	02/01/2025	03/12/2025	39	29
31 / PA-2025-0034	04/02/2025	04/14/2025	12	2
32 / PA-2025-0037	04/09/2025	04/20/2025	11	1
41 / PA-2025-0051	04/25/2025	05/15/2025	20	10
53 / PA-2025-0062	05/17/2025	05/31/2025	14	4
64 / PA-2025-0077	06/14/2025	07/03/2025	19	9
69 / PA-2025-0085	07/13/2025	07/24/2025	11	1
70 / PA-2025-0086	07/02/2025	07/14/2025	12	2

### Objective 12.2 – Lieutenant Completed within 18 Days of Squad Accident

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (c), “The squad accident report shall be reviewed by the supervisor/shift commander within 10 days following the receipt from the supervisor who completed the report (within 18 days of the incident).”

The Audit Unit compared the incident date (squad accident) and the completed date in the Tracking Tab of the AIM system.

### Results

After review of the AIM tracking for the 70 squad accidents, 49 passed, five (5) were not applicable, and 16 failed for a success rate of **75.38% (49/65)**. A Lieutenant filed the five (5) samples, which resulted in no receipt from another supervisor. The 49 squad accidents that passed Objective 12.2 were completed in AIM within 18 days of the squad accident. The 16 failed samples are listed in Table #18.

*Table 18– Failed for Objective 12.2:*

<b>Sample No. Squad Accident Report:</b>	<b>Squad Accident:</b>	<b>Completed Date:</b>	<b>Days Completed:</b>	<b>Days Late (-18)</b>
5 / PA-2025-0004	01/10/2025	02/07/2025	28	<b>10</b>
6 / PA-2025-0006	01/13/2025	02/12/2025	31	<b>13</b>
10 / PA-2025-0010	01/26/2025	02/20/2025	26	<b>8</b>
12 / PA-2025-0013	02/03/2025	03/12/2025	38	<b>20</b>
38 / PA-2025-0053	04/16/2025	05/06/2025	21	<b>3</b>
39 / PA-2025-0046	04/18/2025	05/12/2025	19	<b>1</b>
41 / PA-2025-0051	04/23/2025	05/15/2025	23	<b>5</b>
43 / PA-2025-0048	04/23/2025	05/20/2025	28	<b>10</b>
48 / PA-2025-0056	05/03/2025	06/02/2025	31	<b>13</b>
49 / PA-2025-0058	05/05/2025	05/29/2025	24	<b>6</b>
50 / PA-2025-0069	05/01/2025	06/05/2025	36	<b>18</b>
51 / PA-2025-0061	05/12/2025	06/02/2025	22	<b>4</b>
64 / PA-2025-0077	06/11/2025	07/03/2025	23	<b>5</b>
65 / PA-2025-0080	06/18/2025	07/09/2025	21	<b>3</b>
66 / PA-2025-0082	06/23/2025	07/21/2025	28	<b>10</b>
69 / PA-2025-0085	06/29/2025	07/24/2025	25	<b>7</b>

## Objective 13 – Commanding Officer (Supervision)

### Objective 13.1 – Commanding Officer Completed within 17 days of Receipt

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (d), “The squad accident report shall be reviewed by the commanding officer within 17 days following receipt from the supervisor/shift commander (within 35 days of the incident).

The Audit Unit compared the assigned date of the supervisor who completed the Squad Accident report and the commanding officer's completion date in the Tracking Tab of the AIM system.

#### Results

After review of the AIM tracking for the 70 squad accidents, 55 passed, five (5) were not applicable, and 10 failed for a success rate of **75.38% (55/65)**. Lieutenants completed the five (5) not applicable samples, which were related to Objective 12. The 55 squad accidents that

passed Objective 13.1 were completed within 17 days of the squad accident. The 10 failed samples are listed in Table #19.

*Table 19– Failed for Objective 13.1:*

Sample No. Squad Accident Report:	Assigned Date:	Reviewed Date:	Days Completed:	Days Late (-17)
1 / PA-2025-0001	01/09/2025	02/25/2025	47	30
11 / PA-2025-0011	02/06/2025	03/03/2025	25	8
25 / PA-2025-0026	03/16/2025	04/15/2025	30	13
29 / PA-2025-0030	03/31/2025	05/03/2025	33	16
31 / PA-2025-0034	04/14/2025	05/05/2025	21	4
46 / PA-2025-0055	04/30/2025	07/18/2025	79	62
51 / PA-2025-0061	06/04/2025	06/23/2025	19	2
60 / PA-2025-0073	06/03/2025	08/19/2025	77	60
62 / PA-2025-0071	06/04/2025	06/23/2025	19	2
63 / PA-2025-0076	06/26/2025	07/29/2023	33	16

### Objective 13.2 – Commanding Officer Completed within 35 days of the Squad Accident

#### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (d), “The squad accident report shall be reviewed by the commanding officer within 17 days following receipt from the supervisor/shift commander (within 35 days of the incident).

The Audit Unit compared the squad accident date (Incident Date) in the AIM system with the commanding officer's completion date in the Tracking Tab.

#### Results

After review of the AIM tracking for the 70 squad accidents, 53 passed, five (5) were not applicable, and 12 failed for a success rate of **81.54% (53/65)**. A Lieutenant was the Acting Captain and completed the five (5) not applicable samples. The 53 squad accidents that passed Objective 13.2 were completed within 35 days of the squad accident. The 12 failed samples are listed in Table #20.

*Table 20– Failed for Objective 13.2:*

Sample No. Squad Accident Report:	Squad Accident Date:	Completed Date:	Days Completed:	Days Late (-35)
1 / PA-2025-0001	01/02/2025	02/25/2025	54	19
4 / PA-2025-0003	01/10/2025	02/15/2025	35	1
5 / PA-2025-0004	01/10/2025	02/15/2024	36	1
12 / PA-2025-0012	02/03/2025	04/29/2025	50	15
29 / PA-2025-0030	03/12/2025	05/03/2025	52	17
31 / PA-2025-0034	03/29/2025	05/05/2025	37	2
38 / PA-2025-0053	04/16/2025	05/29/2025	43	8

40 / PA-2025-0044	04/19/2025	06/19/2025	61	26
46 / PA-2025-0055	04/29/2025	07/18/2025	97	62
51 / PA-2025-0061	05/12/2025	06/23/2025	42	7
60 / PA-2025-0073	06/02/2025	08/25/2025	84	49
63 / PA-2025-0076	06/08/2025	07/29/2025	51	16

## Objective 14 – Commanding Officer Recommendations

### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (C) (2), “Commanding officers shall provide recommendations for further action or investigation (if needed), and they shall forward the AIM system report to the Internal Affairs Division (IAD).”

The Audit Section reviewed the AIM systems Recommendation Tab and Notes Tab of the Incident Tracking form to IAD.

### Results

After review of the AIM Recommendation Tab for the 70 squad accidents, six (6) passed, zero (0) were not applicable, and 64 failed for a success rate of **8.57% (6/70)**. The six (6) squad accidents that passed Objective 14 had the AIM Recommendation Tab completed. The 64 failed samples did not have a recommendation recorded in AIM.

## Objective 15 – Internal Affairs Division (IAD) Review of Squad Accidents

### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (4) (f), “The Internal Affairs Division shall review the reports within 21 days following the receipt from the commanding officer of the work location.”

The Audit Unit reviewed the tracking date assigned by the commanding officer and the completion date set by IAD.

### Results

After review of the AIM Recommendation Tab for the 70 squad accidents, 69 passed, zero (0) were not applicable, and one (1) failed for a success rate of **98.57% (69/70)**. The 69 squad accidents that passed Objective 15 were reviewed and approved by IAD within 21 days. The one (1) failed sample is listed in Table #21.

Table 21– Failed for Objective 15:

Sample / Squad Accident Report:	Reason for Failure:
21 / PA-2025-0022	The report was assigned on 02/24/2005. The report was reviewed and approved on 03/18/2025.  02/24/2025 – 03/18/2025 = <b>22</b> days

## Objective 16 – Member’s Rank and Prior Squad Accidents

### Objective 16.1 – Member’s Rank

#### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Details Tab contains the member’s rank under the Employee Details Tab.

The Audit Unit reviewed the member’s rank for all 70 squad accident AIM reports.

#### Results

The results of this objective did not measure compliance, but reviewed the member’s rank in the AIM system. The results are listed in Table #22.

*Table 22– Member’s Rank:*

<b>Member’s Rank</b>	<b>Total:</b>
Captain	1
Lieutenant	0
Sergeant	5
Detective	3
Police Officer	61
N/A – Legally Parked Squad	1
<i>Grand Total:</i>	70

### Objective 16.2 – Prior Squad Accidents

#### Methodology

Per MPD’s Administrative Investigation Management (AIM) system training, the Squad Accident Details Tab contains the member’s name under the Employee Details Tab.

The Audit Unit reviewed the member’s name in the squad accident section of the AIM reports for prior squad accidents.

#### Results

The results of this objective did not measure compliance, but reviewed the member’s rank in the AIM system. The Audit Unit only counted previous squad accidents within the last three years. The results are listed in Table #23.

*Table 23– Prior Squad Accidents:*

<b>Number of Squad Accidents:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
One	43
Two	19
Three	4
Four	1
Five	1
N/A – Legally Parked Squad	1

## Objective 17 – Accountability

### Methodology

Per SOP 650.40 (C) (2), “Commanding officers shall provide recommendations for further action or investigation (if needed), and they shall forward the AIM system report to the Internal Affairs Division (IAD).”

The Audit Unit reviewed the recommendations section of the AIM squad accident report. Additionally, the Audit Unit reviewed the Action Taken Tab.

### Results

After reviewing the AIM Recommendation and Action Tabs for the 70 squad accidents, 22 passed, 33 were not applicable, and 14 failed, for a success rate of **61.11% (22/36)**. The 22 squad accidents that passed Objective 17 had an AIM Recommendation and/or Action Taken completed. The 14 failed samples are listed in Table #24.

*Table 24 – Failed for Objective 17:*

<b>Sample Number:</b>	<b>Reason for Failure:</b>
13 / PA-2025-0012	<p>The member hit a parked car. The member did not report the squad accident for over an hour. The member was not counseled for failing to immediately report the squad accident.</p> <p>Per SOP 650.40 (A) (1), “Department members shall immediately report to their supervisor any crash with a department motor vehicle operated by them or in their charge. The supervisor shall respond to the scene of all crashes involving a department vehicle.”</p>
15 / PA-2025-0016	<p>The member exited the freeway at 60+mph. The member lowered their speed to 40+mph. The road conditions were wet (rain) and slippery. The member was driving too fast for the weather conditions. The member should have been counseled.</p>
16 / PA-2025-0017	<p>The member struck a citizen’s vehicle and kept going. The member reported the accident 45 minutes later, and after the citizen called the police. The member was not held accountable for failing to report the squad accident immediately.</p> <p>Per SOP 650.40 (A) (1), “Department members shall immediately report to their supervisor any crash with a department motor vehicle operated by them or in their charge. The supervisor shall respond to the scene of all crashes involving a department vehicle.”</p>
28 / PA-2025-0029	<p>Policy Training/Review was recommended. However, the Policy Review was not documented in the Action Taken Tab.</p>

	It should be noted that IAD updated this tab after the Audit Unit discovered it.
30 / PA-2025-0033	The member received a Policy Review for the squad accident. However, the member was not counseled for failing to have their body-worn camera (BWC) activated at the time of their call for service (Medical Clearance/Conveyance).
31 / PA-2025-0034	The member was not held accountable for failing to yield as they merged. The member was merging into traffic at the time of the squad accident.
34 / PA-2025-0040	The member was involved in two (2) squad accidents and side-swiped a citizen's vehicle. The member was not held accountable.
39 / PA-2025-0046	The member struck a legally parked squad car and was not held accountable.
42 / PA-2025-0049	The member was in Brookfield getting lunch when they were involved in a squad accident. The member was held accountable for the squad accident. However, the member was not held accountable for leaving the City of Milwaukee for lunch.
43 / PA-2025-0048	An MPD captain rear-ended a citizen. The captain was not counseled. It should be noted that the same captain approved this AIM report.
55 / PA-2025-0065	The member struck a pole. The member should have been held accountable.
61 / PA-2025-0072	The member was responding to an emergency. The member did not have their lights or sirens on. The member drove in the right parking lane at the time of the squad accident. The member should have been held accountable.
64 / PA-2025-0077	The member had a stop sign. The member proceeded through an intersection and was involved in a squad accident. The member was not held accountable.
66 / PA-2025-0082	The member created a roadblock and was struck by the suspect vehicle. Roadblocks are prohibited under MPD SOP 660.20 (N) (2). The member should've been held accountable.

67 / PA-2025-0083	The member struck a pole. The member should have been held accountable.
-------------------	---

## Other Related Matters

During the audit, the Audit Unit discovered the following items.

- **PA-2025-0003**
  - This squad accident was on January 10, 2025. The member received remedial on April 24, 2025, 105 days after the initial incident.
    - Remedial is intended to correct and improve deficiencies in performance. This remedial should have been done sooner.
  
- **PA-2025-0048**
  - The captain who approved this squad accident was the driver of the squad car.
    - Supervisors should not approve reports that they are directly involved in.
      - This ensures the investigation is impartial and fair.
  
- **PA-2025-0085**
  - A supervisor did not respond to this squad accident.
    - Per SOP 650.40 (A) (1), “The supervisor shall respond to the scene of all crashes involving a department vehicle.”
    - If a supervisor of the member’s work location is not available, a supervisor from the district where the accident occurred is supposed to respond.

## APPENDIX

### Summary of Findings

<b>Objective:</b>	<b>Compliance:</b>
1 - CAD Numbers	98.57% (69/70)
2 – Crash Report (DT4000)	97.10% (67/69)
3 – Vehicle Pursuit	100% (11/11)
4 – Type of Activity (Officer)	N/A
5 – Squad Vehicle Type	N/A
6 – Photographs	84.29% (59/70)
7 – Video	95.24% (50/42)
8 – Driver Action (Citizen)	N/A
9 – Injury (Officer/Citizen)	N/A
10 – Squad Accident Damage	N/A
11 – Sergeant Tracking	83.08% (54/65)
11.1 Prior to Securing	
11.2 Completed within 8 Days	64.62% (42/65)
12 – Lieutenant Tracking	86.15% (55/65)
12.1 Completed within 10 days of receipt	75.38% (49/65)
12.2 Completed within 18 days of the squad accident	
13 – Captain Tracking	75.38% (55/65)
13.1 Completed within 17 days of receipt	81.54% (53/65)
13.2 Completed within 35 days of the squad accident	
14 – Commanding Officer Recommendations	8.57% (6/70)
15 – Internal Affairs Tracking	98.57% (69/70)
16 – Member’s Rank and Prior Squad Accidents	N/A
17 – Accountability	61.11% (22/36)
<b>N/A = Data Collecting</b>	



## Mission

Through independent, civilian oversight of Milwaukee's public safety departments, the Fire and Police Commission (FPC) strives to enhance public safety for our residents, promote accountability and public trust, increase diversity within the departments, and safeguard the constitutional rights of all people.

City Hall  
200 E. Wells Street  
Room 705  
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Phone:  
414-286-5000  
(24-hour message line)

Fax:  
414-286-5050

Email:  
[fpc@milwaukee.gov](mailto:fpc@milwaukee.gov)

[Media Inquiries](#)

Hours:  
Monday - Friday  
8:00 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.  
(except holidays and furlough days)

Website  
[Fire and Police Commission \(milwaukee.gov\)](#)