

INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY POLICING REVIEW BOARD

City of Alexandria, Virginia

July 17, 2026

Delivered via electronic and U.S. mail

To: The Honorable Mayor and Members of the Alexandria City Council
The City Manager, City of Alexandria
The Chief of Police, Alexandria Police Department
The Alexandria Independent Policing Auditor

**Re: Determination of the Independent Community Policing Review Board —
Investigation into the In-Custody Death of Mr. Allan Tucker, Jr.**

Dear Mayor Gaskin, Vice Mayor Bagley, Distinguished Members of City Council, City Manager Parajon, Chief of Police McGuire, and Independent Policing Auditor Kamara:

On behalf of the Independent Community Policing Review Board (“the Board”), I write to formally convey the Board’s determination following its public hearing concerning the investigation into the death of Mr. Allan Tucker, Jr. (“investigation”), who died on August 15, 2025, while in the custody of the Alexandria Police Department (APD).

Pursuant to Alexandria City Code, Title 2, Chapter 4, Article AA, the Board received the Alexandria Independent Policing Auditor (AIPA) final report and summary of the investigation and held a public hearing as required by the ordinance. The public hearing was held on June 29, 2026, and was recessed and completed on July 1, 2026.

At the conclusion of that public hearing, and after due deliberation, the Board acted under the authority granted in the city ordinance. **By unanimous vote, the Board determined that, in its judgment, the investigation is incomplete, and the Board recommends additional investigation.** This determination is made pursuant to Section 2-4.227(c), Board duties, which provides the board with the option to take one of four actions, including: “advise city council, the city manager, the APD, and the AIPA that, in the board’s judgement the investigation is incomplete and recommend additional investigation by majority vote and final approval by city council.”

Basis for the Board’s Determination

The Board’s role is to assess the investigation for fairness, objectivity, and thoroughness. The Board appreciates the level of detail of the report and the AIPA’s willingness to engage the Board members’ questions and comments. However, in carrying out that charge, the Board identified specific areas in which it believes the investigation was not complete, including matters concerning supervisory responsibility, factual accuracy within the report with regard to the Sheriff’s Office, information on training and access to information provided to APD employees mentioned in the investigation, and the inclusion of disciplinary recommendations necessary to inform the Board’s own such recommendations as authorized by the ordinance. Further elaboration is provided below.

- 1. The supervisory role of the sergeant.** The investigation does not adequately examine the leadership and supervisory role of the sergeant on duty during the relevant period. The report recommended that the Board further review the Sargent’s

actions to determine if they were consistent with the duties of the position. The Board itself does not hold investigative authority — that responsibility rests with the Independent Policing Auditor. It does, however, find this is a significant gap and recommends that the Auditor pursue further investigation into the sergeant's supervisory role and performance expectations.

2. **The role of Alexandria Sheriff's Office staff.** Comments received during the public hearing, as well as additional review of information provided to members of the Board, raise questions regarding the accuracy of specific information related to the Sheriff's Office. We request that this information be reviewed to ensure factual accuracy within the report. Points include the role of Sheriff Office staff in the provision of medical assistance, ownership of the detention facility building, and whether the Sheriff's Office is a state agency.
3. **Training:** While the report included identification and description of applicable directives, regulations, and procedures, in order to evaluate the appropriateness of findings (e.g., recommendation for refresher training), the Board requests more information regarding when the officers and the sergeant were last trained and how this information was made available to them.
4. **Omission of recommended disciplinary actions:** Sec. 2-4-221 of the City Ordinance grants the Board authority to "provide actionable recommendations to the city council, the city manager, [AIPA], the school board, the school superintendent, APD and other public agencies **regarding appropriate discipline**, policing practices, policies and procedures in Alexandria" (emphasis added). The Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Board, APD, and the City Manager reinforces this, providing that "[u]pon completion of an independent investigation, the Auditor shall submit a final investigative report, including findings **and any disciplinary recommendations**."

The ordinance thus authorizes the Board to make actionable recommendations regarding discipline, and the MOU contemplates that the Auditor's report will include disciplinary recommendations, if any. The final investigative report, however, did not address discipline. The Board requests that the final report include the specific discipline recommended by the AIPA to ensure a complete written report on which to base any Board action in this regard.

Recommendation and Requested Action

Accordingly, and consistent with the ordinance, the Board respectfully recommends that additional investigation be conducted to address the factual and other deficiencies identified. The Board further notes that, under the governing ordinance, this recommendation for additional investigation is subject to final approval by the City Council, and the Board requests that Council consider and act favorably upon this recommendation.

Finally, if the Council approves this recommendation, the Board respectfully requests that it set a defined timeframe for the completion of the additional investigation by the AIPA and for the return of the results to the Board. The Board raises this because the governing ordinance does not establish any timeline for this stage of the process, and the Board is concerned that, absent a clear and agreed-upon schedule, this matter — and the accountability the community and Mr. Tucker's family are owed — could be delayed indefinitely. A timely response is essential to preserving public confidence in this process.

The Board remains committed to a fair, objective, and thorough process, and to honoring the seriousness of the matter before it. We are prepared to provide any further information the

Council, the City Manager, the Alexandria Police Department, or the Auditor may require, and we welcome continued coordination toward a complete and credible investigation. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Respectfully,

Deborah Porter

Deborah Porter

Chair, Independent Community Policing Review Board

City of Alexandria, Virginia

cc: Members of the Independent Community Policing Review Board; ICPRB.file