

**City of Albany  
Citizens' Police Review Board  
Albany Public Library  
161 Washington Avenue – Large Auditorium  
April 10, 2007  
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Jason Allen, Daniel Fitzgerald, Ronald Flagg, Mauri Davis Lewis, James Malatras, John Paneto, Andrew Phelan, Jr. and Anthony Potenza.

**Absent:** Hon. Fowler Riddick.

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chairman Jason Allen called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. He noted that a quorum of the Board was present.

**II. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was reviewed. Chairman Allen called for a motion to approve the agenda. James Malatras seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**III. Approval of the February 13, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

Chairman Allen asked board members if they had adequate time to review the February 13, 2007 minutes and if anyone had comments. Dan Fitzgerald responded that he was not able to review the minutes. Chairman Allen then called for a motion to table approval of the minutes until the next meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Jim Malatras. The motion carried unanimously.

**IV. Old Business**

**CPRB No. 4-05/OPS No. C05-63** (Presented by Ronald Flagg)

Ronald Flagg stated that this case should be a simple presentation, but he was just informed that the Board's attempt to communicate by mail with the plaintiff had been unsuccessful. He added that in lieu of the fact that the Board has tried very hard to finalize the mediation component of the process, this case would be an excellent case for mediation. Mr. Flagg recommended that this case be tabled until the Board is able to successfully contact the complainant to see whether she still wants the complaint to be mediated. Mr. Flagg commented that although the complaint was filed in February 2005 and is two (2) years old, another attempt to reach the complainant should be made. Chairman Allen expressed concern that the case is old and memories might not be fresh, and he is not sure how effective mediation would be. However, circumstances of this

case are perfect for the type of mediation the Board is trying to achieve which would ensure that citizens have an opportunity to air their issues and have police respond to them. Chairman Allen asked the board for their comments before the vote. Mauri Davis Lewis commented that this would be a great case to be mediated and that when she read the case, she perfectly understood the complainant's issue.

A motion was made by Ronald Flagg to table this case until next month. The motion was seconded by Mauri Davis Lewis. The motion carried unanimously.

**V. New Business**

*A. New Complaints*

New Complaints Received Since February 13, 2007 Meeting

Chairman Allen reported that there was (1) new complaint received by the Board since its March 13, 2007 meeting. Andrew Phelan read a summary of the new complaint.

Andrew Phelan informed the board that this case was filed on March 20, 2007. The case relates to snowplowing and the complainant's car being towed. The complainant signed the complaint but failed to give his name and address. Mr. Phelan proceeded to read the case verbatim. Mr. Phelan checked with the OPS and they informed him that they couldn't do anything without a file or case number. Chairman Allen asked the Board members if they had any input about anonymous complaints as this is a new scenario to him. Dan Fitzgerald asked whether the Board has ever received an anonymous complaint. Chairman Allen commented that he respects that someone might want to file a complaint anonymously but it puts the case at a disadvantage as the complainant can't be contacted for follow up questions or verification. However, anonymity is at odds with the complainant wanting to file a lawsuit. James Malatras asked Sharmaine Moseley if there were any personal identifiers on the complaint. Ms. Moseley replied that there were not. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if it was part of the Board's by-laws that the Board couldn't investigate a case that involved a lawsuit against the city. Mr. Flagg noted that this is a public board meeting and if the individual feels that his complaint requires scrutiny than he needs to come forward, and the Board will respect his privacy and confidentiality. Mr. Flagg recommended a motion to dismiss the complaint for lack of finding.

Chairman Allen commented that there are enough specifics in terms of time, date, and the female voice that perhaps the police can say the operator cursed at the complainant and it was inappropriate. Chairman Allen suggested letting the police department communicate to the Board how they are going to dispose of this case. If the police department stated that they couldn't do anything because there was no name, then the Board perhaps could act on it. Mr. Flagg commented that he didn't disagree, but enough time was given, more time than an anonymous case deserved. Ms. Moseley asked the Board if a number should be assigned.

Chairman Allen called for a motion to assign the complaint a number and have the Albany Police Department communicate their findings on the case to the Board. The motion was seconded by James Malatras. The motion carried unanimously.

B. New Complaint(s) For Review

Chairman Allen reported that there were two (2) new complaints on the agenda for review by the Board.

**CPRB No. 18-06/OPS No. C06-283** (Presented by John Paneto)

John Paneto summarized the complaint. The complainant alleged that the Albany Police and State Police used excessive force while detaining and arresting him. Mr. Paneto noted that the OPS report did not find the behavior of the police officer to support the complaint of excessive use of force. He also noted that the monitor's report did not find that the police officer used excessive force. Mr. Paneto mentioned that the monitor was present. The monitor's review of this complaint also did not find any support for the use excessive use of force allegation. The OPS investigation and the monitor's report did not find any legitimate reason to support the excessive use of force allegation. Mr. Paneto stated that he agreed with the OPS and the monitor. He noted that the allegations from the complainant are without merit and the complainant's mug shots did not reveal any significant or visible injuries to support the allegation. Mr. Paneto also noted that the complainant denied medical treatment at the crash and officers took down the complainant while he attempted to flee which may have caused some of the injuries, but the mug shot did not support the allegation that the complainant was injured and needed immediate medical attention. Mr. Paneto noted that the OPS summary concluded that the police officer used appropriate force to apprehend and arrest the suspect. Mr. Paneto stated that if you took into consideration that the suspect fled police at the initial traffic stop, crashed the motor vehicle into a parked truck, and then attempted to flee on foot, then you could conclude that appropriate force was used.

Mr. Paneto summarized that the officer was responding to an armed robbery call which was a legal stop based on the identification of the victim. The suspect did not comply as directed by the police officer and then sped away in a motor vehicle. The photo of the suspect reveals no significant injury and any injury could have occurred due to the crash of the motor vehicle or the take down after the suspect attempted to flee on foot. Mr. Paneto stated that the monitor agreed with the OPS report. Monitor George Kleinmeier was recognized. Mr. Kleinmeier added that when the complainant was arrested he had a starter pistol in his waist band. Mr. Paneto further stated that two (2) guns were recovered from the suspects. Mr. Paneto concluded that the actions taken by the Albany Police Department were appropriate in light of the actions taken by the suspect, appropriate force was used, and the Albany Police Department should be commended for not only apprehending the individual but for taking the best course of action in a very, very dangerous situation with individuals that had weapons.

Mr. Paneto motioned that this case be closed as *exonerated* on the use of force and denial of medical treatment. Chairman Allen asked if the complainant was present and whether anything was left out in the report. He acknowledged that the complainant was not present. Mr. Paneto restated that the Albany Police Department followed all procedures and did a follow up investigation; the officer at the scene never drew his gun, even knowing that the suspect was armed. No additional harm was caused to the suspect or police officers. Again, the police department should be commended that no one was seriously hurt considering the suspects ran away and had weapons.

Mr. Paneto motioned to accept the OPS findings. Ron Flagg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**CPRB No. 29-06/OPS No. C06-490** (Presented by Daniel Fitzgerald)

Dan Fitzgerald summarized the complaint. The complainant alleged that he was being threatened with a ticket in exchange for information he did not have. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that he examined the report of the target officer, the report of the supervisor who was in the second Albany Police car at the scene, and the OPS report. He also noted that a monitor was not assigned to this case. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the target officer's report was very similar to the complaint with some minor changes. The target officer's report stated that the officer noticed the expired inspection sticker when he first passed the complainant; and the target officer then asked the complainant if he knew about people who lived at the same address as the complainant. The target officer reported that the other officer who arrived at the scene was the supervisor who asked him if he called out at the scene. The target officer replied that he did not call out at the scene. The target officer advised the complainant to get his inspection taken care of. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that more information was discovered from the supervisor's report. In the report, the supervisor stated that he saw the traffic stop and looked at his computer monitor and saw that no APD car was out on a traffic stop in that area. The supervisor stopped to inquire on the status. He informed the target officer that failure to notify the dispatcher of a traffic stop prior to approaching a vehicle is in violation of department policy. The supervisor reported that the target officer failure to comply with department policy was addressed. Mr. Fitzgerald added that the OPS report stated, very similarly, and Detective Ramanor clarified that the target officer was inquiring about individuals at the same residence that had not been included in the target officer's report.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted that no monitor was assigned to the case and asked whether the complainant was present and had anything to add. The complainant was present and stated that Mr. Fitzgerald's summary was correct and that the officer asked if he had information about people who lived on the street; he replied that he didn't. The officer was persistent about getting information.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted that the OPS found that the complaint was *not sustained* because the review failed to disclose sufficient facts to prove or disprove the allegations made by the complainant. The officer reported in his IDC that he did not threaten the

complainant. He only inquired about whom else resided at the address shown on the complainant's license. The officer also stated that he did not issue the complainant a ticket, only advised the complainant to get the inspection completed. The complainant felt threatened by the target officer's questions regarding the other individuals and by the complainant not cooperating with the officer he was going to get a ticket, but the officer didn't give him a ticket.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked the complainant if he felt he was being threatened with a ticket. He asked the complainant if foul language was used and stated that it was unclear about the contents of the center console. The complainant replied that no foul language was used. Chairman Allen asked if a ticket or warning were issued. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that it was a warning. The other issue was that the complainant was not able to get the officer's name or shield number because there was no ticket. The complainant did have the right to know who pulled him over. The complainant stated that when he asked the officer for the information there was an enormous amount of sarcasm and he was told that the information would be on the ticket. The complainant further stated that he asked the officer for his name and badge number because he felt the response he received was disrespectful and wasn't called for. He went directly to the station but they were unable to tell him anything because he didn't have a ticket, name of, or badge number of, the officer, so he was given the run around when he tried to find out the identity of the officer. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the station probably did have that problem as the officer did not follow procedure and did not call out at the stop, so there was no record of the stop in their system.

The complainant's mother stated that her son came home right after this incident occurred and they went down to Division 2. She didn't know who or what the police were inquiring about. Her son lives with her in the house and her 80-year old mother lives downstairs. Her son had just gotten home from college and was going to pick up his brother from work. He was driving a Lexus. She is not sure if that was why he was stopped. She didn't feel that it was appropriate for the police to stop someone on the corner of Eagle Street, in a car that they paid for, and to threaten to issue a ticket unless you provide information. She continued to state that if you are stopped by a police officer; think what else you are being asked about. First thing, a young black man in a Lexus being stopped is threatened with a ticket. If you are going to give a ticket, give the ticket and let him pay for it. Don't threaten him because he didn't have the information you want. The house on the hill was mislabeled by the city of Albany 17 years ago when the house was built, so the house number they were looking for or asking about didn't exist. Even if her son gave them a number or said something, the officer with the number had a fictitious number.

Commander Beattie commented that the officer did not follow proper police policy; however the traffic stop was valid because the inspection sticker had expired which was a violation of traffic laws. The complainant stated that when he was stopped the officer was driving with a state trooper at the time. He further stated that the officer passed him

on the opposite side of the street and there was no way he could have known the inspection sticker was expired until he approached the car.

Chairman Allen asked the complainant if the officer told him the reason for the stop. The complainant stated that he did not and the officer asked him questions about the neighborhood before explaining why he was pulled over. He further added that the officer used the expired inspection sticker “as an excuse to cover his own butt”. The complainant agreed that the inspection sticker was expired and that he deserved a ticket, but he didn’t deserve a ticket because he didn’t have the information the officer wanted. The complainant further stated that if he had been given a ticket flat out without being asked questions, he wouldn’t be here today. He was threatened with a ticket because he didn’t have the information. He also stated that during the process of him talking to an officer at Division 2, and then filing a complaint, not one person would stand there and look him in the face and say the officer was wrong for what he had done. The complainant stated that the officer did not follow proper protocol and he has been waiting eight (8) months to hear someone say that.

Dan Fitzgerald stated that this is why the Board reviews cases and it is unfortunately takes time to go through the appropriate channels. Technically the reason for the stop was valid and it is hard to say at what point the inspection sticker was noticed. Chairman Allen asked if the reason for the stop was stated in the report as being for an expired inspection sticker. Mr. Fitzgerald replied yes and that the target officer reported this. Mr. Fitzgerald explained the rationale of why the stop was initiated. The target officer did not follow proper procedure and it was addressed by the target officer’s supervisor. Mr. Fitzgerald further stated that this case would have been a good candidate for mediation.

The complainant’s mother again stated that a traffic stop should be a traffic stop and not an inquiry for information and explained her reasons for this and why there should be an appropriate time and place for this type of questioning. Chairman Allen stated that corrective action was taken with the officer and asked if there was a way to edit the OPS report stating that the officer had been advised of his failure to comply with policy. Commander Beattie replied that the report stated that the target officer was told by his supervisor at the scene of his failure to comply with policy.

Chairman Allen stated that he was under the impression that an officer can ask a civilian whatever question he wants. The complainant’s mother agrees but in this scenario the officer was clearly attempting to gather information. Commander Beattie explained the police protocol for a police stop and the right to ask questions, and further explained that as a citizen you have the right not to answer the questions. Mr. Fitzgerald asked for further clarification. Commander Beattie explained, that in this case, the complainant did not have this option because he was technically in custody, being detained for an out-of-date inspection sticker, and he could not leave until he either received a summons or the officer released him. Chairman Allen said that the fact that no ticket was issued demonstrated no mal intent on the part of the officer but the possibility that he was looking for data. John Paneto commented that the issue is with anonymous cops; if a

citizen asks for information it should have been provided on the spot or soon thereafter. A citizen should not have to fish for identification about the police officer who made the stop and when the parent goes to the police station they should not get the same “bad treatment.” Mr. Paneto further stated that the point is that the police officer did something wrong, and then when confronted by the parent with a request for identification he did not provide it.

James Malatras clarified that they received no information at the station because no ticket was issued and there was nothing to compile into the system. Chairman Allen added that the failure was noted and corrected at the scene by the supervisor. The complainant’s mother again stated the importance of the police officer providing names and badge information to prove their identity – there was no record that the stop ever occurred and for the community’s safety, future stops like this shouldn’t happen.

Dan Fitzgerald asked the OPS if an interview ticket or contact card was used and what is the policy for using them? Commander Beattie stated that field interview cards are reports of the information taken (pedigree) by the officer. Dan Fitzgerald asked what the policy was for giving badge numbers to citizens who ask. Commander Beattie clarified that it is policy to give this information. Mr. Malatras asked the complainant if he asked for the badge number at the scene. The complaint replied that he asked both officers for it multiple times; the officer said no, and the trooper smirked and said it would be on the ticket.

Dan Fitzgerald asked Commander Beattie if a field interview card should have been completed because no ticket was issued. Commander Beattie replied yes. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that this changes the scenario and that procedure was not followed in more ways than previously discussed.

Mr. Fitzgerald motioned to look back for field interview cards to verify that proper procedure was followed and to look further into supplying name and badge numbers of police officers. Ron Flagg stated that the board was assured over two (2) years ago by Chief Turley that officers who are asked for badge numbers would give the information. This issue needs to be dealt with. For two (2) years the Board has been assured by Chiefs that this would be handled. The Board continues to have citizens that come in with this allegation. Chairman Allen asked Mr. Fitzgerald if this was considered in the IDC or anything that he read. Mr. Fitzgerald replied no.

The complainant stated that no verbal warning was given. Dan Fitzgerald motioned to return the complaint to the OPS to find out if there was a field interview card filed and to look further into the officer not providing the complainant with his name and badge number. Commander Beattie described the information that’s on a field card. He also explained that no warning ticket was issued. Chairman Allen explained the motion as to agree with the OPS’ finding; however the Board is concerned with the citizen asking for, but not getting, the officer’s name and badge number. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed with the explanation.

Mr. Fitzgerald called for a motion to agree with the OPS finding of *not sustained* on the complainant feeling threatened. The motion was seconded by Jim Malatras. The motion passed unanimously. Chairman Allen stated that a second motion could be made to send a letter saying once again we have a case where an officer was asked for his badge number and it wasn't given. Dan Fitzgerald motioned to accept the OPS' findings of *not sustained* on the first allegation. James Malatras seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Dan Fitzgerald made a second motion for the policy committee to look into the number of cases where there were allegations with officers not providing badge numbers and names and make a policy recommendation based on the finding. Chairman Allen stated that a letter will be drafted stating the policy committee will work with the APD to see what controls are in place to ensure that officers are complying with these requests. Ron Flagg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

*C. Appointment of New Members to the Committee on Complaint Review for May 2007*

The following Board members were appointed to the Committee on Complaint Review for May 2007: Mauri Davis Lewis, James Malatras, Andrew Phelan, Jr., John Paneto, Anthony Potenza, and Fowler Riddick.

*D. Committee Task Force Reports*

By-Laws Committee

Committee Chairman Jason Allen reported that the Public Safety Committee is having a meeting on standing on Wednesday. He introduced Hon. Richard Conte, a member of the Albany Common Council, who is not on the committee but will be at the meeting and asked him if this is going to be a public comment session.

Hon. Richard Conte was recognized. He answered that the committees that make up the local outreach will be able to comment and discuss meeting details further. Chairman Allen stated that his issue is that members of the Board are just finding out tonight about the meeting, and he has a commitment and can't attend. Chairman Allen stated that he was going to request that the Chair of the Public Safety Committee table it for the next meeting or for another time.

Community Outreach

Committee Chairman Jim Malatras reported to the board that the community outreach committee will attend a meeting this month at the West End Neighborhood Association. He also passed out sheets for Board members to fill in at least two (2) suggestions for community outreach. Chairman Allen asked who is attending the meeting at the West End church and if anyone else can attend in his place. Andrew Phelan replied that he could attend. John Paneto requested a more formalized structure for attendance at these

community events. Mr. Malatras replied that he would rather work around the Association's schedules than them working around the Board.

### Mediation

Committee Chairman Allen reported that they received great input from the Albany Police Department unions last week and many Board members are aware of the feedback. Sharmaine Moseley provided the Board members with a draft of the mediation protocols and Chairman Allen asked members to please review and provide feedback as quickly as possible.

### Policy Review/Recommendations

Committee Chairman Daniel Fitzgerald reported that a brief meeting was held prior to tonight's Board meeting. Two (2) things discussed were: lost paperwork was identified in the online system that they are putting in place and there is no need to pursue it; and review of the early warning system to help track problem areas in the department so that the Board can start to build consistent information that can help identify problems early on.

### Public Official Liaison

Committee Chairman Ronald Flagg noted that the committee had nothing new to report. He also expressed his disappointment that proper notice of the Public Safety meeting scheduled for the next day was not given.

Patrick Jordan, corporation counsel, was recognized. He will address this issue with Councilwoman Barbara Smith. There was a definite lapse in communication and it will be addressed.

### Monitors Task-Force

Committee Chairman Allen reported that everyone received a marked copy of the monitor protocol via email. He will be taking comments tonight or at next month's meeting. This document is internal and doesn't have to go before the Common Council. Chairman Allen stated that it is a start and the Board can amend it at any time. Furthermore, it provides a guideline. Mr. Malatras added that he has read these protocols in great detail several times and commented that a great job was done incorporating everyone's comments and concerns which are addressed in this document and he could not see any reason to not move forward tonight. Chairman Allen reinforced that Board members will need to enforce the protocol. The Board needs monitors to be a part of the investigative process and not just file readers.

Mr. Paneto stated that he never has an opportunity to meet with the monitors and all of the paperwork should converge at one time. Mr. Malatras stated that he also had that

concern but it is addressed in the document. The monitor report needs to be submitted three (3) business days prior to the meeting which doesn't allow enough lead time to take it in and discuss it with the monitor if need be. Mr. Paneto stated that he doesn't find this satisfactory. Ms. Moseley mentioned that meeting packets are sent ten (10) days prior to the meeting and the monitor report is included in those packets. Chairman Allen clarified that the monitor report should be there ten (10) business days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked at what point in the flow of the paper work is a monitor assigned a case. Ms. Moseley explained that the complaint report status is included in the meeting packets and the monitors are listed, and the Board receives the packets ten (10) days in advance. Chairman Allen stated that the pay increase will be stricken from the monitor's protocol and addressed separately.

Chairman Allen called for a motion to accept the monitor's protocol with pay increase taken out to be addressed separately and increasing the cycle from three (3) to ten (10) days. The motion was seconded by Andrew Phelan. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Allen addressed the Board regarding the pay for monitors. He asked them to remember an earlier draft where the rate was \$65 an hour, reflecting a pay raise from \$50 instituted in 2000, and that there has been no pay raise until now. The communication he has had with the City is that it is okay to start the new rate immediately. Patrick Jordan stated that he has received correspondence from Associate Dean and Director Patricia Salkin and the Deputy Mayor agreeing that pay should be increased but the Government Law Center only has enough money to operate the Board and pay monitors at the current rate. Ms. Salkin and the Deputy Mayor would have to determine if there is enough money to pay for the increase. Ms. Moseley explained how the GLC pays the monitors and receives reimbursement from the City. Mr. Jordan stated that he would talk to the Comptroller regarding this.

#### *E. Report from the Government Law Center (GLC)*

Government Law Center Coordinator of the Board Sharmaine Moseley gave the report.

#### Complaint Status as of Date of Meeting

It was reported that as of today, there are currently sixteen (16) active complaints before the Board for review. Of those sixteen (16) active cases, two (2) were reviewed at tonight's meeting and three were sent to OPS for further investigation.

Two hundred twenty-six (226) complaints have been closed and twelve (12) complaints suspended from review. The total number of complaints filed to date is two hundred fifty-four (254).

#### Reports

It was reported that included in the Board packets for tonight's meeting is a draft copy of the 2005 Annual Report. Ms. Moseley asked the Board to forward any questions or concerns to her regarding the report. It was also reported that the fourth quarterly report is currently being drafted and should be ready for the Board to review by the next meeting.

Mr. Paneto asked what "suspended" means. Ms. Moseley explained that if the case is in litigation or civil court then the Mayor suspends it. Chairman Allen added that the database scorecard is a good tool, and suggested adding the reasons in the notes column so that the casual reader can understand why a case has been suspended. The Board agreed that the scorecard is easy to read and keep track of complaints. The By-Laws states that something is late after sixty (60) days. The OPS responded that they are working on catching up with the cases. Chairman Allen asked the Board members for help with completing information on cases that they are working on by adding notes. Mr. Paneto asked about the relevance of complaints that are over 2000 days old, is there any need to pursue these? Patrick Jordan explained why the older complaints are still relevant. Chairman Allen asked that discussion be tabled until the notes have been filled in for better classification.

*F. Report from the Office of Professional Standards*

Commander Beattie was recognized. In the first quarter there were 171 incidents; 5 cases involving complaints filed by members of the community and 5 cases were turned over to the supervisors of the officers involved for action. Each case was closely monitored by OPS. Additionally, the Office of Professional Standards handled another 161 cases. These cases included: preparing departmental charges against members of the department, providing information for the City's Law Department for notices of claims and civil actions pending against the City. Other investigations included, but were not limited to: injured prisoners, injured officers, off-duty police contact by officers, the processing of Public Service Officer applicants, the processing of Telecommunications Specialists and investigations for other city departments, as well as departmental inspections. The total amount of calls for service for the First Quarter of 2007 was 38,558 and the total number of arrests for the First Quarter was 1,963. (This number does not include the juvenile arrests that were made.) Based upon the number of police contacts as compared to the amount of Citizen Complaints filed, Citizen Complaints are generated on .01% of all police and citizen encounters. Chairman Allen asked if the .01% was rounded up. Commander Beattie agreed that it was.

*G. Report from the Chair*

Chairman Allen reported that the Board member packets contain correspondence from the Chief and the Mayor. If there are any questions please let him know.

**VI. Public Comment**

The floor was opened for public comment.

Jim Winestad was recognized. Mr. Winestad had a couple of questions relating to the field interview card. He asked what specific categories are collected on the card. Commander Beattie replied that it contains pedigree, stop location, and information relating to the stop. Mr. Winestad asked if information is collected regarding gender, race, ethnicity, and skin color. Commander Beattie reported that he needed to check on that. Mr. Winstead inquired about the statistics kept regarding the location of stops, demographics, etc. Chairman Allen explained that the Board's annual and quarterly report captures that information and can be found on its website.

**VII. Adjournment**

Chairman Jason Allen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Daniel Fitzgerald seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ronald Flagg  
Secretary