

**City of Albany
Citizens' Police Review Board
Albany Public Library
161 Washington Avenue – Large Auditorium
June 13, 2006
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.**

Present: Jason Allen, Beresford Bailey, Ronald Flagg, Marilyn Hammond, Judith Mazza and Fowler Riddick.

Absent: Michael Whiteman and Paul Weafer.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Jason Allen called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. He noted that a quorum of the Board was present.

II. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was reviewed. Ronald Flagg moved to approve the agenda. Fowler Riddick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

III. Approval of the May 2006 Meeting Minutes

The May 2006 meeting minutes were reviewed. Ronald Flagg moved to approve the meeting minutes. Beresford Bailey seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. New Business

A. *New Complaints*

1. New Complaints Received Since May 2006 Meeting

Judith Mazza reported that three (3) new complaints had been received by the Board since its May 18, 2006 meeting. Ms. Mazza read a summary of each new complaint.

CPRB No. 24-06

Following a traffic interaction and after the complainant had parked her car, the complainant alleges a uniformed police officer stopped her personal car in the middle of street and started pounding on the complainant's driver side window. The complainant claims that when she rolled down her window, the officer "went ballistic" and started screaming obscenities at her. According to the complainant, she contacted South Station and while waiting for the dispatched officer, the officer at the scene opened the complainant's car door, "was putting her fist in [the complainant's] face," and "almost

dragged [her] out of the car.” The complainant states that she was intimidated and threatened by the officer’s behavior, was in fear for her safety and well-being, and thought she was going to be assaulted.

A monitor was appointed to this complaint.

CPRB No. 25-06

The complainant alleges that she came home to find her minor daughter alone in their home being questioned by an officer. The complainant claims that when she asked the officer why he was questioning her daughter in their home without an adult present, the officer “said you could be picking her up from downtown right now and if she does something else this will come up and she will have a record.” The complainant further claims that when she asked him to leave, the officer commented, “[w]hy is it that you seem like you don’t trust the police?” According to the complainant, when she asked the officer to leave a second time, the officer stated “‘you people’ have a habit to taking things and turning them into a black and white issue and it is not,” and further stated “‘you all’ are always trying to make things into a race issue and race has nothing to do with it.”

Following an incident with the grandmother of a young girl with whom the complainant’s daughter had an issue earlier and where the complainant’s daughter was threatened, the complainant alleges that she went to the police station to file a complaint, but no one wanted to take a statement from her. She alleges that it was not until she said that she would contact the newspaper to tell them how she and her daughter were being treated that a statement was taken. The complainant claims that the officer taking her statement and another officer in the station “were laughing and making funny faces.” She further claims that while at the station, she exchanged words with the officer who was at her home earlier and told him that she was aware of the real reason for his visit to her home.

Following the incident with the officer at her home and the officers at the station, the complainant alleges she asked to speak with a supervisor, but was told no supervisor was on-site. She was instructed to come back the next day and given directions to the Office of Professional Standards. After explaining what had happened, the complainant claims the officers with whom she spoke did not see any problems and wanted to know why she was so upset. According to the complainant, “their unwillingness to help was so upsetting [she] left without filing a complaint.”

A monitor was appointed to this complaint.

CPRB No. 26-06

While en route to a friend’s house, the complainant alleges that he was stopped by a man and asked for change. After telling the man that he had no change, he continued to the friend’s house. After he arrived at the house and was sitting on the steps outside, the

complainant claims an officer pulled up, told the complainant to put his hands up, asked the complainant if he had any crack on him, and searched him. According to the complainant, the officer told him that he saw the complainant talking to someone. When no drugs were found, the complainant alleges the officer questioned him, asking him if he was in the area to buy drugs, asking how he knew the friend, and asking for his and his friend's name. The complainant was subsequently arrested for a parole violation. The complainant alleges he was not read his rights and believes the officer is guilty of violating his 4th and 5th Amendment rights, harassment, racial harassment, character assassination, and false arrest.

A monitor was appointed to this complaint.

2. *New For Review*

New Complaints For Review

It was reported that there were four (4) new complaints on the agenda for review by the Board.

CPRB No. 26-05/OPS No. C05-365 (Presented by Fowler Riddick)

Fowler Riddick asked if the complainant was present and had anything to add to his complaint. The complainant replied that he did not. The monitor, George Kleinmeier, was asked if he had anything to add, and he too said no.

After investigating the allegations made by the complainant, and reviewing the facts of this case, Mr. Riddick reported that the Office of Professional Standards (OPS) recommended the allegations in the case be closed as ***unfounded***, where the review shows that the act or acts complained of did not occur or were misconstrued.¹

The complainant alleged that the police officer was rude and forceful until they (the complainant and officer) reached the patrol unit in the parking lot. Once outside, the complainant further alleged that the police officer was rude, discriminatory, and threatened to bash his teeth.

The police officer's actions were found to be neither rude nor discriminatory based on the group's refusal to leave at the request of the clerk, necessitating the officer to help the

¹ In the preliminary report of its investigation of this complaint, the OPS categorized the allegations in the complaint as follows: use of force (2 counts), call handling, and conduct standards (2 counts). The OPS made findings of ***unfounded*** as to the call handling allegation – the officer was rude and discriminatory, and as to one allegation of use of force – the complainant was pushed hard and shoved repeatedly by the officer while inside the Dunkin Donuts. The OPS made findings of ***not sustained*** as to both allegations regarding conduct standards – the officer threatened to bash the complainant's teeth in and to have him locked up or spend the night in jail, and the officer used profanity and an aggressive tone toward the complainant and his friends. The OPS also made a finding of ***not sustained*** as to one allegation of use of force – the complainant was shoved repeatedly in the parking lot

clerk. One of the witnesses admitted that the clerk asked the group to leave. Mr. Riddick reviewed the video tape of the incident and found that it shows the complainant getting up from the table and the officer showing him the door. The police officer was three to four feet behind the complainant and did not touch him until he got to the door. The officer never shoved the complainant. Mr. Riddick agreed with the OPS's findings and moved to accept the findings and close the case.

Chairman Allen recapped by saying that the complainant alleged that the officer shoved him out of the store. The appointed monitor, Mr. Kleinmeier, agreed with the OPS's findings. Marilyn Hammond asked if the monitor was able to review the video tape, and he replied yes. The monitor recommended that someone from the Board also review the tape. Mr. Riddick reviewed the file and video tape. The complainant was not afforded the opportunity to review the tape as well.

The complainant was recognized. He stated that he was definitely shoved while inside and repeatedly outside. He also admitted that the clerk asked him to leave; he was on his way out the door and was not refusing to leave. He said that the store clerk didn't repeatedly ask him to leave, the clerk only asked once.

Mr. Riddick moved to accept the OPS's findings on this case. Chairman Allen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CPRB No. 5-06/OPS No. C06-82 (Presented by Judith Mazza)

Judith Mazza summarized the complaint.

She reported that this case would be *closed as no finding* because the complainant has withdrawn the complaint. The complaint was made by a witness to a situation where she observed police officers arresting an individual on the street. The complainant saw a man walking along, an officer went after him, and in the end there were approximately six officers who had the man on the ground. The complainant felt that he was complying with the officers' verbal demands, but the officers continued to use aggressive force and continually used swear words towards the man. At some point, the officers were able to handcuff the man, an ambulance was called, and the man was taken away on a stretcher. After interviewing the witness and explaining what was actually going on, that the man had not been tased and was taken in an ambulance, the complainant decided to withdraw the complaint.

There are two other complaints connected with this that are being pursued by another witness and the person who was being arrested. The monitor, Theresa Balfe, is working on the other complaint connected with this.

Theresa Balfe was recognized. She reported that she was not assigned both of the connected cases. Ms. Mazza replied that, at first, the Board did not realize that the complaints were all connected. Ms. Mazza explained that the witnesses came in

separately, but now understands they should be looked at together. Ms. Balfe suggested transferring the connected complaint assigned to another monitor to her because it is an extensive file and would be time consuming having two monitors. The Government Law Center was instructed to coordinate the transfer of the connected complaint to Ms. Balfe.

Ms. Mazza moved to close the complaint with a finding of *no finding* because the complaint was withdrawn. Ronald Flagg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CPRB No. 6-06/OPS No. C06-85 (Presented by Jason Allen)

Chairman Allen summarized the complaint.

The complainant heard a knock on the door, and a voice saying that her son was being arrested. She went outside to see her son handcuffed in the back of a patrol car. She asked the officer what her son was being arrested for and he asked her to go to the porch until they were done processing her son and his two friends. The complainant said to the officer that she knew why they pulled them over “because they are black.” The complainant states that the officer lost his temper and was rude to her, pointing his finger in her face and demanding that she clear the scene and wait on the porch. The complainant’s son and friends were in custody because they were double parked. After the incident, the son was released as well as one friend; the other was taken in for an outstanding warrant. The Albany Police Department (APD) cited the son for loud music. The complainant’s son concurs that he was double parked in his witness statement despite the fact that there was an open spot. The officer admits pointing his finger, but not at the complainant rather he pointed at the porch where he wanted her to wait. One of the witnesses stated that the complainant’s son was initially uncooperative with the officers when asked for identification. The officer’s statement agrees that the son was temporarily placed in the car because he was uncooperative and combative. At the end of questioning and upon release, the officer explained to the complainant’s son that “this could have been avoided.” The son responded by shouting, “I hate cops” as he walked away.

The complainant alleges that her son was searched, handcuffed, and held in a police car for no reason and believes that the officer was out of line in coming up to her and intimidating her. In addition, she doesn’t believe that the officers had probable cause to search her son just because he was double parked.

As to the first allegation, the OPS’s finding was *exonerated*, where the acts which provide the basis for the complaint occurred, but the review shows that such acts were proper. The officer and witness reported the complainant’s son was uncooperative and combative, and, for the officer’s safety, the complainant’s son was handcuffed and placed in the back of a police car.

As to the second allegation, OPS's finding was *not sustained*, where the review fails to disclose sufficient facts to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint. The officer stated that he told the complainant several times to stay back and someone would come and speak to her regarding her son. The complainant failed to follow the officer's orders and continued to yell at the officers while they were conducting an interview. Another officer on the scene stated that the complainant confronted the officer in an aggressive manner, swearing loudly and making a scene.

As to the third allegation, the OPS's finding was *unfounded*, where the review shows that the act or acts complained of did not occur or were misconstrued. Officers and witnesses stated the incident started when the complainant's son failed to legally park his car. The officer's actions were based on the complainant's son's actions, not his race.

When Chairman Allen went to the OPS to review the file, he asked to look at the Standard Operating Procedure. Per article 47.2 of the APD Standard Operating Procedure, page 368, "once a vehicle is stopped the subject is considered to be in custody." Custody is, as defined in article 50.2, "depriving a subject or suspect of his or her freedom in a significant way." Chairman Allen agrees that it is non-negotiable that the complainant's son was illegally parked and the vehicle was stopped for that reason. As they were in custody, his freedoms were deprived in a significant way until the officer's were done processing him. The officers are entitled to approach to request information per article 50.1 of the Standard Operating Procedure. By double parking, the complainant's son put himself at risk of temporarily losing his freedoms.

Chairman Allen moved to accept the OPS's findings. Ms. Mazza asked if the search was a pat down search or a full search, adding that this was a traffic violation and asking why was the complainant's son searched or patted down in this situation. Chairman Allen replied that the complainant's son was refusing to provide identification to the officer.

Assistant Police Chief Anthony Bruno stated that these are small issues for the Board, but, for those who live on this street this is a 24 hour a day problem. There are a lot of complaints about these issues and many requests for service to move these things along. Sometimes people who double park and play loud music are not respectful to others around them, including the police. They are less than cooperative, but once a subject is put in the back of the police car, he is patted down for the officer's safety.

Chairman Allen moved again to accept the OPS's findings. Fowler Riddick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CPRB No. 13-06/OPS No. C06- (Presented by Ronald Flagg)

Ronald Flagg summarized the complaint, using monitor Theresa Balfe's report.

The incident occurred on December 13, 2005. The complaint was received at Albany Law School on March 21, 2006. The complainant alleges that the APD arrested him

under false pretenses and that he was illegally searched without a warrant. Ms. Balfe went to OPS and reviewed documents that are cited in her report. Mr. Flagg also reviewed the documents.

In essence, the complainant was considered to be a target for selling drugs. A police informant had acknowledged that the complainant had made a sale, and as a result had gotten an arrest warrant with two addresses on it. The officers went to the addresses and arrested some individuals. The complainant was not present at that time. As the police were loading the individuals into their car after the arrests, they saw the individual walk down the street and go into a bar. The officers proceeded to arrest him at which time they found that he had drugs on him. In April, he was indicted by the Grand Jury and is waiting in the Albany County Jail.

Mr. Flagg reported that all of the detectives involved indicated that the informant was a target, and after completing a controlled buy, he was identified by the seller. He also reported that the search warrant was signed by Judge Carter and at the time of the arrest, the complainant had crack cocaine in his possession.

The monitor, Theresa Balfe, was recognized. She reported that the officers followed APD policy and procedures, and they utilized good documentation in their investigation. They used a controlled buy and obtained a search warrant signed by Judge Carter.

Mr. Flagg summarized the two allegations in the complaint. First, the complainant alleged officers apprehended and falsely arrested him. The OPS's finding was that the officers be *exonerated*. The complainant also alleged that the arrest was based on an illegal search warrant, which was obtained by false reports and evidence. The OPS's finding was *unfounded*. Mr. Flagg moved to accept the OPS's findings. Marilyn Hammond seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

In Ms. Balfe's report, she noted that instead of listing the addresses on Lark Street, she put asterisks in place of numbers. She asked the Board if monitors are allowed to put physical addresses in their reports. Chairman Allen replied that the anonymity of the complainant is not maintained, but the name is not said publicly. So, the address should be treated the same way.

B. Complaint Review Committee

The following Board members were appointed to the Committee on Complaint Review for July 2006: Jason Allen, Beresford Bailey, Ronald Flagg, Marilyn Hammond, Fowler Riddick, Paul Weafer, and Michael Whiteman.

C. *Committee/Task Force Reports*

By-Laws Committee

In the absence of Committee Co-Chairmen Paul Weafer and Michael Whiteman, Chairman Jason Allen noted that the committee had nothing new to report.

Community Outreach

Committee Chairperson Judith Mazza noted that the committee was working on revising the brochure. Chairman Allen suggested waiting to publish the new brochure until the new board members are appointed. Ms. Mazza stated that the committee needs to begin making changes and updating it. Mr. Flagg reported that he has an acquaintance who could reformat the brochure, and he would forward the brochure to that individual.

Mediation

Committee Chairperson Jason Allen gave the report. Former Board Chairperson Barbara Gaige remains committed to working on the mediation task force with the APD. She has sent a process map and documents to the Assistant Chief Bruno and to Chairman Allen.

Policy Review/Recommendations

Committee Chairman Jason Allen gave the report. A note was sent to Police Chief James Tuffey, asking him to place the regular standing monthly meetings of the committee and the APD on hold. Since the last meeting, the Standard Operating Procedure is under review and major revision. Chairman Allen requested to re-engage the committee when the APD is ready to discuss and share changes.

Assistant Chief Bruno was recognized. He reported that the OPS has been reviewing orders and general orders going back to 1996. They are incorporating new changes and they want to come up with a more user-friendly format. He does not have a projected date of completion. Chairman Allen suggested looking at review control because some things are out of date.

Public Official Liaison

Committee Chairman Ronald Flagg noted that the committee had nothing new to report.

Task Force on Complainant/Standing

In the absence of Task Force Chairman Paul Weafer, Chairman Allen noted that the task force met with Chief Tuffey. They came to an understanding as to how the document should appear. The Chief would like to work with it for a few more days. Progress is being made and the Board should know more by the next meeting.

Task Force on Monitors

Task Force Chairman Jason Allen noted that the first meeting, scheduled for the evening before, did not take place. The task force's strategy consists of developing job qualification requirements, identifying what it takes to be a monitor, determining how to advertise openings, identifying the process for approving new monitors, and discussing monitor training.

D. *Report of the Government Law Center (GLC)*

Senior Staff Attorney Justina Cintrón Perino gave the report.

Complaint Summary

As of the date of the meeting, it was reported that there were 35 active complaints before the Board for review, four (4) of which were in the process of being closed. Ten (10) complaints remain suspended from review, and a total of 234 complaints have been filed with the Board to date.

Correspondence

It was reported that the Center had prepared and forwarded, on the Board's behalf, a request to the OPS for further investigation of CPRB No. 21-05/OPS No. C05-231. It was also reported that the GLC had forwarded correspondence from CPRB No. 7-05/OPS No. C05-92, responding to the Board's findings, and correspondence from CPRB No. 17-06 – a new complainant – to the Board for its review. It was noted that a copy of the letter from Complainant 17-06 would be forwarded to the OPS, and a response prepared. Finally, it was reported that the GLC was in the process of preparing a number of responses to letters received from individuals inquiring about the complaint process, filing a complaint, and seeking resources and research.

Research Tasks

Name of Researcher – In response to a request for the name of the individual who gave a presentation at SUNY Albany about a research study on traffic stops, it was reported that the individual is Associate Professor of Criminal Justice Robin Engel of the University of Cincinnati. Professor Engel's presented findings from her three-year research study of stops and searches performed by the police in Arizona and Pennsylvania.

Best Practices in Racial Profiling Studies – in response to the Board's request for research on best practices in racial profiling studies, it was reported that a memorandum, summarizing the Center's findings, was forwarded to Board members as part of their meeting materials.

Circumstances Surrounding the Cincinnati Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Concerning Policing – it was reported that a research request was made to the Center,

asking the Center to look into the circumstances surrounding the Department of Justice's memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the City of Cincinnati concerning policing.

Outreach

It was reported that a copy of the current Board brochure was sent to Outreach Committee Chairperson Judith Mazza for revisions. Copies of the brochure and complaint form were forwarded to the Board for its review, comments, and revisions. Board members were asked to forward input, ideas, and changes to the GLC in the next month.

Training

It was reported that the Center was in the process of coordinating Ethics training for the Board, and had identified three potential trainers from around the country. A training date would be identified based upon the availability of members of the Board and the availability of the selected trainer. The Center was encouraged to reach out to the ethics trainer who spoke at the NACOLE (National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement) Conference in Chicago.

It was reported that the NACOLE Conference information, including the agenda, was forwarded to the Board as part of the meeting materials. This year's conference is scheduled to take place September 25th-28th in Boise, Idaho.

F. *Report from the Office of Professional Standards (OPS)*

Assistant Police Chief Anthony Bruno gave the report. Assistant Chief Bruno reported that the OPS had submitted its quarterly report to Ms. Perino for circulation to members of the Board.

Assistant Chief Bruno also reported that the OPS has scheduled some in-service training schools and would like the Board to be involved in some aspect of this training. He noted that he would like to present the idea of having the CPRB be part of training to the officers. He explained that he would like to offer the Board the option of taking 10-15 minutes to talk about the Board during the January/February school.

Chairman Allen commented that this training would be an in-service school, and added that 100% of the police force would participate. Assistant Chief Bruno noted that the APD sets aside time for each agency to come in and make a short presentation to the officers, and would like to include the CPRB. The Board was receptive to participating.

Assistant Chief Bruno reported that he and Ms. Perino would coordinate the scheduling of ride-alongs for the Board members.

Judith Mazza commented that at the last meeting, the Board had asked the OPS to revise its preliminary report for CPRB No. 20-05/OPS No. C05-232, removing a statement regarding credibility. Ms. Mazza asked the OPS about revising the report and forwarding a copy to the GLC for the file.

G. *Report from the Chair*

Chairperson Allen thanked the public for attending. He reported that he is working with Ms. Perino to develop a training matrix of core competencies, including ride-alongs and any other training the Board should and could have.

Chairman Allen reported that he is anticipating that there will be a lot of Board turnover this fall. He has asked Ms. Perino to draft a letter to the Mayor and Common Council, outlining the Board's desire to name those individuals who will be members of the Board this fall. Chairman Allen commented that he would like these individuals to sit in on meetings and shadow Board members on their cases as part of their training. He added that he is trying to prevent a two to three month period where there are Board members who have left and other members who are not yet trained to serve. This letter will be going out soon and Chairman Allen will be working with Mr. Flagg to follow up.

Ms. Perino reported that the professor who teaches "Introduction to Policing," an undergraduate course offered at SUNY Albany's School of Criminal Justice, has invited Board members to guest lecture for 30 minutes during a class session scheduled to take place on June 28th from 6:00-9:00 p.m. Ms. Perino explained that the professor is asking a member or members to give an introduction to the Board and explain how it works/functions. She noted that former Board Chairperson Barbara Gaike had participated in the course in the past, and had distributed copies of the local law, complaint form, and most recent quarterly report.

Chairman Allen addressed the summer meeting schedule. He proposed taking the months of July and August off from meetings, noting that this proposal is based on the rate of complaints being processed, the recent loss of one board member, and vacation schedules. Chairman Allen noted his concern with the backlog becoming overwhelming. Ms. Perino commented that there are 35 active cases, four (4) of which are in the process of being closed. She noted that some of the 35 cases are outstanding items that can be revisited after the hiatus, and a portion of the cases were recently filed and are in the investigatory phase. Chairman Allen commented that if an emergency occurs or if there is a specific need to meet, the Board will do so. Mr. Perino and Assistant Chief Bruno agreed to stay in touch during this time. Chairman Allen added that the task forces would continue their work during this time, and that he would continue to work on new member appointments.

Chairman Allen then moved to take the months of July and August off from monthly meetings. Marilyn Hammond seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-1, with Judith Mazza voting against the motion.

VI. Public Comment

The floor was opened for public comment.

A representative from the Center for Law and Justice was recognized. He commented that the Board had made a reference about the lack of participation by the community at the meeting. He stated that this might have been affected by the change in the meeting date. He suggested that in the future, if the Board changes the date, the Board should provide signs for the library to post so that the community is aware of the meetings. He encouraged the Board to communicate with the public as much as possible.

Chairman Allen added that he would like to communicate with the Common Council and the Mayor about when the monthly meetings are scheduled to take place so that this will be part of the interview questioning during Board member selection. Judith Mazza commented that the Board may no longer be able to meet in the library, given its new meeting schedule.

Ms. Perino commented that the GLC sends notices of Board meetings to the media, the City, the Common Council, the police department, and a number of individuals, groups, and organizations who are listed on the Board's mailing list. She added that the mailing list was recently updated to include all of the neighborhood associations with mailing addresses, and area churches and organizations who recently agreed to distribute complaint forms. She noted that the media is not consistent in printing CPRB meeting notices, and often does not list CPRB monthly meetings as part of the community calendar. Chairman Allen suggested putting a link on the website where interested parties could subscribe to receive updates.

The Center for Law and Justice representative inquired about the mediation process that was brought up at a prior meeting. He commented that the process was going to include a discussion between the Board, the union, and city officials, and added that he had introduced the idea of adding community input. Chairman Allen replied that he would ask Barbara Gaige about getting community involvement into the process.

The Center for Law and Justice representative also inquired about the Standard Operating Procedures. He noted that at previous meetings, there was concern about making it available to the public. Chairman Allen responded that there are specific chapters of the Standard Operating Procedure that are redacted and available for the public. Chairman Allen added that he would like to start with the subcommittee working with the APD on the policy review. He added that he cannot commit, at this point, to getting a broader audience to discuss it.

The Center for Law and Justice representative also inquired about monitors' qualifications, advertisements, the approval process, and training. He asked how someone is nominated, elected, or considered for a monitor position. Chairman Allen replied that there was one round of hiring when the Board was started. He commented that the Board is now trying to lay out the process, like a regular job interview and noted that there is a task force now committed to doing this. Chairman Allen explained that this would be posted publicly when the process is finished.

being laid out. Ms. Perino clarified that the initial search was done by the Government Law Center through an application and interview process. Interested applicants submitted an application, were interviewed, and a pool of these interviewees were recommended to and approved by the City. The only requirement in the law is that these individuals be "lawyers, judges, and the like." The Center for Law and Justice representative mentioned his concern that it be well publicized so that the pool of applicants is as diverse as possible.

The Center for Law and Justice representative also acknowledged that a few weeks ago, he met with Assistant Police Chief Breen and Lieutenant Coles about drug activity on Livingston Avenue. A week or two later there was a major arrest made. He appreciated the response, was glad to see the results, and commented that it was good to see the community working with the APD.

VII. Adjournment

Chairman Allen moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald Flagg
Secretary



6/13/06