

**City of Albany  
Citizens' Police Review Board  
Albany Public Library  
Washington Avenue (HBH Room)  
September 8, 2003  
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Kenneth Cox, Barbara Gaige, Marilyn Hammond, Judith Mazza, Eleanor Thompson, Herman Thomas, and Michael Whiteman.

**Absent:** Manuel Alguero and Paul Weafer.

**I. Call to Order & Roll Call**

Chairman Cox called the meeting to order at 6:17 p.m. and addressed the quorum requirement. He noted that while Manuel Alguero and Paul Weafer would not be in attendance at the meeting, Vice-Chairman Herman Thomas was expected to be in attendance and would arrive shortly.

**II. Approval of July 1, 2003 and August 2003 Meeting Minutes**

The minutes were reviewed. Michael Whiteman moved to approve the minutes. Barbara Gaige seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**III. Old Business**

*A. One (1) old complaint for review*

**CPRB Complaint No. 50-02/OPS No. C02-420** (Presented by Michael Whiteman)

Mr. Whiteman summarized the complaint and noted that this matter involved four allegations. The driver was proceeding east on Central Avenue and was signaling to make a left hand turn and as the driver proceeded, she was hit by a following patrol car. The complainant alleged that the police officer failed to use emergency lights in overtaking the driver on her left. The driver was also told that she would not be issued a citation for a traffic infraction. The complainant stated that a traffic citation was issued and that the driver's license wasn't returned for several weeks. The complainant further alleged that it took two months to get a copy of the accident report filed.

The Office of Professional Standards (OPS) finding was "*unfounded*" as to all allegations in that either the events did not occur or did occur but were misconstrued. The Board returned the complaint to the OPS for further investigation and asked that the following questions be answered: 1) what efforts were made to communicate with the complainant regarding the issuance of the citation and the withholding of the driver's license and what caused the delay in issuing the accident report to the complainant.

With respect to the failure to engage emergency equipment, there was at least one witness who heard the siren and lights and stated that the emergency equipment was being operated.

As to the improper issuance of citation, the guidelines of the police department indicate that a citation can be issued up to a year after an incident. The fact that the officer may have said he or she would not issue a ticket doesn't preclude issuance.

As to why the driver's license wasn't returned, Mr. Whiteman stated that there appears to have been an inadvertent error. According to the officer who initially took possession of the license, he or she thereafter gave the license to a second officer who placed it in his brief case and appears to have forgotten it was there. When the second officer was asked to look for it, he found it and returned it to the driver.

As to the delay in furnishing a copy of the accident report, the OPS's preliminary report confirmed that there was a delay, but stated that it wasn't the officer's responsibility to get the report to the driver. The officer completed the report two days following the accident and then submitted the report to the data processing unit. The delay occurred in the data processing unit where the OPS indicated that there was a backlog of two to three months. The report was "misplaced" in the backlog pile, but was furnished when found. Mr. Whiteman noted that the officer's report was filed in a timely fashion.

In response to the Board's specific questions for further investigation, OPS Commander Stephen Reilly offered the following response in a letter dated June 9, 2003. An officer is not supposed to communicate with a person who is going to receive a citation in order to avoid a roadside trial. The letter from the Commander included an apology regarding the breakdown in procedures that caused the driver's license to be withheld. The letter also indicated that the accident report was properly filed by the officer, but the backlog in the data processing unit caused the desk officers to be unable to access the report and furnish a copy to the complainant and driver.

Michael Whiteman inquired as to whether or not the OPS had procedures for communicating its apologies in a letter to the complainant. According to Mr. Whiteman, it seems appropriate to do so in some fashion.

Judith Mazza inquired as to the policy regarding the issuance of a citation. OPS Detective Sergeant Steven Krokoff responded that this is not a new policy, but rather a part of the Vehicle and Traffic Law. Judith Mazza suggested that officers receive additional training on this Law and should be reminded that they should not comment on a ticket at a scene.

Michael Whiteman moves to adopt the OPS's finding of "*unfounded.*" Judith Mazza seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### IV. New Business

##### A. *New Complaints*

##### 1. Received since August meeting

Barbara Gaige noted that there were no new complaints received since the Board's August meeting.

##### 2. Five (5) new complaints for review

**CPRB No. 70-02/OPS No. C02-128** (Presented by Judith Mazza)

Ms. Mazza summarized the complaint. The complainant was on a bus when a shooting happened in Colonie. The complainant was frustrated with the bus because it was always late and never on time. When the bus arrived, the complainant engaged in a verbal dialogue with the bus driver. While it was en route from Troy to Albany, the bus was stopped by Colonie police. The driver exited the bus and spoke with police officers. The complainant alleged that the bus driver told the complaint "when the police stop us and you have that attitude, you'll see what happens to you." The bus was then stopped a second time by Albany police officers. The complainant stated that his bag was unlawfully searched and a shotgun was pointed at him.

According to the police department's dispatch calls from that morning, there was a lot of confusion due to many complaints being reported about the same incident involving the DJ shooting in Latham. In this case, the bus driver reported to his dispatcher that he had let someone off his bus that fit the description of the suspect in the shooting. That report was transmitted to the Colonie Police Department, and officers proceeded to stop by the bus. During the stop, the bus driver was shown a photo of the suspect, however, he indicated that the suspect was not on the bus. The Watervliet Police Department then called the Albany Police Department (APD) directing the APD to stop the bus because the suspect may be on the bus. When the bus was pulled over by the APD, officers were unaware of the fact that the bus had previously been pulled over by Colonie police officers.

In their analysis, the OPS recommended that the case be closed with a finding of "*exonerated*." It was reported when APD officers got on the bus, they believed that they could encounter someone with a weapon, which is the reason why their guns were drawn. It was also reported that the complainant was already angry and frustrated with the bus driver, and his own agitation and frustration contributed to the situation. The complainant admitted that one of the officers eventually told him what was happening and explained to him why he was stopped and frisked.

Barbara Gaige asked if it was unusual to take a shotgun in this situation. Detective Sergeant Krokoff stated that it was not unusual if a dangerous situation is present. The monitor's report indicated that a shotgun would be used for accuracy purposes. An

officer with the shotgun would have much more of an accurate shot and quick shot, in a dangerous situation, than he or she would if he or she had to draw a weapon out of the holster. The report also included the fact that no force use was used in this situation.

Ms. Mazza added that the APD's Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) indicates that it is proper procedure for certain officers to carry shotguns in their vehicles. She noted that the officer who had the shotgun in this situation was the supervisor and trained in the usage of the shotgun. Detective Whalen explained that the use of the shotgun was the safest route.

It was reported that other witnesses were interviewed. The bus driver admitted to having a verbal exchange with the complainant. The complainant, however, did not come in to be interviewed by the OPS.

Ms. Mazza commented that the lack of communication between the departments was the problem. The APD had no idea that the bus had already been stopped.

Ms. Mazza then moved to accept the OPS's finding of "*exonerated.*" Vice-Chairman Herman Thomas seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**CPRB No. 7-03/OPS No. C03-131** (Presented by Vice-Chairman Herman Thomas)

Vice-Chairman Thomas summarized the complainant, noting that this complaint involved another bus incident. The complainant alleged that he was a passenger on a CDTA bus going up Central Avenue when it was stopped by the APD. The APD stopped the bus because a bank robbery suspect had allegedly got on a bus and because the complainant fit the description of the robber. The complainant alleged that officers boarded the bus, approached him, asked where he was coming from and asked for his identification. The complainant alleged he repeatedly asked officers why he was being detained, but received no answer. The complainant claimed that he reached for his backpack and was thrown to the floor by an officer. The complainant alleged that his backpack was searched. The complainant claimed he asked again why he was being stopped and he was told that he fit the description of a bank robber. He was told that people from the crime scene were going to look at him to see if he was in fact the bank robber. The complainant stated that he refused and was advised that if he refused to cooperate, then he would be charged with "Obstructing Governmental Procedures." The complainant claimed that a news crew was present and took his picture. The complainant stated that he believes that all white officers think all back men look the same.

Vice-Chairman Thomas reported that he had visited the OPS and reviewed all reports, documents and witnesses statements, including the statement from the police officers and the bus driver, relating to this complaint.

The complainant was recognized and offered the following comments:

There is a lot of information missing from the OPS report. Four police officers boarded the bus. One of the officers pulled his revolver. A police officer should not draw a revolver unless there is imminent danger. The officer never identified himself and did not tell me why I was being detained. There was no complete description give over the radio either. Supposedly, I ran from Madison Avenue to the Capitol. I told the officers I was in City Hall and was searched there by officers before I entered the traffic division. If I traveled that distance, I would have been running. I told them that I just left city hall and they could have called city hall to verify that. I told officers that I just got on the bus and that I was at the stop with another lady, but the officers never asked her. I asked for badge numbers and they told me they wouldn't give me their badge numbers. I presented my identification and another officer searched my backpack. Another officer then threw me down. Someone in charge notified me that I fit the description of a bank robber. I happened to remember the badge number. In this process, they told me that I had to wait until someone comes to the scene. I told him that I didn't have to stay because they weren't telling me anything and then they told me of this obstruction charge. In the process, someone had notified Channel 6 and I was brought through the back door where they filmed me. A weapon was drawn on me and that jeopardized the safety of all there. I don't think that a citizen has to go through that without any idea of a description.

Monitor George Kleinmeier was recognized. According to Mr. Kleinmeier, the complainant's statement accurately details how officers boarded the bus. However, all of the people interviewed stated that the complainant was never thrown down and was never cuffed; he was just being questioned. The complainant responded that he never stated he was cuffed.

Vice-Chairman Thomas questioned OPS about the protection for the people on the bus. Detective Sergeant Krokoff stated that officers do not want a hostage situation in these types of circumstances. He added that if there is a suspect on the bus, the first step is to examine the suspect for weapons.

Vice-Chairman Thomas commented that this puts those people on the bus at risk and questioned how the department apologizes to those detained in this type of situation. Detective Sergeant Krokoff commented that there should be some type of apology, but he was not sure how the department could make an appropriate apology. Vice-Chairman Thomas agreed that there should be an apology.

George Kleinmeier commented that the conclusion of the OPS report stated that officers did apologize to the complainant and provided the complainant with a business card. The complainant commented that he was given the card only after he requested it and informed the officer that he was going to make a complaint with Internal Affairs.

Vice-Chairman Thomas commented that there should be some departmental policy regarding apologies in these types of situations where persons are detained.

George Kleinmeier inquired as to whether there is anything in APD's SOP and general orders pertaining to hostage situations. Detective Sergeant Krokoff responded that if there was a hostage situation, APD would call Emergency Services. However, in this type of situation, regular police officers would intervene.

Marilyn Hammond commented that she could not understand how the department could make a mistake in the description of the suspect. Judith Mazza replied that according to the police report, someone saw the complainant at the bus stop with a green colored coat similar to the coat worn by the robbery suspect.

Chairman Cox commented that at the last meeting Mr. Washington had many positive things to say about police officers, however, it is not beyond common courtesy for an apology to be made.

Complainant stated that at this time an apology wouldn't be acceptable because parts of the report aren't accurate. He added, "The main question I have is - are these procedures acceptable to the citizens of this community? Is a revolver being pulled acceptable? What happens to the officer who pulled the gun? Is there really going to be corrections made?"

Vice-Chairman Thomas moved for a finding of "*unfounded*," noting that it was not because the incident did not happen. He added, however, that the police department should find a way to present apologies.

Mediation was suggested as an alternative. Assistant Corporation Counsel Todd Burnham commented that if the OPS made a finding, then there is no rational basis for the union to send the officer(s) to mediation. Barbara Gaige commented that the Board is not asking the officer(s) to apologize for wrongdoing. The Board is asking that they apologize about the inconvenience.

Eleanor Thompson commented that the Board has seen similar things like this before and questioned if there is any policy that police abide by to stop action from going this far and if there is any training to prevent this. Detective Sergeant Krokoff responded by saying that the officers in this case acted according to the policy.

Michael Whiteman stated that the problem in these cases is that the officer claims to have acted in accordance with policy and this may be the case. He noted that the same issue presented itself in another complaint. However, there appears to be a failure on both sides to recognize that the other side has a particular position and is faced with a set of circumstances. In this case, the police officers had a set of facts, which included the fact that the suspect might have been on the bus. Here, there seems to have been a failure to recognize the feelings of the individual being stopped after the police officers realized

that he was not the suspect. Mr. Whiteman would like to see some recognition on both sides of the other person's perceptions.

There was brief discussion about descriptions and identifying suspects. Judith Mazza commented that the police have to be very conscious of media presence and if there is media present, then the police should prohibit them from being present when an identification needs to be made. Marilyn Hammond questioned why the officers did not make a phone call to city hall and added that the officers there could have identified the complainant.

Barbara Gaige commented that the Board should bring this issue to the attention of the Commissioner. Chairman Cox asked for the Board's input as to an appropriate way to communicate its concerns to the Commissioner. Ms. Gaige responded that the Board could send a letter under the Chairman's signature outlining the Board's discussion and its concerns. She added that the APD should be more cognizant about building good public relations.

Todd Burnham suggested that the Chairman meet with the Commissioner personally to address the Board's concerns.

Michael Whiteman recommended that the Board make a finding of "*unfounded*" with a recommendation that an appropriate communication be sent to the Commissioner to express the Board's concerns about the aftermath of these cases. Barbara Gaige seconded the motion. The motion carried with five members in favor and two members, Marilyn Hammond and Judith Mazza, abstaining.

**CPRB No. 8-03/OPS No. C03-145** (Presented by Barbara Gaige)

Ms. Gaige read the complainant's statement. The complainant alleged that a police officer banged on her door hysterically demanding that she open it. She claimed that when she opened the door, the officer barged past her with two CPS (Child Protective Services) workers and immediately began searching her home. She alleged that the officers frightened her son who is in a wheelchair. The complainant claimed that she thought the officer and workers went into her 13-year-old daughter's room and ran upstairs after them. She claimed that the officer grabbed and twisted her right arm. She stated she was placed in handcuffs. She also stated that she had recently had 25 stitches placed in her left hand following an injury, and claims that the stitches were "busted." She complained of continued shoulder pain. She stated that she had instructed her daughter to call the child's grandmother and that the officer grabbed the phone from the child.

This incident occurred on March 3, 2002, but the complaint wasn't filed until 2003. The allegations involved the excessive use of force and call handling. Albert Lawrence was the assigned monitor to this complaint.

There were no radio or phone transmissions available because the complaint was filed more than 6 months following the incident. The complainant was interviewed. The officer was also interviewed and stated that a hotline call was received and when the officer arrived at the scene he observed smoke and marijuana. In addition, he observed someone going out the back door. Child Protective Services (CPS) workers spoke with the complainant and stated that the officer didn't ask about drugs. The officer did a quick visual search and saw marijuana joints. The complainant stated that the officer is still harassing her. The CPS worker who was interviewed did not recall the nature of the complaint and did observe the "roaches." The worker stated that it was common practice to request police assistance. She stated the officer was not rude and spoke in a tone of being in charge. The second officer to arrive said she also noted a smell of marijuana.

Albert Lawrence was recognized. The complainant did allege that the officer twisted her arm and opened a pre-existing wound. However, she did not seek medical attention and she often had pain before from pushing her child's wheel chair. According to Mr. Lawrence, all of the available witnesses were questioned and there is nothing to sustain allegations.

Ms. Gaige then moved to accept the OPS's findings of "*exonerated*" with respect to call handling and "*unfounded*" with respect to use of force.

Michael Whiteman inquired about the complainant's call handling allegations and commented that he could not understand why the apartment was searched without a warrant based on a third party verbal complaint of an unreliable witness. Barbara Gaige responded that the police were called to accompany the CPS workers for their protection and noted that it was the CPS workers that searched the home and not the police officers. She added that the CPR worker stated she observed the marijuana in the residence.

Mr. Whiteman stated that he thought the officer claimed to have searched the apartment for 30 minutes. Albert Lawrence clarified by stating that this was an allegation of the complaint and not fact.

Ms. Mazza questioned why a transcript of the CPS report wasn't included. According to the OPS, CPS doesn't allow the police department to include witness statements in their reports.

Marilyn Hammond seconded Ms. Gaige's motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**CPRB No. 9-03/OPS No. C03-178** (Presented by Barbara Gaige)

Ms. Gaige summarized the complaint. She noted that the complainant was present at last month's meeting and presently in Albany County Jail. The complainant alleged that he was down near the Plaza Grill and a bunch of college kids got into his taxi van. The complainant claimed that he was stopped by a police officer and he was asked to step out of the car. The complainant alleged that an officer cursed at him. He stated that he was placed in handcuffs, wasn't told he was being arrested, and wasn't mirandized. He also

alleged that there was extensive name calling and that there was corroboration between the officers. The complainant's primary concerns were that he wasn't read his Miranda rights and that the officers used profanity. In addition, he was concerned about the lack of a police presence in the area of Ontario Street and Madison Avenue.

The complainant did not appear for an interview with the OPS. Before he was arrested, he had run over a woman's leg. The reports indicate that he left the scene and an officer just happened to come up behind him and call in the plate number to dispatch. The dispatcher called for another patrol car and supervisor.

An interview with the target officer took place on April 24<sup>th</sup>. The officer said he stopped the complainant and took him out of the car. He noted that there were more than the normal numbers of passengers, 11 in an 8-passenger van. The officer denied using obscenities. The supervisor claimed the situation was non-confrontational and the backup officer denied using obscenities.

The video that the complainant submitted to prove that there was no police presence that evening shows a passing police cruiser in the area. The complainant also identified an officer at the scene and it was determined that the named officer was not on duty that night. In addition, there was an overtime detail at Michaels on the evening of the incident. Therefore, the reports indicate that there was police presence in the area.

The complainant alleged that he was not read the Miranda warnings. According to the OPS, Miranda warnings are read to persons who have been placed in custody and who are being interrogated.

Ms. Gaige reported that the OPS made a finding of "*not sustained*" with respect to the allegations contained in the complaint and made a motion to accept the OPS's findings.

Michael Whiteman inquired about the department's procedures and asked whether or not it was the department's policy, upon arresting someone, to read the Miranda warnings. Detective Sergeant Steven Krokoff responded that it was not a departmental policy. Mr. Whiteman inquired as to what would happen if an individual "blurts" something out. Detective Sergeant Krokoff replied that the information said would be used against the individual and would stand up in court. The Detective Sergeant further explained that an officer would have mirandized an individual during an interrogation, but there was no interrogation here. Mr. Whiteman commented that it was difficult for him to believe that the officer didn't ask questions in this situation. He added that he believed that officers always ask questions.

Marilyn Hammond seconded Barbara Gaige's motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Officer James Teller, President of Council 82, was recognized. Officer Teller addressed the last comment made by Michael Whiteman and questioned how Mr. Whiteman could sit on the Board in an unbiased manner while making statements like the statement he

just made. A brief verbal exchange ensued between Officer Teller and Mr. Whiteman about the comment.

**CPRB No. 11-03/OPS No. C03-154** (Presented by Marilyn Hammond)

Marilyn Hammond read the complainant's statement. The complainant alleged that he was at the 518 Club when several fights broke out. Officers began to clear the streets. The complainant stated that he and a friend got into their car and attempted to leave, but the vehicle in front of him stopped in the street to watch the fights. The complainant alleged that he began honking his horn to get the vehicle to move when an officer approached and told the complainant to stop honking his horn. The complainant stated that he was getting out of his car to speak with the officer when the officer allegedly grabbed the car door and yanked it open causing damage to the hinges. It is alleged that the officer then knocked the complainant to the ground, struck and kicked the complainant in the head, and placed him under arrest. The complainant further alleged that an officer called the complainant an "a\*shole" and allegedly threatened to "shove his car horn up his a\*s."

Ms. Hammond stated that the complainant started to fight the officer and that medical records indicated that the complainant wasn't actively bleeding. The complainant never told Albany Medical Center or EMS that his injuries were from being hit in the face. When Ms. Hammond looked at his picture, she concluded that his injuries were just a scrape and that it didn't come from a baton. In addition, the complainant insinuated that if the officer dropped the charges, the complainant wouldn't press charges. The OPS attempted to contact the complainant and witnesses. The complainant and his witness showed up, but could not stay. They left their written statements with Detective Shade. The witness did not return to the OPS to be interviewed. The club owner said that the officer didn't open the door or hit the complainant with a baton.

Theresa Balfe, the monitor assigned to the complaint, was recognized. Ms Balfe added that Detective Arthur Shade attempted to speak with the complainant and his witness while at the OPS, but the complainant said that he could not stay. Detective Shade asked to speak with the complainant's witness independently, but the complainant claimed that he and his witness had to leave. Detective Shade then followed the complainant to his vehicle and saw that there was no damage. According to Detective Shade, the complainant stated, "it works now, it must have been frozen then." Ms. Balfe noted that the complainant and his witness did not want to meet with her and reported that the bar owner also agreed with the officers statements. Ms. Balfe stated that she also read the training procedures and the baton used is consistent with the procedures and agrees that the pictures show scrape marks. According to Ms. Balfe, EMS took the complainant to Capital District Psychiatric Center because he hadn't taken his mediation. With respect to the written statements given to the OPS by the complainant and his witness, Ms. Balfe noted that they both had the same misspelled words.

Ms. Hammond reported that the OPS made a findings of "*exonerated*" with respect to the use of force and "*not sustained*" with respect to the officer's conduct.

Michael Whiteman noted that based upon the investigative information, the “*exonerated*” is not the appropriate finding for use of force. He commented that the proper characterization for the use of force should be “*unfounded.*” Todd Burnham agreed with Mr. Whiteman in that the proper finding should be “*unfounded.*”

Marilyn Hammond then moved to make findings of “*unfounded*” with respect to the use of force and “*not sustained*” with respect to the officer’s conduct. The motion was seconded by Michael Whiteman. The motion carried unanimously.

B. *Appointment of two new members to the Committee on Complaint Review of October 2003.*

The following Board members were appointed to the Committee on Complaint Review for October 2003:

Barbara Gaige, Judith Mazza, Herman Thomas, Paul Weafer and Michael Whiteman.

C. *Report from Corporation Counsel*

Todd Burnham offered a brief report. Mr. Burnham stated that he received several requests from the Government Law Center (GLC) for opinions relating to the following issues. He added that he would forward written opinions to the GLC.

1. Officer James Teller asked that all correspondences sent to officers from the Board be forwarded to him as well. Mr. Burnham reported that he has consulted with Deputy Corporation Counsel Ennio Corsi and a response is forthcoming.
2. The GLC inquired as to the process for appealing a Board determination. Mr. Burnham explained that the proper procedure for bringing an appeal would be to commence an Article 78 proceeding. Mr. Burnham noted that this appears to be the only available procedure.
3. The GLC inquired as to whether, under city legislation, a member of the Board may hold a city or county office while also serving as a member of the Board. Mr. Burnham cited City Charter Article 3, Section 301(e) and commented that serving as a member of the Board does not prevent the holding of a county or state office. He added that a city employee cannot serve as a member of the Board.

D. *Policy Recommendations*

GLC Staff Attorney Justina Cintrón commented that the GLC forwarded three policy letters, approved by the Board at its July meeting, to the Commissioner of Public Safety and noted that a response has not yet been received with respect to these letters. She noted that the GLC is in the process of drafting a follow-up letter regarding a bias-based policing policy for the Board’s approval. She also noted that the Board has not yet

received any written response from the Commissioner regarding the December officer-involved shooting. She added that the GLC would be conducting a review to determine if there are any outstanding policy recommendations/requests that have been made by the Board, but have not yet received any follow-up communications from the Commissioner or police department.

#### *E. Report from the GLC*

Justina Cintrón gave the report.

#### Status of Complaints

It was reported that the status of active, closed, suspended and mediation complaints remained unchanged from August.

#### Union Meeting

It was reported that the Board had a meeting with the union tentatively scheduled for September 15<sup>th</sup> to discuss mediation. However, the union was unable to meet on that date. It was noted that efforts would be made to reschedule the meeting.

#### October Meeting

It was reported that the Board's October meeting had been scheduled for October 13<sup>th</sup>, Columbus Day. The Board was asked whether or not it would like the meeting to take place on an alternate date in October. Chairman Cox instructed the GLC to keep the October meeting date if Paul Weafer and Manuel Alguero would be in attendance.

#### NACOLE Conference

It was reported that the Annual Conference of the National Association for Citizen Oversight of Law Enforcement would be taking place September 21<sup>st</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> in Los Angeles. It was also reported that the city had agreed to cover the expenses of two Board members to attend the conference. Ms. Cintrón noted that Barbara Gaige and Michael Whiteman were selected to attend, and represent the Board at the conference.

#### Training

It was reported that the Board's training program would resume in October and that training would be scheduled for the months of October and December. October 6<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, and 27<sup>th</sup> were identified as tentative training dates for October; and December 1<sup>st</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, and 29<sup>th</sup> were identified as tentative training dates for December. In addition, two topics had been identified by members of the Board for training: police/community relation's forum and institutional racism.

## Mediation

Karleen Karlson reported that she has made little progress with respect to mediation. While she had an opportunity to speak with one complainant who was willing to participate in mediation once the program is up and running again, she has not yet heard back from the remaining complainants whose cases had been referred to mediation.

### *F. Report from OPS*

Detective Sergeant Steven Krokoff commented that, in the absence of the OPS Commander Stephen Reilly, the OPS had nothing new to report.

## **V. Public Comment**

The floor was opened for public comment. However, no public comment was offered.

## **VI. Adjournment**

Chairman Kenneth Cox moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Whiteman  
Secretary