

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

Present: Jason Allen, Ronald Flagg, James Malatras, John Paneto, Andrew Phelan, Jr., Anthony Potenza, and Hon. Fowler Riddick.

Absent: Daniel Fitzgerald.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

II. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was reviewed. Chairman Jason Allen moved to approve the agenda. Ronald Flagg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

III. Approval of the June 12, 2007 and September 11, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The June 12, 2007 and September 11, 2007 meeting minutes were reviewed. Ronald Flagg moved to approve the minutes. Fowler Riddick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Old Business

A. *CPRB No. 13-07/OPS No. C07-282 – Letter to State Police*

Chairman Jason Allen noted a change to the agenda to discuss this item when James Malatras arrived.

V. New Business

A. *New Complaints*

1. New Complaints Received Since October 9, 2007 Meeting

Andrew Phelan reported that four (4) new complaints had been received by the Board since its October 9, 2007 meeting. Mr. Phelan read a summary of each new complaint.

CPRB No. 23-07

On September 11, 2007, the complainant alleges that he was assisting a complete and total stranger who seemed ill. While contacting EMS for the stranger, the complainant alleges that he was threatened by an officer who had a nightstick in his hand. According to the complainant, the officer told him not to yell at the EMS and snatched his cell phone from him and slammed it shut. The complainant further alleges that the officer threatened him with jail. When the complainant went to the south station to file a complaint, the same officer was present mocking and making a joke of the situation. The complainant alleges that the officers refused to give him a complaint form because they could not locate them and that he would have to go to Washington Avenue for the form.

A monitor was not appointed to investigate this complaint.

CPRB No. 24-07

While at a legislature meeting in City Hall, the complainant alleges that when he went to give another candidate some of his fliers, the sheriff stopped him, grabbed his flier, pushed him, and asked him to leave the site. The complainant further alleges that the sheriff asked him to stop disrupting the meeting.

A monitor was not appointed to investigate this complaint.

CPRB No. 25-07

The complainant alleges five to six evidence handling complaints, with the latest occurring in mid-August. The complainant further alleges that in mid-August an officer told her three times that he would arrange for the collection of evidence. According to the complainant, the officer believed that he had a conflict handling it because the same evidence could be used in someone else's civil litigation against the city. The complainant claims that the officer repeatedly promised that someone would handle it and get back to her before he was transferred to patrol. She made many attempts to contact him when nothing happened.

A monitor was not appointed to investigate this complaint.

CPRB No. 26-07

The complainant alleges that on her way to visit a friend, an unknown woman began yelling obscenities at her. The complainant's friend became aware of the situation and called the police. The complainant's fifteen year old niece heard the commotion and walked over from her house to see what was happening. When the police arrived, the complainant's niece decided to go back home. Upon seeing her niece walk away, one of the officers grabbed her niece. The complainant claims that she and her friend told the officer that her niece was not involved, but the officer continued to grab her niece and put

her into the backseat of his squad car. The complainant's niece called her mother from the squad car. The complainant alleges that her niece's mother, who is the complainant's sister, arrived on the scene and made attempts to get the officers to release her daughter. The complainant claims that her sister was not hostile or aggressive toward the officers, but the officer was controlling and rude. The complainant further claims that as her sister started to walk towards the squad car, an officer grabbed her sister from behind and twisted her arm behind her back. Two State troopers joined the officers and all three officers brought her sister to the ground into some bushes. The complainant alleges that one of the troopers had her sister's arm; while the other had a knee in her back; and the officer had a choke hold on her. According to the complainant, her sister's eyes were rolling back into her head. Her sister was handcuffed and arrested and taken away in another police car. While the complainant and her mother were on their way to the station, another neighbor informed them that her sister was on the ground around the corner. When she approached the area, EMS was on the scene and the police would not let them near her sister who was eventually transported to Albany Medical Center. The complainant alleges that her sister suffered a stroke, a broken elbow, amongst other injuries, and spent eight days in the hospital. Her niece was released to her brother and never brought to the station. The complainant states that there was no reason for her sister and niece to be treated the way they were and the police never addressed the reason they were called to the scene.

A monitor was appointed to investigate this complaint.

2. New Complaints for Review

Chairman Allen reported that there were three (3) new complaints on the agenda for review by the Board. He noted that the complaint assigned to James Malatras for review, which was listed first on the agenda, would be reviewed once he arrived.

CPRB No. 8-07/OPS No. C07-219 (Presented by John Paneto)

John Paneto noted that the complainant was not present at the meeting. He also noted that the monitor assigned to investigate the complaint was present. Mr. Paneto summarized the complaint. The complainant alleged that his request for medical attention was delayed; his request made of the officer to take a report on the assault was denied; and his request to search for his lost property was also denied.

Mr. Paneto summarized the Office of Professional Standards (OPS) preliminary report. According to the OPS report, the complainant alleged that he was the victim of assault by unknown white males. The complainant stated that while he was wrestling with the white male who struck him, his personal property fell from his pocket onto the snowy ground. The complainant claims that the police showed up, and would not allow him to retrieve his property. According to the complainant, although the officer continued to tell him to leave, he did not because he wanted to get his property. After he refused to leave, the officers told

the complainant that he was under arrest, handcuffed him, and placed him in the back of a police car. While being placed into the police van, the complainant stated he told the officer that his eyes and the laceration on his lip were burning from the salt on the ground. According to the complainant, the officer did not respond, and closed the door. While being transported to the station, the complainant spit the salt from his mouth in the back of the van. Upon arrival at the station, the complainant claimed that he needed medical attention. The complainant further claimed that the EMS showed up about 2 hours later, but by that time the bleeding had stopped, so they did not treat him.

Mr. Paneto stated that the complainant listed two witnesses who were at the scene. The first witness stated that she saw a man swing at the complainant, missed and they were wrestling on the ground. The witness stated that she saw no injuries when he got up. She further stated that she and the complainant had been drinking that night, and the complainant was probably intoxicated. The first witness stated that there were other fights going on when the police arrived. She did not feel that the police were mean, but just doing their job to stop the fighting. The first witness heard the officer telling the complainant to leave. According to the second witness, the complainant was "pretty drunk," and did not see how he fell to the ground. The second witness was quoted as saying "I was smashed," and so was the complainant.

Mr. Paneto acknowledged that the appointed monitor, George Kleinmeier, was present. He summarized the monitor's report. The monitor investigated several interdepartmental correspondence from the complainant's file. The police responded to a fight, in which one of the individuals in the fight (referring to the complainant) was apparently drunk on the scene. According to the arrest report, the complainant was arrested for disorderly conduct and criminal tampering. The criminal tampering charge was for spitting in the squad car. According to the admission screening sheet, the complainant checked off that he had no physical injuries and that he was under the influence of alcohol or drugs. According to the property report, there were several items in the complainant's possession, including his wallet, at the time of booking. Mr. Paneto noted that he disagreed with the complainant's allegation that he was not allowed to go find his personal property, because it was on him when he was booked. Mr. Paneto further noted that the photo of the complainant, taken at the time of booking, showed no signs of injury to the complainant's lip or any trauma to his face.

Mr. Paneto summarized the findings of the OPS on the conduct standard allegation as *unfounded*; the call handling allegation as *unfounded*; and the second conduct standard allegation as *not sustained*.

Mr. Paneto noted that an inconsistency in the complainant's allegation that he did not receive medical attention, and that it took two hours for the police to comply. The timeline from his contact with the police officer to the time he was actually placed in the jail cell was less than three (3) hours. Mr. Paneto also noted that when someone at the booking station finally determined that maybe they should call for medical assistance, the complainant refused assistance, and sent the paramedics away. Lastly, the complainant's

witnesses did not corroborate his view of what happened.

Chairman Allen asked Mr. Kleinmeier if he was at the interview with the complainant and the witnesses. Mr. Kleinmeier responded in the negative. Commander Burris Beattie stated that he always tries to get the monitor to be present, but in this instance he believes the witnesses were interviewed in the field. Detective Kathy Hendrick explained that the complainant showed up at the office without notice, so there was not a chance to contact the monitor, and the Board did not have the complaint yet. She further clarified that there was not a monitor on the case yet, because they received the complaint before it was turned over to the Government Law Center.

Chairman Allen asked Mr. Paneto and Mr. Kleinmeier if they saw the video. Both responded in the negative. Commander Beattie added that there was no request made to see the video from the booking station. Mr. Paneto commented that he did not see a need to view the video because the photo did not show any injuries. Mr. Kleinmeier agreed.

Mr. Paneto moved to accept the findings of the OPS on the allegation of conduct standard for refusing medical attention as *unfounded*; the call handling allegation for failure to file a report by the police as *unfounded*; and the conduct standard allegation for not retrieving property as *not sustained*. Chairman Allen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

CPRB No. 12-07/OPS NO. C07-279 (Presented by Andrew Phelan)

Andrew Phelan summarized the complaint. The complainant alleged that a police officer stopped him in his vehicle, and kept him waiting a few minutes before he approached the car. The complainant further alleged that once he gave the officer his license and registration, the officer kept him waiting another 20 minutes. The complainant also claimed that when he exited the vehicle and went toward the officer, the officer shouted for him to get back in the car or he would spend the night in jail.

Mr. Phelan summarized the OPS preliminary report. The complainant alleged that the officer was unprofessional and rude, and threatened to arrest him. According to the OPS investigation, the officer claimed that the complainant exited his car and stood in the roadway. According to the officer, he told the complainant for his own safety to have a seat back in his car, or he would be placed in custody. The officer claimed that he did not tell the complainant that he would spend the night in jail. Mr. Phelan reported that the complainant claimed that he was held for thirty-five (35) minutes. The target officer's call ticket showed that the officer conducted a traffic stop at 5:44 p.m., and returned to service at 5:55 p.m. It was noted that it was an eleven (11) minute stop. Mr. Phelan asked if the complainant was present. It was noted that the complainant was not present.

Mr. Phelan moved to accept the OPS finding of *not sustained* for the conduct standard allegation and *unfounded* for the call handling allegation. Ronald Flagg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. *Appointment of New Members to the Committee on Complaint Review for December 2007*

The following Board members were appointed to the Committee on Complaint Review for December 2007: Jason Allen, John Paneto, Andrew Phelan, Anthony Potenza, and Fowler Riddick.

C. *Approval of 2007 First Quarterly Report*

Chairman Allen asked Coordinator of the Board Sharmaine Moseley if the database scorecard was helpful in creating the reports. Ms. Moseley responded in the affirmative. Ronald Flagg moved to accept the 2007 First Quarterly Report. Fowler Riddick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. *Committee/Task Force Reports*

By-Laws and Rules

Committee Chairman Jason Allen reported that by the end of the year, he intends to work with the Board to make recommendations to the Common Council on any updates to its by-laws based on experiences with the mediation program and other initiatives. Chairman Allen requested that the Government Law Center staff schedule meetings between Thanksgiving and Christmas, with the Deputy Mayor, and the Public Safety Committee.

Mediation

Committee Chairman Jason Allen reported that there is a red-lined mediation protocol document within the Board's meeting packets. He noted that his intent was not vote on it tonight, but for the Board to review the suggested changes. He suggested that the Board vote on the document next month.

Public Official Liaison

Committee Chairman Ronald Flagg reported that the GLC staff will schedule a meeting with the public officials between Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Chairman Allen added that the Board should begin thinking of items that are necessary to bring to the public officials' attention, in terms of the Board and any support it needs. Mr. Flagg stated that he would give dates in December when he would not be available to attend the meeting. Chairman Allen stated that he thought the Board should have a twice a year meeting with public officials.

Police Department Liaison and Policy Review/Recommendations

In the absence of Committee Chairman Dan Fitzgerald, Chairman Jason Allen noted that the committee had nothing new to report.

Community Outreach

Chairman Jason Allen noted that Committee Chairman James Malatras was not yet present. He pointed out the brochure in the meeting packets, and recognized Ronald Flagg for his part in its creation. Ronald Flagg acknowledged the GLC staff for its role in the creation of the brochure. Chairman Allen noted that a good thing about it is that the Board members' names do not appear in the brochure, which will help it to maintain relevance, and not be out of date for a number of years.

Chairman Allen asked what the intent was for distributing the community outreach brochure. He stated that Committee Chairman James Malatras is taking the lead on this project. Mr. Flagg agreed that Mr. Malatras has strategies on how to distribute it, and who should receive it. Chairman Allen stated that the Board would table this discussion until Committee Chairman Malatras arrives.

Monitors Task Force

Chairman Allen asked the Government Law Center to amend the future agendas to reflect James Malatras as reporting on the monitors task force, since he agreed to be Chair of the task force at the Board's October 9, 2007 meeting. Chairman Allen noted that there is a red-lined monitor protocol in the meeting packets for the Board to review so they could vote on it.

It was noted that James Malatras arrived to the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Chairman Allen asked that Ms. Moseley give the report from the GLC while Mr. Malatras settled in.

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 twenty-nine (29) active complaints before the Board for review. Of those twenty-nine (29) active cases, three (3) were reviewed at tonight's meeting.

It was further reported that two hundred forty-one (241) complaints have been closed and seven (7) complaints were suspended from review. The total number of complaints filed to date is two hundred seventy-four (274).

Reappointment

Ms. Moseley reported that she briefly discussed the reappointment of Ronald Flagg with Common Council President Morris. It was further reported that the Council is aware that they need to act on it.

CPRB Brochure

It was reported that enclosed in the meeting packets is a draft copy of the CPRB brochure. Ms. Moseley asked that any comments/suggestions be forwarded to her.

Reports

It was reported that the GLC has completed the second quarter report for 2007 and it is currently undergoing review. A draft copy will be mailed out to members in the December meeting packets.

Board Meeting

It was noted that the next Board meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 13th at the Albany Public Library.

VI. Old Business

CPRB No. 13-07/OPS No. C07282 – Letter to State Police

Chairman Jason Allen noted that the Board would now address the item listed on the agenda under old business which was tabled until Mr. Malatras arrived. Chairman Allen stated that last month, the Board voted to send an informational letter to the State Police regarding a complaint that was filed against a member of the Albany Police Department and a State trooper. Since then, the Board has received a letter from its counsel with his recommendation. Chairman Allen noted that the Board received this recommendation after they voted on sending a letter, so a further discussion is necessary. He asked the Board if they had any comments on the letter. Mr. Malatras stated that he wanted there to be a comfort level with the OPS in sending the letter. Since the letter is tone-free, and there is a relationship between the State Police and the APD, the letter would not harm that relationship.

Chairman Allen asked the Board if anyone had concerns about the letter being sent. It was noted that there were no responses. Chairman Allen concluded that the letter would be sent. Chairman Allen then returned to the complaint on the agenda that was held for review until Mr. Malatras arrived.

CPRB No. 4-07/OPS No. C07-122 (Presented by James Malatras)

James Malatras summarized the complaint. On January 21, 2007, the complainant and two companions went to the South Station to inquire about the arrest of another friend. While waiting in the lobby of the station, the complainant alleges that it was cold in the station, so she asked the officer behind the desk if the heat was on, or if there was anywhere else for the three to wait. Shortly thereafter, the officer came out from behind the desk with a metal coat hanger in hand, untied the hanger, and fused the outside and inside doors together so that freezing cold air flowed into the waiting area. The complainant further alleges that the officer made a sarcastic remark when she moved to remove the hangers and close the doors. The complainant alleges that the officer yelled at her to sit down, and when she did not, the officer grabbed her and forcefully threw her out of the station. As a result, the complainant claims that she suffered bruises and scrapes on her arms and legs.

Mr. Malatras reported that the following facts are undisputed by both parties and witnesses. The first fact was that the complainant and her companions were intoxicated. The second fact was that the complainant and one of her companions made numerous inquiries about the state of their friend who was arrested. The third fact was the officer did in fact open the doors to the waiting room with the intent to get the complainant (and her companions) to leave, without giving verbal warning before opening the door. Mr. Malatras further reported that the OPS made two findings. The first finding, with respect to the allegation of misconduct, the OPS recommends that the case be closed as *sustained*, where the review disclosed sufficient facts to prove the allegations. The officer admitted to propping open the door to try to get the group to leave by making it cold, because the officer was tired of the complainant and her friends' disruptive state. The OPS further sustained this complaint, because prior to opening the door, the officer failed to warn the complainant, nor give verbal commands to leave the station. Regarding, the second finding, with respect to the use of force allegation, the OPS recommends that the complaint be closed as *unfounded*, where the review shows that the act did not occur, or was misconstrued. The officer stated that the complainant moved the coat hanger, although he instructed her not to, and because of her refusal to listen, the complainant would have to leave. However, the complainant refused to leave. Consequently, the officer stated that he pushed the complainant lightly on her shoulders, but she latched onto the door and would not let go. The officer needed to pry the complainant's hand from the doors. Mr. Malatras stated that he reviewed various documents, which included the OPS report, the monitor's report, summaries of the interviews, and other pertinent documentation. He further stated that he agreed with the findings of the OPS with respect to the first allegation of misconduct. However, many of the facts leading up to the use of force are inconsistent and unresolved. For instance, the complainant's companions, the complainant, and the officers on duty offered different accounts of the events. Although the officer states that it was the complainant that removed the hanger, the testimony of one of the companions indicated that it was not the complainant who removed the hanger. In addition, the officer only indicated that he interacted with the complainant, when one of the testimonies clearly stated that the officer also interacted with one of the companions. Mr. Malatras reported that the facts surrounding the excessive use of force are unclear. First, the complainant stated that she fell to the ground, while one of her companions said she hit her shin on the door on the way out. Also, neither the complainant nor any of her companions indicated any injury at the

time. The OPS made repeated requests to the complainant and her witnesses to give additional sworn statements to clarify discrepancies between the various players. On each occasion, the OPS requests were refused. Mr. Malatras stated that due to lack of cooperation, he agreed with the finding of the OPS as **unfounded** with respect to the allegation of excessive use of force.

Monitor Al Lawrence stated that he had a slightly different view on the second allegation. He further stated that he had no issues with the way the investigation was conducted, the number of witnesses that were interviewed and so forth, however it seems to him that the officer, having done this silly thing of opening the door to try to force them to leave, should have recognized that that was an inappropriate way to deal with the situation. He should have allowed them to close the door, or closed the door himself, and then given them a warning that they would be evicted if they did not sit down and behave. Mr. Lawrence stated no force at all was necessary at the point at which the target officer employed it.

Mr. Malatras stated that he initially agreed with the monitor's report in that sense, but that the discrepancies between the accounts, and the refusal of the complainant and the witnesses to clarify with sworn testimony after four (4) or five (5) attempts, led him to not be able to find the evidence to make a finding other than **unfounded**. There is some responsibility of the complainant to follow through with the OPS. He added that even with the initial testimonies, there were discrepancies between the complainant and the witnesses with respect to whether the force was excessive or not.

Mr. Lawrence stated that he would agree that had the officer allowed the door to be closed, and people continued to disrupt the operations of the station, and *then* he used force, that the force he used was not excessive. Mr. Lawrence further stated that as Mr. Malatras pointed out, the complainant herself said she fell to the ground, and one of her witnesses, the best behaved of the group, said she hit her knee on the way out. The third individual said she did not witness any injury by the complainant at all. Mr. Lawrence restated that the target officer should not have used any force at the point at which he did, and that it was excessive at that point.

Chairman Allen asked how the Board felt about the fact that the witness mailed the complaint in, used his return address; signed the complaint, and it appears that the handwriting on the envelope is the same writing that is used in the complaint. Mr. Malatras responded that he was not particularly offended by it because the witness directly observed the incident. Mr. Lawrence noted that the "witness" they are referring to could have been the complainant. Mr. Malatras stated that he believed that because the first allegation with the door applied to all the parties, and the second allegation applied to only the complainant, the complainant was the one who was pushed out of the station while the other two were not.

Ronald Flagg clarified that the Board is not disputing the facts, just that somebody else wrote it. Chairman Allen stated that a complaint is a serious matter, and if he was pushed out of a station, he would not want somebody to complain on his behalf; rather, he would do it himself. Mr. Lawrence stated that he thinks it was because the complainant was a student, and left town shortly after this occurred. Mr. Malatras noted the issue of the officer, without giving any verbal warning, opening the doors. If that action is taken out of the whole case, there would not have

been any force at all, as the force was predicated upon the first piece of opening the door. Also, when the statements were made, the complainant did not ever allege that she was injured. Then there was a discrepancy about how the injury that she complained about later actually occurred. One witness said she hit her knee on the way out the door; while she said she fell down presumably because she was pushed, and was drinking.

Ronald Flagg stated that the officer's initial act was in poor judgment. The officer decided to make that first act, which was unbelievably childish, irresponsible and immature, and which led to the second act.

James Malatras noted a previous case reviewed by the Board at its last meeting. He stated that this case is factually the same. A verbal command was given, there was non-compliance, and then force was used. Mr. Malatras added that the Board should be consistent with rulings or findings of its cases. Ronald Flagg stated that there was force that was used, and the reason the officer was put in that predicament to use force was because of the initial decision to wire the door. Chairman Allen added that the force the target officer used was prying her fingers from the door and pushing her lightly on her shoulders.

Commander Beattie stated that part of the issue was that the OPS never had an actual face-to-face conversation with the person. It was all by phone. The OPS never had a statement from the actual person. The OPS had her friend's statement, the witnesses that were spoken to, and then they basically hit a dead end. They had the target officer's statement, but did not know if they had more than one officer's correspondence. Commander Beattie added that the OPS pursued this as far as they could based on what they had. The officer "forcefully threw her out of the station" is her complaint. Commander Beattie stated that he did not think that she was forcefully thrown out of the station. She was trying to remain in the station, and the officer did what he could to get her fingers off of the door, and then got her out of the station. Mr. Flagg stated that we have an officer pushing a drunk into the street who could possibly drive drunk or run into a problem with someone else.

Commander Beattie replied that that's what the complaint alleges, but the OPS does not have her statement. The only one involved and still cooperating is the target officer. Commander Beattie added that the OPS addressed the target officer's behavior through the Chief's Policy on Progressive Discipline. Chairman Allen stated that this complaint will be used as a disciplinary tool, which is why it would be problematic that the person who the complaint is about did not file a complaint.

Mr. Malatras moved to accept the OPS finding of *sustained* for the conduct standard allegation and *unfounded* for the use of force allegation. Chairman Allen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Community Outreach

Chairman Allen noted that the brochure was not voted on. He added that the Board gave positive feedback in its development. Mr. Malatras thanked the GLC staff and Mr. Ronald

Flagg for the brochure layout. He suggested that the Board look at its substance to see if that is what the Board wants. Mr. Malatras noted that the brochure looked very professional. Chairman Allen added that the Board would vote on it next month. Mr. Paneto added that the brochure also should be printed in Spanish. Chairman Allen asked if Mr. Paneto could translate the brochure into Spanish. Mr. Paneto responded in the negative. Mr. Flagg stated that there are agencies that could translate the brochure. Mr. Paneto stated that it should be a parallel mission to get the final form translated into Spanish. Chairman Allen stated that it will be part of the review process voted on next month.

Chairman Allen asked for the date of the next Council of Albany Neighborhood Association (CANA) meeting. John Paneto replied that the CANA meeting was last night. Chairman Allen stated that the committee members should attend CANA's December meeting. Mr. Paneto suggested that the Board appoint someone to meet with the Association, and for that person to contact CANA's person at least two months ahead of time to get on the agenda. Chairman Allen stated that the Board assigned a couple of members to that duty. Chairman Allen asked Government Law Center staff to schedule time on CANA's meeting agenda for December.

F. Report from the Office of Professional Standards

Commander Beattie stated that the OPS had nothing new to report.

G. Report from the Chair

Chairman Allen stated that his reports were included in the committee/task force agenda items. Mr. Paneto added that the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) conference is scheduled for October 2008 in Cincinnati, Ohio. He recommended the attendance of more Board members and members from the Albany Police Department. Mr. Paneto suggested that the Board plan for this conference now and use it as a training vehicle. Chairman Allen stated that the Board will hopefully be meeting with the Deputy Mayor in the next month or two regarding budgeting for the conference as well.

V. Public Comment

Chairman Jason Allen opened the floor for public comment. He noted that there were no comments offered.

VI. Adjournment

Chairman Allen moved to adjourn the meeting. Ronald Flagg seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald Flagg
Secretary