

Approved: July 9, 2015



**ATLANTA CITIZEN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

June 25, 2015
Atlanta City Hall
ATL Stats Room
55 Trinity Avenue, SW, Floor 'G'
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
6:30 p.m.

The June 25, 2015 meeting was called to order by *Chair William Harrison* at 6:39 p.m.

AGENDA

ROLL CALL

(Eleven Members of the Board)

ACTIVE MEMBERS PRESENT

PAUL BARTELS <i>(Secretary/Bartels)</i>	ALAN MORRIS <i>(Morris)</i>
BILL BOZARTH <i>(Vice-Chair Bozarth)</i>	RUTH PRICE <i>(Price)</i>
WILLIAM HARRISON <i>(Chair/Harrison)</i>	SHERRY WILLIAMS <i>(S. Williams)</i>

ACTIVE MEMBERS ABSENT

GERALD SOUDER *(Souder)*

VACANT BOARD SEATS

Office of the Mayor *(vacant 1 year and 10 months)*
Atlanta Business League *(vacant 3 years and 00 months)*
Gate City Bar Association *(vacant 10 months)*

STAFF ATTENDEES

SAMUEL LEE REID *(Reid)*, Executive Director; **SHEENA ROBERTSON**, Investigation Manager *(Investigator Robertson)*; **ROBIN LOLAR**, Investigator, Sr., *(Investigator Lolar)*; **BRIAN FLEMING**, Investigator, Sr., *(Investigator Fleming)*; **CHARLES CURRY**, Outreach Specialist *(Curry)*; **VERONICA HOFFLER**, City Attorney Assigned to ACRB, COA Law Department.

The *Chair* announced that *Maceo Williams, Sr.*, recently resigned and is no longer a member of the ACRB. Mr. *Williams* provided each member of the board a written copy of his resignation. The *Chair* welcomed guests and members of the community. He indicated that the order of the agenda would be changed to accommodate the number of citizens who signed up for Public Comments. He indicated that some public comments will be heard after the Executive Director's Report in order to move the meeting along and the remainder of the public comments

will be heard at the end of the meeting. He reminded the crowd that comments were limited to three (3) minutes per person and that the Board will not respond to questions raised during public comments. Questions can be directed to the ACRB office at a later time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING, MAY 14, 2015

The **Chair** directed the Board's attention to the minutes for May 14, 2015. The floor was opened for discussion and corrections to the minutes. Hearing no discussion or corrections, **Bartels** moved to adopt the minutes. **S. Williams** seconded. Hearing no discussion, the motion was approved.

Regarding the May 14th meeting, **Vice Chair Bozarth** said, "Some of you who were at the May meeting, there were some very specific comments, and after a number of people left there were some additional comments. In the spirit of openness I would like for you to make sure that everyone know that (*the minutes*) are available." Once the Board approves the minutes, a copy is made available on the website within a week.

The **Chair** also noted that the meeting today was not the regular standing meeting date. The ACRB meets every second Thursday of each month at 6:30 p.m. June's meeting was postponed until today, to accommodate the **Chair's** travel schedule. He said, "I appreciate the Board and staff accommodating me with that."

GEORGIA RISE UP PRESENTATION

Presenter: Nelini Stamps, Co-Director

Georgia's Rise Up mission is to bring social change to communities throughout Georgia by taking vote action to demand political, economic and social equality regardless of race, class, gender, ability and citizenship status. Ms. Stamps explained that the organization was created in the movement of Black Lives. Georgia Rise Up focuses on community safety and safety initiatives because it is dedicated to restoring public safety that is rooted in transformation of the police and criminal justice systems. The organization believes that it needs to alter the relationship between law enforcement and communities to build trust so that we can see a better tomorrow. Ms. Stamps shared some of their long-term community safety initiatives that they will be talking to City Council members about and reasons behind them. Some of the initiatives include the following:

- **Mental Health Response Unit:** *"We believe the city should create this unit consisting of mental health professionals who can effectively and humanely deal with community members who are having mental health issues. These professionals include social workers, crisis counselors who can work with police to actually be the first respondents so that the police are not doing a job that they are not suited to do." "Cities such as San Antonio, Seattle, and Los Angeles have similar programs."*
- **Community Control Training Programs:** *"Youth from the ages of 18-25 years old are the most impacted by police practices. They should be able to train officers on how they want to be treated and how they want to interact, and also strengthen the trust between young people and police. Similar programs exist in New York and reference materials are available."*
- **Mandatory Data Collection:** *The organization wants the City to enforce mandatory data collection statutes that mandate data collection on age, race, gender and ethnicity of individuals on police interactions. "We should have racial impact studies, so I want to know from the Quality of Life Unit, what's the impact on our community."*
- **Chief of Police Disciplinary Power:** *"Unlike other states, the City of Atlanta, in the municipal code, gives the power to the Chief of Police to discipline police officers. However, in 2014, the Atlanta Police Chief rejected 50% of your recommendations. We believe the disciplinary power should go to this Board. Why should police be able to investigate themselves if you all are truly independent?"*

Ms. Stamps thanked Director Reid for meeting with Georgia Rise Up and explaining the steps that are being taken to reform the Citizen Review Board. "We agree with a lot of them, but we also have some recommendations:

1. Regarding vacant board positions. “We really believe that it is imperative for the City to have a youth representative on the Board represented between the ages of 16 and 25 years old. Young people between the ages of 16 and 25 are disproportionately abused, incarcerated by the police in the City of Atlanta.
2. Remove the charter where it says convicted felons cannot sit on the Board. Who is going to understand most than someone who has been through the system?
3. In light of the Police Chief rejecting 50% of your recommendations, ACRB needs to take steps to hold the police chief accountable. We recommend that whenever the Chief deviates from the Citizens Review Board disciplinary recommendations he/she must submit a publicly available explanation detailing the reason why the recommendation was denied. This explanation must be individualized to a specific case and should include specific evidence of the ACRB’s the decision was not supported by substantial and reliable evidence. On a quarterly basis the police chief must appear before the Board in a public setting with civilians to review his/her compliance with The Citizens Review Board recommendations and provide explanations to the public why board recommendations were rejected.

Ms. Stamps concluded saying, “The reason why we are telling you all of this is because we want to be also transparent about who we have been talking to and we are going to be talking to City Council supporting some of the recommendations that you have given us.” “I want to thank you all for allowing us to present who we are.”

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Reid reported. Below are highlights from the report:

Community Outreach

As a new initiative, ACRB is reaching out to different community organizations that are involved in activities and want to improve police relationships. “The goal is to have these groups and organizations, from time to time, come in and present to the Board so that we can see what people are doing in relation to policing and police accountability. This goes along with our other outreach effort, having meetings in other locations.”

Issues Raised at the May 14th Board Meeting

Director Reid indicated that one of issues raised at the last meeting was regarding the minutes on the website. Minutes dating back to 2010 up through the end of 2014 were never removed from the website. Only three reports were missing when the issue was raised and they have since been added and all approved minutes are posted to date.

Director Reid also addressed issues concerning the proposed ACRB ordinance changes and complaint filings, anonymous complaints, and sworn statements. **Reid** explained that the City Attorney’s Office advised that the Board could accept a complaint from anyone as long as the complaint is within the acceptable categories. **Reid** explained, however, that in order for the Board to make a decision on complaint allegations a signed sworn statement concerning the allegations must accompany the complaint.

Discussion...

1. **Chair Harrison:** “So what you are saying is that the sworn statement presents a problem because the person has to have personal knowledge.”
2. **Director Reid:** “Right.”
3. **Harrison:** “That’s why we need a sworn statement, otherwise we can’t take it?”
4. **Reid:** “We can take it, but you will not be able to do anything with it. However, there is one way it can work under the current reading of the ordinance. If ACRB takes anonymous complaints that can lead us to find an individual or person that was involved in the incident then we can get the sworn statement from them. So the question that the Board is going to have in July when we have the final review from the Law Department on the ordinance changes is do we go on and keep it the way it is or specifically state we will accept anonymous complaints and not just have it in that gray area, but we will have to do something about the personal knowledge requirement.”
5. **Bartels:** “One question that I had when reviewing the cases for this week, I noticed that we had a case from a gentlemen where he was not able to identify a specific police officer that had engaged in any misconduct. Is that a threshold requirement in investigating a case?”
6. **Reid:** “No. If someone reports a complaint to us where they cannot determine the identity of the officer, it falls on us to try to identify that officer through technology and when officers were in certain areas and reports and things to try and identify the officers who were involved at that scene in that area.”

Reid continued say, “The Law Department has the ordinance. The Board saw it in February and you voted in support of it. Reid explained that once the Law Department returns the ordinance draft, the Board will receive the changes for final approval. **Reid** encouraged the board to be bold with regard to the ordinance changes. City Council will decide what they want to do about the proposed changes.

Returning back to the subject of the website, **Reid** made a request to the Board for a committee to be created to discuss and determine how much data, without using the citizen’s name, should go on the website. **Reid** indicated that citizens have expressed employment concerns and other difficulties about information associated with their complaint being available through internet searches.

Discussion...

1. **Chair Harrison:** “On the website issue, it is my understanding as a Board, maybe a year ago there was some determination about what we would take off and that was based on a citizen’s complaint because he didn’t want his information on the website. Do you know, exactly, what the Board decided regarding the decision to take down until we came up with a solution or was it a decision to take everything down permanently?”
2. **Reid:** “This discussion took place either at the end of 2011 or the beginning of 2012. It appears that the Board had a lengthy discussion and from our office, we saw some confusion as to exactly what the Board wanted. So that’s why I am asking for a committee to have a clear policy on what the Board wants on the website as far as people’s information.”

Gate City Bar Appointment to the ACRB

Reid explained the status of the Gate City Bar Appointment. The Municipal Clerk and City Council Staff received the communication on the appointment. It starts on the floor of the full City Council. They will refer it to Public Safety and they take a vote. If the vote is favorable it is sent back to full Council for a vote of confirmation. If he is confirmed then the final step will be the Municipal Clerk swearing him in. Because of the timing of the July meeting, he probably will not be ready until the August meeting.

Judge Batten Order Relating to APD’s Non-compliance with Previous Orders on Training and Policy

Reid received a directive to draft a Board response to a news article reporting that Federal District Court Judge Batten issued an Order on a Motion of Contempt against the Atlanta Police Department for failure to comply with previous orders requiring the department to conduct additional search and seizure training and several policy changes. **Reid** explained that the Order highlighted a concern raised in the ACRB Body-Worn Camera report about the changing of police department policies that have a significant impact on citizens’ rights without any public input.

To provide some background on the issue, Reid explained the Eagle Settlement Agreement (which the City of Atlanta agreed to take certain steps involving training and policy changes, etc.) that city agreed to take certain steps involving training and policy changes

The current Order indicated that the Atlanta Police Department had taken out policies that were ordered to be placed in the manual and also had not been doing some training that they had been ordered to conduct. The Order also required the City to pay the plaintiff’s attorney in excess of \$48,000 for attorney costs associated with the Motion and pay for the attorneys’ future costs to ensure the Police department’s compliance with the Order.

Don’t Run Campaign

Reid reported that the office received information from the City Attorney’s office that the campaign does not violate any City policies or laws and if the Board wished to proceed, it could do so.

Discussion...

1. **Harrison:** “Give us a brief summary on what the “Don’t Run Campaign” is?”
2. **Director Reid:** “The Don’t Run Campaign” essentially is a campaign that was based on the staff’s experience and what we have seen throughout the nation and incidents that occur and statistics. A citizen is at greater risk to be harmed when they run from the police. The ACLU said this, we said it and anybody involved in this work will say this. While we can understand the fear, we can, also, understand someone that would say, “Well if I get away, I’m good”

or “I don’t have to worry about dealing with those cops.” Well if you are thinking like that and if you get away, you may feel that is good. BUT, if you don’t, well this is where we come in...when the injuries and deaths occur. Using our experience, we decided to do this campaign of “Don’t Run”...not running from the police. Assert your rights and stand up like a man or woman to the police. If the officer violates your rights, you need to report it to someone and stick with the process about it. That was the thought process behind “Don’t Run”. We heard some concerns from the people, both good and bad. Some people here had some problems with it, but’s that’s okay, because one of the good things that came out of it was people started talking about it. People started paying more attention to the agency and what we do and that was the good thing. But at the end of the day, we have to make a decision about what message do we want to communicate to our citizens when it relates to interacting with the police and things that can happen and the opportunities that you can create if you run. The “Don’t Run Campaign” is actually a smaller part of ACRB’s, “Know Your Rights,” training that we are currently doing throughout the city. We talk about how to interact with the police. We have done training workshops on, “Know Your Rights” with NAN and other organizations. Mr. Curry, our Outreach Specialist will talk more about the training.

3. **Curry:** “ACRB has been conducting “Know Your Rights” training workshops at 34 library branches. I just conducted one this morning for teenagers to give them an opportunity to talk about their experience and at the same time, letting them know what their rights are when interacting with the police. It’s been an illuminating experience on both sides. The dialogue is great and developing. We are getting an understanding of what some of the issues are, and people are starting to understand what they can do under the law when they are confronted by an officer.”
4. **Chair Harrison:** “And when you have been educated and know what your rights are, you are less inclined to run from the police. You can say “I don’t want to be searched”. “I don’t want to say anything.”
5. **Curry:** “Yes, it is an educational experience because most of our citizens don’t know these things.”
6. **Chair Harrison:** “A lot of the Board members are certified practitioners meaning we have been through a lot of training ourselves. Once a community becomes more educated about what’s going on they should be less inclined to run from the police, although that may not always happen, and we know that. Yet I am speaking to this in light of the larger campaign. The “Don’t Run” campaign is part of a larger campaign referred to as “Know Your Rights.” What we have to decide as a board is how you want to present that campaign to the community. We will vote on what the Executive Director has presented to us. When we get to the Old Business part of the agenda, we can move into some of those public comments.”

INTAKE REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF MAY 2015

Investigation Manager **Robertson** reported that for the month of May 2015, the ACRB received 13 complaints. The following is a breakdown of those complaints and staff recommendations:

Dismissals

Seven (7) complaints are recommended for dismissal for a lack of jurisdiction (allegations are outside of our jurisdiction or the officer is not with APD):

- ACRB 15-065 - False Imprisonment & Harassment involving a DeKalb county police officer,
- ACRB 15-066 - Lack of merit because the complainant was unable to provide any information for us to go on.
- ACRB 15-067 - Allegation of discourteous behavior by an officer.
- ACRB 15-071 - Allegation involved a DeKalb County police officer.
- ACRB 15-073 - False Arrest incident that occurred in October 2014 outside the 180 days and is time barred.
- ACRB 15-076 - Allegation of reckless driving and theft.
- ACRB 15-077 - Involved the Atlanta Fire Department.

Staff is requesting that these seven complaints be dismissed for reasons stated.

Complaints for Investigations

- ACRB 15-068 – Recommends an investigation of False Imprisonment (*complainant alleges that he was improperly detained by an APD lieutenant at Crim High School*).
- ACRB 15-069 – Recommends an investigation as a death complaint (*complainants filed a complaint against the investigation of the shooting death of Alexia Christian that occurred on April 30, 2015 by APD officers*).
- ACRB 15-070 – Upon receipt of a signed complaint, staff recommends an investigation of excessive force (*complainant alleges an APD officer grabbed her arm and tried to force*

her out of the AWDA building). If signed complaint is not received, staff will recommend dismissal.

ACRB 15-072 –This complaint was filed by a male & female (*male complainant alleges that he and the female were illegally stopped and detained by APD officers. He further alleges that he and the female complainant was pepper sprayed, forcibly removed from the vehicle and thrown to the ground. Male complainant further alleged that he was tasered four times and kned in the head*). Staff recommends, at this time, an investigation of excessive force, false imprisonment and possibly, a false arrest complaint. However preliminary investigation revealed that both complainants’ criminal cases are pending adjudication in the Fulton County Superior Court and the investigation into the false arrest allegation will depend on its outcome. For this reason, staff is also recommending suspension of the investigation pending the resolution of their cases.

ACRB 15-074 - Staff recommends an investigation as a false imprisonment complaint (*complainant alleges while at Hartsfield-Jackson Airport, he was questioned and followed by APD officers*).

ACRB 15-075 – Awaiting signed complaint. If the complaint is received within the next few weeks, recommend investigation as a false imprisonment complaint (*complainant alleges that he was improperly and detained by an APD officer*). If not, dismissal will be recommended.

It was moved by **Bozarth** and seconded by **Williams** to accept the Intake Report as presented. Hearing no discussion, the motion was approved by all.

CONSIDERATION OF SUBPOENA FOR CASE #15-068, M. Lightfoot

Investigator Brian Fleming summarized the purpose of the request to subpoena. He stated, “Mr. Lightfoot had an altercation with an officer on an APS high school campus. There is video footage of the altercation and APS officials are ready to release it, but a subpoena is needed to get the video. If the Board will sign the subpoena they are ready to hand it over to us.”

Discussion...

1. **Bozarth:** “What can you tell us about the allegation?”
2. **Fleming:** “Basically, there was a verbal altercation between Mr. Lightfoot and the officer. There may have been something physical as well and that is why we need the video.”
3. **Bozarth:** “The officer was there as part of the standard plan of police officers being on campus?”
4. **Fleming:** “Yes.”
5. **Bartels:** “Was he a resource officer?”
6. **Fleming:** “To my knowledge he was.”

Following the brief discussion, it was moved by **Bozarth** to authorize the request to subpoena. The motion was seconded by **Bartels**. Hearing no further discussion, the motion was approved.

Special Note: Ruth Price arrived joining the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

COMPLAINTS REVIEW:

ACRB CASE NO. 14-018 (E. Tucker) and ACRB CASE NO 14-032 (B. Parrott)

Chair Harrison summarized the allegations of both complaints.

Ms. E. Tucker and Mr. B. Parrot alleged on February 7, 2014 Atlanta Police Officer Dennis Joseph falsely arrested Ms. Tucker. He slammed Ms. Tucker’s head into a brick wall, pointed his firearm at Mr. Parrott and engaged in abusive language at them. Mr. Parrott alleges that handcuffs were applied extremely tight. We will take the false arrest allegation by Ms. Tucker, first.

A. False Arrest as alleged by E. Tucker

On the day of the incident APD records show that Officer Joseph had been dispatched to an address to investigate a suspicious person's call. However, instead, he responded to a different address which according to Officer Joseph was a mistake. Officer Joseph claims when he arrived to the location he observed two people seated in a park vehicle in the driveway. When he approached the vehicle to investigate he smelled marijuana. A claim Ms. Tucker and Mr. Parrott vehemently denies. Officer Joseph did have reasonable suspicion to detain Ms. Tucker, as well as, Mr. Parrott based on the nature of the call, even though he was at the wrong address. The facts that Ms. Tucker refused to provide her identification gave Officer Joseph probable cause to arrest and charge her with obstruction. Ms. Tucker's other charges drug related were added after the search of the resident recovered illegal drugs. The ACRB staff recommends the allegation of false arrest against Officer Joseph be assigned a finding of **not sustained**.

Discussion...

1. **Bartels:** *"I would disagree that the officer had reasonable articulable suspicion to detain Ms. Tucker and ask for I.D. Found it strange that the officer had been patrolling this area for several years, but still went to the wrong address. I looked it up on the map and the house that he went to is two streets over and it's not like it was next door or just across the street, so I took that into consideration. I also took in consideration that the behavior of the two complainants made it clear that they did not wish to interact with the police, and at that point, the officer would have had a right to detain them and ask for identification if he had reasonable articulable suspicion. I am having a difficult time believing that he smelled the marijuana from that distance. First of all there was a notation in the police report that a very small amount was found in the car and never booked into evidence. Nobody was able to determine what happened to that alleged amount. And if that was in the car, I do have difficulty believing that smell would travel the distance where the officer would be able to smell that and detain them. The report does indicate what was found inside the house, but it was the initial detention that led up to that. I think if a court considers it, it's possible that it could go either way. My thought is the officer went to the property and it was the wrong address. The call was about I believe a white male and a black male. The people he detained were a male and a black female. That's different than what he was called about initially. I would be inclined to sustain the false arrest allegation."*
2. **Bozarth:** *"Mr. Bartels made a good point. This would have never happened if the officer would have gone to the address he was dispatched to. Like so many incidents that come before us, it is an unfortunate set of circumstances that led to a bad situation. I want to point out that the address he went to was the same house number on the both streets. The names were similar and started with the same letter. I believe the officer honestly made a mistake, but at that point, I think I agreed with what you (Bartels) said, but having them acting as he did he may not have had, what's your phrase?"*
3. **Bartels:** *"Reasonable articulable suspicion."*
4. **Bozarth:** *"I agree with that conclusion and would be inclined to sustain the false imprisonment charges."*

Following the discussion, it was moved by **Bartels** to **sustain** the allegation of false arrest. **Bozarth** seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the motion was approved with one opposing vote by **Morris**.

B. Excessive Force Allegation of E. Tucker

Ms. Tucker alleges that Officer Joseph slammed her head against a brick wall causing injury to her lip and tooth as documented in the medical report there is no doubt that Ms. Tucker suffered injury to her lip. Those injuries were consistent with the force Officer Joseph inflicted upon her during the incident. Ms. Tucker's injuries had to be caused by blunt force and not just merely from bumping into a wall as suggested by Officer Joseph.

Discussion:

1. **Bozarth:** *"The staff recommends that the complaint be sustain. I agree with that recommendation. It seems that the amount of force that was used is excessive to me and I agree with the staff conclusion."*
2. **Bartels:** *"I agree with the staff's recommendation on that particular account of the excessive force complaint. One thing to factor in is that the staff noted that the use of force report was not completed by the officer until eight months after the incident."*
3. **S. Williams:** *"And we saw the pictures that showed the injuries described."*

It was moved by **Bartels** move to sustain the allegations of excessive force. Seconded by **S. Williams**. Hearing no further discussion, the motion was approved by all.

C. ACRB Case #14-032, Brandon Parrott Allegation of Excessive Force

The **Chair** summarized the allegation of excessive force as alleged by Mr. Parrott against Officer Joseph. “Officer Joseph allegedly pointed his firearm at him without provocation. Officer Joseph admits pointing his firearm at Mr. Parrott because he was in fear of his safety because Mr. Parrott threatened to kill him and had an object in his hand that appeared to be a gun. At that time Officer Joseph was the only officer on the scene. Mr. Parrott denies Officer Joseph’s claim and claims it was Officer Joseph who threaten to shoot him. None of the witnesses could corroborate either account. Staff’s recommendation is to **not sustain**. Any discussion?”

Discussion:

Bartels: “I would be inclined to agree with staff recommendation of not sustain. This is another case where a body mounted camera would have been very helpful to know what happened. The officer said he unholstered his gun, but did not point it at Mr. Parrott.”

It was moved by **Bozarth** to **not sustain** the allegation. Seconded by **Bartels**. Hearing no further discussion, the motion was approved by all.

D. Case #14-032, B. Parrott Second Allegation of Excessive Force for Handcuffs Applied Extremely Tight

Summary: The second allegation is Mr. Parrott said the handcuffs were applied extremely tight. Mr. Parrott stated that nothing was done when he complained about the handcuffs being too tight. He did state he was un-cuffed from the chair and allowed to stand up for about ten minutes. Although Mr. Parrott could not identify the officer that handcuffed him, he did not seek any medical treatment for any injuries to his wrist as result of the alleged tight handcuffs. Staff’s recommendation is to **not sustain**.

It was moved by **Bartels** to accept staff’s recommendation of **not sustain** for second allegation of excessive force as alleged by B. Parrott. Motion was seconded by **S. Williams**. Hearing no discussion, the motion was approved by all.

E. Cases 14-018 and 14-032, Abusive Language Allegation by Ms. Tucker and Mr. Parrott

As summarized by the Chair...Both Ms. Tucker and Mr. Parrott alleges that Officer Joseph was verbally abusive towards them. They stated Officer Joseph said words to the effect of “come on nigger save your wife and called him a pussy.” Officer Joseph denies the allegation and contends it was Mr. Parrott that was verbally abusive towards him. Both parties presented contradictory accounts of the incident and there were no other witnesses. Although there is some video footage of the encounter with Officer Joseph no abusive or profane language can be heard by either party. ACRB staff recommends the abusive language allegations against Officer Joseph be assigned a finding of **not sustained**.

Discussion:

1. **Bozarth** asked if there were people on the scene.
2. **Investigator Robertson:** “There were neighbors living next door they could hear some of the conversation, but none could hear the officer using abusive language.
3. **Bozarth:** “It is very possible that the officer said these things, we are in the unfortunate position of having to go with two different versions of it...which is often the case. This is a different question, but if there had been body worn cameras on the scene, it would have recorded not only visually, but it would have recorded verbally. So I think that it sort of points out to me that either the officer will not make those remarks in the first place and if he doesn’t the complainant would not make up a story that he did whichever one of these two people is not telling the truth. So I do agree with staff recommendation that in absence of corroborating evidence we have to not sustain the complaint unfortunately.”
4. **S. Williams** responded by saying there was a dash cam, but it wasn’t in view of what was going on.”

5. **Bozarth:** *“But you couldn’t have heard what was going on. And for the benefit of the audience, we get a lot of these cases where there are two different stories and we are trying to adjudicate these in a fair way but we simply can’t accept it...unfortunately.”*

Following the discussion, it was moved by **Bozarth** to agree with staff to **not sustain** the verbal abuse complaint as alleged by Ms. Tucker and Mr. Parrott. The motion was seconded by **Morris**. Calling for the vote, the motion was approved by all.

Following the vote on the allegations involving both cases, the **Chair** indicated that there were some additional recommendations by staff for the Board to consider on this particular case.

F. ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STAFF

- Any incident that results in an arrest of any citizen, APD should always ensure that the dash cam footage be down load and saved.
- We should ask that APD look into the issue or we can call for the review of the issue of what took place at the location stated in the complaint prior to the issuance and the execution of the search warrant. Specifically, the allegations that the officer went into Mr. Parrott’s vehicle and appeared to have taken something out of it. This is an allegation that was caught on tape.

Robertson explained, “The complainant provided some video that was recorded by the neighbors. During the time that they were taken to the precinct, there was an execution of a search warrant to search the house, but prior to that they had some officers who stayed at the house while the search warrant was being processed at the court house. On the video that was provided, an officer can be seen going into the car before they got the search warrant and before it was executed. Either he took something out or put something in, we don’t know. That is something they need to look into.”

- The incident report indicates a small plastic bag containing one gram of marijuana was recovered from the passenger side door handle of Mr. Parrott vehicle. However, this item is not listed in the property report. APD property unit has no record of it. APD needs to investigate this matter further to determine what happened to it or if it existed at all.
- The Use of Force report was not prepared until eight months after the incident and only after ACRB’S inquiry of its existence which is in violation of APD’s policies. Therefore it is recommended that APD look further into this issue and take appropriate action in accordance with APD’s disciplinary matrix.
- It is further recommended to lessen response errors, such as, responding to the wrong location that Sgt. Joseph be counseled on importance of paying attention to details when given an assignment.

Discussion:

1. **The Chair:** “On number two with regards to his search warrant, is maybe look into that further before we do disciplinary actions to see if that particular officer may have done something. How do we know that the arresting officer wasn’t the officer who was seen going into the car?”
2. **Investigator Robertson:** “No it wasn’t him. There was a description. And all of this was something for OPS to investigate because it is outside of our jurisdiction.”

Following the recommendations and brief discussion, **Bartels** moved to accept staff’s five recommendations. The motion was seconded by **Bozarth**. Hearing no discussion, the motion was approved by all.

G. DISCIPLINE FOR OFFICER JOSEPH:

Investigator Robertson provided the Board with disciplinary history on Officer Joseph.

Officer Joseph has been with APD since April 2008. He was recently promoted to Sergeant. He has had eight complaints against him. None of them were prior false arrest complaints, but two were prior excessive force complaints. One of them was not sustained which was a prior case that ACRB investigated and had recommended sustained. APD rejected this recommendation from ACRB. The other excessive force complaint is this case that we are discussing tonight which APD has not resolved. Regarding the other six complaints on his record, two were sustained. One has to do with disobeying a supervisor for which he received an oral admonishment. The other was failure to follow procedure dealing with a crime scene, and he also received an oral admonishment for this one.

Sustained complaints and Recommended Discipline against Officer Joseph:

False Arrest: This is a category ‘A’ offense. The penalty would be an oral or written admonishment and or training.

Discussion...

1. **Bartels:** “I think unless somebody works in the legal system or has been arrested, they don’t really appreciate what being arrested does to somebody. It’s not just like you go to jail, you post bond and then you are out. You could lose your job. You could lose your home. They have to post bond. I’m an attorney and I been in lots of jails and even the ones that are the best run and the cleanest are still scary as hell. I think if somebody is actually arrested and booked in jail without a legal justification, I think that deserves something more than just an oral or written reprimand. I would vote for a suspension of some kind.”
2. **S. Williams,** “I agree, and its more than losing your job, it also can affect you psychologically and mentally. Sometimes your children too, because they have to leave the children alone and that brings up other serious issues.”

Following the discussion, **Bartels** made a motion to recommend a ten day (*working days*) suspension, on the false arrest. Hearing no second the motion failed.

Price made a motion to recommend that Officer Joseph receive a five day suspension without pay and additionally, be sent to psychological services. **S. Williams** seconded the motion. Calling for the vote, the motion was approved by all.

Excessive Force Discipline Recommendation

This offense is a category ‘C’ and the penalty range would be a four (4) to fifteen (15) day suspension, demotion and the proactive and corrective action could be: training, psychological intervention and a mandated substance abuse program.

It was moved by **Bartels** to add an additional five (5) days of suspension without pay for the excessive force and psychological intervention. **S. Williams** seconded. Hearing no discussion, the vote was called and the motion was approved.

H. ACRB Case #14-115 (T. Daniel)

The **Chair** summarized the complaint as alleged by Mr. Daniel: Mr. T. Daniel alleges Officers Loubens, Lundi and Smith engaged in excessive and unnecessary force when Mr. Daniel was grabbed and forcibly taken to the ground and handcuffed without provocation. On September 21, 2013, the day of the incident, Mr. Daniel was at the Park Bench Bar when he was asked to leave because he was allegedly inappropriately touching several women. Mr. Daniel alleges he was leaving the bar when Officer Lundy grabbed him and forcibly threw him to the ground. Mr. Daniel alleges Officer Smith assisted Officer Lundy in getting him into custody and grabbing his arm and handcuffing him. Officer Lundy contends that the force he used was minimal, but necessary because Mr. Daniel refused numerous commands to leave the bar. Officer Smith denies having any physical contact with Mr. Daniel. However, his claim is refuted by Officer Lundy and Mr. Daniel. Even though this discrepancy exists, Officer Smith did not witness the events that led to Mr. Daniels' arrest and there were no other independent witnesses that could corroborate either account. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether the force that was used on Mr. Daniels was reasonable or not reasonable. Therefore, ACRB staff recommends the allegation of excessive force against Officers Lundy and Smith be assigned a finding of not sustain.

Discussion:

1. **Bozarth** acknowledging Mr. Daniel in the audience said to him, "In a situation like this, without corroborated evidence it is difficult for us to sustain a complaint without somebody else who was not involved to testify, I am incline to, perhaps reluctantly, to accept staff's recommendation to not sustain the complaint.
2. **Chair Harrison** asked **Investigator Robertson** what was the OPS decision.
3. **Investigator Robertson** said OPS decision was not sustain for Officer Lundy on excessive force and Officer Smith was exonerated of involvement.
4. **Bartels**: "Were you able to interview any of the employees at the Bar?"
5. **Robertson**: "No. We made numerous attempts to contact the manager. The only thing we have is his statement."

Morris moved to accept staff's recommendation to **not sustain**. **Price** seconded the motion. No further discussion, the vote was called and the motion was approved by all.

Following the motion, additional recommendations were made regarding the complaint. **Investigator Robertson** reported the following recommendation: There were some inconsistencies in Officer Smith's statement were he alleges he didn't have any physical contact with Mr. Daniel, but according to Officer Lundy and Mr. Daniel it appears that he did have some physical contact with Mr. Daniel. Whether it was excessive or not, there appears to be some inconsistencies in his statement. Staff recommends that APD address this issue.

Bartels made a motion to send that recommendation over to APD. **S. Williams** seconded the motion. Calling for the vote, the motion was approved with one vote of opposing made by **Morris**.

I. ACRB CASE #14-064, (J. Harmon)

The **Chair** summarized the first allegation involved in the complaint.

- Abusive Language

Mr. Harmon alleges that on August 11, 2014, Atlanta Police Officer Javon Edwards used abusive language towards him and ordered him to leave a clinic without cause. Mr. Harmon was standing outside the Fulton County Health clinic located at 99 Jessie Hill Drive when Officer Edwards approached him. Mr. Harmon alleges Officer Edwards said to him if he saw him selling drugs or cigarettes he was going to arrest him. Mr. Harmon alleges that Officer Edwards then made the statement to him "I'm ready to knock your ass out." Officer Edwards did not recall this specific incident, but believes Mr. Harmon to be the same individual he suspects of suspicious activity outside the clinic. However, Officer Edwards denies making the alleged statement "I'm ready to knock your ass out." He asserted that this is not something that he would say to a citizen. This was a one on one

incident with no witnesses to corroborate the allegation. ACRB's staff recommends the abusive language allegation against Officer Edwards be assigned a finding of **not sustain**.

Discussion...

1. **Bartels:** "The officer said that he had noticed some suspicious activity. Did he say what suspicious activity?"
2. **Investigator Lolar:** "Selling drugs and selling cigarettes."
3. **Bartels:** "He didn't say what the complainant had done to make him think he was doing that, did he?"
4. **Lolar:** "Because he usually hangs out there and outside in front on his bike, he presumed that he was one of the people who he believed to be engaged in that activity."

Morris moved to accept ACRB's recommendation of **not sustain**. **Bartels** seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion, the motion was approved by all.

- Harassment (second allegation, case #14-064)

Mr. Harmon alleges Officer Edwards ordered him to leave the clinic without cause. Shortly after the first incident, Mr. Harmon was again standing outside the clinic when he observed Officer Edwards drive up. Mr. Harmon then went inside the clinic to avoid contact with the officer. Mr. Harmon stated that he was in contact with the security guard on duty inside the entrance. Officer Edwards entered the clinic and asked Mr. Harmon to leave. Officer Edwards could not recall if he ordered Mr. Harmon to leave and stated it was not unusual for him to enter and do a walk through the clinic. The security supervisor doesn't recall having a problem at the front entrance that would cause APD to respond. And if they did have a problem proper protocol would be to notify Fulton County Deputy who is usually stationed upstairs in the facility. Officer Edwards did not deny ordering Mr. Harmon to leave the clinic; therefore, it's probable that it could have happened and if so it was done in violation of Mr. Harmon's constitutional rights. ACRB's staff is recommending the allegation of harassment against Officer Edwards be **not sustained**. The investigation established there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the officer committed the alleged act of harassment as defined by the city ordinance, and that APD investigates this issue further to determine whether any constitutional or APD violations occurred.

Discussion...

1. **Bozarth:** "Mr. Harmon did not go to jail. Am I correct? He was just run off the property, right?"
2. **Bartels & S. Williams** agreed.
3. **Bozarth:** "Fulton County has jurisdiction inside the facility. So Sheriff Deputy would have arresting power there. You have a private security company running the entrance and you have an Atlanta Police officer coming and going as part of it. My question is why was he there? It goes to the heart of the complaint. If he is out there harassing people, we need to sustain the complaint."
4. **Executive Director Reid:** "The challenge is the definition of harassment which is why we want to make the change in the ordinance. In our current definition, it is a continuous, persistent verbal and physical type of thing."
5. **Lolar:** "And that is why I made the recommendation that APD and OPS should look into it because of ACRB's jurisdiction. In the ordinance under the definition of harassment, it doesn't meet the criterion."

Morris moved to accept staff's recommendation. **Bartels** seconded with comment. "It could be harassment, but I would second due to the definition of the ordinance. Calling for the vote, the motion was approved by a vote of four to two. **Morris** and **Harrison** opposed the motion.

J. ACRB CASE #14-086 (R. Washington)

The Chair summarized the complaint of false imprisonment as alleged by the complainant.

Mr. Washington alleges that he was walking in the downtown area when he was stopped unlawfully by two APD officers. The City ordinance defines false imprisonment as intentionally restraining another person without a legal right to do so, physically detaining someone without the right to do so. Mr. Washington first reports that he was at a crosswalk waiting for the light to change when ordered to get out of the street. However in his ACRB interview, when questioned for details regarding his location at the time of the encounter, he stated that he was in the process of crossing from the middle of the street. If Mr. Washington was not in the street, it seems unreasonable that officers would tell him to get out of the street. If Mr. Washington was in the process of crossing the street, outside the crosswalk, the officers were within their authority to warn him to get out of the street. According to Mr. Washington after he was told to get back on the sidewalk, instead of continuing on his way, he stopped to engage the office to ask why he was being told to get on the sidewalk. Based on Mr. Washington's account of the evidence, there is no evidence that he was detained. According to Mr. Washington there was no physical contact between him and the officer. Mr. Washington was free to walk away, but stopped instead to question the officers. Mr. Washington has failed to provide any identifiable information that would lead one to reasonably conclude that APD officer engaged falsely detaining him, and because of this Mr. Washington's complaint does not raise to the level of misconduct. Therefore, the staff recommends a finding of **unfounded**.

Discussion...

1. **Bartels:** "My question is, if he was unable to identify the officer that he is making the allegation against, how can we sustain it?"
2. **Lolar** indicated that if the officer told him to get out of street, there still was no misconduct. Also she mentioned that Mr. Washington was unable to tell her the exact location of the incident and could only provide landmarks. When pressed for more details, his statements were inconsistent.
3. **Bartels:** "I don't see how you would have been able to identify a particular police officer. You can ask for duty list for that zone, but who knows how many officers were on duty that night."

Bartels moved to accept staff's recommendation of **unfounded**. **S. Williams** seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the vote was called and the motion was approved by all.

OLD BUSINESS

Don't Run Campaign

The *Chair* opened the floor for public comments specifically related to the campaign.

1st Speaker: Yordi Warner

"I became aware of the campaign when Mr. Reid was on the radio speaking about it. I also spoke with Mr. Curry. I have been on probation. While on probation, I opened up a DUI school in Decatur. On a weekly basis, I help 10 to 15, similar ages, similar demographics get their license back, get off probation, deal with open warrants. For me personally, I don't know of a situation where I could have run from the Police and it would have worked out in my favor. It heightens the situation to me and it is more dangerous to my end and not the cops end. What I try to convey to my students, my clients is that is not the route you want to take. I am an advocate for body cameras. The last thing I want to do is have my mother turn on the news and I'm running away from the cops and it escalates to something else. If I know my rights and I am aware of what is going, I don't have any open warrants, my license is in good standing then I should have even less reason to run from the Police. I understand the "Don't Run" campaign has a bigger issue of knowing your rights, but I think we need to spend more time telling young males and young ladies as well to get your license straight. If you have any warrants, go holler at a lawyer and get that taken care of. Take as many wild cards out the deck so that you don't feel like you got to break and end up on CNN. We have seen the national news stories, Walter Scott in Charleston, South Carolina and Nicholas Thomas out here in Smyrna. Autopsy just showed that he took a bullet to the back. So running may not necessarily save your life but cost your life. I don't think running is a wise move to make. I appreciate your work Mr. Reid and Mr. Curry.

2nd Speaker: Dawn O'Neal

Speaker asked if there was some way the slogan campaign could be changed. "I think we don't have so much of a problem with the campaign, but with the wording of it. By you saying "Don't Run" you are putting the blame on the people instead of on the police. It is the wording you are telling people to "Don't Run." Can we change it to "Know Your Rights and Call Us?" Don't blame the people.

3rd Speaker: Nelini Stamps

"I'm just wondering how much money was actually spent on the billboards because there are probably other ways to use that money." "Some of us are actually going into Barber and Beauty shops, July 10th and passing out your complaint forms."

Following the specific comments, the **Chair** opened the floor for discussion.

Discussion...

1. **Executive Director Reid** made the following comments. "We have support on both sides when it comes to the campaign. Based on my experience and what I do, I don't see the problem with "Don't Run." "In hindsight, while we knew it was part of the "Know Your Rights" campaign, people who are just learning about us and what we do may not have made that connection. So I can see adding in 'Know Your Rights,' but I don't see taking out 'Don't Run.' I see the "Stay Calm, Don't Run, Know Your Rights." The Board has the option of approving it the way it was or approve with the "Know Your Rights" being inserted in the message... "Stay Calm, Don't Run; Know Your Rights, Report Police Misconduct."
2. **S. Williams:** It is not about being right or wrong. It is about trying to communicate the right message to the audience we are trying to reach. In our effort to communicate, if they are not open to receive it, then there are not enough words and enough ways for us to try to build a bridge."
3. **Reid:** "Who are 'they'?"
4. **S. Williams:** "Our audiences are the constituents in all of Atlanta."
5. **Reid:** "So are you saying all of the constituents in Atlanta or the ones just in this room? The work that we do, we will never get 100% of everyone to agree. You are not going to get even 80% in agreement. That is just the nature of what we do. But when we think about sending a message out to the people, if we save one person, one family, the pain of suffering then we are doing our job. The discussion about messaging and marketing, we are not talking about marketing in the advertising sense, we are talking about how we convey a message to an individual. Someone in City Council said something about marketing. We are not marketing anything here. I would suggest that if we want to have a prolonged conversation about different messaging then we will no longer be talking about the "Don't Run" campaign; it will be whatever new message you decide to put on. If you don't want to do the "Don't Run" then let's not do it and let's continue doing the other outreach stuff that we do. If we are going to do the "Don't Run" then it is a matter of how do we convey "Don't Run" in a manner that is more appealing to the public who have expressed a concern. We got a lot of support for this. Someone sent us a \$100 donation. We can't use it. It has to go back to the city. This campaign as it is has started a national debate. If the problem is in the message, I would rather it go to a committee to talk about to develop the "Don't Run" campaign or just say you don't want to do it and we will continue doing the outreach the way we do it based on our experiences; not everybody, because we can't be everything to everybody."
6. **Chair Harrison:** "When you speak about nationally, I work with NACOLE serving on the national board and I spend a lot of time in New York and it is an issue in New York. When you look at what they do with the same issues, the same problem of running from the police, I do see that there is a problem with the public being educated about what their rights should be so that they don't run. I understand enough to know that from what some of the citizens are saying that we shouldn't send a message that indicates that the Citizens of Atlanta are wrong in running, but a lot of time what prompts these cops to shoot is that you are trying to run. Then they come up with all kinds of excuses as to why they shot them. I understand both sides of the argument, but I am a little sensitive as to how that particular message is presented and comes across. I don't know that I'm for a billboard saying "Don't Run."
7. **Price:** "I was out of the city when that came up, but it's all in how you perceive the police. When I was growing up, the police was considered a community helper. Our children today do not see them the same way because they have seen the police out there dragging their parents to jail and doing search warrants. To me, I took it as a phrase. Add what you want to it, but it all depends on what your experiences has been with the police."
8. **Bozarth:** "If we make a decision to re-craft the content of the billboard, are we talking about something that can be done relatively quickly in terms if we want to get back on the boards in a relative short period of time?"
9. **Reid:** "That would depend on the availability of the Board. If the board members want to meet next week and sit down and talk about it and see what you can come up with, it can be done."
10. **Bozarth:** "Earlier someone mentioned money, can you summarized how much we have invested so far on the campaign?"

11. **Reid**, “We spent \$2,500 dollars on those billboards. That is \$125 dollars per board for a couple of months. One of the numbers that was tossed out at the last meeting was \$1,500 per billboard.”
12. **Bozarth**: “Based on what I have heard, I would be willing to invest some of my time to try to craft a message essentially the same one we have now but does not make “Don’t Run” the number one comment. I would be willing to do that. The whole idea is that we are trying to create a better relationship between the community and police department. A lot of people are trying to do that but we are only one organization. I don’t want to be a ship out in the middle of the ocean not doing anything, so I would be willing to participate in an effort to re-craft the message.”
13. **Price**: “I would too. I will support that same effort. I don’t mind investing my time.”
14. **Reid**: “Now mind you, that cost I gave you was the cost at that time. I don’t know what it would be if we wanted to do another.”
15. **Bozarth**: “I would like to take off the table the option of doing nothing and getting off the billboards. We want the billboards. It is a question of getting a message that will be better received in the community. We would like to spend the money. If it is \$1500 a shot to go for two month on that number of billboards, I think is a very good investment in getting the message out. You have to go to a lot of barbershops and beauty shops to touch as many people as you do when you got people in their cars seeing it.”
16. **Reid**: “So do you want to set a date to meet? Should I call you all? What do you want to do?”
17. **Chair Harrison**: “I’ll appoint Mr. **Bozarth** to head up a committee and he can choose his members. Or he can send out an email to see who is interested in serving with him on the committee.”

Following the lengthy discussion, it was moved by **Bartels** to establish a committee to re-craft the “Don’t Run” with Mr. **Bozarth** as Chair. An email will be sent out to the board to solicit whoever is interested in working on it. **Price** seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the motion was approved by *all*.

NEW BUSINESS AND OTHER COMMENTS

The **Chair** opened the floor for discussion/comments on two items:

- A. ACRB response to Judge Batten’s Order regarding Atlanta Police Department’s failure to comply with the previous orders related to policy changes and training.

Comments / Discussion...

1. Regarding the letter, drafted by Director **Reid** responding to Judge Batten’s Order, **Chair Harrison** said, “I would urge every board member to read the letter that will be presented to APD, AJC, City Council.”
2. **Bozarth**: “Will it go out in the form of a press release?”
3. **Reid**: “Yes, but it will be titled an ‘Open Letter.’”

Following a brief discussion, and noted corrections made by **Bartels** and **S. Williams** the floor was open for a motion. It was moved by **Bozarth** to accept the contents of the letter with noted corrections. **Bartels** seconded. Hearing no further discussion, the motion was approved.

- B. NACOLE CONFERENCE (National Association of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement)

Chair Harrison announced that he and two other board members, **Bozarth** and **S. Williams**, will be attending the conference being held in Riverside, California.

Discussion / Comments...

Price: “Since this board has been put together, we have spent almost \$60,000 sending people to NACOLE, and I don’t see anything that has benefited this Board. The only reason why we are into NACOLE is because of the past director. I see nothing. I went to one. I worked for the City 26 years and of all the conferences, I attended was nothing as bland as this one. What have we brought back to this board that is assisting us in oversight? To me, it is the good ole boy thing out there in the Northwest part of the country. I think we can create our own thing. Let’s think outside the box because that is a lot of money to send people who come back and bring us a little tape and talk the same mess. I have a whole lot of issues with that. I see it as a waste. NACOLE has done nothing for the Atlanta Citizen Review Board. It is a waste of money as far as I am concerned. Three and four people going to bring back what? It is a mini-vacation at the City’s expense.”

PUBLIC COMMENTS (Continued)

1st Speaker: Leonard Jones, National Action Network

“Usually, I am here representing the National Action Network and we really appreciate you all coming out and doing outreach with us and things like that. We look forward to partnering with you going forward. I, also, am here to introduce a new organization that will be visiting here as well, New Order Human Rights organization.

Concerns Mr. Jones touched on were:

- Georgia Open Carry Gun Law that became effective last July. “I want to find out what type of additional training the officers at APD are receiving to deal with this new Open Carry Law and how prevalent it would be for citizens to be carrying weapons on them when stopped by the police. Do you all have any information about that as of yet?”*
- After reviewing ACRB’s report on Body Cameras and the importance of every officer having body cameras, inquired about the implementation of the cameras and how soon.*
- Board vacancies and the seats going unfilled. This is a huge disservice to the community. We would like for someone to take up the conversation of reallocating those positions to another presenter...a young person or civil rights community also be considered.”*
- Georgia Open Records Act and citizens not be able to get information that should be readily available since Georgia supposedly has a strong Open Records Acts friendly to citizens.*
- New hires with APD and if the ACRB is involved in that process or participating in what the APD is doing new to make better police officers.*
- Expressed concerns with Police Chief Turner unfavorable response to the ACRB recommendations regarding complaints against APD officers.*
- Inquired about incentive for Police officers exhibiting good behavior.*

2nd Speaker: Asia Parks

Commenting on the “Don’t Run” campaign, “I think that marketing is extremely important because you want to reach people, but maybe the person who doesn’t like the “Don’t Run” campaign is a person who doesn’t know their rights.”

3rd Speaker: El’louise Alexander:

“This is actually my first time really hearing about the “Don’t Run” campaign. I kind of agree with, but I don’t agree with it.” “At first I was taken aback so maybe you should re-word it so that everyone, no matter their age will find it inviting.”

4th Speaker: Olivia Nelson

Ms. Nelson asked a question about complaint procedures and board determinations. “I was just curious about procedure. Maybe opening up the floor because if those people are in the room and while you are reviewing their complaints, maybe give them some space to speak.” “I think when those people are in the room when their complaint is being heard it is kind of a weird situation to be discussing their case and not give them any space to speak.”

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, *the Chair* entertained a motion to adjourn. **Bartels** moved to adjourn. **S. Williams** seconded. Meeting adjourned at 9:27 P.M.

Approved: July 9, 2015
Paul Bartels, Board Secretary