



80 NEW SCOTLAND AVENUE
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12208-3494
*Albany Community Police Review Board
c/o Government Law Center*

PUBLIC MONTHLY MEETING MEETING MINUTES

*November 7, 2023, at 6:00 p.m.
Albany Law School, Room W212*

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (N. Vives)

CPRB Chair Nairobi Vives called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

CPRB Chair Nairobi Vives, Vice Chair Veneilya Harden, Victor Person, Matthew Ingram, John Levendosky, Kevin Cannizzaro, and Antionette Santos.

Rev. Dr. Victor Collier and Paul Collins-Hackett were excused from attendance.

OTHERS PRESENT:

CPRB Program Manager Michele Andre, Monitor Al Lawrence, and Julie L. Schwartz (T&M Managing Director of Investigations).

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (N. Vives)

Chair Vives called the meeting to order and moved to approve tonight's agenda. Motion seconded and passed.

III. CASE REVIEW AND UPDATE

CC2021-013 (A. Santos)

Julie L. Schwartz commenced case review. The incident happened March 5, 2021, but the complaint was not received until this year, well past the statute of limitations. There are two allegations: (1) call handling and (2) that the detective's supervisor may have coached him in what to say in the accident report. Complainant was involved in an accident with a department vehicle which ran a red light. Two officers and a sergeant responded and eventually submitted an accident report. No one was interviewed in this case, only statements were submitted to OPS and through the chain of command.

Officer Bennett wrote in a separate statement reporting that Detective Peloga, the one involved in the accident, thought he had the right of way while detective Dragos wrote in his statement that Peloga's failure to yield was the contributing factor to the accident. However, the accident report completed by Dragos said that Peloga had a steady green light. Complainant filed an insurance complaint with the city which was denied based on the accident report.

Ms. Schwartz further reported that though the APD said in their correspondence to the CPRB that Detective Peloga was off-duty, the police report submitted at the time stated that he was on-duty. APD never interviewed Detective Peloga because he was out of the line of duty when the complaint was filed and then retired. Officer Bennett did have his body worn camera (BWC) on for the encounter but only had his audio on when talking to the complainant and there was no footage of Officer Bennett talking to Peloga. Peloga was not wearing a BWC, and when he told the complainant that he called the police, it is unclear whether he called 911 or the lieutenant.

In conducting her review, Ms. Schwartz did not receive the line of duty accident report, standardized incident report, investigations reports, insurance forms, DVR request forms, copies provided for the file from OPS. Ms. Schwartz found two things glaring: (1) that in the two reports from the officers that were at the scene, neither said that Peloga had a steady green light, but that fact was included in all the official paperwork and (2) that the APD incident report from three days later has two different officer and supervisor names and says that the detective was on duty and reports a steady green light. Because of the APD incident report, complainant was denied coverage.

Ms. Schwartz ultimately concluded that OPS conducted a minimal investigation, and while the window for discipline has passed, she recommended that if an officer is involved in an accident in an unmarked vehicle, there should be an obligation to identify themselves as a member of the department. While the finding by OPS were not totally inappropriate given they had nothing to base their findings on, Ms. Schwartz, noted OPS's failure to do a full investigation was a detriment to the complainant and if they had done one, it would have become obvious that the reporting was sloppy and inconsistent. Additionally, Ms. Schwartz discussed the limited BWC footage, and while it does not indicate that the officers were trying to hide the fact that the detective was a member of the APD, it leads to complainant's mistrust of the process.

Chair Vives raised concerns over the seeming falsification of the incident report considering the discrepancies between the statements from the responding officers and the incident report. Chair Vives further clarified that there were two officers at this incident which are still with APD while others had retired or left.

Board Member Levendosky asked whether there was a clear reason why the detective involved in the incident was in the vehicle, especially if there are claims that he was off-duty. Ms. Schwartz stated that it is not clear nor was she able to get a clear answer from OPS. Board Member Santos confirmed this, though she believes the context points to the fact that he was on-duty. Board Member Cannizzaro asked whether OPS

has addressed the clear inconsistencies in the records and whether they have reconsidered the case in light of this information. Ms. Schwartz responds that it has not been brought to their attention and they thought it best to bring it to the Board first.

Finally, Board Member Santos noted the egregious nature of the circumstances that there were four different people who signed off on the report and yet were not even at the scene, to which Ms. Schwartz agreed. Chair Vives voiced her concerns over OPS not bringing these issues to the Board.

Board Member Santos moved to table this case so that the investigations committee can look at it. The motion passed unanimously.

Before moving on, Board Member Cannizzaro raised concerns over ongoing issues with the APD and BWC footage with which Chair Vives agreed.

CC2020-009

(A. Santos)

The date of the alleged incident is July 6, 2020, at 5:00 AM but was only reported to the CPRB on March 14, 2023. The allegations include two counts of call handling. Board Member Santos reported that following a dispute with a female with which the complainant lived, he was denied entry to his house. After climbing in through a window, the female occupant called the police who, upon arrival, took his phone, chain, medallion, several forms of identification, and fifty dollars. Complainant stated that the APD officers wrongly accused him of physically assaulting a child that lived in the home who was special needs.

Board Member Santos reported that she reviewed the file which included the call-ticket history, domestic incident report, 911 calls, radio transmissions, BWC footage, and G.O.'s 3.1.70 and 2.1.00. She also reported that there were no disciplinary records of the officers involved.

Board Member Santos reported that APD Detective Pierce concluded both allegations of call handling to be unfounded. Board Member Santos did not concur with the first and explained that the BWC footage shows the APD officers taking away complainant's phone and necklace and saying that they belong to the victim and further that the officers involved said in their interviews that the victim was able to show ownership of the phone and the necklace. Because of this, Board Member Santos finds the officer's actions to be exonerated as to the first count. Board Member Santos concurred with the finding as to the second count of call handling because at no point did the officers, as shown on BWC footage, take or have possession of complainant's identification cards, money, or wallet.

Board Member Santos made a motion to close this case based on the findings below. Motion seconded and passed.

After review and deliberation of the investigation of the complaint by the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the CPRB has made the following findings as to the conduct of the specific officers involved:

- With regards to first count of allegation of improper Call Handling, the CPRB and OPS reached a finding of **Exonerated**
- With regards to the second count of allegation of improper Call Handling, the CPRB and OPS reached a finding of **Unfounded**

Before moving on, Board Member Santos noted that the case was received by the CPRB more than two years after the alleged incident, well past the statute of limitations for disciplinary sanctions.

CC 2019-027

(J. Levendosky)

The complaint was received on September 20, 2019, and the allegation is call handling. The complainant stated that she made a call to APD, concerned that her grandchildren were being neglected. She felt that the officers did not inspect the situation thoroughly enough and failed to contact CPS regarding the children's welfare.

Board Member Levendosky reported that the incident occurred February 22, 2019, when the target officer was called to the location following an accusation of children being mistreated and neglected. The target officer and his supervisor conducted interviews and reviewed CPS documents and found the children to be in good health. The target officer followed G.O. 3.8.05 in response to the incident as well as APD and state procedure (contact supervisor and follow-up with CPS paperwork). Board Member Levendosky noted, however, that no BWC was in the OPS file because the footage was deleted. He also noted that it was not opened for investigation by OPS until two years after the initial filing.

Board Member Levendosky concurred with the OPS finding of Exonerated due to the documentation and evidence showed that the officer in question adhered to APD protocols, and he moved to move this case based on the findings below. Motion seconded and passed.

After review and deliberation of the investigation of the complaint by the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the CPRB has made the following findings as to the conduct of the specific officers involved:

- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Call Handling, the CPRB and OPS reached a finding of **Exonerated**

CC 2021-019

(M. Ingram)

Board Member Ingram noted that this case, CC 2021-019 and the next, CC 2021-032, are closely related as they were made by the same complainant and involve the same underlying landlord-tenant dispute. Additionally, the complaints are about similar aspects of call handling and police conduct.

Case number CC 2021-019 was from June of 2021 while CC 2021-032 is from September 2021. Because they were flagged as related, Board Member Ingram was able to acquire all the materials at once. Chair Vives clarified that Al Lawrence was assigned to be a monitor on CC 2021-019 but not CC 2021-032.

As to CC 2021-019, Monitor Lawrence reported that the incident occurred on June 23, 2021, and noted that there were two OPS detectives involved in this investigation: Detective Pierce who handled most of it and Detective Burns who picked up the case and wrote the report. Monitor Lawrence stated that the dispute started over the removal of a dryer in the tenant's building resulting in the landlord calling the police the next day. The landlord reported to the police that the tenant threatened him and the property manager with a taser as they worked to remove the dryer. The responding police officer talked with the landlord and then went upstairs to talk to the tenant who refused to open the door and at some point, called the police separately. Tenant then made several calls to a dispatcher who at one point answered with "hello" and laughed when the tenant says she had been waiting for hours for someone to take her complaint. Tenant proceeded to call South Station and demand to speak with a sergeant.

Officers were sent again the same day around 1:00PM and spoke to the tenant who continued to berate and insult the officers, and she further accused an officer of laughing at her. The tenant made three complaints: (1) the responding officer refused to take her complaint, which OPS found to be Exonerated, (2) the responding officer laughed at her, which OPS found to be Unfounded, and (3) the dispatcher was being rude and unprofessional, which OPS found to be Sustained.

Monitor Lawrence concurred with OPS as to the findings of complaint (1) and (3) but recommended a finding of Not Sustained as to count (2). Board Member Ingram agreed that Count 2 should be considered Not Sustained and Count 3 should be sustained and made a motion that finding for Count 2 be Not Sustained.

Board Member Santos asked to clarify whether this finding was due to missing BWC footage and Monitor Lawrence answered that the footage was supposedly available to Detective Burns who viewed it but could not be located when he requested to view it. Board Member Ingram added that there is only one set of BWC footage missing of the four that should be available and that Detective Burns explained that it could have been deleted or lost when the materials were transferred from Detective Pierce to Detective Burns. He also questioned why it could not be retrieved from axon since it was related to an ongoing complaint and is further connected to a criminal proceeding.

Regarding the Count 2 finding of Not Sustained, the motion was seconded and passed.

Board Member Ingram moved to make a finding of Sustained as to Count 3.

Board Member Cannizzaro asked whether the dispatcher faced any discipline. Ingram responded that he did not have the full report in front of him, but he believes the dispatcher received some sort of counseling.

Regarding the Count 3 finding of Sustained, the motion was seconded and passed.

Board Member Ingram returned to Count 1 and stated that the BWC footage from the responding officer showed a very short interaction (total of 17 minutes). Ten minutes in, the responding officer went upstairs to talk to the tenant who refused to open the door or recount her side of the story. Once the responding officer gave her an ultimatum saying that if she was not going to come out and talk with him, he was going to do the report based on the landlord's version and she could respond to that in court. At this point, the tenant changed her tune and stated that she needed to file a report to which the responding officer said goodbye and walked away. Board Member Ingram interpreted this as being unprofessional and inappropriate to give such an ultimatum and then ignore the tenant. This interaction lasted less than two minutes, and once the tenant realized the officer had walked away she got very agitated to which you can hear the officer laugh a little when talking to the landlord and property manager.

Board Member Levendosky asked whether the tenant could have left her apartment to make her complaint. Ingram replied that she could have, but the officer's interaction with the tenant escalated the situation and agitated the complainant.

Board Member Ingram moved to make a finding of Sustained as to Count 1, Conduct Standards.

Chair Vives clarified when the 911 calls took place, specifically whether the call to the dispatcher occurred after the tenant expressed that she needed to file her own complaint. Ingram responded that the timeline is unclear since the calls were not dated, but in the first call, the tenant says the officer is at her door and the call handling violation occurred on the third.

Regarding the Count 1 motion to make a finding of Sustained, motion was seconded and passed.

After review and deliberation of the investigation of the complaint by the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the CPRB has made the following findings as to the conduct of the specific officers involved:

- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Conduct Standards, the CPRB reached a finding of **Sustained**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Conduct Standards, the OPS reached a finding of **Unfounded**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper General Call Handling and Procedure for Dispatch, the CPRB reached a finding of **Sustained**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper General Call Handling and Procedure for Dispatch, the OPS reached a finding of **Sustained**.

- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper General Call Handling and Procedures, the CPRB reached a finding of **Exonerated**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper General Call Handling and Procedures, the OPS reached a finding of **Exonerated**.

CC 2021-032

(M. Ingram)

Board Member Ingram reported that this is the same tenant, landlord, address, and underlying dispute as CC 2021-019, but it took place on September 22, 2021. The property manager called APD because the complainant changed the lock on the main entrance to the building, and at this stage the landlord and tenant had entered into eviction proceedings. Three officers responded including the target officer, Officer Bennett. Bennet arrived last as the property manager came closer to the tenant who started swearing at the property manager. Officer Bennett then interceded, telling the tenant to calm down and not to judge people after she called the property manager a former felon. The tenant then turned her attention to Officer Bennett and told him to shut up. In response, Bennett said to the tenant “what’s wrong with you,” as she’s explaining, he said “maybe it’s because of how you’re acting” which only escalated the interaction. Ultimately, Bennett said, “whatever lady” and walked away.

After Officer Bennett has disengaged and the other two officers had finished up their duties, Bennett tells the tenant to “get some help,” further upsetting her.

Ingram reported that there are two allegations noted by OPS: (1) call handling as to the officers not doing anything due to eviction proceedings being ongoing and (2) conduct standards as to the rude comments made by Officer Bennett.

Board Member Ingram agreed with OPS’s finding of Unfounded as to the call handling allegation and moved to accept this finding. Seconded and passed.

Ingram disagreed with their finding of Exonerated as to the conduct standards allegation. He did not find the conduct of Officer Bennett to be helpful or proper and proposes that Count 2 be sustained.

Board Member Levendosky asked whether there were any personnel and disciplinary histories. Ingram answered that the response he got was OPS was that there are no records of discipline and none of the officers had been disciplined. Ingram did eventually receive them the day prior to the Board Meeting. Levendosky followed up to clarify that it was just Officer Bennett who was causing trouble. Ingram confirmed that the other two officers were handling the tenant respectfully, calmly, and professionally, and Officer Bennet escalated the situation.

Board Member Ingram moved to make a finding of sustained as to Count 2 – conduct standards. Seconded and passed.

After review and deliberation of the investigation of the complaint by the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the CPRB has made the following findings as to the conduct of the specific officer involved:

- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Call Handling, the CPRB reached a finding of **Unfounded**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Call Handling, the OPS reached a finding of **Unfounded**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Conduct Standards, the CPRB reached a finding of **Sustained**.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Conduct Standards, the OPS reached a finding of **Exonerated**.

Board Member Ingram noted that during both of the tenant/complainant's calls in the previous two cases, the tenant mentions having PTSD and interacting with the officers was triggering for her. He further noted that officers in both situations made comments about her mental stability, and at no point did the officers change their approach after hearing her mention her PTSD. Ingram mentioned the fact as well that this address has been the subject of numerous calls and thought that there should perhaps be a more community or problem oriented form or policing to identify this location as requiring a different kind of approach.

Chair Vives reiterated that OPS found Officer Bennett to be exonerated as to the conduct standards and asked Ingram to try to explain which G.O.'s OPS relied on to find the officer's response proper. Program Manager Andre and Board Member Ingram read from the OPS report which characterized Officer Bennett's actions as calm. Chair Vives used this to highlight how OPS could see the same evidence and find no issue with the conduct.

CC 2021-029

(P. Collins-Hackett)

Batman was excused from this meeting and therefore this review was tabled until the next meeting.

CC 2021-036

(J. Levendosky)

Levendosky reported that the complaint was received December 20, 2021, and the assigned detective was Detective Shane. The allegations are: Arrest Authority – Procedures and Conduct Standards. Complainant alleged that his vehicle was stopped by the police and he was issued two tickets without discernable cause. Complainant further alleged that the officer who issued the tickets was erratic and that his conduct suggested narcotics use.

Levendosky stated that the incident occurred on December 8, 2021, at 3:33PM. Complainant was pulled over for not wearing his seatbelt. The officer approached the vehicle asked for license and registration which the complainant initially contested. Board Member Levendosky reported that that the officer remained calm, was not

argumentative, and remained professional and polite. Further, the BWC footage did not exhibit erratic behavior, belligerence, or drug use.

OPS made a finding of Not Sustained as to the conduct standards allegation and Unfounded as to the arrest authority allegation. Levendosky agreed with both findings. Board Member Levendosky made a motion to close this case based on the findings below. Motion seconded and passed.

After review and deliberation of the investigation of the complaint by the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the CPRB has made the following findings as to the conduct of the specific officer involved:

- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Arrest Authority & Procedure, the OPS and CPRB reached a finding of Unfounded.
- With regards to the 1 count of allegation of improper Conduct Standards, the OPS and CPRB reached a finding of Not Sustained.

CC 2022-040

(V. Person)

Board Member Person reported that the incident occurred on November 1, 2022, and involved one count of call handling. The complainant hired a taxi to transport a companion from the train station to Sheridan Avenue where payment would be made upon arrival at the destination. The complainant alleged a taxi pulled up to her address, but she was unable to get her personal property from the taxi due to non-payment. The belongings were locked in the trunk of the taxi which contained important documents. She stated that the police were contacted by both her and the taxi company and the police intentionally allowed the taxi driver to leave with her personal property and she was unable to collect her property from the taxi company. The complainant has since attempted to contact the officer, but she was not able to receive a response and has indicated that she would like to pursue charges against the officer.

Board Member Person further explained that the officer did not have any contact with the complainant or her companion as they did not exit the apartment. The officers informed the taxi driver that he was not under any criminal investigation, and he was free to leave. The driver provided the personal items to the APD officer who informed the complainant how they could retrieve the items.

Board Member Person agreed with the OPS finding of Unfounded as the officer did not take the personal property, the complainant was informed of how the rightful owner can retrieve the property with identification, and also that the complainant was unable to retrieve the property as she was not the owner.

Chair Vives asked Board Member Person whether he review BWC footage in making this determination. Person replied that there were multiple calls made but the BWC footage did not show any relevant parts of the interaction.

Board Member Person made a motion to concur with the OPS finding of unfounded. Motion seconded and passed.

After review and deliberation of the investigation of the complaint by the Office of Professional Standards (OPS), the CPRB has made the following findings as to the conduct of the specific officer involved:

- With regards to the allegation of APD's response to Call Handling, the CPRB and OPS reached a finding of **Unfounded**

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

PUBLIC OFFICIAL LIAISON

(N. Vives)

Chair Vives reported that the committee was scheduled to meet on October 31, 2023, but it was cancelled, and she will update the Board when the committee is reconvened. Chair Vives states that she will address some of the issues brought up at this meeting as they seem to be ongoing. Chair Vives invited Board Members to join in on any of the conversations concerning the issues raised at this meeting.

Chair Vives clarified for Board Member Ingram that the committee generally meets at 4:00PM on the last Tuesday of each month but, it is subject to change.

BYLAWS AND RULES

(A. Santos)

Board Member Santos reported that there is a proposed new section to the Bylaws and will make the motion during the new business portion of the meeting.

INVESTIGATION

(J. Levendosky)

Board Member Levendosky reported that since the last meeting, the committee has received two OPS reports and six new complaints from the public. The committee also receive reports and case summaries for 38 OPS since the beginning of the year and the Board has reviewed 15 and 8 that were presented at this meeting. Levendosky reports that they will be able to review almost all the cases that are pending by the end of the year except for those that are under independent investigation. After this meeting, the Board will only have 5 pending cases.

The committee has also received updates on the ongoing South Station independent investigation. The independent investigators are in the process of completing the investigation after speaking with APD administrative officials.

Levendosky reported that Board Members continue to express issues with receiving disciplinary histories from OPS and noted that it needs to be rectified in order to complete investigations. The committee recently received APD's policy manual from the department's training unit which was distributed by Program Manager Andre.

The committee has been advocating for allocation of fiscal resources to ensure that they are able to complete ongoing investigations. On October 18th, the committee presented their budget proposal to the Common Council Finance Assessment and taxation Committee.

Regarding requests for proposals for investigative services, it was closed on October 6th. More than 54 submissions were received and the decision to move forward with interviews will depend on the 2024 adopted budget. The proposed reduction of the CPRB budget is 14%. Levendosky reported his discussions with local media outlets and discussed the Board's role and mission.

Board Member Ingram commented that once he clarified his request for disciplinary histories with Detective Burns, he received the proper documentation. Levendosky clarified that this is an ongoing issue and Program Manager Andre added that the Board was told that they have to specifically ask for it because they did not want it to impair the review of the case.

Chair Vives reiterated her concerns with the lack of cooperation with the disciplinary histories.

DISCIPLINE MATRIX

(N. Vives)

Chair Vives reported that the committee is in the process of scheduling with the Chief to finalize the matrix and have not yet provided a redlined version from the Chief. The Chief's office said they were planning to meet with the unions and leadership and then they will submit suggested changes. The committee expects the changes to be minimal. APD has had the matrix for a full month. Chair Vives said the Chief's office seems to be in agreement with the process and wants to work together.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

(V. Person)

Chair Vives noted that Batman is excused but stated that member of the Board are receiving awards at the Italian American Community Center and others are welcome to attend and support. Additionally, Chair Vives will be addressing the Normanskill Neighborhood Association on December 5, 2023.

The Black Expo is coming up on November 11, 2023.

MEDIATION

(V. Harden)

Not discussed as Rev. Collier and Dr. Harden are not fully with the Board at this meeting. Program Manager Andre reported that they received correspondence about participating in research in regard to the Board's mediation program. She provided them with some background and are willing to meet to discuss it further, though they did request to send questions to APD officers but the Board will help formulate the questions.

REPORT FROM GOVERNMENT LAW CENTER

(M. Andre)

Program Manager Andre, Chair Vives, the vice chair, and Secretary Hackett had a day trip to New York City to share resources and knowledge with their Police Review Board.

On November 1, 2023, Program Manager Andre attended the DOJ's United Against Hate Connected Community Voices and Strengthen Law Enforcement Partnership Forum which was helpful in making connections related to federal law.

Further, they were contacted by the Girl Scouts of Northeastern New York requesting a donation of time to help the girls earn their civic duty badge. The girls are scheduled to meet with Judge Stein, Prof. Woods, and Program Manager Andre on November 9, 2023.

Program Manager Andre noted that she will be attending the NACOLE conference in Chicago from November 13-17 with Chair Vives, Dr. Harden, and Board Member Santos.

Program Manager Andre has also submitted that quarterly reports should be standardized to coincide with fiscal quarters. She also will offer up the October 12 Public Monthly Meeting Minutes for approval which says that purchase requests are on hold until January 2025. She also is proposing amendments to the 2023 adopted budget addressing the independent expert and training and conference budget line. These include a \$20,000 reduction in the consultant line, \$8,000 reduction in the outside council line, and a \$15,000 reduction in public outreach. Further Corporation Counsel has forwarded a request for proposal for administrative agency for the CPRB for review and posting. The CPRB is reviewing this proposal along with Corporation Counsel.

Board Member Cannizzaro attended the final public hearing regarding the 2024 budget, and the Finance Assessment and Taxation Committee of the Common Council will meet on November 8, 2023, at 5:30PM to discuss the CPRB's 2024 budget. Program Manager Andre has forwarded public comments in support of a budget increase for the CPRB.

Finally, Common Council member Hoey has introduced Local Law J of 2023 which just clarifies what the terms limits are for CPRB Board Members. Local Law K of 2022 seeks to prohibit tear gas usage by APD which is still in consideration, but there is a Local Law L of 2023 which would only limit usage. Additionally, Ordinance 49-1221-2022 proposed a reduction of reporting requirements for APD.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

(N. Vives)

Chair Vives emphasized the issues which follow a budget reduction for the Board. If the Board were not fully funded, Chair Vives opined that consultants and public outreach would suffer. Chair Vives concluded by thanking the members of the Board and staff for their hard work.

V. NEW BUSINESS

(N. Vives)

Board Member Santos introduced proposed revisions to the bylaws, specifically section VII on the Standing Committee on Investigations. Board Members Santos and Levendosky along with Program Manager Andre, and GLC student Sarah Panariello, submitted recommendations to Chel Miller, the publications editor for the GLC, along with consultant Andrew Law.

Board member Santos moves to approve the changes. Motion seconded and passed.

Chair Vives moved to approve the quarterly reports for the second and third quarters of 2023 as well as the meeting minutes for the October 12, 2023, meeting and the reports made in the meeting minutes from October 12.

Motion seconded, Board Member Ingram abstains from the vote on the meeting minutes, motion seconded and passed.

Chair Vives moved to approve the slate for elected Board officer positions. Motion seconded and passed. Board Member Cannizzaro expressed his support and appreciation for Chair Vives, Vice Chair Dr. Harden, and Secretary Collins-Hackett.

Board Member Santos moved for approval of the 2023 amended budget to cover independent investigation, training, and conference budget lines. Motion seconded and passed.

VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

(N. Vives)

Chair Vives moved to go into executive session to discuss ongoing litigation, motion seconded and passed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:28 PM.