

**MINUTES
CITIZENS' LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
October 9, 2018**

Attachment A

- Roll Call**
- The meeting was held at the County Administration Center and came to order at 5:30 p.m. All Board members were present except Delores Chavez-Harmes, Jordan Gascon and Lourdes Silva.
- Public Comments**
- N/A
- Minutes Approval**
- The September 2018 meeting minutes were approved by motion by Darrel Harrison and second by G.I. Wilson.
- Presentation/Training**
- N/A
- Executive Officer's Report**
- Overview of Activities of CLERB Executive Officer and Staff since last meeting
 - Executive Officer Paul Parker's last day was Thursday, September 6, and since then Aron Hershkowitz has been adjusting to and working hard to fill the role of Interim Executive Officer.
 - On September 13, Mr. Hershkowitz attended the PSG Leadership Team Meeting at the COC where, during the roundtable, jail inspections were discussed.
 - On September 13, Mr. Hershkowitz met with CLERB's Probation Liaisons from the Internal Affairs Unit, Ross Lewin, Brian Barnum and Irene Lilly, to discuss the transition of Mr. Hershkowitz' role as Interim Executive Officer of CLERB.
 - On September 17 Mr. Hershkowitz and Lynn Setzler met with the CLERB Rules and Regulations subcommittee along with County Counsel, to review and make changes.
 - On September 19, San Diego Sheriff's Department (SDSD) Division of Inspectional Services CLERB liaison Sergeant Aaron Meleen and Lieutenant David Gilmore visited CLERB's office for an ongoing regular monthly meeting.
 - CLERB's computer database, called Administrative Investigations Management (AIM), will be updated from a prior 2011 version to the most current version. CLERB will be able to access the new online version. CLERB will also work with AIM to customize reports in order to discontinue the use of outside applications for recording data. The timeframe for this new version rollout is scheduled for approximately September 9, 2018.
 - Investigative Workload Report for September
 - There were 7 new cases (as compared to 17 for August 2017).
 - At the end of September there were 84 active cases (five in "lodged" status and 79 open and active).
 - There were 33 open death cases.
 - CLERB had documents for 13 cases and are awaiting documents on the remaining 20.
 - There was 1 new death case in September (one in-custody possible suicide).
 - SDSD Policy Recommendation and Sustained Responses
 - 17-038/Stucki (Attachment D)
 - CLERB requested a policy revision to require the deputies in detention facilities to have disposable protective gloves and a protective airway mask on their person while interacting with inmates. The Department stated that deputies are already required to carry the protective airway mask (PAM) or protective barrier membrane (PBM) on their duty belt while on duty in a detention facility. With regards to gloves they are provided at all Sheriff's facilities and are readily available to all staff. They can be found in various locations at detention facilities including housing floors, deputy stations, medical, booking/intake areas and processing. While it is not written in policy, it is common practice for deputies and medical staff to carry protective gloves on their person while working around inmates at a detention facility. Therefore the Department did not making any policy changes with regards to gloves.
 - 17-038/Stucki (Attachment E)
 - The Department changed a practice with regards to the initial documentation of medical intake information in July 2018. The medical screening is now documented in the computer (JIMS) while the arrestee is being interviewed by medical staff as

opposed to being recorded on paper. Also two nurses are assigned to screen arrestees which will reduce wait time of the arrestee and ensures they are evaluated sooner.

- The new computerized intake screening includes questions related to drug and alcohol use as well as the appearance of the arrestee for obvious signs alcohol intoxication or signs and symptoms of being under the influence or drugs. This new information could prompt the medical staff to potentially start alcohol protocols as needed on new bookings.
- With regards to the failure to review, arrange for review and/or act in a timely fashion of the chest x-ray, the common practice is as follows. The chest x-ray is read by the medical staff prior to classification and housing placement of the arrestee. In this matter the Department believes it was an isolated incident so no policy changes were instituted.
- 17-068/Rivera (Attachment F)
 - The findings with regards to unidentified deputies not providing the complainant and inmates with soap and denied access to a shower for longer than 48 hours, in accordance with the Sheriff's Detentions Policy and Procedure was forwarded to the Detention Services Bureau for appropriate administrative action, including a referral for an Internal Affairs investigation, if needed.

Board Chair's Report

- N/A

New Business

- Appointment of Nominating Committee
 - There will be an election in December 2018 to vote for the 2019 CLERB Officers. Jim Lasswell was asked to chair the nominating committee and he has accepted that role. Both Kim-Thoa Hoang and Ms. Chavez-Harmes have volunteered to participate on this committee. Please inform Mr. Lasswell if you have an interest in serving as an officer.
- San Diego Central Jail Tour for CLERB Board Members
 - The tour is scheduled for Monday, November 5, 2018. At this point there are four, possibly five attendees scheduled. Gary Brown, Mr. Wilson, Ms. Silva, and Ms. Hoang are confirmed attendees and Mr. Lasswell is tentatively scheduled. The maximum number of participants is five. If there is a demand for another tour, it can be arranged.
 - Mr. Lasswell: I would point out that Central is a very interesting experience, but what was interesting to me was seeing East Mesa and George Bailey as well, because when you see one, you have not seen them all. I would strongly recommend that we have a continuing education element that brings the Board into these areas.
 - Mr. Herschkowitz: This has already been discussed and the second tour is probably going to be the Vista Jail tour because Vista is very interesting and it is one of the older facilities. It is definitely eye opening for everyone to see. Central will be the first one and as long as there are participants it should be a regular tour that would be another time for each facility.

Unfinished Business

- Update of Proposed Revision to CLERB Rules and Regulations provided by Ms. Hoang
 - Thank you to all of the subcommittee members: Mr. Brown, Mr. Lasswell, and Madame Chair. I would also like to thank County Counsel.
 - The subcommittee met with County Counsel on September 17, 2018, in order to clean up the last version, which you have in front on you today. At the last meeting you were provided a timeline from April 2017 to this date, that the subcommittee worked through.
 - The subcommittee added a Mission Statement to the Rules and Regulations as this was lacking, so that Board members know why we are here and what we are here for. There was a lot of clean-up and cosmetic work for style purposes, consistency and uniformity. The hope was to produce a more user-friendly document for Board members, members of the public and staff. In order to provide more flexibility we added "in compliance with the law" or "as applicable by law" statements. By doing this, the Rules and Regulations do not have to be changed every time the law changes. Definitions for case, criminal conduct, case, file and lodged were added, so that all of those words may be clarified pertaining to complaint and/or death cases. The term "citizen" was removed so that people are not under the impression that you have to be a citizen in order to file a complaint. The term "citizen" was changed to "public or people". The subcommittee

proposed that the complainant must prove his or her mental incapacity by medical opinion and not just a mere allegation. Supporting documents must be provided. Majority vote was clarified to the majority of the currently appointed members, not the majority of general potential Board members. The subcommittee decided to change "Action Justified" to "Exonerated". Exonerated conforms more with the California Code designations and reporting guidelines. The subcommittee consulted with representatives from Civilian Oversight agencies across the country regarding this item. The definitions of "Unfounded", "Not Sustained" and "Sustained" were changed to comport with the California Code definitions. These changes do not change the meaning, the language was changed to comport with the code. The subcommittee also added that the Rules and Regulations would be reviewed every four years after the revision date because until now there had not been an official formal revision. The subcommittee wanted to ensure that the Rules and Regulations will be reviewed every four years.

- During the last meeting it was suggested inspection of the juvenile detention facilities be included along with the inspection of the adult detention facilities. The subcommittee unanimously decided to table that item at this time. The Rules and Regulations will not include inspection of the juvenile detention facilities at this time; it is subject to revision at a later time. There are a number of concerns, for example, juvenile detention facilities are subject to very strict confidentiality rules to protect the rights of the minors. It is not something that CLERB can tack on without more expertise. At this time there are a lot of workload and other priorities for this Board to work on. The Board would need to go before the Board of Supervisors in order to achieve this.
 - Mr. Harrison: On page six at the top, 4.1.1, you refer to section 4.6, but I do not see it in here at all.
 - Ms. Hoang: I am asking Mr. Hershkowitz to take notes. In section 4.4.1 where it states as provided in section 4.6, it should read as provided in section 4.3.
 - Mr. Wilson: On page 13, challenges of Board members, is there a mechanism where if someone identifies a bias or conflict of interest whereby the Board member can recuse himself without going through the rest of this?
 - Ms. Arkin: This refers to the investigative hearing panel. As far as regular Board members, is that what you are asking about?
 - Mr. Wilson: Yes, is there a way that somebody could recuse themselves if it is brought to their attention?
 - County Counsel: Yes.
 - Mr. Wilson: Okay, it was just a question; no changes.
 - Susan Youngflesh: On 1.1 and 1.2 mission and purpose are both bolded, but all of the other captions are underlined. Is that intentional? In 3.1 only part of the caption is underlined where the whole thing should be. In 5.1 there is an extra period between "b" and "e". In 5.2.a.1 capitalize complaint to be consistent with the rest of the document. There should be a space or a line between the two. Section 12 on the bottom of page 12, the caption should be pushed to the next page. In 13.6, 13.7 & 13.8 the spacing is not consistent. There is one space after 13.6 and two spaces after both 13.7 & 13.8. The numbers are underlined in 13.10 & 13.11 and they are not underlined in the other captions. In section 16 there are two spaces. It looks like there might have been a change in the margin. In section 17, I think this may have been corrected. After "In such cases," there is a hard return after the comma and this should be one line. On section 19 the caption should be moved to the next page.
 - Ms. Arkin: Does anybody else have any questions or comments about substance? Mr. Brown.
 - Mr. Brown: The page numbers in the Table of Contents do not match the document. On page 6 the sentence above section 4.1.3, "The written statement...", the word "written" should be removed. In line with the comments on page 7 paragraph 4.4.d. It is my understanding that neither the current ordinance nor the current ballot measure that the people voted on permitted or mentioned this as one of our duties. In line with that, why are we even including this?
 - Ms. Arkin: I think the feeling is, if I am not mistaken, that they should be part of our duties and it requires an ordinance established by the Board of Supervisors, which apparently is a relatively easy thing to do for something that has already been part of the Rules and Regulations for years. It was recommended by the Mental Health

Report that we take on inspecting the jails and we have a handbook now for inspecting jails. Once we are back at full staff and perhaps convince the Board of Supervisors that we need another staff person in order to do this effectively with all of the jails that we have in the County. We would like to be able to continue to do this. It's expected, it's appropriate, it's important. We did not include the juvenile facilities, as stated by Ms. Hoang, there are a whole host of other reasons legal, professional, all of the things that have to do with dealing with juveniles that we are not prepared to do at this time. We can handle doing the adult jails once we get back to full staff, but to go into juveniles at this point, is just a little bit too much.

- Mr. Brown: Would anybody object then if at the end of this we simply say if and when approved by the Board of Supervisors in an Ordinance.
- Ms. Arkin: What will happen is that we will take this as it is to the Board of Supervisors and at the same time there will be an Ordinance for inspecting the jails. They will start concurrently.
- County Counsel: At the last meeting it was discussed that the provision for jail inspections seems to have appeared in 2004 and we were not aware of any Ordinance that implemented that. As it turns out, this was in the rules from the beginning, so no Ordinance would have been necessary because it was part of the package that went to the Board of Supervisors initially establishing CLERB. So that issue is mute. If in the future CLERB wanted to introduce inspections of probation facilities, it would need to be done by Ordinance.
- Mr. Brown: It is contrary to the notion that in the Ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors, it says that our duties are such and such, and only by Ordinance passed by the Board of Supervisors could those duties be changed or added to. If these rules were adopted at the same time that we were formed where was the Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors to allow this?
- County Counsel: I agree at the time an Ordinance did come to the Board of Supervisors establishing CLERB. It came as a package.
- Mr. Brown: Wouldn't it be clearer to pass an Ordinance that allows it since no Ordinance exists?
- County Counsel: That would complicate things because we would be passing an Ordinance for a change that we are not making.
- Mr. Brown: Well there are a lot of things in these rules that are not changes to previous rules, correct?
- County Counsel: That is correct.
- Mr. Brown: Okay, so it seems like we are compounding an error by not going ahead with an Ordinance. One bit of background, when I was talking to Mr. Hershkowitz about this earlier this week or last week he mentioned that the Public Safety Group seems to have a problem with us doing this. Yet, contrary to that the previous Executive Officer said that the Public Safety Group was a big supporter of us doing this in line with the recommendations of the Disability Rights California Group. So I am just wondering what happened at the Public Safety Group. I don't know what the hassle is with passing an Ordinance. As the Chairperson stated, it's no big deal, so why don't we do it right?
- County Counsel: We can do that, if that is your Board's decision. That will require two hearings at the Board of Supervisors. Because the Board wanted this expedited, it would be best to go ahead with just the one. I am happy to start an Ordinance if that is what you would like to do.
- Mr. Lasswell: Basically, Counsel has said that by Ordinance CLERB was formed with a certain set of Rules and Regulations, therefore there was an Ordinance saying we did this.
- Mr. Brown: No, there wasn't.
- Mr. Lasswell: Well you guys have a personal disagreement that you need to look at.
- County Counsel: I agree with what Mr. Brown said. My point is that I do not think there is a legal risk there because the Board of Supervisors intention was clear.
- Mr. Brown: I think the Board's intention then, having dealt with some Boards, if they passed something, I would be very surprised if they read all of the details. Therefore, why not bring it to their attention that this is something that we would like to do and it has been requested by an outside group and therefore, it's all fair and up and up with

the Board.

- Mr. Harrison: That authority is already alive; that authority exists as it is now. You just want to dot an "I".
- Mr. Brown: No, I just want to live by the law. I don't want to be a Board that expands its purview. People complain a lot about government and Boards getting into things they were not mandated to do. We do not have the Board of Supervisors mandating us by Ordinance as they said they would; as the Ordinance that created us said we should.
- Ms. Hoang: When this Board was created, the first set of Rules and Regulations were approved by the Board of Supervisors. At that time, that set of rules already included the jail inspections. It was passed, so it is legal. At this point, it is our understanding that we have the cooperation of the Sheriff's Department, and Lieutenant Gilmore can correct us, but I believe that the Sheriff's Department has no objection to our conduction jail inspections.
- Mr. Brown: If everybody agrees with this what is the harm of asking the Board of Supervisors if we understand them correctly. I say the way to do that is to put the Ordinance in front of them.
- Ms. Hoang: Lieutenant Gilmore.
- Lieutenant Gilmore: Ma'am the Sheriff's Department has been more than willing to cooperate with CLERB on just about every single thing that you have asked. We've scheduled tours so that before you start the inspections you have an educational process in the hopes that when the staffing is able to do what you need to do to fulfill your mission you would have a much better grasp before you even walk in the door to do the inspections.
- Ms. Arkin: I guess the question that Ms. Hoang has asked is does the Sheriff's Department willing want us to do jail inspections.
- Lieutenant Gilmore: I do not know that there is a want or anything. I think that we have an obligation to work with CLERB hand-in-hand and we have done that many, many times as we have proven. I don't know that there is a want so much in that we feel that it is the right thing to do.
- Ms. Arkin: So you feel this is an important thing to do?
- Lieutenant Gilmore: It is all important, every bit of this is important.
- Mr. Brown: Given its importance why don't we ask the Board that created us or the Board that created the Ordinance that created us if it's the right thing to do? We hold officers to a book of rules, that's just amazing.
- Mr. Lasswell: Are there any others rules that are in the Rules and Regulations we would want them to then create a separate Ordinance for? If you have a booklet of Rules and Regulations that was basically approved from the beginning and are obligated to approve before we can enact them then I would think that's that.
- Mr. Brown: But the Ordinance that created us listed our duties. It did not, under duties, in section "d", Duties and Responsibilities of CLERB, item "d"...
- Ms. Arkin: That is not what Counsel said.
- Mr. Brown: This is what I am saying. That the Ordinance that created us did not contain item "d", in the Ordinance it said if we want to do other things not listed in the list of duties an Ordinance should be created. To Mr. Lasswell's point, I don't think an Ordinance is necessary to pass every rule here, but certainly if we want to have something as a duty or a responsibility, I believe an Ordinance is necessary.
- Ms. Arkin: I am a little confused then because I thought I heard Counsel say that when CLERB was formed a series of Rules and Regulations was submitted to the Board of Supervisors at that time and it included inspections of jails and therefore since it passed at the very first, not the 2004 version, but an earlier version, since it had already passed and adopted, it was a legal duty and responsibility of CLERB. That is what I heard Counsel say.
- County Counsel: Mr. Brown is correct, it should have been done as an Ordinance, but the fact that the Board passed that along with the Ordinance establishing CLERB. That was the legislative intent of the Board. I think that it would strengthen the Board's authority if we did do this by Ordinance, but I do not think that it is legally required, but it certainly would strengthen it.
- Mr. Brown: Using our own Counsel's words, why not strengthen it. Although it takes

two readings to pass an Ordinance, it does not take two readings to pass the Rules and Regulations am I correct?

- County Counsel: That is correct, but we would not be able to...we would pass the Rules and Regulations and have the first reading of the Ordinance at the first meeting and pass the Ordinance at the second meeting.
- Mr. Brown: Especially, if we added the words if and when an Ordinance approved by the County Board of Supervisors allowing this activity. So it would not delay the passage of the Rules and Regulations.
- Ms. Youngflesh: I was going to agree with Counsel. I think the question comes down to whether it is really an efficient use of government time, but that's not really our role to decide that because we are here for the Board's purpose. So if it does strengthen, through talking it through, in a way, I am agreeing with Mr. Brown.
- Ms. Hoang: I would like to add that from the initial Ordinance "this Board has the authority to review and make recommendations on policies and procedures of the Sheriff." Since detention facilities are within the scope of duties of the Sheriff, in order for us to review and make recommendations on policies and procedures of the Sheriff we should be able to conduct adult detention facility inspections and since that language was already introduced, and accepted and authorized by the Board at the inception, I don't believe we have a problem now. Especially in light of the fact that the Sheriff is cooperating. Of course it would be better if we had a clearer statement, but if that Ordinance that we are seeking is going to delay the Rules and Regulations being completed.
- Mr. Brown: We have already heard our Counsel say that it does not delay it.
- County Counsel: The rules do not take effect until the Ordinance is passed, but I think it could be done. We need to take a look at the dates, I think we could still do it by the end of the year.
- Ms. Arkin: Why would we do the Rules and Regulations first and not the Ordinance first?
- County Counsel: Because we do not want to delay the rules passing.
- Mr. Wilson: Could we just add comport with any Ordinance specific to jail inspections. Make so that in the future if there a multiple Ordinances with comply with it. Would it be possible to add that? I would just say comport with the County Ordinance.
- Mr. Brown: Okay.
- County Counsel: What does that add here?
- Mr. Wilson: You are just throwing the word Ordinance in there so that when they pass one, we can hang our hat on it.
- Ms. Arkin: Would you like to make a motion about your concerns with having an Ordinance in order to strengthen the Rules and Regulations.
- Mr. Brown: Let me first say though that I am not opposed to doing this, I am just trying to make it clear so that no one would be able to challenge it later on. I say that this paragraph is fine if Counsel can have a separate item with an Ordinance that lists this as one of our duties and responsibilities.
- Ms. Hoang: Could you clarify your motion? So the motion is to request an Ordinance for this Board to conduct jail inspections.
- Mr. Brown: Correct.
- Ms. Hoang: So that does not have anything to do with these Rules and Regulations? That is a separate thing. We were hoping to have a motion on the Rules and Regulations as proposed tonight, so the motion regarding the Ordinance is separate.
- Mr. Brown: Counsel, can the Ordinance and the Rules and Regulations go to the Board of Supervisors concurrently?
- County Counsel: Yes, it would be done in one Board Letter, but two Board meetings.
- Ms. Arkin: The motion is that we request that Counsel create a separate item with the Ordinance concerning section 4.4.d to go to the Board of Supervisors concurrently with the Rules and Regulations. Motion was made by Gary Brown and seconded by Robert Spriggs. **The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.**
- Ms. Youngflesh: In section 4.3 there is another reference to section 4.6. I believe it is referring to section 4.4. Also the last part of that paragraph on page 7 it says "within the time limit set forth in section 4.4", I would change it to say "within the time limit set forth herein."

- Ms. Arkin: Are there any other corrections additions?
- Mr. Brown: It was mentioned in section 9.1 it says “screening of cases” and yet it seems everything under section 9.1 is complaints, so I am just wondering why you are thought it would be better to call it cases.
- County Counsel: Subdivision “c” covers the death investigations so we used the term cases.
- Mr. Brown: Okay, and related to that under 9.1.a.1 could we just list an item c after a & b saying all death investigations?
- Ms. Arkin: 9.1.a refers to file a complaint.
- Mr. Brown: Okay, so it wouldn’t come under death investigations.
- Ms. Arkin: Death investigations are not complaints.
- Mr. Brown: The paragraph above section 9, should we add whichever happens sooner to the end of this paragraph since they do not occur at the same time? *“The disclosure of information, including, but not limited to, the identification of the Subject Officer, in CLERB’s meeting agenda, public documents, and other public reports shall comply with applicable law existing at the time of the release of the documents and reports or the public meeting or hearing.”* The public meeting does not happen when the release of documents happens.
- Ms. Hoang: Could you please clarify what point in time you are referring to?
- Mr. Brown: Well it seems to me that since...you explain, yes.
- County Counsel: What he is referring to is a series of events. It is referring to we’d apply the laws at the time of release, they are talking about the release of a document and we would comply with the law. I do see that it is not clear. I would suggest putting a period after “applicable law”.
- Ms. Arkin: I thought we had chosen to at “applicable law existing at the time” because the laws change. So we will remove *“existing at the time of the release of the documents and reports or the public meeting or hearing.”*
- Ms. Youngflesh: Madame Chair just to add to that, generally, my understanding is that law would not be retroactive unless it was stated within that law and so going along with that line of thinking, it would only be retroactive if it actually said that.
- Ms. Arkin: So it would say *“...and other public reports shall comply with applicable law.”*
- Mr. Harrison: On page 9 in section 7 it says *“CLERB shall attempt to avoid contacting any Subject Officer home.”* It should be apostrophe s.
- County Counsel: I have a couple of minor changes I would like to get on the record. On page 1 section 1.2 remove “Code of Administrative Ordinances”. On page 8 5.2.a there should be a comma after the word following.
- Ms. Arkin: I will entertain the motion to adopt the latest revisions of the Rules and Regulations. Motion made by Mr. Wilson and seconded by Mr. Lasswell. **The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.**
- Update of CLERB Executive Officer Selection and Appointment Committee presented by Ms. Arkin on behalf of Ms. Chavez-Harnes
 - A total of 41 candidates have responded, of those 8 are qualified submitting all documents and 10 are pending review. Five meet the requirements but have yet to turn in all of their documents. The Human Resources manager will send out a reminder. There were 18 that did not meet the education and experience requirements.
 - The job posting will close September 10, 2018, at 11:59 p.m. There is a question as to whether we should extend that? Discussion: The Board agreed that there should not be an extension of the deadline.
 - The first subcommittee meeting to review the finalists will be held on Monday, October 15, 2018.

Board Comments

- Mr. Brown: The press has been doing a lot of write-ups on Senate Bill 1421 which changes the rules about disclosure and I am wondering if we could add it to some future briefing for the Board to see how it affects us.
- Mr. Hershkowitz: This matter has already been discussed with County Counsel. Once Counsel’s review has been completed, we will be informed on how that Bill is going to affect us.
- County Counsel: To clarify, I am not looking at it, I am checking with County Counsel to

determine if your outside Counsel should be advising you regarding this matter. Our office has given advice to the Sheriff and I just want to head off any disagreement that we might have. So either I or outside Counsel will provide that to you.

- Ms. Arkin: It hasn't passed yet, has it?
- Mr. Brown: Oh yes, it has. It goes into effect in January 2019.
- County Counsel: One correction on the agenda, item 11a can be stricken, it is not going to be heard separately. It is already on the agenda under 11b. There was a misunderstanding and I had Aron send out a revised agenda. So, 11a will be stricken from the agenda, it is already covered in 11a.

**Sheriff/Probation
Liaison Query**

- N/A

The Board entered closed session at 6:35 p.m.

Closed Session

~~a) Review jail surveillance video for case 17-135.~~

b) PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE/DISMISSAL/RELEASE

Discussion & Consideration of Complaints & Reports: Pursuant to Government code Section 54957 to hear complaints or charges brought against Sheriff or Probation employees by a citizen (unless the employee requests a public session). Notice to government Code Section 54957 for deliberations regarding consideration of subject officer discipline recommendation (if applicable).

CASE NO.	LAST NAME	CASE NAME	LAST NAME
17-113	Issa et al	17-133	Supsic
17-135	McCoy	18-031	Swanguen
18-095	Tino		

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Tamicha Husband, Administrative Secretary


ARON HERSHKOWITZ
Interim Executive Officer


KIM-THOA HOANG
Secretary to the Board