

MINUTES

BOARD OF CORRECTION

JUNE 28, 1979 MEETING

A regular meeting of the New York City Board of Correction was held on June 28, 1979 in the 14th floor conference room at 100 Centre Street.

In attendance were Chairman Peter Tufo, Mr. Angelo Giordani, Mr. David Lenefsky, Mr. Jack Poses, and Mrs. Rose M. Singer. Also in attendance by invitation of the Board were Peggy Davis, Deputy Coordinator for Criminal Justice; Larry Finnegan, General Counsel, Department of Correction; and Clay Hiles, Staff Attorney, Prisoners' Rights Project, the Legal Aid Society, as well as Board staff: Michael Austin, Michael Cleary, Arden Culver, Sherry Goldstein, Fr. Robert Harrison, and Joseph V. Smith.

Peter Tufo chaired the meeting and Arden Culver served as secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 2:47 P.M.

Mr. Tufo announced to the Board that the City's Deputy Criminal Justice Coordinator, Peggy Davis, would be speaking at today's Board meeting concerning the status of the Rikers Island transfer.

Mrs. Singer asked for an excused absence for Mr. Schulte which was approved.

Mrs. Davis stated that a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed by the City and State and an accompanying letter from the Governor was sent stating the transfer was in the interest of both parties. The terms of the transfer are a 99-year lease with a 99-year renewal possible. The first facility to be transferred will be the Correctional Institution for Women, which is scheduled to occur in September 1979. Since the State does not know who its Commissioner will be, the timetable will probably be delayed by a couple of months. The State will provide \$200 million to be used solely for the construction of replacement detention facilities for the City. Plans for the replacement system are ongoing. Total capital costs are estimated at \$360 million for building new facilities. With regard to annual operating costs, there is much uncertainty. The Department of Correction believes that operating costs would increase \$15 million per year for the new facilities based on the projected staffing pattern for the new Tombs; 350 officers and approximately 100 civilians, for 450 inmates. They state that this is the staffing necessary to provide security and implement the minimum standards and consent decrees. Other jurisdictions estimated staffing at 250, with the second-highest estimate being 398. This is a critical issue. We are involved in an intense effort to get agreement

from the Department in getting the staffing numbers down. The Board of Estimate and the Office of Management and Budget will not approve a \$15 million annual increase in the Department's operating budget. The first and second facilities will be turned over before new facilities can be built. As a result, interim arrangements have to be made.

The State has agreed to provide facilities for housing detained women and will house sentenced women for \$15 per day. Fulton has been offered by the Governor. Many people have problems with Fulton. The State is flexible on this question and we are now in the process of looking at other State facilities in the City and would be interested in your recommendations on this subject.

We want to put in new programs and take advantage of no longer being on Rikers Island, i.e., the possibility of Vera putting in a bail office in the facility. There will be an incentive to keep the numbers low because of space limitations.

The second facility to be turned over is ARDC. The adolescents will move into C-71/C-95. The Department of Correction has a list of renovations that would be required in order to move the adolescents to C-95. The State has agreed to pay for the renovations as long as they agree with them. Money will not be as much of a problem as time and staffing. We should have an updated planning document in the next three weeks. We would like to have your input with respect to this document.

Mr. Tufo asked Mrs. Davis about the public's concern with the advantages and disadvantages and cost of going forward with the Rikers Island proposal.

Mrs. Davis stated that it was hard to say what we would spend if the proposal doesn't go through. Our office, OMB, and the Department are trying to agree on some figures. We agree that over the next five years we will have to spend \$160 million to supplement the \$200 million the State would provide if we go ahead, and we agreed, with a lot of difficulty, that we would likely spend \$87 million for capital improvements and a new facility on the White Street site in order to substantially reduce the population at HDM. It is impossible to say what capital costs would occur if the deal does not go through. We are more certain of budgeted costs of new facilities. The current estimate is a bit high, but I think it is wise to have it a bit high. There are people who say we should not spend \$160 million to improve our jail system, and we will hear a lot of that as the weeks go by. There is public concern in Queens that State prisoners are more dangerous than detainees. Those of us who have looked at this problem know that the reverse is true. As we begin to identify sites, we can expect to have communities disturbed about having prisons near them. We are trying to select sites close to the courts and not in residential areas. We cannot afford a \$15 million

operating increase and if those numbers do not go down, the deal might not go through.

Mrs. Singer asked how long before the Tombs would be completed.

Mrs. Davis stated that demolition would start next month and it will be an 18-month project. We are now making design decisions. If a second facility is constructed at the White Street site, the pairing of that facility with the renovated Tombs will lead to some economies. By having the State take women, parole violators, and State readies, we will also save money.

Mrs. Singer asked whether the \$360 million figure included renovating interim facilities.

Mrs. Davis stated this figure did not include renovations of existing facilities but that the issue was still under negotiation.

Mr. Lenefsky asked whether the interim facilities will satisfy minimum standards because "interim" could mean as long as four or five years.

Mrs. Davis replied that their staff is working on the problem and invited Board to participate in the planning process. Agreement has been reached that we do not have to build through the normal City procedures. This will free us from a lot of time-consuming procedures. The new facilities will be constructed through a facilities development corporation.

Mrs. Singer asked how, between now and September 1, the women could be moved into any existing facilities.

Mrs. Davis stated that it was possible that they may not be able to be moved by September. She further stated that a team was going around now to check out possible interim facilities.

Mr. Austin asked what other institutions besides Fulton were being considered.

Mrs. Davis stated that Bayview, Park Side, Edgecombe, Lincoln & Queensboro had been named. She said that Park Side might be good for adolescent females if they could get a grant to establish a program within that facility.

Mr. Tufo asked what kind of Board participation was being asked for.

Mrs. Davis stated that her office would welcome suggestions. You know the facilities better than we do and can anticipate problems we might have with interim sites. We would like to send you our planning reports and ask for your reaction to them.

Mrs. Singer suggested that the Board should be very much involved in this planning process.

Mr. Austin asked whether a decision had been made on the use of dorms v. cells at this point.

Mrs. Davis replied, "No, there are strong arguments on both sides."

Mr. Lenefsky asked if single-celling had been advocated by anyone other than Ken Schoen.

Mrs. Davis stated, "Yes, Ken Schoen had canvassed individuals across country." She further stated that Schoen and Miller were talking about different approaches. Schoen is talking about a system in which people spend very few hours in their rooms.

Mr. Tufo asked Mrs. Davis what her office would be putting before the Board of Estimate for their approval.

Mrs. Davis replied that the lease of the Correctional Institution for Women would be the first item put before them.

Mr. Tufo asked whether the whole transfer would be open to debate.

Mrs. Davis said it would be.

Mr. Tufo stated that the timing of public hearings was important. He said that the Deputy Mayor has agreed that he would not involve himself in any public hearings until he testifies before the Board at its public hearing on the transfer. He also stated that the Board is concerned about the implementation schedule, where the women will be housed, what physical changes will be necessary before we can move them, where mental observation people will be and the changes for C-71/C-95 before adolescents can be moved. He then asked Mrs. Davis when she would know if September 1 was a realistic date.

Mrs. Davis said that the State would most likely be agreeable to a November 1 date.

Mr. Tufo stated that the Board would like to fully participate in planning, site investigation, and new negotiations with the State from this point forward. Mrs. Davis said they were doing preliminary reports, developing selection criteria, and working on a plan to serve as a prototype for all new facilities. We will send you all the reports, and you can give us your thinking about where the facilities should be and what they should look like. The important thing is that we have a letter from the Governor stating that the State will give us 1400 beds, Fulton, and take responsibility for sentenced women.

Mr. Lenefsky asked who Mrs. Davis' office was working with at the State level.

Mrs. Davis answered that they are talking to Ray Wolf from State Budget and that other people will be joining in. At this point, Mrs. Davis left the meeting.

There was a motion to accept the minutes from the May 22 meeting. This motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Mr. Tufo asked if anyone had anything to say about the Board's recent mental health hearings?

Mrs. Singer said that she was very impressed with the audience and that she felt the staff deserved credit for coordinating it so well.

Mr. Lenefsky asked about follow-up to the mental health hearings.

Mr. Tufo stated that future hearings would have to be held on the Rikers Island transfer and that if the Board of Estimate is going to consider the lease in August, we must hold hearings in July. These hearings would include discussion of the impact of the transfer on mental health services. He said that based on what Mrs. Davis has said, if the Board of Estimate waits until after August (since the transfer may not occur until November), we will wait until September or October to hold the hearings.

*Schedule
hearing*

Mrs. Singer stated that the longer we wait the better. What is being considered for women is abhorrent.

Mr. Tufo stated that the date was not up to us. He stated that the Board would have a better chance to have a thorough hearing and fuller participation if the hearing were held in September or later than in the middle of the summer.

Mr. Lenefsky asked when in July the hearing would be.

Mr. Tufo stated the hearing would be held on the 23 or 24 of July.

Mr. Tufo stated that he would talk to Peggy Davis next week about what is going to happen. He asked if any of the members opposed the Date of September 10 if the hearings were not held July 23. There was no opposition.

Mr. Tufo next spoke about the escape of Sean Ryan from ARDC and the disturbance at ARDC. He stated that he had gone to ARDC the Sunday of the disturbance in 1A. There had been fairly total destruction of the dayroom by the inmates. He said he had spoken to two inmates who seemed to be the leaders and they said the disturbance was caused in part because the normal procedures in the institution have been circumscribed and they are angered over increasing pressure put on them by the warden. The warden's attitude is that these inmates are escape risks and the warden said there had been confusion over orders dealing with recreation and religious services that weekend. Mr. Tufo said that the Board should ensure that institutional procedures and minimum standards for inmates in administrative segregation are not withdrawn unless such determinations

are made on an individual basis.

Mr. Smith stated that housing area 1 Upper at ARDC had a similar problem last night.

Mr. Tufo stated that the warden is particularly concerned because of the escape and suicide. He said that in the variance requests, the Department states they are providing more recreation at ARDC than required by the minimum standards. The level of violence and the difficulty the correction staff has in controlling this institution are the rationale for this approach.

Mr. Tufo next spoke about personnel matters. He stated that Judy LaPook would be the new special counsel to the Board. He stated that she had high recommendations from Nick Scoppetta and Stan Lupkin. She will be joining the Board on August 6.

Phil Leshin has agreed to help the Board out with the mental health hearings and Rikers Island hearings on a part-time basis if we can provide consultant funds. Since he left the Department of Correction, Mr. Leshin has set up his own public affairs firm. If the consultancy is approved, it will be for a 6-month period at \$150 per day.

Mr. Lenefsky asked what Mr. Leshin would do.

Mr. Austin replied that Mr. Leshin would assist with the writing and preparations of documents that will come out of the hearings.

Mr. Giordani asked if there were a proposal or contract involved.

Mr. Tufo replied that Phil Leshin would work under the same kind of agreement as Dan Pochoda, Harvey Alter, and Fr. Harrison. He then stated that Harvey Alter is leaving us. "I want to thank him for the hard work he has done on the grievance procedure, putting the field staff together and his work on the public hearings."

Harvey Alter stated that it was a pleasure working for the Board, and he felt that the grievance mechanism had the potential to become a model for other states.

Mr. Tufo asked where the grievance grant stood at this point.

Mr. Alter replied that the Department of Correction must hire a director who will then work with the Board to develop an operational manual. The Department has set up a task force to interview candidates and by August 1 they should have hired a director. It is scheduled to begin in November. George Nicholau from the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution and I met with Bernard Goldstein from the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. They are ready to provide arbitrators.

It will be the first formal grievance mechanism to be set up in a detention system the size of New York City.

Mr. Tufo stated that it was a pleasure to see something grow from where there was nothing. Thank you.

Mr. Tufo stated that Larry Finnegan from the Department of Correction will be here to discuss the variance requests. Clay Hiles from the Prisoners' Rights Project of the Legal Aid Society will also be present.

Mr. Tufo continued, "Larry Finnegan is now General Counsel and responsible for the Conditions of Confinement Unit. He is ready to deal with us on the question of variances."

Mr. Finnegan stated to the Board that his May 22 letter provided the Department of Correction's present position. The variance requests are made not because of negligence but because of matters that were just not predictable. Our May 22 and June 11 letters accurately reflect those standards which we are presently not in a position to meet. We were successful in meeting the recreation standards at ARDC and HDM and consequently other standards have not been met. It is easy to find fault with things that have happened in the past. Nothing has been done with indifference or has been ill-intended.

Mr. Tufo then quoted from Clay Hiles letter of June 28. "As we have previously stated to the Board . . ., the history of the Department's response over the years to the Minimum Standards, as well as to court orders, is that it will move only so fast as it is absolutely required to move."

Mr. Finnegan said he challenged that statement. "We could have done less but have chosen to go beyond the minimum standards in providing recreation at ARDC. We tried to devise the best method for meeting the minimum standards."

Mr. Giordani asked how much time would the Department need to meet the other standards.

Mr. Finnegan replied that the Board of Correction March 1 letter asked for phased implementation. If the correction officers' test is administered in July and not litigated, early in calendar year 1980 would be the earliest that the remainder of the necessary hiring would begin.

Mr. Lenefsky stated that we get notice too late on the hiring delays. There is no reason you can't tell us sooner of your projections on hiring; you also give us variance requests too late.

Mr. Finnegan apologized and said he had only been in this position for five weeks and that it would not happen again.

Mr. Cleary asked what early in 1980 meant?

Mr. Finnegan replied that if everything goes well, we will have people out of the academy by December 1979.

Mr. Giordani asked whether there was anything that is "do-able" short-term?

Mr. Finnegan replied that he has 44 people assigned to HDM and ARDC for minimum standards. Nothing else is do-able until I get more correction officers.

Mr. Tufo stated that the Board was aware of the areas in which the Department has made a strong effort to comply with standards through its staff monitoring. He asked if there were other areas where Mr. Finnegan felt the Department is complying?

Mr. Finnegan answered we are now only developing a tracking system. To date, I have used your documents as my bench mark.

Mr. Lenefsky stated that he found the laundry situation appalling.

Mr. Tufo stated that no one told us the HDM pilot project would be limited to white clothing only. Now you are coming back to us and saying you want to use buckets and clothes lines. This is hard for us to accept.

Mr. Finnegan said, "We agree that this is archaic, but at this time it is the best we can do. Anything requiring prisoners to give up their clothes will not work. Also, it would cost \$2 million to put machines in each housing unit."

Mr. Lenefsky stated, "We feel the Department has taken advantage of our good faith. There is something wrong with this request."

Mr. Finnegan stated that he would respectfully disagree.

Mr. Giordani asked about translating materials for Hispanics.

Mr. Finnegan said that the Department is having great difficulty getting anyone to do a free translation of the minimum standards. Spanish newspapers are now provided in the Bronx. A Spanish-speaking individual in the Queens House is about to be assigned to translate institutional orders and documents.

Mr. Tufo then stated that the Board granted a variance with respect to the optional lock-in section of the standards, which is being openly flouted at the mental health center. We are now being asked to take a 180 degree turn on this issue. Please explain why there was non-compliance with this? It appears there has been no effort do do evaluations and no reasons why in the Rikers Island Mental Health Center people are not being allowed to lock in.

Mr. Austin added that Prison Health Service staff are not allowing people to lock-in within Rikers Island Mental Health Center. They are

simply ignoring the standard. There is a difference in philosophy between Prison Health and the language of the variance that the Board had adopted. He asked if there has been any communication between the Department of Correction and Prison Health Services as to this fact?

Mr. Finnegan indicated that he would ascertain whether this had been communicated to Prison Mental Health Services.

Mr. Tufo then raised the variance request regarding laundry services.

Mr. Lenefsky noted that the Department's performance on the laundry standard could hurt them and that they could not get away with buckets and soap.

Mr. Finnegan stated he didn't disagree, and they would have to go back to the drawing board on the laundry pilot program. Maintenance is a higher expense than the original cost of the machines.

Mr. Tufo stated that "whites only" is a ridiculous system. Inmates must give up their clothes without fear of them not being returned.

Mr. Austin asked whether it was conceivable that additional correction officers might be available as a result of the shift in population from JODC to Spofford.

Mr. Finnegan replied that we might have 27 more. "Conceivable" is a fair word.

Mr. Austin indicated that our staff was aware of several situations in the Bronx House of Detention where they were out of compliance with a particular standard, and Warden Lee was able to bring them into compliance with a little bit of ingenuity. Have other avenues elsewhere (such as using space now used for other purposes) been exhausted? Our staff can assist in this.

Mr. Finnegan said that we are looking for some fat in the current manning formula. Your field staff could play a significant role in doing the same thing. If we (Board of Correction staff included) could find excess manpower, that would be helpful.

Mr. Austin asked about the weekend law library situation at the Correctional Institution for Men. There was a problem due to a conflict in the use of space for adolescent visiting. Couldn't other space be used for that purpose?

Mr. Finnegan replied that there is low usage there. We will take a further look.

Mr. Lenefsky asked when did you learn that the contract for telephone lines at C-76 had not been awarded yet?

Mr. Finnegan replied, "Three days before the memo stating this fact was sent to you."

Mr. Tufo stated, "We were disturbed because we were told in March that a contract had been let."

Mr. Finnegan indicated that the Board's reaction was understandable. At this point, Mr. Finnegan left the meeting.

Mr. Tufo indicated that Mr. Clay Hiles of the Legal Aid Society's Prisoners' Rights Project was present and asked him how they were ascertaining whether the standards were being met?

Mr. Hiles replied that there were two kinds of situations where they know standards are not being met. First, when we get calls from individuals, very often the message regarding standards does not filter down in a timely fashion. Secondly, there are those instances where problems are notorious (laundry and visiting).

Mr. Tufo asked if they were planning legal action.

Mr. Hiles replied that they were gathering specific information and the Board of Correction's May 15 compliance report had been very helpful.

Mr. Tufo stated that, "If we believe we are not being stonewalled and if we have seen reasonable efforts to show that what can be done administratively is being done, then we believe taking the Department of Correction to court would not be helpful."

Mr. Hiles said that anytime you deal with an enormous organization, if they say they can't do it, it is not necessarily true.

Mr. Tufo said that the Board had put pressure on the Department by granting six-month variances, by letting the Department show their good faith." We have a law firm prepared to go forward. Our only alternative is a strong position that overtime be used to comply with the standards and the use of overtime would put them in violation of our own standards and put us in conflict with OMB. It is the one option short of going to court."

Mr. Hiles said that it was difficult for the Board and the Prisoners' Rights Project to second-guess the Department about manning formulas.

At this point, Mr. Hiles left the meeting.

Mr. Tufo stated that the Board should now consider the variances that are the most controversial. First laundry and then optional lock-in.

Mr. Austin said that in effect, the Department is asking for an amendment on the laundry standard. Staff recommends that the Board require the Department to comply with the terms of the standard as it is now written and provide adequate laundry services to all prisoners. The onus should be on the Department. Staff recommends that no further variance be granted and that the Department begin immediately to utilize existing laundry facilities and equipment to provide laundry services to prisoners systemwide. The Department must provide a temporary plan within two weeks and a permanent plan by September 15 for purchasing and installing any additional laundry equipment required to meet the level of prisoner demand for the laundry services required by the standard. We should indicate we do not consider the bucket and lines plan to meet the law of the standard.

Mr. Lenefsky said that this was a good recommendation.

Mr. Cleary stated that we should tell the Department of Correction that before it decides that the present plan would not work and that it is going to reinterpret the standard itself, it should try both methods--decentralized and centralized--and keep records on usage and problems so a rational decision can be made.

Mr. Austin indicated that Fr. Harrison had spoken to inmates at HDM with respect to the experimental laundry program and asked for his findings.

Father Harrison stated that the inmates would prefer to also send their colored clothes but a sound program would have to be established that would convince inmates that they would get their clothing back.

Mr. Tufo stated that a detention institution is different than a sentenced institution with regard to laundry. Clothes might not catch up with a person, but a pilot program would test this.

Mrs. Singer stated that mechanization of the laundry might cost more for repairs and being out of use.

Mr. Tufo stated that this is one of the reasons we made the suggestion for a centralized system.

Fr. Harrison stated that the person on duty can supervise the activity, machines can be locked up, and vandalism can be controlled.

Mr. Austin said that this should be taken up at a meeting with Assistant Commissioner Hommel.

Mr. Tufo asked if there was any objection to staff recommendation that we deny the variance request? A letter should be written about the history of the Department's position, asking that they move forward quickly in establishing a workable system.

Mr. Poses stated that they should go to a manufacturer and tell them what the problems are and ask the company to come up with a solution.

Mr. Tufo said staff recommend a September 15 date. I want to put a very short fuse on this. I would propose that we require the submission of a temporary plan within two weeks and require a permanent plan by September 15, 1979.

The Board unanimously adopted this approach.

The Chairman then raised the optional lock-in issue. Prison Health Services had decided this standard is without merit and will not follow it.

Mr. Austin stated that Ms. Sandy Zarsky of the Mental Health Center would prefer that the presumption of the standard be reversed so that inmates at C-71 are denied optional lock-in.

Mr. Smith said his impression was that they should be able to review the decision within ten days. Traditionally, Prison mental health care has always been denied to inmates, and I don't believe we should be part of that tradition unless otherwise ordered by a psychiatrist or psychologist based on the fact that all inmates in this setting are psychotic or suicidal, and Prison Health Services doesn't have sufficient staff to conduct a ten-day review. In the alternative, she has requested a thirty-day review period.

Mr. Tufo stated that he was concerned about medical and lay opinions on this issue. We have the Miller report which agrees with our variance and Prison Health Services position, which disagrees.

Mr. Austin stated that we are asking Dr. Kellerman to review the procedure and make a recommendation to us as to what proper professional and medical procedures should be. In the interim, we should deny any amendment requests on this. We should write to the Department stating that we are seeking another evaluation and once we have that evaluation, we will go forward with the final amendment decision.

This approach was adopted unanimously by the Board.

Mr. Smith asked if it would be premature to add to the letter that something be done about the sixth floor dorm at the Rikers Island Hospital?

Mr. Tufo said that we should address that to the person who does the evaluation. We are not doctors and should rely on professional medical judgment on this issue.

Mr. Tufo stated that no action is required with respect to the multiple occupancy standard since the Department has not requested a variance extension. With regard to multiple occupancy, the Department is requesting a further six-month delay at the Correctional Institution for Men, with reference to that section of the standard requiring a single bed for each occupant. The stated reason for the request is to permit the hiring of sufficient correction officers to open closed dormitories, where single beds would be available, and since there is no longer a list to hire from, the use of overtime would be required.

Therefore, a variance from this section was granted at the Correctional Institution for Men until November 1, 1979.

The Chairman next raised the variance request on the involuntary lock-in standard.

The Board unanimously adopted staff's recommendation that this compliance with this section be delayed to November 1, 1979, except at the Bronx and Queens Houses of Detention, the Correctional Institution for Men, the Correctional Institution for Women, and the Rikers Island Hospital.

Mr. Tufo stated that on the Department's need to hire additional staff, the progress that the Department has made in hiring must be reviewed before the end of the year.

Regarding recreation at institutions other than Queens, ARDC and HDM, for which a six-month variance has been requested, staff recommends that a variance be granted until November 1, 1979 and that the stipulation contained in the current variance requiring one day of weekend recreation for each prisoner remain in effect.

Mr. Austin stated that the Board cannot backtrack on the current stipulation. While we recognize their staffing problems, the Department should be held to the standard set in September 1978.

This course of action was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Tufo stated that concerning law libraries, staff recommended a two-month variance at Queens. This is the last standard Queens is not in compliance with. In addition, staff asks for time to review the situation at the Correctional Institution for Men so that we can grant another two-month variance while we investigate. I don't feel we should use people to open a library no one uses. Staff recommends a four-month variance at all institutions except Queens and the Correctional Institution for Men.

The recommendations were adopted unanimously.

With regard to the visiting standard, staff recommends a four-month variance, until November 1, 1979, at Brooklyn, HDM and ARDC.

This recommendation was adopted unanimously.

Concerning telephone calls, I feel that we should send a strong letter to the Commissioner regarding this situation. The Department had advised the Board they had contracted to provide the necessary lines at the Correctional Institution for Men by July 1, 1979. They now advise us of a date of December 1, 1979. Staff recommends the variance be extended until December 1, 1979.

This recommendation was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Lenefsky asked about follow-up on the mental health hearing.

Mr. Tufo stated that staff should digest the testimony of the witnesses, their observations and recommendations, note key points of agreement, and make recommendations.

Mr. Austin stated that at Mr. Lenefsky's recommendation, we are meeting with Frank Schneiger, former Director of Prison Health Services. We will also sit down with other mental health professionals and ask for their input.

Mr. Tufo stated that one or more standards on mental health should come out of this. If we don't have hearings, I propose a regular Board meeting on July 23.

There was no opposition to this proposal.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 P.M.