

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

1

1 Public Board Meeting
2 of the Civilian Complaint Review Board
3 Wednesday, March 11, 2015
4 6:41 p.m.
5 Stanley M. Neighborhood Center
6 415 East 93rd Street
7 New York, New York 10128

8 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

9 RICHARD D. EMERY, ESQ., CHAIR

10 MINA Q. MALIK, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

11 Reported by:

12 Danielle Cavanagh

13 PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA:

14 =====

- 15 1. Call to Order
16 2. Adoption of the Minutes
17 3. Report from Chair
18 4. Public Comment
19 5. Report from Executive Director
20 6. Committee Reports
21 7. Old Business
22 8. New Business

23 STENO-KATH REPORTING SERVICES, LTD.
24 139 MAMARONECK AVENUE, MAMARONECK, NEW YORK 10543
25 212.95.DEPOS (953.3767) * 914.381.2061
FACSIMILE: 914.722.0816
E-MAIL: Stenokath@verizon.net

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT WERE:
Richard D. Emery, Esq., Chair
Bishop Mitchell G. Taylor
Joseph A. Puma
Youngik Yoon, Esq.
Daniel M. Gitner, Esq.
Janette Cortes-Gomez, Esq.
Lindsay Eason
Deborah L. Zoland, Esq.
Deborah N. Archer, Esq.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

3

1 CHAIR RICHARD D. EMERY: Let's call the March
2 Meeting of the Civilian Complaint Review Board in to
3 order, in order. We'll start with the adoption of
4 the minutes. Anybody have a motion to adopt the
5 minutes that have been previously distributed?

6 BISHOP MITCHELL G. TAYLOR: So moved.

7 MS. JANETTE CORTES-GOMEZ: Second.

8 CHAIR EMERY: Everybody in favor.

9 (Chorus of Ayes.)

10 CHAIR EMERY: Any opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIR EMERY: So the main order of business
13 tonight for the Commission, other than the normal
14 reports and the statistical information, the only
15 real issue that is of moment, I would say, for us is
16 that we have distributed at the back table and
17 distributed among Board Members for public
18 discussion the very first iteration of proposed new
19 rules which will go through the rulemaking process
20 formalized in the city. So there's nothing final
21 about tonight's discussion. It's the first
22 discussion and we are going to have public
23 commentary after this discussion so that at least
24 the initial impressions of anyone who wants to come
25 up and talk about these rules or anything else at

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

4

1 that point, that there's an opportunity to do so.
2 The draft that you'll see has the changes that we're
3 proposing to discuss. I don't think anybody
4 pretends for a second that there is agreement among
5 Board Members about these rules. There's a lot of
6 debate still to be had. It's an open issue.
7 There's a lot of, I think, relatively controversial
8 things in this proposal. I'm not in favor of all of
9 them myself, as you'll hear during the discussion.
10 And but it's a process and I think we should be
11 going through this process openly with public
12 commentary. And I think those watching on live
13 stream or on video later will then also have an
14 opportunity to participate at the next meeting.

15 After this meeting, presumably we'll have
16 another version of these rules with taking into
17 account the commentary that occurs tonight and
18 considerations that we are all having about these
19 rules. And at the next meeting, I would hope that
20 we could come up with a final set of rules that we
21 propose for the public rulemaking process during
22 which there's also time for amendments and changes
23 and the process that takes place at the formalized
24 City-rulemaking process. But in our own processes
25 here, the idea is to discuss them.

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

5

1 So unless anybody has anything that each of any
2 of you want to say, I would just like to just go
3 through these and talk about, obviously, as Deborah
4 has said -- as Debbie has said, there are a number
5 of drafting issues and other kinds of formal issues,
6 which we will handle before we get to the next
7 iteration of this. But I'm much more interested in
8 having a discussion about substance.

9 So if anybody has anything else to say before we
10 do this, can we launch into this? Are we all set to
11 launch into this a little bit?

12 So the first real substantive matter, as I see,
13 is the standing to file, the definition of people
14 who could be complainants before the Board. That's
15 Section 1-15. If anybody has anything before that,
16 say anything you'd like. Any discussion, any
17 commentary on this attempt to capture I think what
18 the current Board has been doing for some time, any
19 thoughts on it?

20 (No response.)

21 BISHOP TAYLOR: What number are you looking at?

22 CHAIR EMERY: 1-15. It's the third page at the
23 top, standing to file. This is essentially a new
24 section which makes it clear that we are taking
25 complaints from witnesses, we are taking complaints

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

6

1 from family members, we are taking complaints from a
2 victim, an alleged victim, we are taking complaints
3 from legal guardians, and we are also reserving the
4 right to take cases that the Board may believe
5 should be resolved; although, I think the idea is
6 that that's a rare case, it's probably a case we've
7 gotten on a video. And ultimately, whether we would
8 resolve a case without any complainant, any personal
9 complainant, is something that seems to be unlikely.
10 But I think we are reserving to ourselves that
11 possibility.

12 And obviously a lot of this has to be evaluated
13 in the context of the charter, and we're in the
14 process of doing that. Some of the things in this
15 draft may not be consistent with the charter. We've
16 tried to make it consistent with the charter but
17 there may be debate about that. So I know that Dan
18 Gitner had views of this so we can also hold this a
19 bit. He's coming tonight, isn't he?

20 MR. LINDSAY EASON: Yes, he said he will be here.

21 CHAIR EMERY: So are there people who have
22 comments on it before Dan gets here? Otherwise,
23 we'll allow ourselves to go back to it.

24 MS. DEBORAH N. ARCHER: I have a question.

25 CHAIR EMERY: Sure.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

7

1 MS. ARCHER: Can you explain what is meant by
2 "categories of cases"? It says we can take "other
3 cases or categories of cases." An example of the
4 other categories of cases would be helpful.

5 CHAIR EMERY: Well, it's a good question.
6 Anybody, any staff, have an answer to that, Mina or
7 Marcos or others that worked on this? Is Jon here
8 tonight?

9 MS. LINDA SACHS: He's parking.

10 CHAIR EMERY: Oh, okay.

11 MS. ARCHER: I can hold it.

12 CHAIR EMERY: But is there -- it's not
13 necessarily Jon. It may just be a drafting issue.
14 Marcos, do you want to say something about that?

15 MR. MARCOS SOLER: Sure. That is connected to
16 our (inaudible) the jurisdiction. There are right
17 now in some instances in which we connect only if
18 people only -- if people only file a complaint that
19 is within a particular type of case that we keep
20 within our jurisdiction. So there is a type of
21 category of cases, that right now, for instance, they
22 are not within our jurisdiction but we are not

23 (inaudible). So if we consider people should be
24 able to file, then we will do it. So right now, for
25 instance, in some cases there is a divide that we

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

8

1 generally use, for instance, strip search and some
2 instances a cavity search and then who has the
3 standing to file that particular case. That is a
4 category of cases, for example, we have referred.
5 But would be a category of cases we can include and
6 then we would have to define the standing to file a
7 case of that category.

8 CHAIR EMERY: You're saying that -- what would
9 be considered a category of cases, cavity -- I mean,
10 what's the decision between a strip search and
11 cavity search?

12 MR. SOLER: There is a distinction, legal
13 distinction, of what are cavity search numbers and
14 strip search numbers.

15 CHAIR EMERY: Of course, yes.

16 MR. SOLER: Right now the Board is investigating
17 mostly strip searches. Most cavity searches, most
18 cavity searches, are referred to the Police
19 Department. And what I'm trying to suggest is that
20 if there was -- if the Board decided to take cavity
21 searches, for instance, and then we'll have to
22 define who has the standing to file a complaint
23 pertaining to a cavity search.

24 CHAIR EMERY: Okay. So it's an --

25 MR. SOLER: So in some instances it would be --

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

9

1 besides a complainant, obviously, in some instances
2 it might be, for instance, officers who observe
3 interactions of officers from IB or somebody else.

4 CHAIR EMERY: Any other? Joe.

5 MR. JOSEPH PUMA: I mean, it might be self-
6 explanatory and the language might be broad here,
7 but I just wanted to confirm what is meant by the
8 phrase, "or any individual having personal knowledge
9 of alleged officer misconduct." I understand that to
10 include witnesses but I wonder what personal knowledge
11 would mean. Does that person necessarily have to be
12 present? I mean, that's usually the case, right?
13 But that is not always the case.

14 CHAIR EMERY: We take complaints now from people
15 who are not present. So I don't think that's a
16 preclusion. And I think it's trying to capture the
17 broad category of people who complain about
18 something that they may have heard about or heard
19 from a family member about or heard from a friend or
20 read about even. So I think it's just -- what it's
21 trying to convey is that we will take a complaint
22 from virtually anywhere if we think it's appropriate
23 to investigate.

24 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Mr. Chair, just to piggyback
25 on what Commissioner Puma just said. So do you

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

10

1 believe that this would be a restrictive paragraph
2 because it does not allow for those who do not have
3 personal knowledge? So for example, now we may
4 have someone contact CCRB if they see something on
5 television or on a YouTube video. Would this
6 exclude them in this current language as proposed?

7 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think the intent is not to
8 but I think that's a question of interpretation for
9 us. But I think the intent is to include anybody
10 who believes they want to complain about something
11 that they are aware of. And maybe we can say that
12 differently.

13 BISHOP TAYLOR: I guess the word "personal," if
14 you want to just be subjective, if you took out
15 "personal knowledge," just be "knowledge of," and
16 that could be viewing a video or --

17 CHAIR EMERY: And I guess the real issue is do
18 we agree with that? Does that make sense from our
19 point of view?

20 BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, I think historically we
21 have taken complaints. I know we did a case that
22 someone saw abuse on YouTube and they made a
23 complaint and the complaint was fully investigated.
24 So I mean, if this language doesn't preclude that,
25 it actually becomes more inclusionary.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

11

1 CHAIR EMERY: So maybe "personal" is an issue.
2 Anything else on that section?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIR EMERY: The statute of limitations is
5 expired. We give the discretion to the executive
6 director to investigate a complaint even though the
7 statute of limitations is expired and the question
8 is what the criteria is for doing that. And I think
9 the idea is if it's sufficiently important that we
10 should say something about it if we believe it's
11 important enough to do an investigation and reach a
12 conclusion, that notwithstanding the statute of
13 limitations we may well do that, although maybe the
14 recommendation of any discipline if that were the
15 outcome would be moot. It may also be that we would
16 make a recommendation that there would be no
17 discipline when somebody had made -- when the statute
18 of limitations had expired but when somebody had been
19 publicized or somehow held up to -- I mean, I take it
20 we always have a tolling of the statute of
21 limitations when there's a criminal proceeding. So
22 I think this is really one where it's a question of
23 whether because of the high-profile nature of the case
24 there should be an opportunity for there to be a full
25 investigation and a ruling. What would ultimately be

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

12

1 done with that is a good question because I'm not sure
2 it would ever get publicized or the public would ever
3 know about it. But the officer would know.

4 BISHOP TAYLOR: I think the extenuating
5 circumstances might mean, this might be a stretch,
6 but if someone was involved in an altercation with
7 an officer and they were in a coma for a certain
8 period of time and didn't have the personal ability
9 to make a complaint or testify on their own behalf,
10 then we would have to wait until they've been
11 rehabilitated to do such. I'm not sure that would
12 be an 18-month stretch but I think that might be an
13 extenuating circumstance. I think that if we're
14 talking about people particularly filing a complaint
15 18 months after an alleged incident I guess we'd
16 have to really talk about why we would allow that to
17 be reported after the 18 months. Other than being
18 very egregious, was there a fear factor, was there a
19 threat? You know, I guess those were the
20 extenuating -- why someone didn't file a complaint.

21 CHAIR EMERY: I don't think the charter in any
22 way precludes us from taking a complaint outside the
23 statute of limitations. And so I think we're just
24 providing here for that opportunity and --

25 BISHOP TAYLOR: Oh, we can take them after the

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

13

1 SOL?

2 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah. I don't think there's
3 any -- I don't think there's any preclusion to that.

4 BISHOP TAYLOR: So let me ask another question.
5 So does the clock for the SOL start ticking -- does
6 this SOL law apply to the incident or to the
7 handling of the investigation, from the filing of
8 the investigation?

9 CHAIR EMERY: It's the incident date.

10 BISHOP TAYLOR: So the incident date, okay.

11 CHAIR EMERY: Incident date triggers the statute
12 of limitations.

13 MS. ARCHER: I have a question. It might be
14 obvious and I apologize if it is. What is the
15 obligation of officers to participate in an
16 investigation that's happening after the statute of
17 limitations?

18 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think they have to
19 participate in our investigation regardless if we
20 call them down. I mean, we don't have to subpoena
21 officers but we always could.

22 Dan, just, we're going over these proposed
23 rules.

24 MR. DANIEL M. GITNER: Thank you. Sorry I'm
25 late.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

14

1 CHAIR EMERY: So the one thing I know you have
2 thought about and have an interest in is on page 3,
3 1-15, the standing to file. And there's a new rule
4 here which is trying to capture I think what we're
5 doing now and what we have done, and I know that you
6 had made comments in the past and this reserves the
7 right for us to get into cases where somebody
8 reports the fact to us that they've learned about a
9 case third hand or whatever, gives us an open
10 capacity to investigate cases.

11 MR. GITNER: I completely agree with that. I
12 think it's a good change.

13 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I'm sorry. Going back to
14 1-16, the determination as to whether or not to
15 investigate a complaint after the SOL is to be made
16 by the executive director.

17 CHAIR EMERY: Right.

18 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Who then makes a
19 determination as to what, if any --

20 CHAIR EMERY: Result would be?

21 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Result.

22 CHAIR EMERY: It would go to a panel, I presume.

23 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: It would still go to the
24 panel?

25 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah. It would go through the

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

15

1 same process. I mean, I think if that's not clear
2 we can make it clear, but that's certainly what's
3 contemplated here.

4 MR. EASON: The entire board or a panel?

5 CHAIR EMERY: A panel. It would be treated like
6 any other case. I think, if I'm not mistaken, and
7 tell me if you want to talk about anything before
8 this, we'll go to -- what section is it -- it's
9 1-24, conduct of interviews, Section L.

10 MR. GITNER: Before you get to that, on 1-23
11 (D), I just want to make the point, and I think it's
12 important, that the addition of the subpoenas being
13 able to be issued at the discretion of the executive
14 director is a very good change.

15 CHAIR EMERY: Oh, I mean, it's necessary because
16 it happens all the time.

17 MR. GITNER: Should've been changed a decade
18 ago. I just wanted to comment that I think that's a
19 very good thing.

20 CHAIR EMERY: I think it's very important
21 because it should be routine when there's any
22 resistance to us getting a video or getting
23 documents or getting witness statements or whatever
24 it is.

25 MR. GITNER: Absolutely.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

16

1 CHAIR EMERY: The next one is actually, and I'm
2 looking at L of 1-24. Let me say what we're trying
3 to do here because I think it's important to
4 understand this. And there's been a good deal of
5 controversy among the unions and the Police
6 Department about this. And what we've tried to
7 suggest here, and in -- where's the second section
8 where we do it with the police officer? Is it also
9 in this section?

10 MR. GITNER: D. There is something in 1-24(D)
11 that's read to the police officer, on the prior
12 page.

13 CHAIR EMERY: Right. Okay. So what we're
14 trying to do here in D and L, and this is, I think,
15 something --

16 MS. DEBORAH ZOLAND: D already exist.

17 CHAIR EMERY: You're right. I understand. But
18 D and L -- and this probably has to be tinkered with
19 and there has to be some work on this -- is we're
20 trying to create a parallel circumstance for the
21 police officer and the complainant to incentivize
22 truth-telling and deter lying. And even to the
23 point of having potentially, hopefully rarely if
24 ever, but potentially some consequences to lying to
25 our investigators when either complainants or police

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

17

1 officers are interviewed. And the theory here is
2 that currently police officers are told, as you can
3 see in D, that if they do not tell the truth, they
4 are subject to patrol guide consequences which
5 include loss of job potentially or serious
6 discipline and that the statements can be used
7 against you in subsequent criminal proceedings if
8 they are -- they can't be used against them in
9 criminal proceedings but they can be used as
10 impeachment and the like, the classic situation.
11 But --

12 MR GITNER: But part of the problem is
13 actually -- I was reading this the other night -- it
14 actually says, "If you answer, neither your
15 statements nor any information or evidence gained by
16 reason of such statements can be used against you in
17 any subsequent criminal proceedings." I'm not sure
18 that's accurate.

19 CHAIR EMERY: You can use that as impeachment.

20 MR. GITNER: Yeah. I actually think -- but by
21 reading it to the officer, I think it becomes
22 accurate. So it would actually does not have the --
23 your point is you want to make, have a deterrence to
24 lying, which of course we all want. If the officer
25 does take the stand in a subsequent criminal

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

18

1 proceeding, I think typically absent that warning,
2 he could be crossed on inconsistencies between the
3 CCRB testimony and the criminal testimony.

4 CHAIR EMERY: Right. And you're saying with
5 this warning he couldn't be crossed.

6 MR. GITNER: I think there's a good argument
7 that with this warning he couldn't be crossed,
8 absolutely, because it's a promise made by a city
9 agency.

10 CHAIR EMERY: Right. And what should be the
11 situation?

12 MR. GITNER: I don't know. That's why we have a
13 law professor on the Board and why the ACLU sits
14 here and tells us when we're doing things wrong. I
15 don't know. But I think typically under a typical
16 situation probably they can be crossed. There's
17 also the question --

18 CHAIR EMERY: A queen for a day would always
19 give a --

20 MR. GITNER: Even under a queen-for-a-day
21 agreement you're not immunizing someone for being
22 cross-examined properly for inconsistent impeachment
23 material. So this seems to be broader than that.

24 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah. And I'm not sure we can
25 grant this immunity as currently stated. I think

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

19

1 both these statements need a good deal of work and I
2 think it's something we have to really talk about
3 carefully. And quite frankly, we have Brian

4 Krist and Lindsey Flook here, have written a memo --
5 oh, no, I guess Roger and Brian have written a memo
6 to us which we're thinking about working on about the
7 question of what criminal statutes are implicated by
8 lying in the context of these interviews, both for
9 complainants and for police officers. And it's
10 probably a low-level perjury as well as ascribing to
11 a false statement. Those are the matters which we are
13 exploring in this area.

14 But I think the whole point here is to change
15 these introductions to the interview process so that
16 the warnings include the potential consequences.
17 And there's more work to be done on this but I think
18 introducing the subject here tonight is for each of
19 us to consider and have the public consider what
20 this means. I know that there's people who will say
21 quite convincingly that whenever you put something
22 like this in a complainant's introduction, you're
23 deterring legitimate complainants from coming
24 forward because they will fear the possibility, even
25 though they're telling the absolute truth, of some

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

20

1 kind of prosecution or some kind of consequences.
2 And so we have to weigh this. It's not clear to me
3 what the right balance is here but I do think that
4 if complainants come to us and plainly lie, they
5 should be told that there are potential consequences
6 to that. And I do think that police officers need
7 to be told that there are more consequences to lying
8 than just what might happen because they gave a
9 false statement as a result of that false statement
10 at the Police Department.

11 So this is an interesting sensitive matter which
12 I'm hopeful that all of you will consider and
13 comment on so that when we come back with another
14 draft, we can discuss it more fully because I don't
15 think it's simple.

16 Anybody have thoughts on this? Bishop.

17 BISHOP TAYLOR: When you say that it would be a
18 low-level perjury for giving false statement, what
19 does that actually mean to a complainant?

20 CHAIR EMERY: An A misdemeanor.

21 BISHOP TAYLOR: What does that mean
22 pragmatically? What is that?

23 CHAIR EMERY: An A misdemeanor.

24 BISHOP TAYLOR: An A misdemeanor?

25 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah. It's a serious criminal

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

21

1 offense but it's not a felony. And it's not even
2 clear exactly what qualifies and that's what we're
3 concerned about. Because generally speaking, you
4 have to be under oath, you have to be sworn, you
5 have to have a person qualified to give an oath in
6 order to trigger a perjury. And that's true if
7 somebody takes an oath. Right now, the officers
8 don't take oaths. They're just told what the
9 consequences may be.

10 BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, let me ask another way
11 then to that point. So if the process was that
12 before an investigation that there would be an oath
13 given by the complainant and the officer, would that
14 kind of preclude some of this indemnity that we're
15 offering, it would just naturally organically happen
16 if it was discovered?

17 CHAIR EMERY: It would, but I would think -- I
18 would be in favor of warning people what it would
19 mean potentially to violate that.

20 BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, when you go to court, they
21 say, I want to remind you that you're under oath
22 and, you know, dah-dah-dah-dah. So I think that
23 statement in itself kind of triggers, you know, a
24 truth serum, if I can use that.

25 CHAIR EMERY: I think it does, and I think we

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

22

1 should have -- I mean, regrettably, nothing that
2 involves an interview at the CCRB is that formal or
3 that -- it doesn't have all the bells and whistles
4 like the court. But I do think that making it clear
5 what the potential consequences are is something
6 that we should debate. I don't know what I think
7 about the ultimate result because I think it's a
8 subtle problem and there are a lot of consequences
9 to it which we have not yet assessed or thought
10 through. But I do think the current situation is
11 probably inadequate.

12 BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, I think there's an upside
13 too because we do have some chronic CCRB
14 complainants that always file CCRB complaints. Some
15 of them -- some of that is connected to a lot of
16 different things. But if a person is a chronic
17 complainant and it's always found that there's no
18 basis to the complaint, you know, and if there's a
19 notation that in that series there was some false
20 statements made in previous complaints by that
21 complainant, then that could shape the investigation
22 or the determination of the panel's decision, I
23 think.

24 CHAIR EMERY: Well, it certainly does that but I
25 think it would do more if the threat would be, don't

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

23

1 make these false complaints. The fear is of course
2 that if you threaten that, are you deterring
3 legitimate complaints. And that's the balance. I
4 think it's tricky. I know in the judicial
5 commission there has been the determination that the
6 complainants -- it's not they aren't sworn. I think
7 they are. But nobody's ever going to prefer them
8 for a perjury prosecution because we don't want to
9 deter legitimate complaints. So there's a lot of
10 discretion here. And similarly, with the officers,
11 I don't think telling them that the patrol guy tells
12 them they have to tell the truth is really adequate
13 for our purposes.

14 MS. ZOLAND: I think with police officers it's
15 different because they don't have a right to not
16 talk. So it's a compelled statement. So it's not
17 under oath but it's a compelled statement so that
18 their consequence is administrative if they must
19 talk or they'll be brought up on charges, they must
20 tell the truth or they'll be brought up on charges
21 for that. But those statements are compelled and
22 they're not allowed to exercise their Fifth
23 Amendment rights and, therefore, they are subject to
24 immunity from criminal prosecution. So it's a
25 different analysis.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

24

1 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think there's -- that's
2 a good question and I don't know the answer. And
3 that's something that I think should be answered in
4 the Krist-Smith analysis of this, which is I think
5 they're definitely immunized for criminal
6 prosecution for the subject matters of what they
7 talk about. I don't think they're immunized for
8 perjuring themselves in their statements.

9 MS. ZOLAND: No, I think they can be brought up
10 on charges. I'm not sure --

11 MR. GITNER: They're not under oath so there is
12 no perjury.

13 CHAIR EMERY: I'm just saying if we put them under
14 oath, which --

15 MS. ZOLAND: I don't think as a matter of label
16 that we could put them under oath. It's
17 a bargaining issue.

18 MR. GITNER: Exactly. They're compelled to show
19 up and answer questions. And so compelling someone
20 to go under oath is a whole different issue. I'd
21 also --

22 CHAIR EMERY: Well, that's an interesting
23 question.

24 MR. GITNER: And the other issue is just more
25 from a practical point of view as opposed to a legal

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

25

1 point of view, questioning somebody under oath, in
2 my experience, changes the nature of the interview
3 and it changes -- it makes it a more formal
4 interview and it will by necessity change the way
5 the CCRB gathers information from police officers.
6 And without exploring whether that's a good thing or
7 a bad thing, I don't know whether that would be a
8 good thing or a bad thing.

9 CHAIR EMERY: And what about complainants?

10 MR. GITNER: Exactly the same. Your point
11 earlier, simply by saying, You know you're under
12 oath, right, changes the way somebody might talk to
13 you, particularly a complainant who's walking in off
14 the street.

15 CHAIR EMERY: But you know now when complainants
16 give a statement they verify it with a statement
17 that says -- they verify it, it's actually verified.

18 MR. GITNER: Right. We can't proceed unless
19 they do.

20 CHAIR EMERY: Excuse me?

21 MR. GITNER: We can't proceed unless they do.

22 CHAIR EMERY: Right. And they have to verify
23 every complaint and they have to swear that what
24 they're saying is true. So I think they are
25 virtually under oath since they're in front of a

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

26

1 commissioner of deeds. I don't know why we don't
2 have notaries. We seem to have commissioner of
3 deeds but not notaries, which is fascinating. I
4 never met a commissioner of deeds before.

5 MS. MALIK: They're specific to New York City,
6 commissioner of deeds, whereas notaries are
7 statewide.

8 CHAIR EMERY: They have to get renewed every
9 year instead of every four years which is silly. In
10 any event, that's an administrative matter. But
11 they are authorized to take oath and swear people.
12 And so my question is, aren't these people in that
13 situation right now? And that's -- so, look, I
14 don't think we have to solve it tonight. But it's a
15 tricky problem that I think this Board has to
16 wrestle with and figure out where we want to come
17 out for the integrity of these investigations and
18 these interviews. It's not simple.

19 MR. GITNER: Well, isn't it the case though that
20 a police officer is compelled to come and talk and
21 he's not under oath, right?

22 CHAIR EMERY: Yes.

23 MR. GITNER: And if he or she faces
24 administrative sanctions if it's determined by the
25 Police Department that there was purposeful

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

27

1 misleading statements or untruths, right?

2 CHAIR EMERY: Or that the things they say
3 constitute misconduct.

4 MR. GITNER: Correct. And isn't it the case
5 that if we really wanted to take under-oath
6 testimony we have subpoena power and you could
7 subpoena that officer and put him or her under oath?
8 And so if you really felt that in a particular case
9 under-oath testimony from an officer was necessary,
10 you could, rather than go through the administrative
11 compulsion process, you could subpoena the officer
12 and put him or her under oath. So you have both
13 options right now, right, or am I misunderstanding
14 the process?

15 CHAIR EMERY: I don't know that just because you
16 subpoena an officer means that have to appear and
17 testify. They don't have to be under oath.

18 MR. GITNER: Well, there's -- I think that the
19 subpoena power, not to produce documents but the
20 subpoena to testify, would require an under-oath
21 testimony, as I understand it. It wouldn't
22 necessarily mean they'd be compelled by their job to
23 show up, but they'd be compelled by whatever powers
24 of the subpoena required them to show up.

25 MS. ZOLAND: Then they can assert their Fifth

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

28

1 Amendment rights against testimony.

2 MR. GITNER: Exactly. If they wish to, they
3 could assert.

4 CHAIR EMERY: And that's the question. I'm not
5 so sure that if somebody's compelled in the
6 employment context they are precluded from being
7 under oath. You may be right about that, Deborah,
8 but I don't know the answer.

9 MS. ZOLAND: I think that DOI had tried it some
10 years ago and it never came into fruition. So I'm
11 not sure why. I just don't recall. We'll have to
12 do some looking into it.

13 CHAIR EMERY: So I just wanted to flag this
14 whole issue because it has been actually a debated
15 issue between the unions and the Police Department
16 and our office and there's no -- there's been no I
17 would say balance or satisfactory resolution and I
18 think we should come to a position as a board as to
19 how our agency should operate in the context of
20 taking these interviews.

21 Now, 1-31 is actually very interesting. And I
22 got to thank Marcos for reading the charter as it
23 always should've been read and how it has been
24 consistently misread by this Board and by the CCRB,
25 by the CCRB as an agency. What's fascinating is we

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

29

1 do not need to have panels with police appointees on
2 each panel. The language of the charter simply
3 mandates that no panel can have members from one
4 appointee. So we can distribute this work a little
5 bit more evenly in the future and not be hamstrung
6 by the fact that poor Debbie and Lindsay who are
7 missing a third member have to do more than double
8 duty. And it also allows something that I've wanted
9 to do very much, which is sit with other members of
10 my appointing authority, mainly Dan and Deborah and
11 so forth. So what this is a proposal to do is do
12 random appointments of panels which we're doing now
13 but not limited so that there's an appointee of each
14 appointing authority on each panel. We can, as long
15 as we have one person on a panel that's from another
16 appointing authority than the other two, under the
17 charter, it's legitimate and proper, and that this
18 rule captures that proposal.

19 MS. ZOLAND: I think we'd have to discuss that
20 further. I think it's wise to have a Police
21 Department appointee on each panel.

22 CHAIR EMERY: It's desirable. But the fact is
23 that we've been saddled with the proposition that we
24 have to get all these cases done with only three
25 Police Commissioner appointees and we've had two of

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

30

1 them for about six months or eight months. It's
2 just happened that way and it has hamstrung the
3 process. And so I just -- and I also think that the
4 collegiality of this board is such that there's -- I
5 mean, we can look at it. We can look at the
6 results. But I bet you there's no difference
7 between the resolutions and recommendations of the
8 Police Commissioner appointees compared to other
9 appointees.

10 MR. GITNER: But it is the case that the Police
11 Department appointees provide, through my
12 experience, invaluable measure of experience of how
13 to understand --

14 CHAIR EMERY: I thought you were the one that's
15 invaluable.

16 MR. GITNER: I mean, I found personally that not
17 having personally been in these kinds of encounters
18 other than getting a speeding ticket, by
19 understanding the Police Department appointees'
20 views and experience has been enormously valuable.
21 So for me at least, I fully appreciate the desire to
22 move things along. And I think you're right to try
23 to mix things up to do that but I'm a little
24 hesitant to personally without thinking about it
25 more to say that panels would be as good at their

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

31

1 analysis without a Police Department appointee.

2 MR. EASON: I believe this has to be approached
3 in terms of the panel consistency the same way we
4 took a delicate approach to the police officer
5 testifying and the complaining victim testifying.
6 It has to be weighed extremely seriously so we can
7 be fair, to being fair, to the process, you know,
8 the police officer and the complainant. I think the
9 same mindset has to be approached with the
10 determination to not have a police representative on
11 a panel to ensure that from the perspective that Dan
12 just mentioned, that if there's an opportunity, I'm
13 sure it can be delayed if it can't be decided, you
14 know, put it off for further investigation, you
15 know, to ensure that the police officer's getting a
16 fair --

17 CHAIR EMERY: See, the thing is, I mean, look, I
18 understand it and I think the issue that Dan raises
19 about the experience of the police officer -- Police
20 Commissioner appointees is a very important one. I
21 would like to look at the numbers. I would like to
22 see what a series of random panels would look like
23 and how many as a practical matter would really
24 exist without -- I can't do the statistics in my
25 head -- how many would really exist without a PC

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

32

1 member, assuming we had three PC members, which I
2 think we're going to have pretty soon. But -- and
3 then make a decision, all of us, make a decision
4 about this. I mean, I think the presumption should
5 always be that there's a PC member on a panel. But,
6 you know, there could be panels with two PC members
7 too. That could happen also under this arrangement.
8 If you did random selection, that could happen too.
9 So I mean, the key phrase here is random selection
10 and I think that this is -- when I came to this
11 place in July, the first thing I did was make random
12 selection because it's the chair's authority to make
13 panels. And quite frankly, I think it's been
14 essential and I think it's been really healthy and
15 I've loved serving with different people on
16 different panels to make decisions and I would like
17 to continue that. I would like to expand it so I
18 get to serve with people from my same appointing
19 authority occasionally once in a while. Bishop.

20 BISHOP TAYLOR: I think there's a larger
21 question looming. If -- you know, I see both sides
22 because the value of a police appointee
23 participating in the panel is immeasurable in a lot
24 of the cases; however, if you really want to attack
25 that and address that in an equitable way and still

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

33

1 be able to glean from the experience of someone that
2 has been on the job, maybe the board composition
3 needs to be challenged. Why should there be ten
4 City Council people and two -- if there's in fact a
5 move to create some equity with that, why can't
6 there be an equal amount of appointees from the
7 different appointing agencies?

8 CHAIR EMERY: There was a legislative decision
9 that goes back to the 1990s that this is the
10 composition of this board. And we could make
11 proposals. And if as a board we decided we want to
12 make legislative proposals, we can do that.

13 BISHOP TAYLOR: I think that really begs an
14 answer, because if you really think about equity,
15 you think about the contribution of someone that's
16 on the job that can help fill in some of the
17 pragmatic points that happen in field. I think that
18 would go a long way. Maybe we should reach for that
19 or either strive to look to equalize that.

20 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think that's perfectly
21 legitimate if that's the Board's view. I personally
22 think that -- so far my perception has been that
23 there's been no lesser sense of accountability for
24 officers from the police members of my -- Lindsay --
25 and even before, with some of the police members

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

34

1 that have retired, were more demanding of discipline
2 than any of their fellow panel members.

3 MS. ZOLAND: Are you proposing that you look to
4 the panels to see if there's a difference, like there
5 is a two to one vote, or if a Police Department
6 appointee has been overruled?

7 CHAIR EMERY: I just --

8 MS. ZOLAND: I'm not sure what you're proposing
9 statistically.

10 CHAIR EMERY: Fair enough. Fair enough. I
11 would -- and I don't think we have to do this
12 overnight but I would think Marcos -- Marcos has had
13 in the past an analysis of how panels have operated.
14 And I think we could apply that and we'll find it
15 any way. If you want to work on this, I'd be happy
16 to have you kind of figure out how we would analyze
17 it. But I think there are ways of analyzing by vote
18 and types of cases, and you could put categories of
19 cases together, how various people are inclined to
20 vote on this Board. And you can put the categories
21 in together as police appointees and mayoral
22 appointees and City Council appointees and see if
23 there's any statistical meaningfulness as to the
24 origin of the appointment. My guess is there will
25 be none in this current board certainly and probably

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

35

1 over the past many years I bet there have been
2 statistical differences which are marked between
3 those fixed panels that used to exist. There I
4 think there were real issues about certain panels
5 favoring certain kinds of cases and certain panels
6 being harder on some cases and types of cases than
7 others and there was a lack of coordination between
8 panels in the agency. Because of the randomness of
9 what we currently do, I don't think that exists
10 anymore.

11 MS. ZOLAND: I think random is excellent. I just
12 think there's a value for a Police Department vote
13 and I'd be curious to see. In the two panels I've been
14 on so far, maybe because I'm new I see a difference.
15 But I have only been on two panels.

16 CHAIR EMERY: Well, let's investigate it because
17 I don't think we have to. But the point is, all I'm
18 saying is, we aren't constrained in the way we all
19 thought we were constrained.

20 MS. ARCHER: Can I make a quick comment?

21 CHAIR EMERY: Please do.

22 MS. ARCHER: I agree that there may be an issue
23 of having the value of the experience they bring to
24 the panel. But a couple of times I heard the word
25 fairness and I want to make sure that we not give

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

36

1 any indication that a panel that wouldn't have a
2 Police Commissioner appointee would be unfair or
3 that folks who are other categories cannot be fair.

4 CHAIR EMERY: Well, in fact, I think that's what
5 we could show if we analyze it. I think the
6 analysis would show that there's no difference
7 whether a Police Commissioner member is on a panel
8 or not, the outcomes in particular types of cases.
9 I mean, to the extent you can show statistics,
10 obviously there's individualized factors.

11 Joe, you want to say something?

12 MR. PUMA: I have something on something we
13 skipped over, so whenever --

14 CHAIR EMERY: Anything more on this for the time
15 being?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIR EMERY: Okay.

18 MR. PUMA: I just wanted to jump back to 1-24,
19 Sub (L), which is also new. It talks about the
20 statement that needs to be read at the commencement
21 of a civilian or witness interview.

22 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah, that what we were -- I was
23 trying to raise that issue by creating the
24 parallelism. But you have something specific?

25 MR. PUMA: There's a sentence here saying that,

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

37

1 "This interview is taking place at the CCRB." And I
2 just would remind us all that we also have
3 interviews, conduct interviews, at other sites,
4 off-site interviews, such as ones that take place at
5 Rikers Island and our CCRB in the Boroughs program
6 that we're trying to launch, and also there are
7 interviews that take place over the phone. So that
8 would just need to be adjusted.

9 CHAIR EMERY: Okay. Good point. And then now
10 there's the next one which is I think relatively
11 controversial, which is on the next page. It's
12 1-33, Sub (5). And this is the addition of a result
13 of a panel ruling, a non-sanction, if you will, which
14 is being proposed here as good faith error. "The
15 acts alleged did occur but were the result of
16 inexperience, requiring training and/or instructions,
17 and committed in good faith," as opposed to
18 instructions. I personally am against this but other
19 people have mentioned this in the past.

20 MR. GITNER: I think this is probably the result
21 of something I did in the panel.

22 CHAIR EMERY: See, there you are.

23 MR. GITNER: I actually think that there are, in
24 not significant number of cases, where panel
25 might find that an officer did not act perfectly but

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

38

1 that the officer's actions were not the result of
2 bad faith, that the officer was trying to do the
3 right thing and just in the heat of the moment, for
4 whatever reason, didn't act perfectly. And in those
5 circumstances, there are times when it's hard to say
6 that that officer on certain facts committed
7 misconduct. But it's also hard to say unsub
8 nothing wrong occurred. I personally think that --
9 I'm not sure it should be called good faith error.
10 That wasn't my terminology. But I think that there
11 should at least be a band of cases where you could
12 unsubstantiate certain allegations and either impose
13 without opposition from the Police Department or
14 request training or instructions so that the officer
15 learns from what might be a good faith mistake. In
16 situations where there's a good faith mistake that
17 doesn't necessarily mean that the officer, in every
18 situation, there should be a substantiated
19 allegation. Under FADO, the A is abuse of power --
20 abuse of authority. Making a mistake isn't always
21 an abuse of authority even if it's experienced that
22 way by the complainant. There has to, I think, be
23 in some situations a middle ground. So that's
24 probably the result of a particular panel case I'm
25 thinking of recently that probably made its way in

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

39

1 here from that.

2 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think you've also
3 mentioned it and the reason it's in here is because
4 it's been discussed and I think you were part of
5 that discussion in the past. And I certainly think
6 it's worth debating. My worry is that this
7 so-called narrow category will swallow the
8 instruction rule and that instructions will very
9 rarely occur, and I think instructions are in some
10 ways one of the most valuable things we recommend,
11 especially now that they're often formalized and
12 people go to --

13 MR. GITNER: But this would require
14 instructions.

15 CHAIR EMERY: Well, yeah, I understand. But I
16 do think that instructions without any teeth at all
17 -- I guess my question is what the charter says.
18 Doesn't the charter -- we have to look at this to
19 make sure that the charter allows for this. And I
20 think it does allow for it but I'm not sure about
21 that. That's an interesting question. Deborah.

22 MS. ARCHER: I am uncomfortable with this.

23 CHAIR EMERY: You are comfortable?

24 MS. ARCHER: I am uncomfortable. One of the
25 reasons is what you mentioned. And I think

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

40

1 substantiating with instructions should cover most
2 of it. But also to me, if you're putting a separate
3 category for people who acted in good faith, it kind
4 of forces us to read into the other categories or
5 requirement proving intent, that they intended to
6 violate someone's rights, they intended to have the
7 consequences. And I don't think that's appropriate
8 to read into, the other categories of FADO.

9 MR. GITNER: I just disagree. I don't think it
10 does that at all. I think that there are clearly
11 cases where officers screw up but they were in good
12 faith. There are plenty of cases where they're
13 trying to do the right thing or they just didn't
14 know that they were allowed to do the strip search
15 then or they didn't know they weren't allowed to
16 search this vehicle at that time, either because
17 they've been on the job for a year or for whatever
18 reason. There are these cases. And the question is
19 whether or not in those circumstances should you
20 substantiate a finding of abuse of authority.
21 Maybe. Maybe not. But right now, we're not allowed
22 to say, Okay, you made a mistake, you didn't
23 purposefully abuse your authority, it wasn't in bad
24 faith. But at the same time, there's got to be some
25 consequence to the mistake.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

41

1 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I disagree.

2 CHAIR EMERY: Your example to me -- sorry, I'll
3 be very short. Your example to me actually paints
4 it very starkly as to why I'm against it because
5 when you say somebody was strip searched and the guy
6 didn't understand what the rule was and he did it
7 totally in good faith, what do you say to the victim
8 of that? I mean, how do you justify it later? You
9 write a letter to the victim saying, We found a good
10 faith error on the part of the officer? I have a
11 lot of difficulty with that. I think somebody that
12 gets strip searched and there's no basis for it or
13 there's an improper basis for it and the cop made a
14 mistake, it's perfectly appropriate to send that cop
15 for instruction at least.

16 MR. GITNER: But I'm not saying he shouldn't be
17 sent for instructions.

18 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I understand. But I'm
19 saying --

20 MR. GITNER: He absolutely should be sent for
21 instructions.

22 CHAIR EMERY: But I think there's a --

23 MR. GITNER: But that doesn't mean you should
24 also say -- I'm not saying in every case. Let's be
25 very, very clear. I view this as a very narrow band

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

42

1 of cases, so I want to be clear about that. But it
2 doesn't mean that in every case there should be a
3 finding of abuse of authority. There has been, in
4 my experience, there has been a narrow band of cases
5 where it's, in my view, very difficult to make a
6 decision. And I think that my fellow panel members
7 in those cases have found exactly the same
8 difficulties. I don't think I'm alone. And this
9 would allow for -- I'm not going to call it
10 compromise because I don't think it is, but I think
11 it allows for in those small areas -- I don't think
12 it will (inaudible) anything -- the proper result,
13 which is the guys got to go to instructions. In
14 those narrow band of cases, there is the threat or
15 possibility that the panel would decide this isn't a
16 substantiated allegation because it wasn't abusive,
17 and then there would be on instructions. What I'm
18 trying to say is that in those circumstances, that
19 guy should still get instructions.

20 MS. ZOLAND: I was thinking that maybe you could
21 have your staff, whoever's doing research, research
22 good faith exceptions for the search warrant in
23 federal court. They allow good faith exceptions
24 when a search warrant is executed wrongfully. We
25 can make do a comparison between those analyses and

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

43

1 what we have here as maybe some kind of road map.

2 MR. GITNER: It's a similar analysis.

3 MR. EASON: Each case will still be judged on
4 its merit of the case. We're not asking for any
5 exception. And the officer would still receive
6 instructions or formalized instructions but there
7 may be a gray area there where if the panel, and
8 taking into account the victims, the complaining
9 victims also, what they're going to be told, but if
10 there's a gray area there where if the panel agrees
11 that the officer, you know, under those
12 circumstances was acting in good faith for whatever
13 reason, you know. So he's not going to walk away
14 scot-free with no attention.

15 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: See, and maybe I have to
16 think about it a little more. But for example, if
17 you have an individual who is driving 30 miles an
18 hour right after it was changed to 25 miles an hour,
19 is a police officer pulling that person going to
20 think the same way, the person driving 30 miles an
21 mistakenly didn't know that it was 25 miles an hour
22 now. Do I give a ticket or not? To me, he's guilty
23 of driving 30 miles an hour instead of 25, so the
24 officer can give a warning instead of a ticket,
25 whereas in these cases, I believe for the most part,

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

44

1 all the panels I've been on, we give instructions
2 instead of charges. It happened, it was wrong, so
3 instead of saying charges or command discipline,
4 we'll do instructions. I think giving this extra
5 category may open a can of worms.

6 MR. EASON: We're talking about something less
7 punitive. We're not talking about substantiated,
8 unsub. We're talking about something less punitive,
9 instructions or formalized instructions, you know,
10 for the officer.

11 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: But the result will end up
12 being the same, we agree that instructions in that
13 specific case are warranted.

14 MR. EASON: That's what Dan is saying.

15 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: But you're not saying that it
16 was substantiated.

17 MS. ZOLAND: But I think the difference is the
18 motorist has a ticket on their record or they don't.
19 Here, the police officer would have a substantiated
20 Civilian Complaint Review Board complaint or they
21 won't.

22 MR. GITNER: Exactly.

23 MS. ZOLAND: So there is a major difference in
24 the outcome. They officer may learn and never do it
25 again and he or she would be instructed. The

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

45

1 question is the motorist has a ticket on the record
2 and the officer has a substantiated complaint on his
3 or her record. And I think what Dan,
4 Commissioner Gitner, is saying is that sometimes
5 they don't deserve that substantiated complaint on
6 their record when the instructions are just good
7 enough.

8 MR. GITNER: It's that, plus, sometimes when a
9 panel might otherwise decide to unsub a case, it's
10 better if the officer also gets instructions or
11 training. And in the circumstances right now, if we
12 unsub, that officer never gets instructions or
13 training. So it hits it from both sides, both --
14 whether or not the officer deserves quote/unquote
15 the substantiated finding on his or her record and
16 you create a situation where you can increase the
17 types of cases in which training or instructions are
18 given.

19 MS. ZOLAND: Which raised the issue of
20 unsubstantiated with training as a category which we
21 don't now use.

22 MR. GITNER: Right. It's basically unsub with
23 training or unsub with instructions.

24 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: See, that I would not object
25 to. The unsubstantiated with training, I would not

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

46

1 object to.

2 MR. GITNER: That's what I would've called it.

3 CHAIR EMERY: I myself, I don't know. That's an
4 interesting question. That raises it -- it's harder
5 for me than good faith error.

6 But, so Joe, you wanted to --

7 MR. PUMA: Right. So I've heard the arguments
8 before about this type of recommendation. I was on
9 the panel that Dan is talking about. And I thought
10 about it more and I certainly oppose good faith
11 error as a term. I think it's -- I agree with lots
12 of the arguments that have been made already. I
13 think there's a risk of eroding the definition of
14 substantiated and unsubstantiated. There is
15 possibly like unintended consequences with any
16 further litigation than the complainant might want
17 to pursue because the Civilian Complaint Review
18 Board has found that the complaint resulted in the
19 recommendation of a good faith error, a disposition
20 of good faith error. And I think there's also -- we
21 have to also think about the opposite of that term,
22 good faith, and any sort of kind of -- so that the
23 shadow side of good faith is bad faith. So I
24 wonder, it may be implying other things about
25 other -- the officer's intent in substantiated cases

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

47

1 that may not be warranted. I think there are
2 certain encroachments and violations that just
3 don't -- that they're serious enough and it doesn't
4 really matter what the intent of the officer was.

5 MR. GITNER: The way I would have done this is I
6 would just, rather than have Category 5 as drafted
7 here, I would just change this so that a penalty of
8 instructions or training could be recommended with
9 any finding including one of unsub. So I wouldn't
10 have done it this way. I would just say, look, you
11 can recommend instructions or training at the same
12 time as charges. You can recommend instructions or
13 training at any time with any finding and in
14 conjunction with any other penalty. And frankly, I
15 think the Police Department, we should engage with
16 the Police Department, where we do recommend
17 instructions or training it should in every
18 circumstance, at least with instructions, be
19 listened to because it's such an easy thing for the
20 Police Department to do.

21 That's the way I would have done this. I think
22 that this particular language comes out of the facts
23 of a particular case that we discussed possibly with
24 somebody who was helping draft this. But the
25 broader way I think about this is just to allow

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

48

1 instructions with any particular finding by a panel.

2 MS. ARCHER: I think that's better. I don't
3 have the same concerns if it's formulated that way.

4 CHAIR EMERY: Well, look, so let's table this
5 for the moment. Mina, I think we should look at the
6 arrest, the search warrant, good faith issue. I
7 think we should think about redrafting this at least
8 for discussion purposes as the discussion has
9 evolved. And we should also make sure we check the
10 charter because I have some recollections in the
11 charter of the types of dispositions being set
12 forth --

13 MR. EASON: If there's no prohibitions --

14 CHAIR EMERY: -- and we want to make sure
15 there's no -- that we have the flexibility and
16 authority to do something like this if the majority
17 believes it's warranted. All right.

18 You wanted to say something else, Joe, sure.

19 MR. PUMA: Also in that section, under 1-33, it
20 goes through our existing dispositions and in
21 Subparagraph (B), it refers to our preponderance of
22 the evidence standard. And then under (D), it lists
23 all of the dispositions possible and I would feel
24 more comfortable with certain changes to the way
25 those are phrased. For example, bearing in mind

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

49

1 that our standard is preponderance of the evidence,
2 which, for me, in layman's terms, just means more
3 likely than not. So then when you see that
4 substantiated means the acts alleged did occur and
5 did constitute misconduct, I would like to insert
6 language like "more likely than not occur," because
7 I think there are cases -- and I think that would
8 sort of follow for consistency because I'm not
9 necessarily sure if in all of our cases we -- I'm
10 not certainly sure -- I'm not the person who is
11 determining whether an act happened. That's how I
12 view the cases when I read them. I'm determining
13 whether more likely or not they happened.

14 MS. ZOLAND: So you would take the language of
15 unsubstantiated and just tweak it for substantiated
16 as more likely than not.

17 MR. PUMA: Yeah. I wouldn't make a definitive
18 statement that the acts alleged occurred.

19 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think maybe the way to do
20 it, if we're talking about substantiated, there is
21 sufficient evidence to conclude that the alleged
22 acts did occur. Just make it parallel with
23 unsubstantiated, as Deborah says. For instance, in
24 4, "Unfounded: The alleged acts did not occur," is
25 not -- we make a finding there -- well, that's by

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

50

1 preponderance also.

2 MS. ZOLAND: Unfounded and exonerated --

3 CHAIR EMERY: This is a drafting issue, and I
4 think it's a good one to bring up. I think it makes
5 sense to. But I don't think we should say more
6 likely than not. I think we should say evidence.

7 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I think the word likely.

8 CHAIR EMERY: No, I don't think likely captures
9 it either. I think it's misleading. I think we
10 have the standard and we should say the evidence,
11 because we have the evidentiary standard.

12 MR. GITNER: You can just use the language as
13 sufficiency, as you just suggested.

14 CHAIR EMERY: Evidence is sufficient.

15 MR. PUMA: And that's language that I think I
16 often see in the closing reports already.

17 CHAIR EMERY: So 6 in that same list, we
18 don't -- we have other misconduct now, don't we?
19 Why is this added? Do you know that, Mina? On the
20 top of the page, number 6.

21 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I believe I use OMN but I
22 don't believe it was ever formalized.

23 MS. MALIK: I don't think it was ever
24 formalized, and that's why it was added.

25 CHAIR EMERY: And we should look again at this

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

51

1 one with respect to the charter because there is
2 some debate about what jurisdiction we have to even
3 say anything about other misconduct noted. And I'd
4 like to resolve it. I'd like to feel comfort that
5 we have the authority, which we are constantly
6 doing, to substantiate an allegation for other
7 misconduct noted, especially memo books. I have no
8 problem looking at the absence of memo books as
9 probitive to reach a particular result, and I
10 think we've talked about that before, and that makes
11 a lot of sense, or other contemporaneous documents
12 you would expect to exist at the time of an incident
13 or around the time of an incident. But I'm not
14 sure -- nobody's ever resolved from me whether we
15 actually have the authority to send over a referral.
16 It's basically a referral. It's basically something
17 that's saying to the Police Department, You should
18 look into whether this person should be disciplined
19 under your system, because nobody's ever prosecuted
20 for it by APU, I don't believe. Is there any APU
21 prosecution for OMN, Jon?

22 MR. JON DARCHE: There is a provision that you
23 could do a joint prosecution but so far we have not
24 done one yet.

25 CHAIR EMERY: But we -- do we have authority to

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

52

1 prosecute as one of the allegations in an APU case
2 OMN?

3 MR. DARCHE: I think it is theoretically
4 possible that it could work out that way but it has
5 not yet, and I don't foresee one in the future.

6 CHAIR EMERY: Well, I think we should explore
7 what our authority is here and make a judgment about
8 it.

9 MS. ZOLAND: Wouldn't it be similar to referring
10 false statements?

11 CHAIR EMERY: Yes.

12 MS. ZOLAND: So that we -- I can't see how there
13 would be anything against our referring a false
14 statements allegation.

15 CHAIR EMERY: I agree, but what we're doing now
16 is we're making them specific allegations and we're
17 subbing them. It's not a referral.

18 MS. ZOLAND: So it's not the same as a false
19 statement.

20 CHAIR EMERY: It doesn't seem to me it's a
21 referral. It goes on the record of the police
22 officer as a substantiated allegation.

23 MS. ZOLAND: Okay, it does, okay.

24 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I'm sorry, we don't
25 substantiate OMN's.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

53

1 CHAIR EMERY: OMN's? Yeah, we do.

2 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: At least the way I have done
3 it, the category is OMN.

4 CHAIR EMERY: But the investigator recommends a
5 substantiation for the OMN and either we agree with
6 it or we don't.

7 MR. SOLER: The Board Member is correct. What
8 we do is we note the OMN. The term is other
9 misconduct noted. The Board notes, meaning makes a
10 record, that the misconduct occurred.

11 CHAIR EMERY: But the substantiation in the
12 voting sheet, it's substantiated. It's not
13 separate -- it's not viewed -- it's one of the
14 allegations on a voting sheet.

15 MR. SOLER: No, no, no. It has its own separate
16 disposition. Other misconduct has it's own
17 disposition, which is other misconduct that is referred
18 to the department under a different option.

19 CHAIR EMERY: I understand. But the panel makes
20 a finding of other misconduct.

21 MR. SOLER: That is separate from whether the panel
22 makes a finding is separate from what I'm saying.
23 Technically, it's called noted as opposed to
24 substantiation. We don't use the term substantiation
25 when referring to the OMN.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

54

1 CHAIR EMERY: In the voting sheets? Is that
2 right?

3 MS. ARCHER: I think so.

4 CHAIR EMERY: But I do think -- I mean, the
5 Board is definitely making rulings on other
6 misconduct noted, whatever you want to call the
7 ruling. And the question is, do we have the
8 power to do that? I'm not so sure we do.

9 BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, I think that this arose
10 several years ago when we saw a lot of memo book
11 omissions. And so in one of our meetings with the
12 PC, Ray Kelly at the time, he was the one that
13 suggested -- no, the chief of departments suggested
14 that anytime we got cases with no memo book entries
15 that we refer it over to the chief of departments
16 because he was very concerned about the omissions.

17 CHAIR EMERY: That's what we do now.

18 BISHOP TAYLOR: Right.

19 CHAIR EMERY: The real question is --

20 BISHOP TAYLOR: I mean, it's not like under
21 FADO. But it's, you know, we came across it so much
22 until it became a conversation.

23 CHAIR EMERY: I have no problem noting it and
24 referring it for whatever they want to do with it.
25 I have a problem with it being in our records for

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

55

1 part of the consequences if we don't have authority
2 to do it.

3 MR. GITNER: That's a good question. Your
4 question is let's assume we substantiate an OMN --

5 CHAIR EMERY: Agree that there is an OMN.

6 MR. GITNER: -- does it go on the officer's
7 record.

8 CHAIR EMERY: In CCRB it does, I believe.

9 MR. GITNER: And meanwhile, we haven't applied
10 our sufficiency of the evidence standard, we haven't
11 applied whatever we should apply to it, and there's
12 no opportunity -- or maybe I'm wrong. And you're
13 wondering is that fair to the officer for us to be
14 sort of hitting him with a record that we have no
15 jurisdiction to keep.

16 CHAIR EMERY: To me, it's not a question
17 necessarily of fairness to the officer that's
18 implied. It's whether we have authority to do it.

19 MR. GITNER: I understand. It's a good
20 question.

21 CHAIR EMERY: And I'd like to sort of get an
22 answer to that proposition. I mean, we're trying to
23 create rules here so I think we should make sure we
24 have the authority to do what we're proposing
25 potentially.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

56

1 I'm not sure what 15 captures given the rule on
2 standing. Since anybody has standing, I'm not sure
3 that there's a person who doesn't have standing to
4 file the complaint or how that ruling could be, how
5 that could be a disposition. But maybe staff can
6 come up with some kind of a rationale for that. I
7 don't know what it is. All right.

8 The other ones I don't think are very -- 20 is
9 pretty obvious, just a rewording. It's a definition
10 of administrative closure.

11 And I don't know that we need 21. I don't think
12 we should have a catchall. I think this is
13 something that has to be part of a rule, don't you
14 think? I don't think we should have resolutions
15 that are undefined.

16 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I agree.

17 CHAIR EMERY: 21 should probably be eliminated.
18 You'll notice throughout, if you look at this again,
19 that there are a number of places where the power of
20 the executive director has been expanded, which I
21 think you should look at. I agree with the places
22 where the executive director for purposes of
23 efficiency and the like should be given the
24 authority in here. But I think each of us should
25 review whether we agree with them. And it's sort of

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

57

1 throughout with respect to various decisions and
2 actions that are taken by the agency.

3 I'm up to 1-43. These are just mainly
4 grammatical and fill-in stuff.

5 Let's see. This is administrative prosecution,
6 1-45. Where's the plea section?

7 MS. ARCHER: (D), 1-46.

8 CHAIR EMERY: 1-46 (D), is it? Yes. So this
9 captures the resolution we passed I think in
10 September that we're not going to accept pleas in
11 APU until after the Police Commissioner agrees so
12 that we're not in the position of making a plea deal
13 with a representative of a police officer in the APU
14 process and then having the Police Commissioner
15 water down the agreement. And this is working as a
16 practical matter at this point. But I think putting
17 in our rules is going to solidify the way the Police
18 Department treats these cases. Actually, the
19 authority to do this is ours because we don't have
20 to approve a plea until we know that it is approved
21 by the Police Commissioner. So we have the leverage
22 here to make this happen. But I do think this
23 should be captured in an actual rule, which is
24 what's proposed here. We passed it as a Board
25 resolution.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

58

1 Any comments on that?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIR EMERY: Okay. So let's go to --

4 MR. GITNER: I have a comment on Section F right
5 underneath it. This sort of imposes upon the Police
6 Department the duty of notifying the CCRB when it
7 disagrees with certain findings or recommendations.

9 CHAIR EMERY: Well, this is trying to capture
10 what we're doing.

11 MR. GITNER: Yeah. So I just have a question.
12 Has the New York City Police Department agreed to
13 this procedure?

14 CHAIR EMERY: "The Trial Commissioner, the
15 Police Commissioner, shall notify the Board with
16 notice to the subject officer at least ten business
17 days prior to the imposition of such discipline."
18 Yes. This is what they are doing and they in
19 principle agreed to. Obviously once we get the next
20 -- I've already given them a copy of these. And we
21 will give them a copy of the next draft and we're
22 asking for their commentary always.

23 MR. GITNER: That was my next question. Good.
24 Thank you.

25 CHAIR EMERY: D is pretty straightforward, down

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

59

1 below on 1-53, just notifying the complainant. I
2 don't think there's anything new about 1-54 --
3 1-51 -- wait a sec, sorry -- 1-54(A), mediation. I
4 don't think there's anything new in mediation.
5 We're getting there.

6 1-55, this is reopening.

7 MS. ZOLAND: I have one question. Is this
8 saying that the parties don't have to sign an
9 agreement but that the mediator who advised the CCRB
10 if a mediation's agreed to? So shouldn't there be
11 something in writing from somebody, at least the
12 mediator?

13 CHAIR EMERY: I thought there is an agreement by
14 the parties. Where are you looking at?

15 MS. ZOLAND: Mediation, the parties may sign an
16 agreement. So that means they may not.

17 CHAIR EMERY: Well, a complainant or alleged
18 victim and the subject officer may resolve a
19 complaint by means of mediation as long as both
20 parties agree.

21 MS. ZOLAND: I'm at G.

22 CHAIR EMERY: Right. Okay. So -- oh, this is
23 the outcome of the mediation.

24 MS. ZOLAND: Yeah.

25 CHAIR EMERY: In other words, they don't have to

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

60

1 resolve it. If they don't resolve it, they're not
2 going to sign an agreement. In other words, they
3 may walk away and say, Sorry, I want --

4 MS. ZOLAND: But that seems to be talking about
5 successful mediation.

6 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Correct. G talks about if
7 it's successful.

8 CHAIR EMERY: I'm sorry, G. I was on the one
9 before.

10 MS. ZOLAND: So are we saying that the parties
11 don't have to sign anything?

12 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah, why isn't it "shall"?

13 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Should be "shall".

14 CHAIR EMERY: Right, it should be "shall". Good
15 pickup. Deborah, you're going to go through
16 everything here and fix it all.

17 Reconsideration. So the theory here is that we
18 can reconsider any case that we believe was wrongly
19 decided if the original panel or the full Board
20 believes that it was wrongly decided or the sanction
21 should be changed.

22 MS. ZOLAND: But do you need -- do you need new
23 evidence or --

24 CHAIR EMERY: I don't think we do. I think the
25 parties --

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

61

1 MS. ZOLAND: Because we don't have any or in the
2 interest of justice.

3 CHAIR EMERY: It should be request. It should
4 be request (inaudible) may reopen any case.

5 MS. ZOLAND: If.

6 CHAIR EMERY: If new evidence or a previously
7 unavailable (inaudible) determination of a panel
8 constitute to consider such new evidence. See, I
9 don't think that section's right. I think we -- we
10 need to work on that. This should be in the
11 interest of justice.

12 MS. ZOLAND: Any compelling factor or something
13 like that.

14 CHAIR EMERY: Interest of justice probably
15 captures all of that. But I think we should be able
16 to reopen cases if we think it's appropriate, if the
17 SOL hasn't expired. Maybe if the SOL has expired
18 that would be a reason we wouldn't, because it
19 wouldn't be in the interest of justice. But other
20 than that, I think --

21 MR. GITNER: I have a question. The way I read
22 it is it's the Board, the Chair or the executive
23 director can reopen the case.

24 CHAIR EMERY: Right.

25 MR. GITNER: Let's assume it's in the interest

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

62

1 of justice. What happens if the Board wants to
2 reopen it but the Chair does not or the Chair wants
3 to reopen it and the Board does not?

4 CHAIR EMERY: Anybody can reopen it. So the
5 Board would override the Chair.

6 MR. GITNER: So the executive director on her
7 own initiative could reopen it.

8 CHAIR EMERY: That's right. But it would go to
9 a panel. It would still have to go to a panel.

10 MR. GITNER: But in this situation, you
11 theoretically -- I'm not saying this is good or bad,
12 I just want to talk about it -- you can have a panel
13 that makes a final determination, executive director
14 doesn't like it -- and we have a wonderful executive
15 director now, but let's say the next executive
16 director doesn't like it --

17 MS. MALIK: Thank you.

18 MR. GITNER: -- and the next executive director
19 isn't as wonderful as the current one -- he or she
20 can then decide, You know what, I don't like the way
21 the panel decided that, I'm reopening it and I'm
22 sending it to another panel.

23 CHAIR EMERY: No, you can't send it to another
24 panel. That panel has to get it back. If that
25 panel exists, the panel that handled it gets it

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

63

1 back. And I think we should be clear about that.

2 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: We should probably say that.

3 MR. GITNER: It should say that.

4 CHAIR EMERY: And then the Board -- then the
5 full Board can do something. But the panel gets it
6 back. You can't go around shopping for panels,
7 especially with Mina or me.

8 MR. GITNER: So it would have to go back to the
9 original panel --

10 CHAIR EMERY: That's right.

11 MR. GITNER: -- not to the Board --

12 CHAIR EMERY: That's right.

13 MR. GITNER: -- but to the original panel.

14 CHAIR EMERY: And the reasons for reopening in
15 the interest of justice would have to convince the
16 original panel to do it.

17 MR. GITNER: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIR EMERY: All right. Can we make sure we
19 capture that, Mina, so it's not --

20 MS. MALIK: Absolutely.

21 CHAIR EMERY: -- because this is all screwy the
22 way it is now. It has to be changed dramatically to
23 reflect interest of justice and reflect Dan's point.

24 MR. GITNER: So what's the difference between A
25 and the first sentence of B?

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

64

1 CHAIR EMERY: I'm not sure there is. I was just
2 looking at that too.

3 MS. ZOLAND: This is without --

4 MR. GITNER: It's hard to read just because the
5 track changes.

6 MS. MALIK: One is following a full
7 investigation; that's A. And B is closed without a
8 full investigation.

9 CHAIR EMERY: It's truncation.

10 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: A is the Board, the Chair,
11 executive director. But B only says the Chair or the
12 executive director.

13 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah, because it's a truncated
14 case. I think --

15 MR. GITNER: That makes sense to me.

16 CHAIR EMERY: You don't want the Board dealing
17 with a truncated case. If somebody came to one of
18 us and it was a truncated case, it's going to be
19 reopened. All you have to do is call up the
20 executive director or call me up and it will be
21 reopened. Okay.

22 D, this is something we already passed in
23 principle as a Board measure but we want to put into
24 a rule. That is that the Administrative Prosecution
25 Unit can reopen to add allegations. This is the one

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

65

1 that's adding allegations or -- reconsider
2 allegations to -- in order to substantiate
3 additional allegations, which then would go to
4 charges. So what happens here is the
5 investigation -- this is something we did discuss in
6 the past and I believe we had -- Jon, didn't we have
7 a resolution about this in the past?

8 MR. DARCHE: Yes, we did, but the Board felt
9 that we should have it in the rules because we had
10 to swear it in by giving a signed statement from the
11 complainant by adding this rule and it would let the
12 AP prosecutor just make the request to reconsider.

13 CHAIR EMERY: Right. So we altered the rule
14 that it was hamstringing us a little bit before by
15 requiring a signed statement from the complainant.

16 Then E is the process we're trying to follow now
17 where DAO asked us to reconsider and gives us
18 reasons in writing and we're trying to -- we've
19 disagreed with them a lot and we've agreed with them
20 some. So I think this is just a function of getting
21 facts and reasons before us that inform us more
22 completely.

23 MS. ZOLAND: Just going back to D for a second,
24 what if APU thinks a case is wrongly decided and
25 should be unsubstantiated? Is there a process --

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

66

1 CHAIR EMERY: They can dismiss. We have a
2 dismissal rule, right? But shouldn't that be in the
3 rules, the dismissal power of APU? Remember we did
4 that with the Chair's consent, I believe?

5 MR. DARCHE: I didn't realize we needed to add
6 it to the rules but if you want me to do that, we
7 can do that.

8 CHAIR EMERY: I think that should be in the
9 rules.

10 MR. DARCHE: Okay.

11 CHAIR EMERY: We should add dismissal here.

12 MR. DARCHE: Understood.

13 CHAIR EMERY: Just so that's all in one place
14 and clear what the processes are.

15 MR. PUMA: On E --

16 CHAIR EMERY: Sorry?

17 MR. PUMA: On E, I -- this was something that I
18 had requested I think in private at the last
19 meeting. I think formalizing this in the rules is a
20 good step in the right direction. As far as the --
21 well, there is a rule in the charter, not a rule, a
22 provision of the charter, that talks about the
23 Police Department's obligation to inform us of what
24 action the Department eventually took on the case.
25 And I'm wondering if -- I'm mentioning that because

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

67

1 the E seems to pertain only to one particular
2 penalty, could be a series of substantiations that
3 the Board has disposed. But I've had in my
4 first-hand experience with this process already a
5 case where allegations A, B and C were substantiated
6 but we were only asked to reconsider the penalty on
7 C, and A and B were indicated in the e-mail as
8 basically the Department was not going to take any
9 action on those allegations that the Board had
10 disposed. So I don't know if there's just a way to
11 kind of build into this communication process with
12 PD about a process whereby it's very clear what
13 they're not taking action on because sometimes --

14 CHAIR EMERY: When you say "not taking action,"
15 you mean they're not disagreeing with us and
16 they're --

17 MR. PUMA: They disagree with us.

18 CHAIR EMERY: Oh, they do disagree with us?

19 MR. PUMA: They do disagree with us and they're
20 not pursuing the --

21 CHAIR EMERY: The charges.

22 MR. PUMA: -- charges or the recommended
23 penalty.

24 CHAIR EMERY: Really? And they haven't asked us
25 to reconsider?

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

68

1 MR. PUMA: They did not in that particular --

2 CHAIR EMERY: Really? I've only seen cases --

3 MR. PUMA: That's how I understood that.

4 CHAIR EMERY: I've only seen cases where they
5 asked us to reconsider. They told us they weren't
6 doing it for X, Y and Z reasons and would we
7 reconsider. And we did or we didn't. But I've
8 never seen one that I could remember, if anybody
9 else can remember where they actually said, I don't
10 even want you to reconsider it.

11 MR. PUMA: I think it's been the exception so
12 far but that's my recollection on one of the cases
13 that I --

14 CHAIR EMERY: Those cases -- if that happens --
15 they usually come through me first I think, so I
16 don't know. I'm missing something. I'd love to see
17 that. But I think our position has to be that if
18 they're not going to do what we recommend, and
19 that's the idea and the spirit behind all of this,
20 then give us reasons for what they're doing and why
21 they're not doing it, and whether we want to agree
22 with them or not is up to us. The other times they
23 might be more amenable saying, We wish you would
24 consider X, Y or Z, and they haven't decided whether
25 they're going to either do what they have -- whether

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

69

1 they're going to do something else and they're going
2 to wait for us to explain. Some cases they don't
3 wait for us to explain. So I'm not sure what change
4 you want there though.

5 MR. PUMA: I would just -- I mean, in the future
6 I would like that to be much more explicit and I
7 don't know if it should be in our rules. I mean,
8 certainly that has to be --

9 CHAIR EMERY: What be more explicit?

10 MR. PUMA: If there are substantiated charges --
11 excuse me, substantiated allegations from the Board
12 that are not being pursued with the recommended
13 penalty, that that's very clear.

14 CHAIR EMERY: In cases of charges, that exists
15 already for APU. They cannot act without giving us
16 an opportunity to comment on their reasons for not
17 acting. That's in the APU sections of the
18 memorandum of understanding, which actually is in
19 our rules, isn't it? The memorandum of
20 understanding was incorporated into our rules. So
21 my question is -- so you're thinking of cases where
22 it's a CD or instructions?

23 MR. PUMA: Exactly, and that was -- I'm
24 referring -- I have in mind a case like that.

25 CHAIR EMERY: Okay. So why don't we look at

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

70

1 this rule and make sure that we capture the same
2 process that exists for charges in APU when the
3 Police Department is indicating that they aren't
4 going to follow our findings.

5 MS. ZOLAND: It's in the MOU, isn't it?

6 CHAIR EMERY: It is, but not with CDs and
7 instructions. So what we want to do is specify that
8 they are going to do the same thing because
9 basically they've agreed to do that, as I understand
10 it, with CDs and instructions, and that this rule
11 ought to capture that thought.

12 And then the last one is just a simple fact --
13 just a grant of power from the Board to the
14 executive director to manage the affairs of the
15 organization in terms of appointing employees,
16 organizational structure, day-to-day operations,
17 which I think is something that we have never really
18 said and we should say.

19 MR. PUMA: I have one addition that is not
20 covered by the current rules at all, suggestion as
21 to how to better capture the power of the Chair to
22 form committees and subcommittees. I don't think I
23 see this.

24 CHAIR EMERY: Isn't that in the rules somewhere?
25 I'm not sure of that.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

71

1 MR. PUMA: It may be encompassed in something
2 more general.

3 CHAIR EMERY: I think that's right, so let's
4 look at it. And I think it's probably a good idea.
5 I think maybe -- I'm not sure if it may be in the
6 charter. Maybe not. Somehow I vaguely remember it.
7 It's certainly been the practice of the CCRB to
8 allow the Chair to form committees and
9 subcommittees.

10 Any other comments on the rules? I think we've
11 done a lot of work on this already.

12 Why don't we -- just let me make two other quick
13 announcements. Today, if I'm not mistaken, Linda,
14 the relevant sections of the patrol guide that
15 relate to FADO have been put on our website for
16 public access. One of the frustrations has been for
17 many years is that the patrol guide has not been
18 available to anybody. We're not going to put the
19 whole patrol guide up there because it involves a
20 lot of stuff about which side of your lapel your
21 medals go on and white socks and the like. But we
22 did put up -- we selected the portions of the patrol
23 guide that relate to our functions. And they are
24 now on our website and accessible.

25 The other significant development on the website

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

72

1 is that our complaint activity maps are now
2 interactive. They've gained sophistication
3 dramatically because of the work that Marcos and
4 Brian and Mina and Linda have done.

5 MS. SACHS: And Lincoln.

6 CHAIR EMERY: And Lincoln, exactly, sorry, and
7 Lincoln. And so they're kind of interesting and
8 it's worth going to when you click on stuff and it
9 pops up at you. It's just a lot of fun. So I think
10 that's worth mentioning.

11 But why don't we take a very short bathroom
12 break because some people have asked for it. And
13 then we'll come back and get public comment.

14 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

15 CHAIR EMERY: Mr. O'Grady, are you speaking
16 tonight?

17 MR. O'GRADY: Yeah. There was someone ahead of
18 me, wasn't there?

19 CHAIR EMERY: No, you're the first. Come on up.
20 How are you, sir?

21 MR. O'GRADY: Fine. Thank you.

22 In the charter of bylaws of this body, statute
23 of limitation, if particulars involved could be,
24 were to be, proved in court of law, statute of
25 limitation does not apply. Recent successors or

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

73

1 leaders of this body spoke. The Police Department
2 has ways of "milking the clock, milking the clock."
3 Strange phraseology. Recent successors or leaders
4 of this body have ways of confusing the identity of
5 the officer behind the wheel of the police vehicle.
6 There are obviously some civilians who you would not
7 want to confront or meet in a dark alley or even a
8 well-lit room.

9 CHAIR EMERY: Thank you. Chris, Mr. Dunn.

10 MR. CHRIS DUNN: Good evening.

11 CHAIR EMERY: Good evening.

12 MR. DUNN: So I didn't expect there to be a
13 regulatory geek-a-thon here, but good for you. I
14 mean that seriously. I think it's great you went
15 through the regs. You didn't have to do that
16 publicly, I don't think.

17 CHAIR EMERY: I think we did, but that's just my
18 opinion.

19 MR. DUNN: Richard, I'm glad that your
20 public-disclosure knee is twitching. I'm glad you
21 did it, whether rightly or wrongly. And I actually
22 think that you raised a bunch of important issues.
23 What I hear you saying, Richard, is there's going to
24 be further public discussion about this.

25 CHAIR EMERY: And we want you to comment on this

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

74

1 stuff between now and the next meeting. And then
2 you're going to have the normal, normal processes
3 after that. But before even the normal processes
4 start, we would love you to -- we'll give you the
5 next iteration of this and love to have your
6 comments.

7 MR. DUNN: Right. I appreciate that. I don't
8 want to overdo comments on things that are in
9 transition.

10 But let me just say a couple things because I
11 assume there'll be some deliberations between now
12 and the next draft. On the subpoena authority, I
13 think it's great that you gave Mina the subpoena
14 authority. I look forward to seeing subpoenas with
15 your signature on it. I will note that as far as I
16 know, the agency has never once in its history
17 issued a subpoena to the Police Department. And I
18 think that the subpoena power is an important power
19 that you have and I hope that it gets used.

20 On the verification issue, I think you have
21 identified what the concerns are about that. I do
22 wonder to the extent to which there's actually a
23 problem with complainants who you think are not
24 telling the truth. I think we do know there's a
25 documented history of police officers making false

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

75

1 statements to the CCRB and that makes the things
2 that are said to police officers in the OMNs about
3 false statements particularly important. I have not
4 heard about complainants that you thought have made
5 false statements. I'm sure it may happen from time
6 to time. And to the extent that you have -- I think
7 someone described frequent complainants who you
8 suspect are making things up; okay, fair enough.
9 But I just question whether or not the impulse to be
10 equal is perhaps misguided because there's not an
11 equal problem. And the real problem is with police
12 officers. I do think, Dan, you make a good point if
13 the script that's being read to the police officers
14 is inaccurate in terms of the immunity to which they
15 are being given and it overstates it, you certainly
16 want to correct that. And I appreciate your having
17 caught that.

18 With respect to the panel assignments, Richard,
19 I totally understand what you're saying. And, Dan,
20 I hear what you're saying about the expertise the
21 Police Department representatives bring. And I
22 think that's valuable. I think it will be very
23 interesting to hear what the Police Department
24 ultimately has to say about this because as you
25 heard from Lindsay and from Debbie, I think the

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

76

1 Police Department's going to push back very, very
2 hard on that because I think they are going to want
3 to have one of their people on every single panel.
4 And I don't think that's necessary in terms of
5 fairness. I think Deborah's absolutely right.
6 Everyone on the Board can be fair. And at some
7 level I think there's a public perception if the
8 Police Department pushes too hard and says, We have
9 to have one of our people on every single panel,
10 because that is going to look like protection. So I
11 look forward to seeing how that goes.

12 With respect to the good faith exception, I
13 heard the group of you seemingly backing away from
14 that and talking about a different regime where you
15 might perhaps be recommending training or
16 instructions even when a case is not substantiated.
17 I do think there's going to be an issue, and I
18 myself will look at this also, the extent to which
19 when there is not a substantiation you have the
20 authority to nonetheless say to the Police
21 Department something should happen to a police
22 officer. I suspect that the PBA will push back very
23 hard on that. And frankly, I think there may be a
24 fair question on behalf of police officers if they
25 are found not to have engaged in any misconduct

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

77

1 whether or not the CCRB and the Department should be
2 requiring them to engage in something that may be
3 viewed in the Department as being disciplinary. So
4 I don't know which way that's going to cut but I do
5 think there are some concerns about that perhaps on
6 behalf, rightly so, of police officers who are in
7 substance exonerated by the Board.

8 The other thing I would say about the good faith
9 error, and, again, it seems like this has gone away,
10 but the other point that I would make is if there is
11 some notion of good faith error, I guarantee you
12 that police officer after police officer will come
13 in in a CCRB interview and will have a very good
14 explanation as to why whatever they might have done
15 wrong was done in good faith. And so I offer that
16 to further buttress the point that I think you have
17 arrived at, which you are not going to do that.

18 The final thing I would say is on the
19 reconsideration option. As we have said many times,
20 and I'm not going to repeat it in substance, we
21 oppose what you have done on reconsideration. We
22 will oppose it when we get to the written comments.
23 The one thing that I would say, not to in any way
24 legitimate in my mind at least that option, but
25 there should be a very short time frame for which

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

78

1 the Department can request reconsideration. Right
2 now, under your resolution, it's 90 days. I don't
3 believe the proposed reg speaks to a time period.
4 Maybe I missed that. I think it just says the
5 Department can request it. I think that should be a
6 very tight time frame. And I've seen the figures
7 for the last couple of months, the reconsiderations.
8 The numbers look quite substantial to me. I think
9 in February you were already up to 15 percent of
10 your sub-cases have come back with a request for
11 reconsideration and we are only 30 days into the
12 cycle. Where we are 60 days from now in terms of
13 what the percentage is, I don't know. I think you
14 had 20 percent of your subs in December came back
15 from the Department with a request for
16 reconsideration. Those in my mind are very big
17 numbers.

18 CHAIR EMERY: Well, we didn't do reconsideration
19 on all of them.

20 MR. DUNN: No, I understand that. I get that
21 and I am frankly less concerned, Richard, about the
22 prospect that you will change your minds. What I'm
23 more concerned about is, and we said this before,
24 you know, kind of the relationship aspect and what
25 that conveys to the world about the finality and

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

79

1 seriousness of what you do. But the other thing
2 more concretely is the time that it adds to the
3 process. Now, to be fair and to be clear, your
4 disposition time has decreased considerably to your
5 credit. But if they have 90 days to come back and
6 ask, you're going to get stuff back on days 60, 75,
7 89. And then you're going to take it seriously, and
8 that might add another 30, 60 days. And all of a
9 sudden, we've tacked on five months to a
10 substantiation that went over to the Department,
11 whereas before you opened this door, APU would have
12 had the case or the Department would have had to
13 take the case and proceed. So that's my practical
14 concern.

15 The other thing which I thought Joe was getting
16 at but maybe I misunderstood this, Richard, is when
17 the Department is duping a case, so if something
18 goes over, it goes to them, it doesn't go to APU,
19 it's instructions or a CD case. And they then come
20 back, and as I understood it, Joe, you were saying
21 on one of the subs allegations they asked you to
22 reconsider. But on the others they were just
23 saying, We're not going to do anything on this.
24 That I believe is a dupe, if that's what you're
25 referring to.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

80

1 MR. PUMA: That's what I'm referring to.

2 MR. DUNN: That's what you're referring to,
3 okay. And I think what I understood you to be
4 saying, which I would encourage you to build into
5 the regs, is a requirement that the Department
6 explain in writing why it's duping a case.

7 CHAIR EMERY: Absolutely. We want to do that.

8 MR. DUNN: Okay. So that's what -- I think you
9 were kind of puzzled, understandably, about the
10 category cases he was talking about.

11 CHAIR EMERY: No. The dupe cases should be
12 handled the same as the Section 2 cases, in my view.

13 MR. DUNN: And I see that, and we see this in
14 this month's report, there's a 20-percent dupe rate
15 last year. And that's still a very big number. And
16 you know, I've been saying this for a long time and
17 I'm not going to repeat the whole thing. I'm just
18 going to say a 20-percent dupe rate in 2014, that's
19 a lot of cases that the new Police Commissioner is
20 saying, I'm not going to pursue, even though you
21 subbed them. And that's a problem.

22 You didn't get to do the regular business,
23 Richard. I don't know if you're going to have a
24 meeting continuing after this or --

25 CHAIR EMERY: Yeah, we are.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

81

1 MR. DUNN: So I see things in the numbers. I
2 guess there are just a couple things I will say and
3 then I'll sit down so you can continue.

4 First, there is the time story today about the
5 drop in complaints and the disparity between the
6 complaints coming from the Department as opposed to
7 complaints coming directly to you. I don't know if
8 you're going to discuss that in the meeting tonight.

9 CHAIR EMERY: We're not.

10 MR. DUNN: You're not, okay. Well, I will just
11 say with a thousand cases not coming from the
12 Department last year as compared to the year before,
13 when I look at that, it feels to me like there's got
14 to be a lot more explanation of what happened to all
15 those cases. And maybe the Department is going to
16 figure it out, but I think you as the CCRB have to
17 get to the bottom of why there's such a significant
18 drop in cases coming from the Department when your
19 intake actually went up in 2014. The second
20 thing --

21 CHAIR EMERY: It's interesting. We should be
22 clear about that. Our intake went up as compared to
23 2013 over the second half of 2013. The first half
24 of 2013 is an unfair measurement because we were
25 still hanging over from Sandy and our phones were

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

82

1 down for several -- a couple of months into '13. So
2 we're looking at the second half of '13 compared to
3 the second half of '14 and in that period, we went
4 up. But the reality is over the period of '14,
5 month by month, our complaints have come down fairly
6 significantly during the period that IAB's referrals
7 to us came down more significantly, just so we're on
8 the same page.

9 MR. DUNN: Yeah. And I understand the numbers.
10 And what I'm saying and what I hope people on the
11 Board understand is there is an apparent significant
12 disparity in the trend of CCRB complaints in total
13 intake with things coming through the Department.
14 And maybe that's just because people stopped going
15 to the Police Department in 2014 and are coming
16 directly to you. And maybe that's because there are
17 ten precincts out there that have a lot of
18 complaints sitting in a back room that they never
19 sent to IAB, and maybe that's because IAB's got 500
20 cases sitting in a closet they never logged. I
21 don't have any idea. But the numbers are so big,
22 there needs to be some inquiry into that.

23 CHAIR EMERY: I think that's a good subject for
24 the IG. I don't know that we can get to the Police
25 Department to make that investigation. They can.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

83

1 MR. DUNN: That's a very good suggestion,
2 Richard. Where is Phil? In fact, he should be
3 coming to these meetings.

4 CHAIR EMERY: Well, he should be. I agree with
5 you.

6 MR. DUNN: I think Mina can give him a call and
7 suggest to him --

8 CHAIR EMERY: Why don't you bring him here,
9 Chris?

10 MR. DUNN: I will do that. And with that, I
11 will sit down. Thank you.

12 CHAIR EMERY: Thank you, Chris.

13 Anybody else have anything to say before we
14 continue with the meeting?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIR EMERY: Thank you. Mina, Executive
17 Director's report.

18 MS. MALIK: Yes. Good evening, everyone. My
19 name is Mina Malik. I'm the Executive Director of
20 the CCRB and I want to thank our hosts here tonight
21 at the Stanley Isaacs Neighborhood Center here in
22 Manhattan for having us here. We're very happy to
23 be here.

24 I first want to provide you with a highlight
25 from our monthly statistical report and then we'll

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

84

1 discuss other matters pertaining to our Agency
2 operations. For a full review of the monthly
3 statistics, I invite you all to please visit our
4 website.

5 In my first month as Executive Director of the
6 CCRB, I have met with executive staff and senior
7 staff and designed a strategy to further reduce the
8 number of old cases in our open docket.

9 So last month, I reported at the end of January
10 that the open docket was 1,767 cases, which was a
11 significant reduction from the 2,699 cases that were
12 pending at the end of January 2014. This month,
13 we've reduced the open docket further by 253 cases,
14 going from 1,767 cases to 1,514 cases. This was a
15 substantial 14-percent reduction in a month.

16 Of the 1,514 cases, 33 percent are awaiting
17 panel review. We have identified 81 cases that are
18 12 months in age or older, and in consultation with
19 the Chair of the Board, I have directed staff to
20 create a special panel of the Board with all 81
21 cases pending panel review that are 12 months or
22 older. The goal is to resolve those cases as soon
23 as possible and to eliminate the possibility of any
24 case being referred to the Police Department beyond
25 the statute of limitations.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

85

1 The second step in the strategy is to further
2 reduce the number of cases in the open docket within
3 the Investigations Division that's headed by Deputy
4 Executive Director -- Acting Deputy Executive
5 Director Jon Darche for Investigations. Last month,
6 I reported that the open docket of the
7 Investigations Division had decreased from
8 1,858 cases in January of 2014 to 961 cases in
9 January of 2015. By the end of February, the open
10 docket has been reduced by another 49 cases to 912.

11 We have focused primarily on cases 12 months
12 or older. At the end of February, we only had 5
13 cases in the Investigations Division that were
14 between 15 to 18 months old and 22 cases that were
15 between 12 to 14 months old. There were 5 cases
16 that were older than 18 months; however, the statute
17 of limitations did not apply and does not apply to
18 those cases as they are on DA hold and the statute
19 of limitation crime exception applies to those
20 cases.

21 With this strategy, the Executive Staff and I
22 are minimizing the number of cases approaching the
23 statute of limitations. We are also creating the
24 conditions for a more effective and
25 efficient-running organization. An analysis of new

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

86

1 cases that were received between the time period of
2 August 2014 through February 2015 shows that we have
3 fully investigated 186 cases, and the average number
4 of days to conduct these investigations has been
5 brought down to 96 days. As the docket is further
6 reduced, we expect to continue to make more
7 efficient gains in timeliness and efficiency.

8 As I also stated last month, the preliminary
9 data for the new POD system shows that it is more
10 effective than the former CCRB Team system. The
11 number of days it takes to interview a complainant
12 has decreased from 31 days in January of 2014 to
13 11 days in year-to-date 2015. In year-to-date 2015,
14 approximately 75 percent of complainant interviews
15 were conducted in less than 15 days.

16 I also want to highlight statistics related to
17 the disposition of our cases. First, the percentage
18 of cases that are fully investigated has increased
19 from 44 percent in 2014 to 57 percent. Second,
20 year-to-date, the Board has substantiated 18 percent
21 of full investigations, which is consistent with
22 data from last year when the Board substantiated
23 17 percent of the cases it fully investigated. And
24 third, in January 2015, the discipline rate was 88
25 percent for cases handled by the Police Department

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

87

1 Advocate Office. It was 73 percent in 2014.

2 In addition to the statistical information, I
3 also want to update the Board on the recent
4 memoranda in the FINEST message that was issued by
5 the New York City Police Department regarding the
6 court-ordered changes to the Police Department
7 practices and policies related to stop and frisk.
8 And in that FINEST message memorandum, there were
9 several things that were outlined: For example, the
10 UF 250 form must be revised to include a narrative
11 section where an officer must record the basis for a
12 stop; there has to be a separate explanation
13 regarding why a frisk was conducted; the check box
14 system on the form is to be simplified and improved;
15 and the Department has to adopt new policies
16 ensuring that NYPD supervisors review the
17 constitutionality of the stops; there must be
18 changes to the process for imposing discipline
19 following substantiated cases by our agency; tracking
20 and investigating civilian complaints of racial
21 profiling; and they also mention a Body-Worn Cameras
22 Pilot Project in which a body camera must be worn
23 for a 1-year period by officers on patrol in one
24 precinct per borough, specifically the precinct with
25 the highest number of stops during 2012; and

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

88

1 finally, with respect to racial profiling, this
2 FINEST message memorandum revoked the patrol guide,
3 Section 203-25 that was implemented in August of
4 2013.

5 And finally, with respect to the Board
6 discussion about the rule amendments, I invite the
7 Board to think about the matters that are important
8 to bringing the uniformity and consistency regarding
9 our Agency's procedure.

10 And I want to thank Deputy Executive Director of
11 Strategic Planning and Policy Marcos Soler and
12 Acting Deputy Executive Director of Investigations
13 Jonathan Darche for working on the rules and
14 proposing new rules to the Board. The staff and I
15 look forward to working with you and assisting you
16 in this process. Thank you.

17 CHAIR EMERY: Committee reports. Janette, you
18 want to say some things about --

19 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I do have a Mediation report,
20 thanks to the work of Lisa Cohen, who unfortunately
21 could not make it today. Again, I'm sorry to bother
22 you all with stats but here we go.

23 In 2014, the CCRB mediated 198 complaints, 182
24 of them successfully for a mediation success rate of
25 92 percent. In addition, 205 complaints were closed

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

89

1 as mediation attempted. These complaints involved
2 454 civilians and 486 members of the NYPD.

3 This month, we would like to highlight some of
4 the categories of the FADO allegations that were
5 closed as mediated or mediation attempted. Each
6 FADO category is subdivided into various types of
7 allegations that can be pleaded. In 2014, CCRB
8 successfully mediated 20 force allegations.
9 Categories of force allegations can range from the
10 use of nonlethal restraining device to handcuffs
11 being too tight to the use of pepper spray to gun
12 pointing. The vast majority of force allegations is
13 in the physical force category and are primarily
14 allegations of being pulled, pushed or shoved. 42
15 force allegations were closed as mediation
16 attempted. 41 allegations were in physical force
17 category and one was other.

18 Abuse of authority. In 2014, CCRB successfully
19 mediated 239 abuse of authority allegations in 15
20 different categories. In addition, 248 allegations
21 in 17 categories were closed as mediation attempted.
22 Commonly cited abuse of authority allegations
23 included stop, questioned, frisked, vehicle stop and
24 search, threat of arrest and failure to provide name
25 and shield.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

90

1 Discourtesy. In 2014, there were 103
2 allegations of discourtesy mediated which fell into
3 three different categories; word, gesture and
4 demeanor. Discourtesy allegations closed as
5 mediation attempted fell into for categories; word,
6 gesture, demeanor, tone and action, totaling 115
7 allegations. Discourtesy by word is overwhelming
8 the most frequent discourtesies allegation.

9 Offensive language. In 2014, 15 allegations of
10 offensive language were successfully mediated.
11 These allegations fell into five categories; race,
12 ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical disability
13 and other. 19 offensive language allegations also
14 in five categories were closed as mediation
15 attempted; race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation
16 and other.

17 For 2015, we only have stats obviously for
18 January and February. In those two months, the
19 Agency successfully mediated 36 complaints and
20 closed 45 complaints as mediation attempted.

21 In 2015, there were four allegations of force
22 which fell into two categories; 3 allegations were
23 physical force, 1 was a hit against an inanimate
24 object. 5 force allegations were closed as
25 mediation attempted, all of them in the physical

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

91

1 force category.

2 44 allegations of abuse of authority were
3 mediated in 2015. These allegations fell into 11
4 categories. 42 abuse of authority allegations in 9
5 categories were closed as mediation attempted. As
6 in 2014, complaints alleging abuse of authority or
7 stop and threat of arrest were most common. 19
8 allegations of discourtesy were mediated and 34
9 closed as mediation attempted. All of the
10 allegations are from word and action.

11 One allegation of offensive language,
12 specifically with respect to race, was mediated in
13 2015. 3 allegations were closed as mediation
14 attempted, 1 for race and 2 for ethnicity. That is
15 the report for the Mediation Subcommittee.

16 CHAIR EMERY: Thank you. Outreach or -- do you
17 want to say something?

18 BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah. For February 2015, we
19 completed, the Outreach Committee, completed 23
20 presentations. One of those events was to the
21 Queens District Council Meeting of Resident
22 Association Presidents, which is made up of all the
23 presidents of housing developments in the Borough of
24 Queens. Two of those meetings were with precinct
25 community council. And there are 29 events that

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

92

1 we're in the middle of executing for March. It's
2 important to note that the next Board Meeting,
3 April, will be held at Staten Island Borough Hall.
4 We're still working on a location for May, but the
5 June meeting will be held at the Lower East Side
6 Girls' Club. There was testimony before the City
7 Council Finance Division. Executives from the
8 agency appeared before the City Council Finance
9 Division in regards to the agency's budget. The
10 City Council indicated that they support our efforts
11 and will try to facilitate our CCRB broader
12 initiative in the five boroughs.

13 The CCRB in the Boroughs initiative has been
14 restarted with sites identified in all outer
15 boroughs. Dates for these off-site locations have
16 already been added to the investigative calendar,
17 with the first dates slated for late March.

18 We're continuing our outreach to NYCHA and the
19 team will continue meeting with the Queens District
20 Council of Resident Association Presidents. And
21 we're hoping that this outreach will result in more
22 advertisement of what the CCRB does and its
23 availability to the community and better attendance
24 in our outer-borough meetings.

25 That's the Outreach report.

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

93

1 MR. PUMA: I have a very brief Training
2 Subcommittee update. The subcommittee composed of
3 Board Members and Staff has still continued to meet.
4 I co-chair along with Commissioner Cortes-Gomez.
5 And within the month, the last month, we did confirm
6 that the mayor's preliminary budget included head
7 count additions that actually applied for the
8 current fiscal year, and so in fact for the last
9 quarter of the fiscal year, and so now we are looking
10 to post those three positions very soon to create a
11 new training unit which is, I think, a very welcome
12 addition to the staff and to just the day-to-day
13 operations of the Agency to ensure the continued
14 quality of our investigations and promote more and
15 better management skills amongst the many supervisors
16 and executive staff, and also work with the Board on
17 issues on which we could benefit from some training
18 as well.

19 So that's my brief report.

20 CHAIR EMERY: I think this training expansion is
21 a big deal for the Agency. People in this agency
22 have been thirsting for training for a long time and
23 it's been a haphazard process where people, Roger
24 Smith, in particular, but others have worked very
25 hard to provide training on a shoestring with all

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

94

1 the other duties that each of them has. And so this
2 is a big new qualitatively different approach to
3 systematic training for not only investigators but
4 really every expertise in the agency. And I'm very
5 excited about it. I think it's a big deal.

6 With that, there's old business, new business,
7 any other commentary, before we close the public
8 meeting and go into Executive Session?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIR EMERY: Can we have a motion to go into
11 Executive Session?

12 MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I'll make that motion.

13 CHAIR EMERY: Second?

14 BISHOP TAYLOR: Second.

15 CHAIR EMERY: Everybody in favor? Anybody
16 opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIR EMERY: Thank you all for coming. We are
19 adjourned for the Public Session.

20 (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 8:55 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25

Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015

95

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.:
COUNTY OF RICHMOND)

I, DANIELLE CAVANAGH, a Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify:

I reported the proceedings in the within-entitled matter, and that the within transcript is a true record of such proceedings.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 16th day of March 2015.

DANIELLE CAVANAGH

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

A		
ability (1) 12:8	44:12 46:11 52:15 53:5 55:5	appointees' (1) 30:19
able (4) 7:23 15:13 33:1 61:15	56:16,21,25 59:20 68:21 83:4	appointing (6) 29:10,14,16 32:18
absence (1) 51:8	agreed (5) 58:12,19 59:10 65:19	33:7 70:15
absent (1) 18:1	70:9	appointment (1) 34:24
absolute (1) 19:25	agreement (7) 4:4 18:21 57:15	appointments (1) 29:12
absolutely (6) 15:25 18:8 41:20	59:9,13,16 60:2	appreciate (3) 30:21 74:7 75:16
63:20 76:5 80:7	agrees (2) 43:10 57:11	approach (2) 31:4 94:2
abuse (13) 10:22 38:19,20,21	ahead (1) 72:17	approached (2) 31:2,9
40:20,23 42:3 89:18,19,22 91:2,4	allegation (7) 38:19 42:16 51:6	approaching (1) 85:22
91:6	52:14,22 90:8 91:11	appropriate (4) 9:22 40:7 41:14
abusive (1) 42:16	allegations (38) 38:12 52:1,16	61:16
accept (1) 57:10	53:14 64:25 65:1,2,3 67:5,9	approve (1) 57:20
access (1) 71:16	69:11 79:21 89:4,7,8,9,12,14,15	approved (1) 57:20
accessible (1) 71:24	89:16,19,20,22 90:2,4,7,9,11,13	approximately (1) 86:14
account (2) 4:17 43:8	90:21,22,24 91:2,3,4,8,10,13	April (1) 92:3
accountability (1) 33:23	alleged (9) 6:2 9:9 12:15 37:15	APU (12) 51:20,20 52:1 57:11,13
accurate (2) 17:18,22	49:4,18,21,24 59:17	65:24 66:3 69:15,17 70:2 79:11
ACLU (1) 18:13	alleging (1) 91:6	79:18
act (4) 37:25 38:4 49:11 69:15	alley (1) 73:7	Archer (12) 2:11 6:24 7:1,11 13:13
acted (1) 40:3	allow (8) 6:23 10:2 12:16 39:20	35:20,22 39:22,24 48:2 54:3 57:7
acting (4) 43:12 69:17 85:4 88:12	42:9,23 47:25 71:8	area (3) 19:13 43:7,10
action (7) 66:24 67:9,13,14 90:6	allowed (4) 23:22 40:14,15,21	areas (1) 42:11
91:10 95:13	allows (3) 29:8 39:19 42:11	argument (1) 18:6
actions (2) 38:1 57:2	altercation (1) 12:6	arguments (2) 46:7,12
activity (1) 72:1	altered (1) 65:13	arose (1) 54:9
acts (5) 37:15 49:4,18,22,24	amenable (1) 68:23	arrangement (1) 32:7
actual (1) 57:23	Amendment (2) 23:23 28:1	arrest (3) 48:6 89:24 91:7
add (4) 64:25 66:5,11 79:8	amendments (2) 4:22 88:6	arrived (1) 77:17
added (3) 50:19,24 92:16	amount (1) 33:6	ascribing (1) 19:10
adding (2) 65:1,11	analyses (1) 42:25	asked (6) 65:17 67:6,24 68:5 72:12
addition (7) 15:12 37:12 70:19	analysis (7) 23:25 24:4 31:1 34:13	79:21
87:2 88:25 89:20 93:12	36:6 43:2 85:25	asking (2) 43:4 58:22
additional (1) 65:3	analyze (2) 34:16 36:5	aspect (1) 78:24
additions (1) 93:7	analyzing (1) 34:17	assert (2) 27:25 28:3
address (1) 32:25	and/or (1) 37:16	assessed (1) 22:9
adds (1) 79:2	announcements (1) 71:13	assignments (1) 75:18
adequate (1) 23:12	answer (7) 7:6 17:14 24:2,19 28:8	assisting (1) 88:15
adjourned (1) 94:19	33:14 55:22	Association (2) 91:22 92:20
adjusted (1) 37:8	answered (1) 24:3	assume (3) 55:4 61:25 74:11
administrative (7) 23:18 26:10,24	anybody (14) 3:4 4:3 5:1,9,15 7:6	assuming (1) 32:1
27:10 56:10 57:5 64:24	10:9 20:16 56:2 62:4 68:8 71:18	attack (1) 32:24
adopt (2) 3:4 87:15	83:13 94:15	attempt (1) 5:17
adoption (2) 1:16 3:3	anymore (1) 35:10	attempted (11) 89:1,5,16,21 90:5
advertisement (1) 92:22	anytime (1) 54:14	90:15,20,25 91:5,9,14
advised (1) 59:9	AP (1) 65:12	attendance (1) 92:23
Advocate (1) 87:1	apologize (1) 13:14	attention (1) 43:14
affairs (1) 70:14	apparent (1) 82:11	August (2) 86:2 88:3
age (1) 84:18	appear (1) 27:16	authority (29) 29:10,14,16 32:12
agencies (1) 33:7	appeared (1) 92:8	32:19 38:20,21 40:20,23 42:3
agency (14) 18:9 28:19,25 35:8	applied (3) 55:9,11 93:7	48:16 51:5,15,25 52:7 55:1,18,24
57:2 74:16 84:1 87:19 90:19 92:8	applies (1) 85:19	56:24 57:19 74:12,14 76:20
93:13,21,21 94:4	apply (6) 13:6 34:14 55:11 72:25	89:18,19,22 91:2,4,6
agency's (2) 88:9 92:9	85:17,17	authorized (1) 26:11
AGENDA (1) 1:13	appointee (7) 29:4,13,21 31:1	availability (1) 92:23
ago (3) 15:18 28:10 54:10	32:22 34:6 36:2	available (1) 71:18
agree (14) 10:18 14:11 35:22	appointees (10) 29:1,25 30:8,9,11	AVENUE (1) 1:23
	31:20 33:6 34:21,22,22	average (1) 86:3

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

<p>awaiting (1) 84:16 aware (1) 10:11 Ayes (1) 3:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>B (6) 48:21 63:25 64:7,11 67:5,7 back (20) 3:16 6:23 14:13 20:13 33:9 36:18 62:24 63:1,6,8 65:23 72:13 76:1,22 78:10,14 79:5,6,20 82:18 backing (1) 76:13 bad (6) 25:7,8 38:2 40:23 46:23 62:11 balance (3) 20:3 23:3 28:17 band (4) 38:11 41:25 42:4,14 bargaining (1) 24:17 basically (5) 45:22 51:16,16 67:8 70:9 basis (4) 22:18 41:12,13 87:11 bathroom (1) 72:11 bearing (1) 48:25 begs (1) 33:13 behalf (3) 12:9 76:24 77:6 believe (14) 6:4 10:1 11:10 31:2 43:25 50:21,22 51:20 55:8 60:18 65:6 66:4 78:3 79:24 believes (3) 10:10 48:17 60:20 bells (1) 22:3 benefit (1) 93:17 bet (2) 30:6 35:1 better (5) 45:10 48:2 70:21 92:23 93:15 beyond (1) 84:24 big (6) 78:16 80:15 82:21 93:21 94:2,5 Bishop (24) 2:4 3:6 5:21 10:13,20 12:4,25 13:4,10 20:16,17,21,24 21:10,20 22:12 32:19,20 33:13 54:9,18,20 91:18 94:14 bit (4) 5:11 6:19 29:5 65:14 blood (1) 95:13 board (59) 1:1,2 2:1 3:2,17 4:5 5:14,18 6:4 8:16,20 15:4 18:13 26:15 28:18,24 30:4 33:2,10,11 34:20,25 44:20 46:18 53:7,9 54:5 57:24 58:15 60:19 61:22 62:1,3,5 63:4,5,11 64:10,16,23 65:8 67:3 67:9 69:11 70:13 76:6 77:7 82:11 84:19,20 86:20,22 87:3 88:5,7,14 92:2 93:3,16 Board's (1) 33:21 body (4) 72:22 73:1,4 87:22 Body-Warn (1) 87:21 book (2) 54:10,14 books (2) 51:7,8 borough (3) 87:24 91:23 92:3 boroughs (4) 37:5 92:12,13,15</p>	<p>bother (1) 88:21 bottom (1) 81:17 box (1) 87:13 break (1) 72:12 Brian (3) 19:3,5 72:4 brief (2) 93:1,19 bring (4) 35:23 50:4 75:21 83:8 bringing (1) 88:8 broad (2) 9:6,17 broader (3) 18:23 47:25 92:11 brought (4) 23:19,20 24:9 86:5 budget (2) 92:9 93:6 build (2) 67:11 80:4 bunch (1) 73:22 business (7) 1:21,22 3:12 58:16 80:22 94:6,6 butress (1) 77:16 bylaws (1) 72:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C (4) 67:5,7 95:2,2 calendar (1) 92:16 call (8) 1:15 3:1 13:20 42:9 54:6 64:19,20 83:6 called (3) 38:9 46:2 53:23 camera (1) 87:22 Cameras (1) 87:21 capacity (1) 14:10 capture (8) 5:17 9:16 14:4 58:9 63:19 70:1,11,21 captured (1) 57:23 captures (5) 29:18 50:8 56:1 57:9 61:15 carefully (1) 19:3 case (42) 6:6,6,8 7:19 8:3,7 9:12 9:13 10:21 11:23 14:9 15:6 26:19 27:4,8 30:10 38:24 41:24 42:2 43:3,4 44:13 45:9 47:23 52:1 60:18 61:4,23 64:14,17,18 65:24 66:24 67:5 69:24 76:16 79:12,13 79:17,19 80:6 84:24 cases (81) 6:4 7:2,3,3,4,21,25 8:4 8:5,9 14:7,10 29:24 32:24 34:18 34:19 35:5,6,6 36:8 37:24 38:11 40:11,12,18 42:1,4,7,14 43:25 45:17 46:25 49:7,9,12 54:14 57:18 61:16 68:2,4,12,14 69:2,14 69:21 80:10,11,12,19 81:11,15 81:18 82:20 84:8,10,11,13,14,14 84:16,17,21,22 85:2,8,8,10,11,13 85:14,15,18,20,22 86:1,3,17,18 86:23,25 87:19 catchall (1) 56:12 categories (19) 7:2,3,4 34:18,20 36:3 40:4,8 89:4,9,20,21 90:3,5 90:11,14,22 91:4,5 category (17) 7:21 8:4,5,7,9 9:17</p>	<p>39:7 40:3 44:5 45:20 47:6 53:3 80:10 89:6,13,17 91:1 caught (1) 75:17 Cavanagh (3) 1:12 95:6,21 cavity (8) 8:2,9,11,13,17,18,20,23 CCRB (28) 10:4 18:3 22:2,13,14 25:5 28:24,25 37:1,5 55:8 58:6 59:9 71:7 75:1 77:1,13 81:16 82:12 83:20 84:6 86:10 88:23 89:7,18 92:11,13,22 CD (2) 69:22 79:19 CDs (2) 70:6,10 Center (2) 1:5 83:21 certain (9) 12:7 35:4,5,5 38:6,12 47:2 48:24 58:7 certainly (9) 15:2 22:24 34:25 39:5 46:10 49:10 69:8 71:7 75:15 certify (2) 95:8,12 chair's (2) 32:12 66:4 challenged (1) 33:3 change (7) 14:12 15:14 19:14 25:4 47:7 69:3 78:22 changed (4) 15:17 43:18 60:21 63:22 changes (9) 4:2,22 25:2,3,12 48:24 64:5 87:6,18 charges (12) 23:19,20 24:10 44:2 44:3 47:12 65:4 67:21,22 69:10 69:14 70:2 charter (17) 6:13,15,16 12:21 28:22 29:2,17 39:17,18,19 48:10 48:11 51:1 66:21,22 71:6 72:22 check (2) 48:9 87:13 chief (2) 54:13,15 Chorus (1) 3:9 Chris (4) 73:9,10 83:9,12 chronic (2) 22:13,16 circumstance (3) 12:13 16:20 47:18 circumstances (6) 12:5 38:5 40:19 42:18 43:12 45:11 cited (1) 89:22 city (10) 3:20 18:8 26:5 33:4 34:22 58:12 87:5 92:6,8,10 City-rulemaking (1) 4:24 civilian (6) 1:2 3:2 36:21 44:20 46:17 87:20 civilians (2) 73:6 89:2 classic (1) 17:10 clear (14) 5:24 15:1,2 20:2 21:2 22:4 41:25 42:1 63:1 66:14 67:12 69:13 79:3 81:22 clearly (1) 40:10 click (1) 72:8 clock (3) 13:5 73:2,2 close (1) 94:7 closed (12) 64:7 88:25 89:5,15,21</p>
--	--	---

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

<p>90:4,14,20,24 91:5,9,13 closet (1) 82:20 closing (1) 50:16 closure (1) 56:10 Club (1) 92:6 co-chair (1) 93:4 Cohen (1) 88:20 collegiality (1) 30:4 coma (1) 12:7 come (16) 3:24 4:20 20:4,13 26:16 26:20 28:18 56:6 68:15 72:13,19 77:12 78:10 79:5,19 82:5 comes (1) 47:22 comfort (1) 51:4 comfortable (2) 39:23 48:24 coming (10) 6:19 19:23 81:6,7,11 81:18 82:13,15 83:3 94:18 command (1) 44:3 commencement (1) 36:20 comment (8) 1:18 15:18 20:13 35:20 58:4 69:16 72:13 73:25 commentary (6) 3:23 4:12,17 5:17 58:22 94:7 comments (7) 6:22 14:6 58:1 71:10 74:6,8 77:22 commission (2) 3:13 23:5 commissioner (18) 9:25 26:1,2,4,6 29:25 30:8 31:20 36:2,7 45:4 57:11,14,21 58:14,15 80:19 93:4 committed (2) 37:17 38:6 Committee (3) 1:20 88:17 91:19 committees (2) 70:22 71:8 common (1) 91:7 Commonly (1) 89:22 communication (1) 67:11 community (2) 91:25 92:23 compared (4) 30:8 81:12,22 82:2 comparison (1) 42:25 compelled (8) 23:16,17,21 24:18 26:20 27:22,23 28:5 compelling (2) 24:19 61:12 complain (2) 9:17 10:10 complainant (18) 6:8,9 9:1 16:21 20:19 21:13 22:17,21 25:13 31:8 38:22 46:16 59:1,17 65:11,15 86:11,14 complainant's (1) 19:22 complainants (12) 5:14 16:25 19:9 19:23 20:4 22:14 23:6 25:9,15 74:23 75:4,7 complaining (2) 31:5 43:8 complaint (24) 1:2 3:2 7:18 8:22 9:21 10:23,23 11:6 12:9,14,20,22 14:15 22:18 25:23 44:20,20 45:2 45:5 46:17,18 56:4 59:19 72:1 complaints (24) 5:25,25 6:1,2 9:14 10:21 22:14,20 23:1,3,9 81:5,6,7</p>	<p>82:5,12,18 87:20 88:23,25 89:1 90:19,20 91:6 completed (2) 91:19,19 completely (2) 14:11 65:22 composed (1) 93:2 composition (2) 33:2,10 compromise (1) 42:10 compulsion (1) 27:11 concern (1) 79:14 concerned (4) 21:3 54:16 78:21,23 concerns (3) 48:3 74:21 77:5 conclude (1) 49:21 concluded (1) 94:20 conclusion (1) 11:12 concretely (1) 79:2 conditions (1) 85:24 conduct (3) 15:9 37:3 86:4 conducted (2) 86:15 87:13 confirm (2) 9:7 93:5 confront (1) 73:7 confusing (1) 73:4 conjunction (1) 47:14 connect (1) 7:17 connected (2) 7:15 22:15 consent (1) 66:4 consequence (2) 23:18 40:25 consequences (12) 16:24 17:4 19:16 20:1,5,7 21:9 22:5,8 40:7 46:15 55:1 consider (6) 7:23 19:19,19 20:12 61:8 68:24 considerably (1) 79:4 considerations (1) 4:18 considered (1) 8:9 consistency (3) 31:3 49:8 88:8 consistent (3) 6:15,16 86:21 consistently (1) 28:24 constantly (1) 51:5 constitute (3) 27:3 49:5 61:8 constitutionality (1) 87:17 constrained (2) 35:18,19 consultation (1) 84:18 contact (1) 10:4 contemplated (1) 15:3 contemporaneous (1) 51:11 context (4) 6:13 19:8 28:6,19 continue (5) 32:17 81:3 83:14 86:6 92:19 continued (2) 93:3,13 continuing (2) 80:24 92:18 contribution (1) 33:15 controversial (2) 4:7 37:11 controversy (1) 16:5 conversation (1) 54:22 convey (1) 9:21 conveys (1) 78:25 convince (1) 63:15</p>	<p>convincingly (1) 19:21 coordination (1) 35:7 cop (2) 41:13,14 copy (2) 58:20,21 correct (4) 27:4 53:7 60:6 75:16 Cortes-Gomez (24) 2:8 3:7 9:24 14:13,18,21,23 41:1 43:15 44:11 44:15 45:24 50:7,21 52:24 53:2 56:16 60:6,13 63:2 64:10 88:19 93:4 94:12 council (8) 33:4 34:22 91:21,25 92:7,8,10,20 count (1) 93:7 COUNTY (1) 95:4 couple (5) 35:24 74:10 78:7 81:2 82:1 course (3) 8:15 17:24 23:1 court (4) 21:20 22:4 42:23 72:24 court-ordered (1) 87:6 cover (1) 40:1 covered (1) 70:20 create (6) 16:20 33:5 45:16 55:23 84:20 93:10 creating (2) 36:23 85:23 credit (1) 79:5 crime (1) 85:19 criminal (10) 11:21 17:7,9,17,25 18:3 19:7 20:25 23:24 24:5 criteria (1) 11:8 cross-examined (1) 18:22 crossed (4) 18:2,5,7,16 curious (1) 35:13 current (7) 5:18 10:6 22:10 34:25 62:19 70:20 93:8 currently (3) 17:2 18:25 35:9 cut (1) 77:4 cycle (1) 78:12</p> <hr/> <p align="center">D</p> <hr/> <p>D (15) 1:9 2:2 3:1 15:11 16:10,14 16:16,18 17:3 48:22 57:7,8 58:25 64:22 65:23 DA (1) 85:18 dah-dah-dah-dah (1) 21:22 Dan (11) 6:17,22 13:22 29:10 31:11,18 44:14 45:3 46:9 75:12 75:19 Dan's (1) 63:23 Daniel (2) 2:7 13:24 Danielle (3) 1:12 95:6,21 DAO (1) 65:17 Darce (8) 51:22 52:3 65:8 66:5,10 66:12 85:5 88:13 dark (1) 73:7 data (2) 86:9,22 date (3) 13:9,10,11 dates (2) 92:15,17</p>
--	---	---

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

day (2) 18:18 95:17
day-to-day (2) 70:16 93:12
days (13) 58:17 78:2,11,12 79:5,6
79:8 86:4,5,11,12,13,15
deal (5) 16:4 19:1 57:12 93:21 94:5
dealing (1) 64:16
debate (4) 4:6 6:17 22:6 51:2
debated (1) 28:14
debating (1) 39:6
Debbie (3) 5:4 29:6 75:25
Deborah (10) 2:10,11 5:3 6:24
16:16 28:7 29:10 39:21 49:23
60:15
Deborah's (1) 76:5
decade (1) 15:17
December (1) 78:14
decide (3) 42:15 45:9 62:20
decided (8) 8:20 31:13 33:11 60:19
60:20 62:21 65:24 68:24
decision (6) 8:10 22:22 32:3,3 33:8
42:6
decisions (2) 32:16 57:1
decreased (3) 79:4 85:7 86:12
deeds (4) 26:1,3,4,6
define (2) 8:6,22
definitely (2) 24:5 54:5
definition (3) 5:13 46:13 56:9
definitive (1) 49:17
delayed (1) 31:13
deliberations (1) 74:11
delicate (1) 31:4
demanding (1) 34:1
demeanor (2) 90:4,6
department (50) 8:19 16:6 20:10
26:25 28:15 29:21 30:11,19 31:1
34:5 35:12 38:13 47:15,16,20
51:17 53:18 57:18 58:6,12 66:24
67:8 70:3 73:1 74:17 75:21,23
76:8,21 77:1,3 78:1,5,15 79:10
79:12,17 80:5 81:6,12,15,18
82:13,15,25 84:24 86:25 87:5,6
87:15
Department's (2) 66:23 76:1
departments (2) 54:13,15
Deputy (4) 85:3,4 88:10,12
described (1) 75:7
deserve (1) 45:5
deserves (1) 45:14
designed (1) 84:7
desirable (1) 29:22
desire (1) 30:21
deter (2) 16:22 23:9
determination (7) 14:14,19 22:22
23:5 31:10 61:7 62:13
determined (1) 26:24
determining (2) 49:11,12
deterrence (1) 17:23

deterring (2) 19:23 23:2
development (1) 71:25
developments (1) 91:23
device (1) 89:10
difference (7) 30:6 34:4 35:14 36:6
44:17,23 63:24
differences (1) 35:2
different (12) 22:16 23:15,25 24:20
32:15,16 33:7 53:18 76:14 89:20
90:3 94:2
differently (1) 10:12
difficult (1) 42:5
difficulties (1) 42:8
difficulty (1) 41:11
directed (1) 84:19
direction (1) 66:20
directly (2) 81:7 82:16
director (24) 1:10,19 2:3 11:6
14:16 15:14 56:20,22 61:23 62:6
62:13,15,16,18 64:11,12,20
70:14 83:19 84:5 85:4,5 88:10,12
Director's (1) 83:17
disability (1) 90:12
disagree (5) 40:9 41:1 67:17,18,19
disagreed (1) 65:19
disagreeing (1) 67:15
disagrees (1) 58:7
disciplinary (1) 77:3
discipline (8) 11:14,17 17:6 34:1
44:3 58:17 86:24 87:18
disciplined (1) 51:18
discourtesies (1) 90:8
discourtesy (5) 90:1,2,4,7 91:8
discovered (1) 21:16
discretion (3) 11:5 15:13 23:10
discuss (7) 4:3,25 20:14 29:19
65:5 81:8 84:1
discussed (2) 39:4 47:23
discussion (12) 3:18,21,22,23 4:9
5:8,16 39:5 48:8,8 73:24 88:6
dismiss (1) 66:1
dismissal (3) 66:2,3,11
disparity (2) 81:5 82:12
disposed (2) 67:3,10
disposition (6) 46:19 53:16,17
56:5 79:4 86:17
dispositions (3) 48:11,20,23
distinction (2) 8:12,13
distribute (1) 29:4
distributed (3) 3:5,16,17
District (2) 91:21 92:19
divide (1) 7:25
Division (5) 85:3,7,13 92:7,9
docket (7) 84:8,10,13 85:2,6,10
86:5
documented (1) 74:25
documents (3) 15:23 27:19 51:11

DOI (1) 28:9
doing (14) 5:18 6:14 11:8 14:5
18:14 29:12 42:21 51:6 52:15
58:10,18 68:6,20,21
door (1) 79:11
double (1) 29:7
draft (6) 4:2 6:15 20:14 47:24
58:21 74:12
drafted (1) 47:6
drafting (3) 5:5 7:13 50:3
dramatically (2) 63:22 72:3
driving (3) 43:17,20,23
drop (2) 81:5,18
Dunn (15) 73:9,10,12,19 74:7
78:20 80:2,8,13 81:1,10 82:9
83:1,6,10
dupe (4) 79:24 80:11,14,18
duping (2) 79:17 80:6
duties (1) 94:1
duty (2) 29:8 58:6

E

E (5) 65:16 66:15,17 67:1 95:2
e-mail (2) 1:25 67:7
earlier (1) 25:11
Eason (8) 2:9 6:20 15:4 31:2 43:3
44:6,14 48:13
East (2) 1:6 92:5
easy (1) 47:19
effective (2) 85:24 86:10
efficiency (2) 56:23 86:7
efficient (1) 86:7
efficient-running (1) 85:25
efforts (1) 92:10
egregious (1) 12:18
eight (1) 30:1
either (7) 16:25 33:19 38:12 40:16
50:9 53:5 68:25
eliminate (1) 84:23
eliminated (1) 56:17
employees (1) 70:15
employment (1) 28:6
encompassed (1) 71:1
encounters (1) 30:17
encourage (1) 80:4
encroachments (1) 47:2
engage (2) 47:15 77:2
engaged (1) 76:25
enormously (1) 30:20
ensure (3) 31:11,15 93:13
ensuring (1) 87:16
entire (1) 15:4
entries (1) 54:14
equal (3) 33:6 75:10,11
equalize (1) 33:19
equitable (1) 32:25
equity (2) 33:5,14

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

eroding (1) 46:13
error (9) 37:14 38:9 41:10 46:5,11
46:19,20 77:9,11
especially (3) 39:11 51:7 63:7
Esq (9) 1:9,10 2:2,3,6,7,8,10,11
essential (1) 32:14
essentially (1) 5:23
ethnicity (3) 90:12,15 91:14
evaluated (1) 6:12
evening (3) 73:10,11 83:18
evenly (1) 29:5
event (1) 26:10
events (2) 91:20,25
eventually (1) 66:24
Everybody (2) 3:8 94:15
evidence (11) 17:15 48:22 49:1,21
50:6,10,14 55:10 60:23 61:6,8
evidentiary (1) 50:11
evolved (1) 48:9
exactly (8) 21:2 24:18 25:10 28:2
42:7 44:22 69:23 72:6
example (8) 7:3 8:4 10:3 41:2,3
43:16 48:25 87:9
excellent (1) 35:11
exception (4) 43:5 68:11 76:12
85:19
exceptions (2) 42:22,23
excited (1) 94:5
exclude (1) 10:6
excuse (2) 25:20 69:11
executed (1) 42:24
executing (1) 92:1
executive (30) 1:10,19 2:3 11:5
14:16 15:13 56:20,22 61:22 62:6
62:13,14,15,18 64:11,12,20
70:14 83:16,19 84:5,6 85:4,4,21
88:10,12 93:16 94:8,11
Executives (1) 92:7
exercise (1) 23:22
exist (5) 16:16 31:24,25 35:3 51:12
existing (1) 48:20
exists (4) 35:9 62:25 69:14 70:2
exonerated (2) 50:2 77:7
expand (1) 32:17
expanded (1) 56:20
expansion (1) 93:20
expect (3) 51:12 73:12 86:6
experience (9) 25:2 30:12,12,20
31:19 33:1 35:23 42:4 67:4
experienced (1) 38:21
expertise (2) 75:20 94:4
expired (5) 11:5,7,18 61:17,17
explain (4) 7:1 69:2,3 80:6
explanation (3) 77:14 81:14 87:12
explanatory (1) 9:6
explicit (2) 69:6,9
explore (1) 52:6

exploring (2) 19:13 25:6
extent (4) 36:9 74:22 75:6 76:18
extenuating (3) 12:4,13,20
extra (1) 44:4
extremely (1) 31:6

F

F (2) 58:4 95:2
faces (1) 26:23
facilitate (1) 92:11
FACSIMILE (1) 1:24
fact (8) 14:8 29:6,22 33:4 36:4
70:12 83:2 93:8
factor (2) 12:18 61:12
factors (1) 36:10
facts (3) 38:6 47:22 65:21
FADO (6) 38:19 40:8 54:21 71:15
89:4,6
failure (1) 89:24
fair (11) 31:7,7,16 34:10,10 36:3
55:13 75:8 76:6,24 79:3
fairly (1) 82:5
fairness (3) 35:25 55:17 76:5
faith (26) 37:14,17 38:2,9,15,16
40:3,12,24 41:7,10 42:22,23
43:12 46:5,10,19,20,22,23,23
48:6 76:12 77:8,11,15
false (12) 19:11 20:9,9,18 22:19
23:1 52:10,13,18 74:25 75:3,5
family (2) 6:1 9:19
far (6) 33:22 35:14 51:23 66:20
68:12 74:15
fascinating (2) 26:3 28:25
favor (4) 3:8 4:8 21:18 94:15
favoring (1) 35:5
fear (3) 12:18 19:24 23:1
February (6) 78:9 85:9,12 86:2
90:18 91:18
federal (1) 42:23
feel (2) 48:23 51:4
feels (1) 81:13
fell (5) 90:2,5,11,22 91:3
fellow (2) 34:2 42:6
felony (1) 21:1
felt (2) 27:8 65:8
field (1) 33:17
Fifth (2) 23:22 27:25
figure (3) 26:16 34:16 81:16
figures (1) 78:6
file (11) 5:13,23 7:18,24 8:3,6,22
12:20 14:3 22:14 56:4
filing (2) 12:14 13:7
fill (1) 33:16
fill-in (1) 57:4
final (4) 3:20 4:20 62:13 77:18
finality (1) 78:25
finally (2) 88:1,5

Finance (2) 92:7,8
find (2) 34:14 37:25
finding (9) 40:20 42:3 45:15 47:9
47:13 48:1 49:25 53:20,22
findings (2) 58:7 70:4
Fine (1) 72:21
FINEST (3) 87:4,8 88:2
first (13) 3:18,21 5:12 32:11 63:25
68:15 72:19 81:4,23 83:24 84:5
86:17 92:17
first-hand (1) 67:4
fiscal (2) 93:8,9
five (4) 79:9 90:11,14 92:12
fix (1) 60:16
fixed (1) 35:3
flag (1) 28:13
flexibility (1) 48:15
Flook (1) 19:4
focused (1) 85:11
folks (1) 36:3
follow (3) 49:8 65:16 70:4
following (2) 64:6 87:19
force (10) 89:8,9,12,13,15,16
90:21,23,24 91:1
forces (1) 40:4
foresee (1) 52:5
form (4) 70:22 71:8 87:10,14
formal (3) 5:5 22:2 25:3
formalized (7) 3:20 4:23 39:11
43:6 44:9 50:22,24
formalizing (1) 66:19
former (1) 86:10
formulated (1) 48:3
forth (2) 29:11 48:12
forward (4) 19:24 74:14 76:11
88:15
found (6) 22:17 30:16 41:9 42:7
46:18 76:25
four (2) 26:9 90:21
frame (2) 77:25 78:6
frankly (5) 19:3 32:13 47:14 76:23
78:21
frequent (2) 75:7 90:8
friend (1) 9:19
frisk (2) 87:7,13
frisked (1) 89:23
front (1) 25:25
fruition (1) 28:10
frustrations (1) 71:16
full (7) 11:24 60:19 63:5 64:6,8
84:2 86:21
fully (6) 10:23 20:14 30:21 86:3,18
86:23
fun (1) 72:9
function (1) 65:20
functions (1) 71:23
further (10) 29:20 31:14 46:16

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

73:24 77:16 84:7,13 85:1 86:5
95:12
future (3) 29:5 52:5 69:5

G

G (5) 2:4 3:6 59:21 60:6,8
gained (2) 17:15 72:2
gains (1) 86:7
gathers (1) 25:5
geek-a-thon (1) 73:13
general (1) 71:2
generally (2) 8:1 21:3
gesture (2) 90:3,6
getting (8) 15:22,22,23 30:18
31:15 59:5 65:20 79:15
Girls' (1) 92:6
Gitner (60) 2:7 13:24 14:11 15:10
15:17,25 16:10 17:12,20 18:6,12
18:20 24:11,18,24 25:10,18,21
26:19,23 27:4,18 28:2 30:10,16
37:20,23 39:13 40:9 41:16,20,23
43:2 44:22 45:4,8,22 46:2 47:5
50:12 55:3,6,9,19 58:4,11,23
61:21,25 62:6,10,18 63:3,8,11,13
63:17,24 64:4,15
Gitner's (1) 6:18
give (12) 11:5 18:19 21:5 25:16
35:25 43:22,24 44:1 58:21 68:20
74:4 83:6
given (6) 21:13 45:18 56:1,23
58:20 75:15
gives (2) 14:9 65:17
giving (4) 20:18 44:4 65:10 69:15
glad (2) 73:19,20
gleam (1) 33:1
go (26) 3:19 5:2 6:23 14:22,23,25
15:8 21:20 24:20 27:10 33:18
39:12 42:13 55:6 58:3 60:15 62:8
62:9 63:6,8 65:3 71:21 79:18
88:22 94:8,10
goal (1) 84:22
goes (6) 33:9 48:20 52:21 76:11
79:18,18
going (45) 3:22 4:11 13:22 14:13
23:7 32:2 42:9 43:9,13,19 57:10
57:17 60:2,15 64:18 65:23 67:8
68:18,25 69:1,1 70:4,8 71:18
72:8 73:23 74:2 76:1,2,10,17
77:4,17,20 79:6,7,23 80:17,18,20
80:23 81:8,15 82:14 84:14
good (53) 7:5 12:1 14:12 15:14,19
16:4 18:6 19:1 24:2 25:6,8 30:25
37:9,14,17 38:9,15,16 40:3,11
41:7,9 42:22,23 43:12 45:6 46:5
46:10,19,20,22,23 48:6 50:4 55:3
55:19 58:23 60:14 62:11 66:20
71:4 73:10,11,13 75:12 76:12

77:8,11,13,15 82:23 83:1,18
gotten (1) 6:7
grammatical (1) 57:4
grant (2) 18:25 70:13
gray (2) 43:7,10
great (2) 73:14 74:13
ground (1) 38:23
group (1) 76:13
guarantee (1) 77:11
guardians (1) 6:3
guess (8) 10:13,17 12:15,19 19:5
34:24 39:17 81:2
guide (6) 17:4 71:14,17,19,23 88:2
guilty (1) 43:22
gun (1) 89:11
guy (3) 23:11 41:5 42:19
guys (1) 42:13

H

half (4) 81:23,23 82:2,3
Hall (1) 92:3
hamstringing (1) 65:14
hamstrung (2) 29:5 30:2
hand (2) 14:9 95:17
handcuffs (1) 89:10
handle (1) 5:6
handled (3) 62:25 80:12 86:25
handling (1) 13:7
hanging (1) 81:25
haphazard (1) 93:23
happen (8) 20:8 21:15 32:7,8
33:17 57:22 75:5 76:21
happened (5) 30:2 44:2 49:11,13
81:14
happening (1) 13:16
happens (4) 15:16 62:1 65:4 68:14
happy (2) 34:15 83:22
hard (7) 38:5,7 64:4 76:2,8,23
93:25
harder (2) 35:6 46:4
head (2) 31:25 93:6
headed (1) 85:3
healthy (1) 32:14
hear (4) 4:9 73:23 75:20,23
heard (8) 9:18,18,19 35:24 46:7
75:4,25 76:13
heat (1) 38:3
held (3) 11:19 92:3,5
help (1) 33:16
helpful (1) 7:4
helping (1) 47:24
hereunto (1) 95:16
hesitant (1) 30:24
high-profile (1) 11:23
highest (1) 87:25
highlight (3) 83:24 86:16 89:3
historically (1) 10:20

history (2) 74:16,25
hit (1) 90:23
hits (1) 45:13
hitting (1) 55:14
hold (3) 6:18 7:11 85:18
hope (3) 4:19 74:19 82:10
hopeful (1) 20:12
hopefully (1) 16:23
hoping (1) 92:21
hosts (1) 83:20
hour (4) 43:18,18,21,23
housing (1) 91:23

I

IAB (1) 82:19
IAB's (2) 82:6,19
IB (1) 9:3
idea (6) 4:25 6:5 11:9 68:19 71:4
82:21
identified (3) 74:21 84:17 92:14
identity (1) 73:4
IG (1) 82:24
immeasurable (1) 32:23
immunity (3) 18:25 23:24 75:14
immunized (2) 24:5,7
immunizing (1) 18:21
impeachment (3) 17:10,19 18:22
implemented (1) 88:3
implicated (1) 19:7
implied (1) 55:18
implying (1) 46:24
important (11) 11:9,11 15:12,20
16:3 31:20 73:22 74:18 75:3 88:7
92:2
impose (1) 38:12
imposes (1) 58:5
imposing (1) 87:18
imposition (1) 58:17
impressions (1) 3:24
improper (1) 41:13
improved (1) 87:14
impulse (1) 75:9
inaccurate (1) 75:14
inadequate (1) 22:11
inanimate (1) 90:23
inaudible (5) 7:16,23 42:12 61:4,7
incentivize (1) 16:21
incident (7) 12:15 13:6,9,10,11
51:12,13
inclined (1) 34:19
include (6) 8:5 9:10 10:9 17:5
19:16 87:10
included (2) 89:23 93:6
including (1) 47:9
inclusionary (1) 10:25
inconsistencies (1) 18:2
inconsistent (1) 18:22

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

7

incorporated (1) 69:20
increase (1) 45:16
increased (1) 86:18
indemnity (1) 21:14
indicated (2) 67:7 92:10
indicating (1) 70:3
indication (1) 36:1
individual (2) 9:8 43:17
individualized (1) 36:10
inexperience (1) 37:16
inform (2) 65:21 66:23
information (4) 3:14 17:15 25:5 87:2
initial (1) 3:24
initiative (3) 62:7 92:12,13
inquiry (1) 82:22
insert (1) 49:5
instance (6) 7:21,25 8:1,21 9:2 49:23
instances (4) 7:17 8:2,25 9:1
instructed (1) 44:25
instruction (2) 39:8 41:15
instructions (36) 37:16,18 38:14 39:8,9,14,16 40:1 41:17,21 42:13 42:17,19 43:6,6 44:1,4,9,9,12 45:6,10,12,17,23 47:8,11,12,17 47:18 48:1 69:22 70:7,10 76:16 79:19
intake (3) 81:19,22 82:13
integrity (1) 26:17
intended (1) 40:5,6
intent (5) 10:7,9 40:5 46:25 47:4
interactions (1) 9:3
interactive (1) 72:2
interest (8) 14:2 61:2,11,14,19,25 63:15,23
interested (2) 5:7 95:14
interesting (8) 20:11 24:22 28:21 39:21 46:4 72:7 75:23 81:21
interpretation (1) 10:8
interview (8) 19:15 22:2 25:2,4 36:21 37:1 77:13 86:11
interviewed (1) 17:1
interviews (9) 15:9 19:8 26:18 28:20 37:3,3,4,7 86:14
introducing (1) 19:18
introduction (1) 19:22
introductions (1) 19:15
invaluable (2) 30:12,15
investigate (5) 9:23 11:6 14:10,15 35:16
investigated (4) 10:23 86:3,18,23
investigating (2) 8:16 87:20
investigation (13) 11:11,25 13:7,8 13:16,19 21:12 22:21 31:14 64:7 64:8 65:5 82:25
investigations (9) 26:17 85:3,5,7

85:13 86:4,21 88:12 93:14
investigative (1) 92:16
investigator (1) 53:4
investigators (2) 16:25 94:3
invite (2) 84:3 88:6
involved (3) 12:6 72:23 89:1
involves (2) 22:2 71:19
Isaacs (1) 83:21
Island (2) 37:5 92:3
issue (18) 3:15 4:6 7:13 10:17 11:1 24:17,20,24 28:14,15 31:18 35:22 36:23 45:19 48:6 50:3 74:20 76:17
issued (3) 15:13 74:17 87:4
issues (5) 5:5,5 35:4 73:22 93:17
iteration (3) 3:18 5:7 74:5

J

Janette (3) 2:8 3:7 88:17
January (7) 84:9,12 85:8,9 86:12 86:24 90:18
job (5) 17:5 27:22 33:2,16 40:17
Joe (6) 9:4 36:11 46:6 48:18 79:15 79:20
joint (1) 51:23
Jon (6) 7:7,13 51:21,22 65:6 85:5
Jonathan (1) 88:13
Joseph (2) 2:5 9:5
judged (1) 43:3
judgment (1) 52:7
judicial (1) 23:4
July (1) 32:11
jump (1) 36:18
June (1) 92:5
jurisdiction (5) 7:16,20,22 51:2 55:15
justice (7) 61:2,11,14,19 62:1 63:15,23
justify (1) 41:8

K

keep (2) 7:19 55:15
Kelly (1) 54:12
key (1) 32:9
kind (13) 20:1,1 21:14,23 34:16 40:3 43:1 46:22 56:6 67:11 72:7 78:24 80:9
kinds (3) 5:5 30:17 35:5
knee (1) 73:20
know (52) 6:17 10:21 12:3,3,19 14:1,5 18:12,15 19:20 21:22,23 22:6,18 23:4 24:2 25:7,11,15 26:1 27:15 28:8 31:7,14,15 32:6 32:21 40:14,15 43:11,13,21 44:9 46:3 50:19 54:21 56:7,11 57:20 62:20 67:10 68:16 69:7 74:16,24 77:4 78:13,24 80:16,23 81:7

82:24
knowledge (5) 9:8,10 10:3,15,15
Kris (1) 24:4
Krist (1) 19:4

L

L (6) 2:10 15:9 16:2,14,18 36:19
label (1) 24:15
lack (1) 35:7
language (13) 9:6 10:6,24 29:2 47:22 49:6,14 50:12,15 90:9,10 90:13 91:11
lapel (1) 71:20
larger (1) 32:20
late (2) 13:25 92:17
launch (3) 5:10,11 37:6
law (3) 13:6 18:13 72:24
layman's (1) 49:2
leaders (2) 73:1,3
learn (1) 44:24
learned (1) 14:8
learns (1) 38:15
legal (3) 6:3 8:12 24:25
legislative (2) 33:8,12
legitimate (6) 19:23 23:3,9 29:17 33:21 77:24
lesser (1) 33:23
let's (10) 3:1 35:16 41:24 48:4 55:4 57:5 58:3 61:25 62:15 71:3
letter (1) 41:9
level (1) 76:7
leverage (1) 57:21
lie (1) 20:4
limitation (3) 72:23,25 85:19
limitations (11) 11:4,7,13,18,21 12:23 13:12,17 84:25 85:17,23
limited (1) 29:13
Lincoln (3) 72:5,6,7
Linda (3) 7:9 71:13 72:4
Lindsay (6) 2:9 6:20 19:4 29:6 33:24 75:25
Lisa (1) 88:20
list (1) 50:17
listened (1) 47:19
lists (1) 48:22
litigation (1) 46:16
little (5) 5:11 29:4 30:23 43:16 65:14
live (1) 4:12
location (1) 92:4
locations (1) 92:15
logged (1) 82:20
long (5) 29:14 33:18 59:19 80:16 93:22
look (25) 26:13 30:5,5 31:17,21,22 33:19 34:3 39:18 47:10 48:4,5 50:25 51:18 56:18,21 69:25 71:4

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

74:14 76:10,11,18 78:8 81:13
88:15
looking (8) 5:21 16:2 28:12 51:8
59:14 64:2 82:2 93:9
looming (1) 32:21
loss (1) 17:5
lot (17) 4:5,7 6:12 22:8,15 23:9
32:23 41:11 51:11 54:10 65:19
71:11,20 72:9 80:19 81:14 82:17
lots (1) 46:11
love (3) 68:16 74:4,5
loved (1) 32:15
low-level (2) 19:10 20:18
Lower (1) 92:5
lying (5) 16:22,24 17:24 19:8 20:7

M

M (3) 1:5 2:7 13:24
main (1) 3:12
major (1) 44:23
majority (2) 48:16 89:12
making (7) 22:4 38:20 52:16 54:5
57:12 74:25 75:8
Malik (9) 1:10 2:3 26:5 50:23 62:17
63:20 64:6 83:18,19
MAMARONECK (2) 1:23,23
manage (1) 70:14
management (1) 93:15
mandates (1) 29:3
Manhattan (1) 83:22
map (1) 43:1
maps (1) 72:1
March (5) 1:3 3:1 92:1,17 95:17
Marcos (8) 7:7,14,15 28:22 34:12
34:12 72:3 88:11
marked (1) 35:2
marriage (1) 95:14
material (1) 18:23
matter (9) 5:12 20:11 24:15 26:10
31:23 47:4 57:16 95:10,15
matters (4) 19:11 24:6 84:1 88:7
mayor's (1) 93:6
mayoral (1) 34:21
mean (32) 8:9 9:5,11,12 10:24
11:19 12:5 13:20 15:1,15 20:19
20:21 21:19 22:1 27:22 30:5,16
31:17 32:4,9 36:9 38:17 41:8,23
42:2 54:4,20 55:22 67:15 69:5,7
73:14
meaning (1) 53:9
meaningfulness (1) 34:23
means (6) 19:20 27:16 49:2,4
59:16,19
meant (2) 7:1 9:7
measure (2) 30:12 64:23
measurement (1) 81:24
medals (1) 71:21

mediated (10) 88:23 89:5,8,19
90:2,10,19 91:3,8,12
mediation (20) 59:3,4,15,19,23
60:5 88:19,24 89:1,5,15,21 90:5
90:14,20,25 91:5,9,13,15
mediation's (1) 59:10
mediator (2) 59:9,12
meet (2) 73:7 93:3
meeting (17) 1:1,13 3:2 4:14,15,19
66:19 74:1 80:24 81:8 83:14
91:21 92:2,5,19 94:8,20
meetings (4) 54:11 83:3 91:24
92:24
member (6) 9:19 29:7 32:1,5 36:7
53:7
members (14) 2:1 3:17 4:5 6:1
29:3,9 32:1,6 33:24,25 34:2 42:6
89:2 93:3
memo (6) 19:4,5 51:7,8 54:10,14
memoranda (1) 87:4
memorandum (4) 69:18,19 87:8
88:2
mention (1) 87:21
mentioned (4) 31:12 37:19 39:3,25
mentioning (2) 66:25 72:10
merit (1) 43:4
message (3) 87:4,8 88:2
met (2) 26:4 84:6
middle (2) 38:23 92:1
miles (5) 43:17,18,20,21,23
milking (2) 73:2,2
Mina (12) 1:10 2:3 7:6 48:5 50:19
63:7,19 72:4 74:13 83:6,16,19
mind (4) 48:25 69:24 77:24 78:16
minds (1) 78:22
mindset (1) 31:9
minimizing (1) 85:22
minutes (3) 1:16 3:4,5
misconduct (14) 9:9 27:3 38:7
49:5 50:18 51:3,7 53:9,10,16,17
53:20 54:6 76:25
misdeemeanor (3) 20:20,23,24
misguided (1) 75:10
misleading (2) 27:1 50:9
misread (1) 28:24
missed (1) 78:4
missing (2) 29:7 68:16
mistake (6) 38:15,16,20 40:22,25
41:14
mistaken (2) 15:6 71:13
mistakenly (1) 43:21
misunderstanding (1) 27:13
misunderstood (1) 79:16
Mitchell (2) 2:4 3:6
mix (1) 30:23
moment (3) 3:15 38:3 48:5
month (11) 82:5,5 84:5,9,12,15

85:5 86:8 89:3 93:5,5
month's (1) 80:14
monthly (2) 83:25 84:2
months (14) 12:15,17 30:1,1 78:7
79:9 82:1 84:18,21 85:11,14,15
85:16 90:18
moot (1) 11:15
motion (3) 3:4 94:10,12
motorist (2) 44:18 45:1
MOU (1) 70:5
move (2) 30:22 33:5
moved (1) 3:6

N

N (3) 2:11 6:24 95:2
name (2) 83:19 89:24
narrative (1) 87:10
narrow (4) 39:7 41:25 42:4,14
naturally (1) 21:15
nature (2) 11:23 25:2
necessarily (6) 7:13 9:11 27:22
38:17 49:9 55:17
necessary (3) 15:15 27:9 76:4
necessity (1) 25:4
need (8) 19:1 20:6 29:1 37:8 56:11
60:22,22 61:10
needed (1) 66:5
needs (3) 33:3 36:20 82:22
Neighborhood (2) 1:5 83:21
neither (1) 17:14
never (9) 26:4 28:10 44:24 45:12
68:8 70:17 74:16 82:18,20
new (27) 1:7,7,22,23 3:18 5:23
14:3 26:5 35:14 36:19 58:12 59:2
59:4 60:22 61:6,8 80:19 85:25
86:9 87:5,15 88:14 93:11 94:2,6
95:3,7
night (1) 17:13
nobody's (3) 23:7 51:14,19
non-sanction (1) 37:13
nonlethal (1) 89:10
normal (4) 3:13 74:2,2,3
notaries (3) 26:2,3,6
Notary (1) 95:6
notation (1) 22:19
note (3) 53:8 74:15 92:2
noted (5) 51:3,7 53:9,23 54:6
notes (1) 53:9
notice (2) 56:18 58:16
notify (1) 58:15
notifying (2) 58:6 59:1
noting (1) 54:23
notion (1) 77:11
notwithstanding (1) 11:12
number (12) 5:4,21 37:24 50:20
56:19 80:15 84:8 85:2,22 86:3,11
87:25

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

9

numbers (8) 8:13,14 31:21 78:8,17
81:1 82:9,21
NYCHA (1) 92:18
NYPD (2) 87:16 89:2

O

O (1) 95:2
O'Grady (3) 72:15,17,21
oath (19) 21:4,5,7,12,21 23:17
24:11,14,16,20 25:1,12,25 26:11
26:21 27:7,12,17 28:7
oaths (1) 21:8
object (3) 45:24 46:1 90:24
obligation (2) 13:15 66:23
observe (1) 9:2
obvious (2) 13:14 56:9
obviously (7) 5:3 6:12 9:1 36:10
58:19 73:6 90:17
occasionally (1) 32:19
occur (6) 37:15 39:9 49:4,6,22,24
occurred (3) 38:8 49:18 53:10
occurs (1) 4:17
off-site (2) 37:4 92:15
offense (1) 21:1
offensive (4) 90:9,10,13 91:11
offer (1) 77:15
offering (1) 21:15
office (2) 28:16 87:1
officer (46) 9:9 12:3,7 16:8,11,21
17:21,24 21:13 26:20 27:7,9,11
27:16 31:4,8,19 37:25 38:2,6,14
38:17 41:10 43:5,11,19,24 44:10
44:19,24 45:2,10,12,14 47:4
52:22 55:13,17 57:13 58:16
59:18 73:5 76:22 77:12,12 87:11
officer's (4) 31:15 38:1 46:25 55:6
officers (21) 9:2,3 13:15,21 17:1,2
19:9 20:6 21:7 23:10,14 25:5
33:24 40:11 74:25 75:2,12,13
76:24 77:6 87:23
oh (6) 7:10 12:25 15:15 19:5 59:22
67:18
okay (19) 7:10 8:24 13:10 16:13
36:17 37:9 40:22 52:23,23 58:3
59:22 63:17 64:21 66:10 69:25
75:8 80:3,8 81:10
old (5) 1:21 84:8 85:14,15 94:6
older (4) 84:18,22 85:12,16
omissions (2) 54:11,16
OMN (9) 50:21 51:21 52:2 53:3,5,8
53:25 55:4,5
OMN's (2) 52:25 53:1
OMNs (1) 75:2
once (3) 32:19 58:19 74:16
ones (2) 37:4 56:8
open (9) 4:6 14:9 44:5 84:8,10,13
85:2,6,9

opened (1) 79:11
openly (1) 4:11
operate (1) 28:19
operated (1) 34:13
operations (3) 70:16 84:2 93:13
opinion (1) 73:18
opportunity (7) 4:1,14 11:24 12:24
31:12 55:12 69:16
oppose (3) 46:10 77:21,22
opposed (6) 3:10 24:25 37:17
53:23 81:6 94:16
opposite (1) 46:21
opposition (1) 38:13
option (3) 53:18 77:19,24
options (1) 27:13
order (6) 1:15 3:3,3,12 21:6 65:2
organically (1) 21:15
organization (2) 70:15 85:25
organizational (1) 70:16
orientation (2) 90:12,15
origin (1) 34:24
original (4) 60:19 63:9,13,16
ought (1) 70:11
outcome (4) 11:15 44:24 59:23
95:15
outcomes (1) 36:8
outer (1) 92:14
outer-borough (1) 92:24
outlined (1) 87:9
outreach (5) 91:16,19 92:18,21,25
outside (1) 12:22
overdo (1) 74:8
overnight (1) 34:12
override (1) 62:5
overruled (1) 34:6
overstates (1) 75:15
overwhelming (1) 90:7

P

p.m (2) 1:4 94:20
page (6) 5:22 14:2 16:12 37:11
50:20 82:8
paints (1) 41:3
panel (51) 14:22,24 15:4,5 29:2,3
29:14,15,21 31:3,11 32:5,23 34:2
35:24 36:1,7 37:13,21,24 38:24
42:6,15 43:7,10 45:9 46:9 48:1
53:19,21 60:19 61:7 62:9,9,12,21
62:22,24,24,25,25 63:5,9,13,16
75:18 76:3,9 84:17,20,21
panel's (1) 22:22
panels (17) 29:1,12 30:25 31:22
32:6,13,16 34:4,13 35:3,4,5,8,13
35:15 44:1 63:6
paragraph (1) 10:1
parallel (2) 16:20 49:22
parallelism (1) 36:24

parking (1) 7:9
part (6) 17:12 39:4 41:10 43:25
55:1 56:13
participate (3) 4:14 13:15,19
participating (1) 32:23
particular (12) 7:19 8:3 27:8 36:8
38:24 47:22,23 48:1 51:9 67:1
68:1 93:24
particularly (3) 12:14 25:13 75:3
particulars (1) 72:23
parties (7) 59:8,14,15,20 60:10,25
95:13
passed (3) 57:9,24 64:22
patrol (8) 17:4 23:11 71:14,17,19
71:22 87:23 88:2
PBA (1) 76:22
PC (5) 31:25 32:1,5,6 54:12
PD (1) 67:12
penalty (6) 47:7,14 67:2,6,23 69:13
pending (2) 84:12,21
people (26) 5:13 6:21 7:18,18,23
9:14,17 12:14 19:20 21:18 26:11
26:12 32:15,18 33:4 34:19 37:19
39:12 40:3 72:12 76:3,9 82:10,14
93:21,23
pepper (1) 89:11
percent (11) 78:9,14 84:16 86:14
86:19,19,20,23,25 87:1 88:25
percentage (2) 78:13 86:17
perception (2) 33:22 76:7
perfectly (4) 33:20 37:25 38:4
41:14
period (7) 12:8 78:3 82:3,4,6 86:1
87:23
perjuring (1) 24:8
perjury (5) 19:10 20:18 21:6 23:8
24:12
person (9) 9:11 21:5 22:16 29:15
43:19,20 49:10 51:18 56:3
personal (8) 6:8 9:8,10 10:3,13,15
11:1 12:8
personally (6) 30:16,17,24 33:21
37:18 38:8
perspective (1) 31:11
pertain (1) 67:1
pertaining (2) 8:23 84:1
Phil (1) 83:2
phone (1) 37:7
phones (1) 81:25
phrase (2) 9:8 32:9
phrased (1) 48:25
phraseology (1) 73:3
physical (5) 89:13,16 90:12,23,25
pickup (1) 60:15
piggyback (1) 9:24
Pilot (1) 87:22
place (6) 4:23 32:11 37:1,4,7 66:13

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

places (2) 56:19,21
plainly (1) 20:4
Planning (1) 88:11
plea (3) 57:6,12,20
pleaded (1) 89:7
pleas (1) 57:10
please (2) 35:21 84:3
plenty (1) 40:12
plus (1) 45:8
POD (1) 86:9
point (17) 4:1 10:19 15:11 16:23
17:23 19:14 21:11 24:25 25:1,10
35:17 37:9 57:16 63:23 75:12
77:10,16
pointing (1) 89:12
points (1) 33:17
police (78) 8:18 16:5,8,11,21,25
17:2 19:9 20:6,10 23:14 25:5
26:20,25 28:15 29:1,20,25 30:8
30:10,19 31:1,4,8,10,15,19,19
32:22 33:24,25 34:5,21 35:12
36:2,7 38:13 43:19 44:19 47:15
47:16,20 51:17 52:21 57:11,13
57:14,17,21 58:5,12,15 66:23
70:3 73:1,5 74:17,25 75:2,11,13
75:21,23 76:1,8,20,21,24 77:6,12
77:12 80:19 82:15,24 84:24
86:25 87:5,6
policies (2) 87:7,15
Policy (1) 88:11
poor (1) 29:6
pops (1) 72:9
portions (1) 71:22
position (3) 28:18 57:12 68:17
positions (1) 93:10
possibility (4) 6:11 19:24 42:15
84:23
possible (3) 48:23 52:4 84:23
possibly (2) 46:15 47:23
post (1) 93:10
potential (3) 19:16 20:5 22:5
potentially (5) 16:23,24 17:5 21:19
55:25
power (10) 27:6,19 38:19 54:8
56:19 66:3 70:13,21 74:18,18
powers (1) 27:23
practical (4) 24:25 31:23 57:16
79:13
practice (1) 71:7
practices (1) 87:7
pragmatic (1) 33:17
pragmatically (1) 20:22
precinct (3) 87:24,24 91:24
precincts (1) 82:17
preclude (2) 10:24 21:14
precluded (1) 28:6
precludes (1) 12:22

preclusion (2) 9:16 13:3
prefer (1) 23:7
preliminary (2) 86:8 93:6
preponderance (3) 48:21 49:1
50:1
present (3) 2:1 9:12,15
presentations (1) 91:20
presidents (3) 91:22,23 92:20
presumably (1) 4:15
presume (1) 14:22
presumption (1) 32:4
pretends (1) 4:4
pretty (3) 32:2 56:9 58:25
previous (1) 22:20
previously (2) 3:5 61:6
primarily (2) 85:11 89:13
principle (2) 58:19 64:23
prior (2) 16:11 58:17
private (1) 66:18
probably (13) 6:6 16:18 18:16
19:10 22:11 34:25 37:20 38:24
38:25 56:17 61:14 63:2 71:4
probitive (1) 51:9
problem (10) 17:12 22:8 26:15
51:8 54:23,25 74:23 75:11,11
80:21
procedure (2) 58:13 88:9
proceed (3) 25:18,21 79:13
proceeding (2) 11:21 18:1
proceedings (6) 1:8 17:7,9,17 95:9
95:11
process (25) 3:19 4:10,11,21,23
4:24 6:14 15:1 19:15 21:11 27:11
27:14 30:3 31:7 57:14 65:16,25
67:4,11,12 70:2 79:3 87:18 88:16
93:23
processes (4) 4:24 66:14 74:2,3
produce (1) 27:19
professor (1) 18:13
profiling (2) 87:21 88:1
program (1) 37:5
prohibitions (1) 48:13
Project (1) 87:22
promise (1) 18:8
promote (1) 93:14
proper (2) 29:17 42:12
properly (1) 18:22
proposal (3) 4:8 29:11,18
proposals (2) 33:11,12
propose (1) 4:21
proposed (6) 3:18 10:6 13:22
37:14 57:24 78:3
proposing (5) 4:3 34:3,8 55:24
88:14
proposition (2) 29:23 55:22
prosecute (1) 52:1
prosecuted (1) 51:19

prosecution (8) 20:1 23:8,24 24:6
51:21,23 57:5 64:24
prosecutor (1) 65:12
prospect (1) 78:22
protection (1) 76:10
proved (1) 72:24
provide (4) 30:11 83:24 89:24
93:25
providing (1) 12:24
proving (1) 40:5
provision (2) 51:22 66:22
public (16) 1:1,13,18 3:17,22 4:11
4:21 12:2 19:19 71:16 72:13
73:24 76:7 94:7,19 95:6
public-disclosure (1) 73:20
publicized (2) 11:19 12:2
publicly (1) 73:16
pulled (1) 89:14
pulling (1) 43:19
Puma (25) 2:5 9:5,25 36:12,18,25
46:7 48:19 49:17 50:15 66:15,17
67:17,19,22 68:1,3,11 69:5,10,23
70:19 71:1 80:1 93:1
punitive (2) 44:7,8
purposeful (1) 26:25
purposefully (1) 40:23
purposes (3) 23:13 48:8 56:22
pursue (2) 46:17 80:20
pursued (1) 69:12
pursuing (1) 67:20
push (2) 76:1,22
pushed (1) 89:14
pushes (1) 76:8
put (12) 19:21 24:13,16 27:7,12
31:14 34:18,20 64:23 71:15,18
71:22
putting (2) 40:2 57:16
puzzled (1) 80:9

Q

qualified (1) 21:5
qualifies (1) 21:2
qualitatively (1) 94:2
quality (1) 93:14
quarter (1) 93:9
queen (1) 18:18
queen-for-a-day (1) 18:20
Queens (3) 91:21,24 92:19
question (33) 6:24 7:5 10:8 11:7
11:22 12:1 13:4,13 18:17 19:7
24:2,23 26:12 28:4 32:21 39:17
39:21 40:18 45:1 46:4 54:7,19
55:3,4,16,20 58:11,23 59:7 61:21
69:21 75:9 76:24
questioned (1) 89:23
questioning (1) 25:1
questions (1) 24:19

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

quick (2) 35:20 71:12
quite (4) 19:3,21 32:13 78:8
quote/unquote (1) 45:14

R

R (1) 95:2
race (4) 90:11,15 91:12,14
racial (2) 87:20 88:1
raise (1) 36:23
raised (2) 45:19 73:22
raises (2) 31:18 46:4
random (6) 29:12 31:22 32:8,9,11
35:11
randomness (1) 35:8
range (1) 89:9
rare (1) 6:6
rarely (2) 16:23 39:9
rate (4) 80:14,18 86:24 88:24
rationale (1) 56:6
Ray (1) 54:12
reach (3) 11:11 33:18 51:9
read (10) 9:20 16:11 28:23 36:20
40:4,8 49:12 61:21 64:4 75:13
reading (3) 17:13,21 28:22
real (6) 3:15 5:12 10:17 35:4 54:19
75:11
reality (1) 82:4
realize (1) 66:5
really (17) 11:22 12:16 19:2 23:12
27:5,8 31:23,25 32:14,24 33:13
33:14 47:4 67:24 68:2 70:17 94:4
reason (6) 17:16 38:4 39:3 40:18
43:13 61:18
reasons (7) 39:25 63:14 65:18,21
68:6,20 69:16
recall (1) 28:11
receive (1) 43:5
received (1) 86:1
recess (1) 72:14
recollection (1) 68:12
recollections (1) 48:10
recommend (5) 39:10 47:11,12,16
68:18
recommendation (4) 11:14,16
46:8,19
recommendations (2) 30:7 58:7
recommended (3) 47:8 67:22
69:12
recommending (1) 76:15
recommends (1) 53:4
reconsider (10) 60:18 65:1,12,17
67:6,25 68:5,7,10 79:22
reconsideration (7) 60:17 77:19
77:21 78:1,11,16,18
reconsiderations (1) 78:7
record (11) 44:18 45:1,3,6,15
52:21 53:10 55:7,14 87:11 95:11

records (1) 54:25
redrafting (1) 48:7
reduce (2) 84:7 85:2
reduced (3) 84:13 85:10 86:6
reduction (2) 84:11,15
refer (1) 54:15
referral (4) 51:15,16 52:17,21
referrals (1) 82:6
referred (4) 8:4,18 53:17 84:24
referring (8) 52:9,13 53:25 54:24
69:24 79:25 80:1,2
refers (1) 48:21
reflect (2) 63:23,23
reg (1) 78:3
regarding (3) 87:5,13 88:8
regardless (1) 13:19
regards (1) 92:9
regime (1) 76:14
regrettably (1) 22:1
regs (2) 73:15 80:5
regular (1) 80:22
regulatory (1) 73:13
rehabilitated (1) 12:11
relate (2) 71:15,23
related (3) 86:16 87:7 95:12
relationship (1) 78:24
relatively (2) 4:7 37:10
relevant (1) 71:14
remember (4) 66:3 68:8,9 71:6
remind (2) 21:21 37:2
renewed (1) 26:8
reopen (8) 61:4,16,23 62:2,3,4,7
64:25
reopened (2) 64:19,21
reopening (3) 59:6 62:21 63:14
repeat (2) 77:20 80:17
report (9) 1:17,19 80:14 83:17,25
88:19 91:15 92:25 93:19
reported (5) 1:11 12:17 84:9 85:6
95:9
REPORTING (1) 1:23
reports (5) 1:20 3:14 14:8 50:16
88:17
representative (2) 31:10 57:13
representatives (1) 75:21
request (8) 38:14 61:3,4 65:12
78:1,5,10,15
requested (1) 66:18
require (2) 27:20 39:13
required (1) 27:24
requirement (2) 40:5 80:5
requiring (3) 37:16 65:15 77:2
research (2) 42:21,21
reserves (1) 14:6
reserving (2) 6:3,10
Resident (2) 91:21 92:20
resistance (1) 15:22

resolution (5) 28:17 57:9,25 65:7
78:2
resolutions (2) 30:7 56:14
resolve (6) 6:8 51:4 59:18 60:1,1
84:22
resolved (2) 6:5 51:14
respect (7) 51:1 57:1 75:18 76:12
88:1,5 91:12
response (8) 3:11 5:20 11:3 36:16
58:2 83:15 94:9,17
restarted (1) 92:14
restraining (1) 89:10
restrictive (1) 10:1
result (13) 14:20,21 20:9 22:7
37:12,15,20 38:1,24 42:12 44:11
51:9 92:21
resulted (1) 46:18
results (1) 30:6
retired (1) 34:1
review (9) 1:2 3:2 44:20 46:17
56:25 84:2,17,21 87:16
revised (1) 87:10
revoked (1) 88:2
rewording (1) 56:9
Richard (10) 1:9 2:2 3:1 73:19,23
75:18 78:21 79:16 80:23 83:2
RICHMOND (1) 95:4
right (52) 6:4 7:16,21,24 8:16 9:12
14:7,17 16:13,17 18:4,10 20:3
21:7 23:15 25:12,18,22 26:13,21
27:1,13,13 28:7 30:22 38:3 40:13
40:21 43:18 45:11,22 46:7 48:17
54:2,18 56:7 58:4 59:22 60:14
61:9,24 62:8 63:10,12,18 65:13
66:2,20 71:3 74:7 76:5 78:1
rightly (2) 73:21 77:6
rights (3) 23:23 28:1 40:6
Rikers (1) 37:5
risk (1) 46:13
road (1) 43:1
Roger (2) 19:5 93:23
room (2) 73:8 82:18
routine (1) 15:21
rule (16) 14:3 29:18 39:8 41:6 56:1
56:13 57:23 64:24 65:11,13 66:2
66:21,21 70:1,10 88:6
rulemaking (2) 3:19 4:21
rules (22) 3:19,25 4:5,16,19,20
13:23 55:23 57:17 65:9 66:3,6,9
66:19 69:7,19,20 70:20,24 71:10
88:13,14
ruling (4) 11:25 37:13 54:7 56:4
rulings (1) 54:5

S

SACHS (2) 7:9 72:5
saddled (1) 29:23

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

sanction (1) 60:20
sanctions (1) 26:24
Sandy (1) 81:25
satisfactory (1) 28:17
saw (2) 10:22 54:10
saying (30) 8:8 18:4 24:13 25:11
25:24 35:18 36:25 41:9,16,19,24
44:3,14,15 45:4 51:17 53:22 59:8
60:10 62:11 68:23 73:23 75:19
75:20 79:20,23 80:4,16,20 82:10
says (8) 7:2 17:14 25:17 39:17
49:23 64:11 76:8 78:4
scot-free (1) 43:14
screw (1) 40:11
screwy (1) 63:21
script (1) 75:13
search (13) 8:1,2,10,11,13,14,23
40:14,16 42:22,24 48:6 89:24
searched (2) 41:5,12
searches (4) 8:17,17,18,21
sec (1) 59:3
second (12) 3:7 4:4 16:7 65:23
81:19,23 82:2,3 85:1 86:19 94:13
94:14
section (13) 5:15,24 11:2 15:8,9
16:7,9 48:19 57:6 58:4 80:12
87:11 88:3
section's (1) 61:9
sections (2) 69:17 71:14
see (24) 4:2 5:12 10:4 17:3 31:17
31:22 32:21 34:4,22 35:13,14
37:22 43:15 45:24 49:3 50:16
52:12 57:5 61:8 68:16 70:23
80:13,13 81:1
seeing (2) 74:14 76:11
seemingly (1) 76:13
seen (4) 68:2,4,8 78:6
selected (1) 71:22
selection (3) 32:8,9,12
self- (1) 9:5
send (3) 41:14 51:15 62:23
sending (1) 62:22
senior (1) 84:6
sense (5) 10:18 33:23 50:5 51:11
64:15
sensitive (1) 20:11
sent (3) 41:17,20 82:19
sentence (2) 36:25 63:25
separate (6) 40:2 53:13,15,21,22
87:12
September (1) 57:10
series (3) 22:19 31:22 67:2
serious (3) 17:5 20:25 47:3
seriously (3) 31:6 73:14 79:7
seriousness (1) 79:1
serum (1) 21:24
serve (1) 32:18

SERVICES (1) 1:23
serving (1) 32:15
Session (3) 94:8,11,19
set (4) 4:20 5:10 48:11 95:16
sex (1) 90:15
sexual (2) 90:12,15
shadow (1) 46:23
shape (1) 22:21
sheet (2) 53:12,14
sheets (1) 54:1
shield (1) 89:25
shoestring (1) 93:25
shopping (1) 63:6
short (4) 41:3 72:11,14 77:25
should've (2) 15:17 28:23
shoved (1) 89:14
show (6) 24:18 27:23,24 36:5,6,9
shows (2) 86:2,9
side (3) 46:23 71:20 92:5
sides (2) 32:21 45:13
sign (4) 59:8,15 60:2,11
signature (1) 74:15
signed (2) 65:10,15
significant (5) 37:24 71:25 81:17
82:11 84:11
significantly (2) 82:6,7
silly (1) 26:9
similar (2) 43:2 52:9
similarly (1) 23:10
simple (3) 20:15 26:18 70:12
simplified (1) 87:14
simply (2) 25:11 29:2
single (2) 76:3,9
sir (1) 72:20
sit (3) 29:9 81:3 83:11
sites (2) 37:3 92:14
sits (1) 18:13
sitting (2) 82:18,20
situation (8) 17:10 18:11,16 22:10
26:13 38:18 45:16 62:10
situations (2) 38:16,23
six (1) 30:1
skills (1) 93:15
skipped (1) 36:13
slated (1) 92:17
small (1) 42:11
Smith (2) 24:4 93:24
so-called (1) 39:7
socks (1) 71:21
SOL (6) 13:1,5,6 14:15 61:17,17
Soler (8) 7:15 8:12,16,25 53:7,15
53:21 88:11
solidify (1) 57:17
solve (1) 26:14
somebody (12) 9:3 11:17,18 14:7
21:7 25:1,12 41:5,11 47:24 59:11
64:17

somebody's (1) 28:5
someone's (1) 40:6
soon (3) 32:2 84:22 93:10
sophistication (1) 72:2
sorry (10) 13:24 14:13 41:2 52:24
59:3 60:3,8 66:16 72:6 88:21
sort (6) 46:22 49:8 55:14,21 56:25
58:5
speaking (2) 21:3 72:15
speaks (1) 78:3
special (1) 84:20
specific (4) 26:5 36:24 44:13 52:16
specifically (2) 87:24 91:12
specify (1) 70:7
speeding (1) 30:18
spirit (1) 68:19
spoke (1) 73:1
spray (1) 89:11
ss (1) 95:4
staff (11) 7:6 42:21 56:5 84:6,7,19
85:21 88:14 93:3,12,16
stand (1) 17:25
standard (5) 48:22 49:1 50:10,11
55:10
standing (9) 5:13,23 8:3,6,22 14:3
56:2,2,3
Stanley (2) 1:5 83:21
starkly (1) 41:4
start (3) 3:3 13:5 74:4
State (2) 95:3,7
stated (2) 18:25 86:8
statement (14) 19:11 20:9,9,18
21:23 23:16,17 25:16,16 36:20
49:18 52:19 65:10,15
statements (14) 15:23 17:6,15,16
19:1 22:20 23:21 24:8 27:1 52:10
52:14 75:1,3,5
Staten (1) 92:3
statewide (1) 26:7
statistical (5) 3:14 34:23 35:2
83:25 87:2
statistically (1) 34:9
statistics (4) 31:24 36:9 84:3 86:16
stats (2) 88:22 90:17
statute (14) 11:4,7,12,17,20 12:23
13:11,16 72:22,24 84:25 85:16
85:18,23
statutes (1) 19:7
STENO-KATH (1) 1:23
Stenokath@verizon.net (1) 1:25
step (2) 66:20 85:1
stop (5) 87:7,12 89:23,23 91:7
stopped (1) 82:14
stops (2) 87:17,25
story (1) 81:4
straightforward (1) 58:25
Strange (1) 73:3

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

Strategic (1) 88:11
strategy (3) 84:7 85:1,21
stream (1) 4:13
street (2) 1:6 25:14
stretch (2) 12:5,12
strip (7) 8:1,10,14,17 40:14 41:5
 41:12
strive (1) 33:19
structure (1) 70:16
stuff (5) 57:4 71:20 72:8 74:1 79:6
Sub (2) 36:19 37:12
sub-cases (1) 78:10
subbed (1) 80:21
subbing (1) 52:17
subcommittee (3) 91:15 93:2,2
subcommittees (2) 70:22 71:9
subdivided (1) 89:6
subject (7) 17:4 19:18 23:23 24:6
 58:16 59:18 82:23
subjective (1) 10:14
Subparagraph (1) 48:21
subpoena (12) 13:20 27:6,7,11,16
 27:19,20,24 74:12,13,17,18
subpoenas (2) 15:12 74:14
subs (2) 78:14 79:21
subsequent (3) 17:7,17,25
substance (3) 5:8 77:7,20
substantial (2) 78:8 84:15
substantiate (5) 40:20 51:6 52:25
 55:4 65:2
substantiated (22) 38:18 42:16
 44:7,16,19 45:2,5,15 46:14,25
 49:4,15,20 52:22 53:12 67:5
 69:10,11 76:16 86:20,22 87:19
substantiating (1) 40:1
substantiation (6) 53:5,11,24,24
 76:19 79:10
substantiations (1) 67:2
substantive (1) 5:12
subtle (1) 22:8
success (1) 88:24
successful (2) 60:5,7
successfully (5) 88:24 89:8,18
 90:10,19
successors (2) 72:25 73:3
sudden (1) 79:9
sufficiency (2) 50:13 55:10
sufficient (2) 49:21 50:14
sufficiently (1) 11:9
suggest (3) 8:19 16:7 83:7
suggested (3) 50:13 54:13,13
suggestion (2) 70:20 83:1
supervisors (2) 87:16 93:15
support (1) 92:10
sure (32) 6:25 7:15 12:1,11 17:17
 18:24 24:10 28:5,11 31:13 34:8
 35:25 38:9 39:19,20 48:9,14,18

49:9,10 51:14 54:8 55:23 56:1,2
 63:18 64:1 69:3 70:1,25 71:5
 75:5
suspect (2) 75:8 76:22
swallow (1) 39:7
swear (3) 25:23 26:11 65:10
sworn (2) 21:4 23:6
system (4) 51:19 86:9,10 87:14
systematic (1) 94:3

T

T (2) 95:2,2
table (2) 3:16 48:4
tacked (1) 79:9
take (18) 6:4 7:2 8:20 9:14,21
 11:19 12:25 17:25 21:8 26:11
 27:5 37:4,7 49:14 67:8 72:11
 79:7,13
taken (3) 10:21 57:2 72:14
takes (3) 4:23 21:7 86:11
talk (11) 3:25 5:3 12:16 15:7 19:2
 23:16,19 24:7 25:12 26:20 62:12
talked (1) 51:10
talking (9) 12:14 44:6,7,8 46:9
 49:20 60:4 76:14 80:10
talks (3) 36:19 60:6 66:22
Taylor (22) 2:4 3:6 5:21 10:13,20
 12:4,25 13:4,10 20:17,21,24
 21:10,20 22:12 32:20 33:13 54:9
 54:18,20 91:18 94:14
team (2) 86:10 92:19
Technically (1) 53:23
teeth (1) 39:16
television (1) 10:5
tell (4) 15:7 17:3 23:12,20
telling (3) 19:25 23:11 74:24
tells (2) 18:14 23:11
ten (3) 33:3 58:16 82:17
term (4) 46:11,21 53:8,24
terminology (1) 38:10
terms (6) 31:3 49:2 70:15 75:14
 76:4 78:12
testify (3) 12:9 27:17,20
testifying (2) 31:5,5
testimony (7) 18:3,3 27:6,9,21
 28:1 92:6
thank (15) 13:24 28:22 58:24 62:17
 63:17 72:21 73:9 83:11,12,16,20
 88:10,16 91:16 94:18
thanks (1) 88:20
theoretically (2) 52:3 62:11
theory (2) 17:1 60:17
they'd (2) 27:22,23
thing (19) 14:1 15:19 25:6,7,8,8
 31:17 32:11 38:3 40:13 47:19
 70:8 77:8,18,23 79:1,15 80:17
 81:20

things (18) 4:8 6:14 18:14 22:16
 27:2 30:22,23 39:10 46:24 74:8
 74:10 75:1,8 81:1,2 82:13 87:9
 88:18
thinking (5) 19:6 30:24 38:25
 42:20 69:21
thinks (1) 65:24
third (4) 5:22 14:9 29:7 86:24
thirsting (1) 93:22
thought (9) 14:2 22:9 30:14 35:19
 46:9 59:13 70:11 75:4 79:15
thoughts (2) 5:19 20:16
thousand (1) 81:11
threat (5) 12:19 22:25 42:14 89:24
 91:7
threaten (1) 23:2
three (4) 29:24 32:1 90:3 93:10
ticket (5) 30:18 43:22,24 44:18
 45:1
ticking (1) 13:5
tight (2) 78:6 89:11
time (23) 4:22 5:18 12:8 15:16
 36:14 40:16,24 47:12,13 51:12
 51:13 54:12 75:5,6 77:25 78:3,6
 79:2,4 80:16 81:4 86:1 93:22
timeliness (1) 86:7
times (4) 35:24 38:5 68:22 77:19
tinkered (1) 16:18
today (3) 71:13 81:4 88:21
told (6) 17:2 20:5,7 21:8 43:9 68:5
tolling (1) 11:20
tone (1) 90:6
tonight (9) 3:13 4:17 6:19 7:8
 19:18 26:14 72:16 81:8 83:20
tonight's (1) 3:21
top (2) 5:23 50:20
total (1) 82:12
totaling (1) 90:6
totally (2) 41:7 75:19
track (1) 64:5
tracking (1) 87:19
training (20) 37:16 38:14 45:11,13
 45:17,20,23,25 47:8,11,13,17
 76:15 93:1,11,17,20,22,25 94:3
transcript (2) 1:8 95:11
transition (1) 74:9
treated (1) 15:5
treats (1) 57:18
trend (1) 82:12
Trial (1) 58:14
tricky (2) 23:4 26:15
tried (3) 6:16 16:6 28:9
trigger (1) 21:6
triggers (2) 13:11 21:23
true (3) 21:6 25:24 95:11
truncated (3) 64:13,17,18
truncation (1) 64:9

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

truth (6) 17:3 19:25 21:24 23:12,20
74:24
truth-telling (1) 16:22
try (2) 30:22 92:11
trying (16) 8:19 9:16,21 14:4 16:2
16:14,20 36:23 37:6 38:2 40:13
42:18 55:22 58:9 65:16,18
tweak (1) 49:15
twitching (1) 73:20
two (11) 29:16,25 32:6 33:4 34:5
35:13,15 71:12 90:18,22 91:24
type (3) 7:19,20 46:8
types (6) 34:18 35:6 36:8 45:17
48:11 89:6
typical (1) 18:15
typically (2) 18:1,15

U

UF (1) 87:10
ultimate (1) 22:7
ultimately (3) 6:7 11:25 75:24
unavailable (1) 61:7
uncomfortable (2) 39:22,24
undefined (1) 56:15
under-oath (3) 27:5,9,20
underneath (1) 58:5
understand (16) 9:9 16:4,17 27:21
30:13 31:18 39:15 41:6,18 53:19
55:19 70:9 75:19 78:20 82:9,11
understandably (1) 80:9
understanding (3) 30:19 69:18,20
understood (4) 66:12 68:3 79:20
80:3
unfair (2) 36:2 81:24
unfortunately (1) 88:20
Unfounded (2) 49:24 50:2
uniformity (1) 88:8
unintended (1) 46:15
unions (2) 16:5 28:15
unit (2) 64:25 93:11
unsub (7) 38:7 44:8 45:9,12,22,23
47:9
unsubstantiated (1) 38:12
unsubstantiated (6) 45:20,25
46:14 49:15,23 65:25
untruths (1) 27:1
update (2) 87:3 93:2
upside (1) 22:12
use (9) 8:1 17:19 21:24 45:21
50:12,21 53:24 89:10,11
usually (2) 9:12 68:15

V

vaguely (1) 71:6
valuable (3) 30:20 39:10 75:22
value (3) 32:22 35:12,23
various (3) 34:19 57:1 89:6

vast (1) 89:12
vehicle (3) 40:16 73:5 89:23
verification (1) 74:20
verified (1) 25:17
verify (3) 25:16,17,22
version (1) 4:16
victim (6) 6:2,2 31:5 41:7,9 59:18
victims (2) 43:8,9
video (5) 4:13 6:7 10:5,16 15:22
view (8) 10:19 24:25 25:1 33:21
41:25 42:5 49:12 80:12
viewed (2) 53:13 77:3
viewing (1) 10:16
views (2) 6:18 30:20
violate (2) 21:19 40:6
violations (1) 47:2
virtually (2) 9:22 25:25
visit (1) 84:3
vote (4) 34:5,17,20 35:12
voting (3) 53:12,14 54:1

W

wait (4) 12:10 59:3 69:2,3
walk (2) 43:13 60:3
walking (1) 25:13
want (43) 5:2 7:14 10:10,14 15:7
15:11 17:23,24 21:21 23:8 26:16
32:24 33:11 34:15 35:25 36:11
42:1 46:16 48:14 54:6,24 60:3
62:12 64:16,23 66:6 68:10,21
69:4 70:7 73:7,25 74:8 75:16
76:2 80:7 83:20,24 86:16 87:3
88:10,18 91:17
wanted (8) 9:7 15:18 27:5 28:13
29:8 36:18 46:6 48:18
wants (3) 3:24 62:1,2
warning (5) 18:1,5,7 21:18 43:24
warnings (1) 19:16
warrant (3) 42:22,24 48:6
warranted (3) 44:13 47:1 48:17
wasn't (4) 38:10 40:23 42:16 72:18
watching (1) 4:12
water (1) 57:15
way (30) 12:22 21:10 25:4,12 30:2
31:3 32:25 33:18 34:15 35:18
38:22,25 43:20 47:5,10,21,25
48:3,24 49:19 52:4 53:2 57:17
61:21 62:20 63:22 67:10 77:4,23
95:14
ways (4) 34:17 39:10 73:2,4
we'll (11) 3:3 4:15 6:23 8:21 15:8
28:11 34:14 44:4 72:13 74:4
83:25
we're (44) 4:2 6:13 12:13,23 13:22
14:4 16:2,13,19 18:14 19:6 21:2
21:14 29:12 32:2 37:6 40:21 43:4
44:6,7,8 49:20 52:15,16,16 55:22

55:24 57:10,12 58:10,21 59:5
65:16,18 71:18 79:23 81:9 82:2,7
83:22 92:1,4,18,21
we've (11) 6:6,15 16:6 29:23,25
51:10 65:18,19 71:10 79:9 84:13
website (4) 71:15,24,25 84:4
Wednesday (1) 1:3
weigh (1) 20:2
weighed (1) 31:6
welcome (1) 93:11
well-lit (1) 73:8
went (5) 73:14 79:10 81:19,22 82:3
weren't (2) 40:15 68:5
wheel (1) 73:5
WHEREOF (1) 95:16
whistles (1) 22:3
white (1) 71:21
whoever's (1) 42:21
wise (1) 29:20
wish (2) 28:2 68:23
within-entitled (1) 95:10
witness (3) 15:23 36:21 95:16
witnesses (2) 5:25 9:10
wonder (3) 9:10 46:24 74:22
wonderful (2) 62:14,19
wondering (2) 55:13 66:25
word (7) 10:13 35:24 50:7 90:3,5,7
91:10
words (2) 59:25 60:2
work (11) 16:19 19:1,17 29:4 34:15
52:4 61:10 71:11 72:3 88:20
93:16
worked (2) 7:7 93:24
working (5) 19:6 57:15 88:13,15
92:4
world (1) 78:25
worms (1) 44:5
worn (1) 87:22
worry (1) 39:6
worth (3) 39:6 72:8,10
would've (1) 46:2
wouldn't (7) 27:21 36:1 47:9 49:17
52:9 61:18,19
wrestle (1) 26:16
write (1) 41:9
writing (3) 59:11 65:18 80:6
written (3) 19:4,5 77:22
wrong (5) 18:14 38:8 44:2 55:12
77:15
wrongfully (1) 42:24
wrongly (4) 60:18,20 65:24 73:21

X

X (2) 68:6,24

Y

Y (2) 68:6,24

**Civilian Complaint Review Board Meeting
March 11, 2015**

<p>yeah (17) 13:2 14:25 17:20 18:24 20:25 36:22 39:15 49:17 53:1 58:11 59:24 60:12 64:13 72:17 80:25 82:9 91:18 year (8) 26:9 40:17 80:15 81:12,12 86:22 93:8,9 year-to-date (3) 86:13,13,20 years (5) 26:9 28:10 35:1 54:10 71:17 Yoon (1) 2:6 York (8) 1:7,7,23 26:5 58:12 87:5 95:3,7 Youngik (1) 2:6 YouTube (2) 10:5,22</p> <hr/> <p align="center">Z</p> <hr/> <p>Z (2) 68:6,24 Zoland (34) 2:10 16:16 23:14 24:9 24:15 27:25 28:9 29:19 34:3,8 35:11 42:20 44:17,23 45:19 49:14 50:2 52:9,12,18,23 59:7,15 59:21,24 60:4,10,22 61:1,5,12 64:3 65:23 70:5</p> <hr/> <p align="center">0</p> <hr/> <p align="center">1</p> <hr/> <p>1 (3) 1:15 90:23 91:14 1-15 (3) 5:15,22 14:3 1-16 (1) 14:14 1-23 (1) 15:10 1-24 (3) 15:9 16:2 36:18 1-24(D) (1) 16:10 1-31 (1) 28:21 1-33 (2) 37:12 48:19 1-43 (1) 57:3 1-45 (1) 57:6 1-46 (2) 57:7,8 1-51 (1) 59:3 1-53 (1) 59:1 1-54 (1) 59:2 1-54(A) (1) 59:3 1-55 (1) 59:6 1-year (1) 87:23 1,514 (2) 84:14,16 1,767 (2) 84:10,14 1,858 (1) 85:8 10128 (1) 1:7 103 (1) 90:1 10543 (1) 1:23 11 (3) 1:3 86:13 91:3 115 (1) 90:6 12 (4) 84:18,21 85:11,15 13 (2) 82:1,2 139 (1) 1:23 14 (3) 82:3,4 85:15 14-percent (1) 84:15</p>	<p>15 (6) 56:1 78:9 85:14 86:15 89:19 90:9 16th (1) 95:17 17 (2) 86:23 89:21 18 (5) 12:15,17 85:14,16 86:20 18-month (1) 12:12 182 (1) 88:23 186 (1) 86:3 19 (2) 90:13 91:7 198 (1) 88:23 1990s (1) 33:9</p> <hr/> <p align="center">2</p> <hr/> <p>2 (3) 1:16 80:12 91:14 2,699 (1) 84:11 20 (3) 56:8 78:14 89:8 20-percent (2) 80:14,18 2012 (1) 87:25 2013 (4) 81:23,23,24 88:4 2014 (15) 80:18 81:19 82:15 84:12 85:8 86:2,12,19 87:1 88:23 89:7 89:18 90:1,9 91:6 2015 (12) 1:3 85:9 86:2,13,13,24 90:17,21 91:3,13,18 95:17 203-25 (1) 88:3 205 (1) 88:25 21 (2) 56:11,17 212.95.DEPOS (1) 1:24 22 (1) 85:14 23 (1) 91:19 239 (1) 89:19 248 (1) 89:20 25 (3) 43:18,21,23 250 (1) 87:10 253 (1) 84:13 29 (1) 91:25</p> <hr/> <p align="center">3</p> <hr/> <p>3 (4) 1:17 14:2 90:22 91:13 30 (5) 43:17,20,23 78:11 79:8 31 (1) 86:12 33 (1) 84:16 34 (1) 91:8 36 (1) 90:19</p> <hr/> <p align="center">4</p> <hr/> <p>4 (2) 1:18 49:24 41 (1) 89:16 415 (1) 1:6 42 (2) 89:14 91:4 44 (2) 86:19 91:2 45 (1) 90:20 454 (1) 89:2 486 (1) 89:2 49 (1) 85:10</p> <hr/> <p align="center">5</p> <hr/>	<p>5 (6) 1:19 37:12 47:6 85:12,15 90:24 500 (1) 82:19 57 (1) 86:19</p> <hr/> <p align="center">6</p> <hr/> <p>6 (3) 1:20 50:17,20 6:41 (1) 1:4 60 (3) 78:12 79:6,8</p> <hr/> <p align="center">7</p> <hr/> <p>7 (1) 1:21 73 (1) 87:1 75 (2) 79:6 86:14</p> <hr/> <p align="center">8</p> <hr/> <p>8 (1) 1:22 8:55 (1) 94:20 81 (2) 84:17,20 88 (1) 86:24 89 (1) 79:7</p> <hr/> <p align="center">9</p> <hr/> <p>9 (1) 91:4 90 (2) 78:2 79:5 912 (1) 85:10 914.381.2061 (1) 1:24 914.722.0816 (1) 1:24 92 (1) 88:25 93rd (1) 1:6 953.3767 (1) 1:24 96 (1) 86:5 961 (1) 85:8</p>
--	---	--