Public Board Meeting
Of the Civilian Complaint Review Board
Wednesday, March 12, 2014
10:12 a.m.
40 Rector Street, 2nd Floor

BISHOP MITCHELL G. TAYLOR, ACTING CHAIR
TRACY CATAPANO-FOX, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA:

New York, New York 10006

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Adoption of the Minutes
- 3. Report from Chair
- 4. Report from Executive Director
- 5. Committee Reports
- 6. Old Business
- 7. New Business
- 8. Public Comment

STENO-KATH REPORTING SERVICES, LTD.

139 MAMARONECK AVENUE, MAMARONECK, NEW YORK 10543
(212) 95-DEPOS (953-3767) * (914) 381-2061
FACSIMILE: (212) 681-1985 * (914) 381-2064
E-MAIL: Stenokat@verizon.net * Stenokath@verizon.net

1	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT WERE:
2	Dr. Mohammad Khalid
3	Daniel Gitner, Esq.
4	James Donlon, Esq.
5	David G. Liston, Esq.
6	Jules A. Martin, Esq.
7	Rudolph Landin, Esq.
8	Alphonzo Grant, Jr., Esq.
9	Youngik Yoon, Esq.
10	Joseph A. Puma
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

2.1

2.5

BISHOP MITCHELL TAYLOR: All right. We're bringing our meeting to order. Thank you so much for being here on today. This has been an exciting month, to say the least. A lot has been happening, a lot of positive things have been going on. As you know, we still do not have a chair appointed by the Mayor, and so we have formed an Executive Committee, the Board has formed an Executive Committee made up of David Liston, Jules Martin and myself, and so we will try to facilitate the absence of a chair until the Mayor appoints one and we can move forward with that process.

Just very briefly, we had a very successful and cordial and comprehensive, I should say, meeting with the Police Commissioner and his new executive staff. And I think that the Board would agree that it seemed to be a very productive and receptive atmosphere. A lot of the issues that we raised, relative to barriers and impediments for smooth, operational functions, we feel that there's been an easy pass of conversation with that. And I think that the proper departments will be meeting with the appropriate staff at NYPD to ameliorate some of the issues that have caused a clog and blockages in some of the processes that we have been executing.

1 I also want to congratulate the APU Unit on very 2 successful interventions and the cases they've been 3 fielding thus far. And it's just -- I think the 4 most important part that I want to highlight today 5 is spring is in the air. Spring is in the air. MR. JULES MARTIN: Till to tomorrow. 6 7 BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah, till tomorrow. But that's 8 a good thing. 9 So now we're going to have the adoption of 10 minutes, and if there's no objection to --11 MR. DAVID LISTON: I'll move that we adopt. 12 BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. Dave Liston moves. 13 I'll second. MR. JAMES DONLON: 14 BISHOP TAYLOR: A second. All in favor? 15 (Chorus of ayes.) 16 BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. Excellent. 17 Now we are going to have the report from the Chair -- that's me, I already gave my report -- from 18 19 the Executive Director. 20 MS. TRACY CATAPANO-FOX: Thank so much, Bishop. 2.1 And I have to thank the Board for doing an 22 excellent job at the Police Commissioner meeting. 23 It was very productive, and we've already seen 24 significant communications between the NYPD and the 25 Agency to move forward on some of the issues that

were presented. So I think that the Board deserves a lot of credit for really presenting issues in a strong, but reasonable, manner.

2.1

2.5

The CCRB received 440 complaints in February of 2014. This is 170 more complaints than it received in 2013 when, at that time, we only received 270 complaints. From January to February of this year, the CCRB received 903 complaints in total. That's 447 more complaints than we received for the two months of 2013, where the CCRB received 456 complaints. While this is a 98 percent increase for these months, it's important to note that once again, last year we still were not as fully operational as we should be because of Hurricane Sandy.

The Board closed 410 cases in February, and 561 cases year-to-date. In the first two months of this year, the Board closed 195 full investigations, which includes 34 substantiated complaints, and mediated 16 cases. Year-to-date, our substantiation rate is 17 percent.

The report includes two forms of reporting the disposition of the CCRB cases. In the report, you'll see we are still reporting it with a report involving truncation rate and then with case

2.1

2.5

resolution rate. And we can talk more about that in a minute, but, essentially, from January to February the updated truncation rate, excluding cases closed as complaint withdrawn, is 52 percent. In the same period from last year, that rate would be 65 percent. And from January to February of this year, the case resolution rate was 38 percent, while in 2013 it was 23 percent.

Of cases closed as complaint withdrawn, the year-to-date breakdown for the cases closed is as follows, and this is included in your packet: 43 percent of complainants had no desire to follow through; 21 percent did not want to take the time to do an interview; 10 percent withdrew upon advice of counsel; 5 percent just wanted to report a complaint; 2 percent provided no reason; 2 percent feared retaliation; and 17 percent withdrew their complaints for other reasons.

The Agency's docket at the end of February of this year stood at 2,599 cases. This is a 4 percent decrease over the open docket from January, when we stood at 2,706 cases. By date of report, 96 percent of our open investigations stem from complaints filed within the last year, and 64 percent were filed in the last 4 months, or within the first

4 months. Of the open cases, 462 were awaiting Panel review, that's 18 percent of our docket; 1889 cases were being investigated, which is 73 percent of our docket; and 248 cases were in the mediation program, which is 9 percent of the docket.

2.1

2.5

By date of incident, 21 cases in the CCRB's open docket were 18 months or older. This is a 0.5 percent percentage of our open docket. And in January of 2014, that was 24 cases. The breakdown is as follows: Three cases are on DA hold, five cases were filed months after the date of incident, one case was reopened by the Board, two cases are late because the Board returned it for further investigation, and two cases are involving investigative delay, and eight cases are pending Board review.

In January of 2014, the Police Department closed six substantiated cases involving seven officers. The Police Department declined to prosecute three officers, two officers received command discipline and two officers received instructions. The disciplinary action rate was 57 percent and the decline-to-prosecute rate by the Department was 43 percent.

In February of 2014, 20 cases were substantiated

2.1

2.5

with the Board recommending charges and specifications. These were added to the APU docket so that by the end of February, the APU had 153 cases. Of these cases, seven cases have guilty pleas entered and are awaiting approval by the Police Commissioner; in one case, the trial verdict was rendered, but we're awaiting approval from the Police Commissioner; three trials have been completed and are awaiting verdict; five trials have commenced, but were not completed; 40 trials are scheduled; 14 cases are calendared for appearances; and 60 cases are awaiting their initial court appearance after charges have been filed; in six cases, charges have been filed; and 17 cases are awaiting the filing of charges.

In terms of requests from the Board from the last meeting, a couple of things I would ask the Board to consider and potentially vote on. One, back in November, we had an Operations meeting where the Board decided to have an Investigations

Committee. The Investigations Committee has been chaired by Dan Gitner, and various Board members are on it, but there was never a full-Board vote to create this committee. So, and we weren't -- at that time, we didn't have minutes taken of that

Operations meeting.

2.1

2.5

So, in the interest of clarity, could the Board vote to formally create the Investigations Committee moving to second it --

MR. LISTON: What does -- let me ask you a question, if I may. What is the Investigations -- and, I'm sorry, I zoned out for a minute -- what does the Investigations Committee do that's separate from what the APU Committee does?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Dan, do you want --

MR. DANIEL GITNER: We work with Denis specifically and talk about how to make things more efficient, how to make the investigations more fulsome, and ensure that we get to the right result faster, frankly.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: In Nov --

MR. GITNER: So I think it's sort of like, if you think of, like, Law & Order, we're the investigations part, and then the APU is the DA part. So, I do think it's separate, and I think -- but I think that they work and should be working very well together.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: At the November Operations

Committee, what we discussed was the idea that there

are times where we might want to get subpoenas of

witnesses who are not willing to come in and be interviewed. And so if we had a committee that Denis could report to and get their approval for that, according to our charge, the Board has to approve subpoening witnesses in that fashion.

MR. LISTON: And are we talking about subpoenas in connection with pretrial --

MR. GITNER: Right.

2.1

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes. Correct.

MR. LISTON: -- subpoenas, right?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Also, at that time, we had issues with regard to whether or not we could get certain supervisory NYPD officials in for interviews. And so that was also something that the Board -- the Operations Committee felt, if there was an Investigations Committee, that Denis could meet with that committee to talk about those types of issues and keep them abreast of sensitive cases and other investigative --

MR. LISTON: Sure.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- pre-Board review cases.

MR. GITNER: To a large extent, it's like a sounding board for the Investigations Unit here and to bounce off ideas to try to figure out the best way to go forward.

MR. LISTON: I'm just going to throw this out there. They are, as you point out, Dan, they're very much related because decisions made at the Investigations stage will have implications for the APU stage, the prosecution stage. I'm just going to throw this out there, I don't how I feel, frankly, about it, but there may be advantages to either combining these committees or perhaps we'd have two co-chairs. I'm just throwing it out there. I don't want us to be a house divided.

MR. GITNER: I, personally, think that's a good idea.

MR. LISTON: Okay.

2.1

MR. GITNER: We could have two co-chairs, it doesn't matter to me, because I do think that to the extent the investigations are resulting in charges --

MR. LISTON: Right.

MR. GITNER: -- and that's something I may want to talk about later today, that obviously affects the APU and how the APU functions and should function. And so --

MR. LISTON: And conversely, sorry, it also affects the cases we don't get.

MR. GITNER: Right.

1 MR. LISTON: Because we may not get charges, but 2 perhaps we should. 3 MR. GITNER: Correct. 4 MR. LISTON: Sorry. I'm just in agreement with 5 you. 6 MR. GITNER: So, I don't have any problem with 7 that. Or, at the very least, we could start meeting together --8 9 MR. LISTON: Right. And see how it goes. 10 MR. GITNER: -- and figure out how it goes. 11 MR. LISTON: Okay. Anybody else? Sorry to take 12 it a way, Bishop. 13 BISHOP TAYLOR: No, no. MR. ALPHONZO GRANT, JR.: So are you proposing 14 15 an Investigations/APU Committee? 16 MR. LISTON: Well, right. I definitely don't --17 I don't think we should have separate committees. That's my view. 18 19 MR. GRANT, JR.: Okay. 20 MR. LISTON: It's more or less a gut feeling, 2.1 but it sounds like Dan has the same view. Because I 22 think we really are working towards the same goal, 23 right, which is to end up with cases that are well 24 investigated and charges that are supported and 25 cases in which charges are issued when they ought to

1 be. So these are all very much related. 2 It seems to me that we probably should have, you 3 know, one committee or perhaps have the two 4 committees meet together. I'm not sure --5 MR. GRANT, JR.: Dan, what are your thoughts? MR. GITNER: I think that's a fine idea; I think 6 7 it's a good idea. MR. GRANT, JR.: A joint committee? 8 9 MR. GITNER: I think that having an APU 10 Committee is probably not broad enough and having an 11 Investigations Committee is probably not broad 12 enough. At the very least, you need both. 13 don't see any problem with having a joint committee 14 or having two committees that are committed to 15 constantly working together and communicating. 16 don't see a functional difference. But I think it's 17 a good idea that they work together. So what -- I'll throw this out 18 MR. LISTON: there as an idea. What if we have both committees 19 20 meet together jointly, and we can see how that 2.1 works. If we decide at the end of the day that it 22 should just be one committee with two co-chairs --23 MR. GITNER: We'll propose as a Board. 24 MR. LISTON: Right.

Does anybody have any views on that?

25

1 BISHOP TAYLOR: I personally think that, going 2 back to Dan's point, that they are two distinct functions, you know, Investigations and APU. 3 4 think one is a preamble to the other. Right. 5 MR. LISTON: 6 BISHOP TAYLOR: I'm certainly with, you know, 7 co-locating the meetings and seeing where the synergies are and how you guys could best work 8 9 together, but I'm also not opposed to having two--10 MR. LISTON: Okay. BISHOP TAYLOR: -- committees. But I think that 11 we should have a little more discussion on it, in 12 13 view of -- in lieu of the fact that there are no recorded minutes on that Operational meeting. And 14 15 maybe we should just refresh --16 MR. LISTON: That's why we have to have a vote. 17 I mean, that's, I think, a good point. 18 BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah. MR. LISTON: Right. 19 20 BISHOP TAYLOR: And I think we should just 2.1 refresh and reset and just have more conversation. 22 We can have that now or at, you know, another moment 23 of time --24 MR. LISTON: Right. 25 BISHOP TAYLOR: -- but I think it's worth that.

1 But I do like the idea of having an Investigation 2 and an APU. And they should synergize by working 3 closely together because of the orientation. 4 MR. LISTON: So I think, given that the 5 Investigations Committee was created, I quess, at an 6 Operations meeting --7 BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, it was suggested, it's not 8 created yet. 9 MR. LISTON: Right. So that's the question, do 10 we want to create it today, and -- or do we want to 11 have one committee that handles both, I guess. That's where the issue is, isn't it? 12 13 DR. MOHAMMAD KHALID: I think there should be a Board discussion on, I think, combining of them 14 15 together --16 MR. LISTON: Right. 17 DR. KHALID: -- not to have two co-chairs because, ultimately, investigation leads into some 18 19 investigation of APU. 20 MR. LISTON: Exactly. It's like two hands are 2.1 separate, but when they're clapping, it's hard to 22 tell the difference, right? 23 DR. KHALID: Right. I think we should work a 24 little bit more on it --2.5 BISHOP TAYLOR: More discussion.

1 DR. KHALID: -- discussion before we vote on it. 2 MR. DONLON: Well, I think we should -- I would 3 move to vote to create the Investigations Committee 4 since it does --5 MR. LISTON: Exist, in a practical matter. MR. DONLON: It's been in existence, it's been 6 7 operating, even though we never formally voted on I think we should vote to, you know, make 8 it. 9 the -- put the committee into existence in the sense 10 that we've, you know, had a chance to vote to that 11 extent. James, valid point. 12 BISHOP TAYLOR: 13 MR. DONLON: And then whether or not it should 14 be merged or operate jointly with the APU Committee, 15 that can, you know, wait for another day. But I 16 would move to vote that the Investigations Committee 17 be formed. Second that. 18 MR. GITNER: MR. GRANT, JR.: Well, before you second that, 19 20 my only concern is I'm not sure where I come out on 2.1 the delegating the subpoena authority. I know we 22 talked about it, but I'd want to make sure that we 23 have something that's concretely in place and that 24 everybody agrees upon it.

MR. GITNER: My view on the subpoena authority

25

is that the Board as a whole has to vote. So the Investigations Committee does not substitute its judgement for the Board, it simply serves as a sounding board for the Investigations Unit who then can come to the Committee to say, do you think this will be a good idea, and help the Investigations Unit present it to the Board in a timely fashion.

But my view, I think that the Charter or the Rules, one of those documents, is pretty clear that the Board has to vote as a whole on the subpoena.

MR. GRANT, JR.: Okay.

2.1

2.5

MR. GITNER: So I don't want anybody to think that the Committee substitutes its judgement for the Board's judgement on that issue.

MR. GRANT, JR.: Okay.

MR. GITNER: Just to be clear. So I think we're on the same page on that.

MR. MARTIN: I agree with my fellow

Commissioners, or Board members, that we should have

further discussion, expressly since there may be

some unidentified impediments that will take two

very productive committees and convene them as one

committee and the process slows down.

So we should talk about it a little bit more before we make a final decision, and, just to be

cautious, to make sure that we cover all bases to make sure that we are not creating a really large committee that's going to not work as efficiently as the two separate committees.

2.1

MR. LISTON: So I think what we're heading towards is we all want to acknowledge -- we already have effectively created this committee --

BISHOP TAYLOR: Well, I guess that's what's in question. I wanted to ask that. Did we actually create it or --

MR. LISTON: We have not, as a Board.

BISHOP TAYLOR: -- is it just, like, in conception, conceptually created?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: The Operations Committee -MR. GITNER: I know I've made reports on behalf
of the Investigations Committee, whether it exists
or not, so either -- I mean, from a functional point
of view, it exists. We've had discussions, we've
had meetings, we've made reports. Whether or not
there was actually a formal vote at the right time,
frankly, I don't know or remember. But it's been

And I think the question is should it be formalized now, and then, you know, I can work with Dave and we can figure out whether or not, from our

essentially functioning.

point of view --

2.1

MR. LISTON: Right.

MR. GITNER: -- in the trenches, we think it makes sense to combine them, and then, to Jules point of view, have the Board discuss it and make their own decision. Or should they continue separately or -- I suppose the vote -- the Board could also vote later on to dissolve one or both committees.

MR. LISTON: And let me say this, if I may, I don't know how we do it, but on other boards I've been on, typically the Chair can create a committee. I don't know if we do it differently here, but I don't even know if we necessarily need a full-Board vote on this.

But, in any event, whether we do or we don't, it sounds like we have, effectively, an Investigations Committee, it sounds like we ought to have one, and the only question is to what extent should it work with the APU Committee. Why don't we just officially bless this?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: I will tell you that in the minutes of the November meeting, the Chairman at the time, Dan Chu, referenced the fact that there was a vote in the Operations Committee meeting to create

an Investigations Committee.

MR. LISTON: Okay.

2.1

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: So it was the Operations
Committee that voted on that at the time; it was
never formalized into a full-Board vote. Although,
on that day, most of the Board was at, not all of
the Board, but most of the Board was at the
Operations Committee, and it kind of morphed into a
full-Board session.

So just to -- for the sake of clarity, that's the only reason why we brought this up today, just to formally adopt what was done at the Operations Committee.

BISHOP TAYLOR: And that was in the -- that's reflected in the November Board minutes?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. GRANT, JR.: Well, look, I'm in favor of creating the Investigations Committee with the understanding that the mandate that you laid out, that you stated, with the understanding that the Investigations Committee is not going to act unilaterally, that any steps that need to be taken will obviously be communicated to not only to APU, but also to the full Board, and just have that

```
1
       clearly stated on the record. So, I'd be in favor
2
       of creating it.
3
           BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. So it sounds like,
4
       then, we're moving in the direction of creating
5
       officially the Investigations Unit with the proviso
       that it would not move unilaterally nor usurp the
6
7
      decision power of the Board as it relates to, I
8
      guess, specifically subpoenas and any other
       sensitive issues like that.
9
           So if someone wants to make a motion.
10
11
           MR. LISTON: It's been made, I think.
           MR. DONLON: Well, I did make a motion to --
12
13
           BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. So James made a
14
      motion to --
15
           MR. GRANT, JR.: Second it.
16
           MR. DONLON: -- to establish the Investigations
       Committee.
17
18
           BISHOP TAYLOR: -- to establish the
19
       Investigations Committee.
20
           Anyone want to second?
2.1
           MR. GRANT, JR.: I second.
           BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay. All in favor?
22
23
           (Chorus of ayes.)
24
           BISHOP TAYLOR: Contrary-wise?
25
           (No response.)
```

BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. So it carries. 1 2 now we have an official Investigative Committee. 3 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you, Bishop. 4 For the Board's information, the plaque for 5 Former Chairman Dan Chu is at the Agency. We did receive it the day after the last Board meeting. 6 7 And we can talk about how you want to present it to him, if the Board -- the Board could talk about that 8 9 at their convenience, but we do have it and --10 BISHOP TAYLOR: Thank you. 11 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- I think it will be a --12 it's a really -- I have to thank Marcos and Brian 13 for working so hard on putting that together on 14 behalf of the Board. 15 BISHOP TAYLOR: Since we're webcammed, it would 16 be nice just to hold it up and maybe he can see it. 17 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And wave? BISHOP TAYLOR: Brian? 18 19 It came a day after the Board meeting and it's 20 here, so it should be in the Board meeting now. 2.1 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you, Bishop. 22 And then in terms of 100 Church, we are moving 23 this weekend. Yes. I know I've been saying this 24 for months, and I thank everyone for their patience

and kindness. But I think most of the staff have

25

2.1

2.5

gone over there to see it, it is a very bright, very open -- and it really is a beautiful space, so I want to thank the Former Executive Director, Joan Thompson, for her hard work on it, as well as the Board for putting it together. And I am reaping the benefits of having such a nice, beautiful space amongst -- with the Agency. So, thank you. And we will be there on Monday, so Friday is our last day here.

The only other topics that came up last month that I want to report on, we were talking last month about administratively closed cases versus truncated cases. And, to clarify, during the November Operations meeting, which we do not have minutes of, there was a discussion about cases that were referred not by civilians and cases where there was no civilian complaints, but were referred by other agencies, NYPD or others, and how to proceed on those cases.

The memo -- the e-mail that was mentioned reflected that presentation and that idea. And I want to thank Al Grant and Tony Simonetti who have really worked on this issue. And we've decided that what we will do is put together a more formalized review of this for the full Board for the next

meeting to talk about exactly how we should proceed with these cases.

We've made a lot of progress with this, and I think everyone is on the same page, but we want to make sure that we accurately reflect these cases in our statistical reporting as well as confirm that these cases go through the Board. They'll go through a number of steps of review between the investigator getting the case, between the deputy executive director of investigations and myself, and then, ultimately, to a Board Panel that would determine whether or not they should be administratively closed.

But we will get you more information so that by the next meeting -- Tony feels strongly -- he wants to be here for it and he apologizes to the Board for not being able to be present today. He's still in Florida and enjoying himself.

MR. LISTON: So sorry.

2.1

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: But he will be here for the next Board meeting, so I think that will be a great opportunity to address that.

And then we can also address the truncated issues case, the issue with regard to whether you want to report cases as truncated versus case

resolution rate. And, again, it doesn't change the actual raw numbers of our cases, it's just a matter of, in the future, how we're going to proceed with those cases.

2.1

I also want to say that the annual report is now at the printer. It should be with us momentarily. I want to thank Marcos and Linda for working so hard on that. And I think that it will be -- we have a press release that I want to thank Linda Sachs for putting together so that we can -- and we have it in the packets.

MS. LINDA SACHS: And on the website.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And on the website. Thank you.

It's listed on the website as well so that everyone can see it. But I think that that will be something that will move forward the discussions with regard to the agencies at Operations and how hard we're working, even despite Hurricane Sandy and the other impediments we had.

So the only other issue, then, is Local Law 103. Last month we discussed the idea and that the Board has to vote on whether or not it wants to have us live stream our meetings or whether or not we want to record them. Either way, they will be on our

1 website and be permanently archived within 72 hours 2 of the meeting. But the Board has to vote on which 3 way it wants to proceed. 4 BISHOP TAYLOR: So, right now, we are recording 5 with the option of posting within 72 hours, right? MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes, sir. We have to post 6 7 within 72 hours. BISHOP TAYLOR: 8 Right. 9 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: So we are recording it and it will be on our website within the next 72 hours. 10 11 BISHOP TAYLOR: Right. And so in the new 12 location, we probably would have more bandwidth and 13 ability to, if we want to do live streaming, 14 probably can do it -- accommodate it better there. 15 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes. 16 BISHOP TAYLOR: So we don't have to decide today whether or not we want to live stream or do we need 17 18 to vote today? MS. CATAPANO-FOX: For next month's meeting we 19 20 will be there, so we could get the equipment and 2.1 have it ready for the April meeting. 22 BISHOP TAYLOR: To live stream? 23 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes. If that's what the 24 Board chooses to do.

Okay.

BISHOP TAYLOR:

2.5

DR. KHALID: What is the expense, Tracy, on live versus recorded?

2.1

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: It's negligible. I mean, we do have to get the bandwidth in order to be able to do live stream, but it's not prohibitive.

DR. KHALID: We should vote on it today then, if it's no expense --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: That would not be an impediment, in terms of the cost. There is a small cost, but -- the benefits of doing it by live stream are that, according to the stat -- the lang- -- the plain language of the statute prefers that it be done by live stream, unless practic- -- unless it's not practicable. So the benefits would be that that is the preferred method. There's no punishment or there's no qualifications to why you can't do it, they haven't been clear about why you wouldn't do a live stream, and it is done by the Mayor's Office and other city agencies.

The benefits of doing a recording is that even though the cost is negligible, there would be no cost of doing a recording because, essentially, we have the equipment right now; we would just bring it to 100 Church and record it.

So, we cannot change the video no matter what,

```
1
       so whether it's live stream, the recording, we're
2
      not allowed to edit it. So that's not an issue.
                                                          So
3
       it's really just a preference at this point by the
4
      Board.
5
           DR. KHALID: We should do live, then.
6
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: We have to make a motion.
7
          MR. GITNER: The statute says live stream is
8
      preferred?
9
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: It says that we should be
10
       live streaming it where practicable.
11
           MR. GITNER: And you're telling us that the cost
12
       is negligible and it's practicable to do it?
13
           MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes.
14
           MR. GITNER: So, do we really have to vote?
15
       Isn't this just acquired by the statute? I'm happy
16
       to vote, but --
17
           MS. CATAPANO-FOX: I think it's --
          MR. GITNER: -- it seems like a no-brainer to
18
19
       me.
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: I think it's better to
20
2.1
      vote --
22
           MR. GITNER:
                        Okay.
23
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- because it's your Board
      meeting, and I --
24
          MR. GITNER: So I move that we be in compliance
25
```

```
1
       with the statute and live stream it.
2
           MR. GRANT, JR.: Second.
3
           BISHOP TAYLOR: All in favor?
4
           (Chorus of ayes.)
5
           BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. So carried.
6
           MR. GRANT, JR.: Bishop, are you going to read
7
           BISHOP TAYLOR: Yes. So we have the plaque for
8
9
       our Former Chair, Daniel D. Chu. It says:
10
           "With deepest appreciation for your years of
11
       extraordinary services and sound leadership as the
       Chairman and Board Member of the New York City
12
       Civilian Complaint Review Board, 2008 to 2013, your
13
14
      wisdom and dedication guided the CCRB to the
15
       implementation of the Administrative Prosecution
16
       Unit, you steered the CCRB to achieve an
17
       extraordinary level of excellence in carrying out
       its mission of investigating and mediating
18
19
       complaints and providing individual " -- "invaluable
       service to the people of New York City."
20
2.1
           See that, Dan (indicating)? That's for you.
22
       Let's give Dan a big hand.
23
           (Applause.)
24
           BISHOP TAYLOR: Excellent. Excellent. All
25
       right.
```

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you very much, Bishop. 1 2 MR. MARTIN: Bishop. 3 BISHOP TAYLOR: Yes. 4 MR. MARTIN: I have a question for, and, I'm 5 sorry, for the Executive Director's report as it 6 relates to APU. I'm still not clear how many cases 7 in the APU that are currently opened that the Police Commissioner has not signed on. I mean, the 8 9 calendar cases, the cases that have not made its 10 first appearance, all of the cases that are in the 11 I heard different categories, but I don't -- I don't -- I would like to know a total. 12 13 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Okay. So we have seven cases 14 that have guilty pleas and who are waiting, so 15 there's seven; there's one from a trial verdict, so 16 that would be eight. Essentially, there's eight 17 cases right now that are waiting. MR. MARTIN: But there are cases that are 18 calendared for trial? 19 MS. LAURA EDIDIN: Correct. 20 2.1 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Oh, yes. 22 MR. MARTIN: Right. You have cases that they 23 have not made their first appearance. All of those, 24 I mean, the whole thing. 2.5 MS. EDIDIN: How many cases are in --

```
1
           MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
2
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: 153 cases.
3
          MR. MARTIN: 153 cases.
4
          MS. EDIDIN: As of the end of February.
5
          MR. MARTIN: I think that's what (inaudible).
6
      Okay.
7
          MR. GITNER: How many -- I'm sorry, I didn't
8
      hear. How many cases are calendared, actually
9
       calendared for trial?
10
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Currently, there's 14
11
       calendared for court appearance, 40 trials are
       scheduled. So that would be 54 cases.
12
13
           MR. GITNER: So there's essentially 100 cases
14
       that haven't even had a first appearance?
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: No.
                                   There are 40 -- the
15
16
       40 cases that are trialed, that are scheduled for
17
       trial have had a first appearance.
           MR. GITNER: But there are 40 cases that have
18
19
      had a first appearance, 14 of what?
20
           MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Fourteen cases are calendared
2.1
       for court appearance, so they're waiting their first
22
      appearance.
23
          MR. GITNER: But I thought you said there were
24
       153 --
25
          MS. CATAPANO-FOX: No. There are 60 other cases
```

1 that are waiting --2 MR. GITNER: Oh, 60 other cases. 3 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- initial court appearance 4 after trials. 5 MR. GITNER: Oh, I'm sorry. 6 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: So we've got cases that are 7 waiting for first -- that's the 60 cases -- waiting for their first appearance. 8 9 MR. GITNER: Got it. MS. CATAPANO-FOX: There's 14 more that have 10 11 gotten the first appearance and are having 12 subsequent appearances. 13 MR. GITNER: Okay. 14 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And then we have 40 trials 15 scheduled on top of that. 16 MR. GITNER: Can I just ask a sort of a 17 follow-up question, actually. It relates to the 18 report. I don't know -- it doesn't have a page 19 number, but it's entitled: "Officers Against Whom 20 The CCRB Substantiated Allegations." That page. 2.1 I read this, and just to make sure I'm reading it 22 right, the Board, it looks like the Board's 23 substantiated approximately 56 cases in February, or 24 at least against 56 officers, and of that, 50 were

recommended charges. Am I reading that right?

25

```
1
           MR. GRANT, JR.: Where are you?
           MR. GITNER: Unfortunately there's no page
 2
       number on it, but it's the --
 3
 4
           MR. GRANT, JR.: Which document?
 5
           MR. GITNER: It's the statistics -- it's
 6
       Executive Director's report --
 7
           MR. GRANT, JR.: Oh, okay.
           MR. GITNER: -- sort of in the middle, and it's
 8
 9
       called "Officers Against Whom The CCRB Substantiated
10
       Allegations, February 2014."
11
           MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Is this the individual case
       number list?
12
13
           MR. GITNER: That (indicating).
14
           MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes, okay. That's it.
15
           BISHOP TAYLOR: So the question is...
16
           MR. GITNER: Well, I just want to make sure I'm
17
       reading it right. As I read it, it's saying that we
       substantiated 56 cases, at least that's what I -- I
18
19
       tried to count it real quick, maybe I'm one or two
       off.
20
2.1
           DR. KHALID: Twenty-four cases.
22
           MR. GITNER: It goes on a few pages, though, I
23
       think. I think it's a three-page report.
24
           MR. GRANT, JR.: I'm sorry, Dan. I -- the one
25
       I'm looking at says 24 substantiated cases.
```

1 DR. KHALID: Twenty-four cases. 2 MR. GITNER: Yeah, but, I mean, against 3 officers. Because if you -- it's a three-page 4 report. I think that there are 56 cells in the 5 report. 6 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Okay, yes. Because some 7 cases will have multiple officers. MR. GITNER: Some cases have more officers. 8 9 MR. GRANT, JR.: Oh, okay. 10 MR. GITNER: So, sorry. So --11 MR. GRANT, JR.: I'm sorry. MR. GITNER: -- substantiated 56 -- against 56 12 13 different officers, or at least 56 different 14 complaints. 15 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Marcos --16 MR. GITNER: And an overwhelming majority are 17 charges, at least as I read it. MR. MARCOS SOLER: The Board substantiated 24 18 19 cases against 35 identified officers. What you have 20 there is the breakdown by specific allegations. 2.1 every cell is an allegation. So what you have is case number 2014, it's not an actual case number, 22 23 but the case number of the month, case number 24 20140201, that is the first case; and then officer 2.5 ID is the first case in the case, 2014020101; and

1 that is the allegation, and allegation is Stop. 2 Then there are -- 02 is allegation against 3 another officer, which is an allegation of Search. 4 And he also has an allegation of Stop, and he also 5 has an allegation of Frisk. So you have --MR. GITNER: So the officer ID line tells you, 6 7 for example, in the first case --MR. SOLER: Right. 8 9 MR. GITNER: -- there are three allegations 10 against one officer whose officer ID ends in 02? 11 MR. SOLER: Correct. MR. GITNER: So that's why there are 35 12 13 officers, but 56 total cells? 14 MR. SOLER: Thirty-five officers, 56 15 allegations --16 DR. KHALID: Allegations. 17 MR. SOLER: -- against an officer. So, and this way the Board can see the specific recommendation, 18 19 penalty recommendation for each allegation, and then, also, in the case of the Police Department's 20 2.1 discipline, the specific recommend -- the penalty of 22 the Department on each allegation. 23 The best way to do it is actually on the 24 statistical chart in the disposition by allegation, 25 where we give you that information breakdown.

MR. GITNER: Where is that?

2.1

MR. SOLER: And that will be CCRB disposition of all allegations and CCRB disposition of cases. So CCRB's disposition of cases, we have a total of 24 substantiated cases in 2000 -- in February 2014. And by allegation, you will see, then, we have 50 allegations that were charges, three allegations that were command discipline, and three allegations that were instructions, which is an unusual pattern for this particular month because normally the number of charges is smaller than the number of command -- than is in this particular report.

MR. GITNER: That was really my question. So, thank you, because I was reading it wrong.

So, but, I am correct that, at least for this month, February, we have a substantial number of charges as compared to other recommended courses of action?

MR. SOLER: The answer --

MR. GITNER: It's almost overwhelmingly charges.

MR. SOLER: The answer is yes. The Board, for the last five years, the charges rate by the Board is 66 percent. Since implementation of the APU Unit, the Board has continued to have a charges rate of 66 percent. This particular month is unusual,

1 and the charges rate is closer to, close to 90 percent. But it's unusual when you compare to 2 3 both the five previous years as well as the last 12 4 month -- you know, basically, the last eight months 5 or nine months since the implementation of the APU 6 Unit. 7 MR. GITNER: And I suppose nothing in the statistics tells us why. It could be just because 8 9 the nature of the cases or anything? 10 MR. SOLER: Right. Nothing --11 MR. GITNER: Nothing in this report could tell 12 you why. 13 MR. SOLER: Correct. 14 MR. GITNER: You have to look deeper. Okay. 15 Thank you. 16 BISHOP TAYLOR: Excellent. Okay. No more 17 discussion on that? We're going to move to 18 Committee reports. 19 MR. GITNER: I'll say one thing on behalf of the 20 now official Investigations Committee. 2.1 BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay. 22 MR. GITNER: My first official report. I just 23 wanted to report that at least in the last two or 24 three months, Denis and his group, not through,

really, any magic from the Investigations Committee,

25

but, frankly, dogged-head work at his new operations and procedures, has been able to reduce the period of time it takes for a case to come in -- between the time the case comes in and gets to a Panel by about 60 days over the last couple of months.

2.1

So that's a significant, in my view, bump that should hopefully reduce the number of cases that come up against statute of limitations issues, and, in any event, should, to the extent we're dealing with charges, should make the APU's job easier because memories are fresher and they have more time. And I could go on and on, but there's a host of benefits to that. And so I think Denis has done a wonderful job, and I just wanted that to be recognized during this meeting.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Can you tell us how the reduction of time was accomplished?

MR. GITNER: Honestly, I think it's purely his hard work.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Denis, can you give us a --

MR. GITNER: He can do it better than I could.

MR. MCCORMICK: I had numbers running for the first eight months of last year, and the days to complete was about 335 to get to the -- 335 days for the Investigations Committee -- for the

Investigations Unit to get the case to the Board.

And then I looked at the last six months, and it's been cut by 60 days. It's down to about 275 or 274.

2.1

So, I mean, I think there was a huge bump after Sandy, where we had, you know, we had delays in cases. But we've, we've really -- and me and Tracy, we've been trying to sit down with the teams that are -- cases that are over 12 months old, and, you know, really try and make sure, ensure that the cases aren't getting any older, and that we're giving them more guidance at that point so that they're younger, but...

And we've also put the new Intake Unit into place where the average caseload per investigator has gone down almost 33 percent, from almost an average of 25 down to 17 in the last two months of active cases. So that also gives them a lot more time to go through cases.

So it's been a lot of hard work by the teams and the team managers and supervisors, but it's also, as I said, the new Intake Unit has helped greatly reduce some of their responsibilities with intake just so that it can concentrate on the cases.

BISHOP TAYLOR: So you said that post-Sandy the time has organically gotten better in terms of

resolving and moving cases forward, right?

2.1

MR. MCCORMICK: Yeah. I just selected two periods of time because, as I said, I thought eight months after Sandy -- I did it through August of 2013 -- and said it was 335. And then I just wanted to look, because I thought that was sufficient -- not sufficient, but a decent amount of time away from Sandy, to see whether we were improving or not.

BISHOP TAYLOR: And just for public point of clarification, could you explain the Intake Unit and how it relieves 33 percent and what that actually is? I don't want people to be confused with that.

MR. MCCORMICK: Gotcha. In the beginning of January, we started a new Intake Unit, which it's -- essentially, we have a team of 18 investigators who are -- who get every complaint that comes in and they attempt to schedule all of the complainants right away. So if you call up right now, they'll try and schedule you for tomorrow, or immediately. In the past, there would be one or two other steps before that would happen, so. And in that way, they schedule it for the teams.

So they'll schedule it for Thursday, let's say, and tomorrow, Team 6 will be on -- and Team 6 will be responsible for conducting those interviews if

the people show up. If the people don't show up, it gets automatically put back into the Scheduling Unit and the Team 6 investigator has no other work to do with that case, but it just goes back to Scheduling.

2.1

So, in the past, the teams would have to be back in Intake, so there would be -- we guessed that they were missing about three or four days a month by doing Intake duties, either by doing walk-in duties or manning the phones, whatever it might be, inputting cases into CTS. So, you know, we're seeing a pretty drastic reduction, A, in caseload, and times to complete in the two months since we've instituted it.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Excellent. Any questions on that?

MR. GRANT, JR.: Yeah. And the Intake Unit, I vaguely remember, but do they also have a role in obtaining documents?

MR. MCCORMICK: Yes, we have been obtaining some documents. We did have a lot of requests going out prior to the Intake Unit. We have cut down the number of requests in hopes of speeding up -- getting some of our other requests back. So we have seen a deduction, but they are in mediation-eligible cases or (inaudible) identification issues that they

are sending out for some documents early on, like,

2 immediately or within a few days. 3 MR. GRANT, JR.: And I guess over time, you'll 4 track that to see how that's been helpful and 5 facilitate it? 6 MR. MCCORMICK: Exactly. I mean it's -- some of 7 the numbers I just gave now are easy for us to track --8 9 MR. GRANT, JR.: Right, I understand. 10

MR. MCCORMICK: -- but some of the other stuff is going to need four or five months --

MR. GRANT, JR.: Right.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. MCCORMICK: -- or six months to get a thorough interpretation.

MR. GRANT, JR.: All right.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And I have to say the team attorneys are doing an excellent job of reviewing cases. They have -- they get a number -- there's only three team attorneys to review all six teams, and they do an excellent job of not just doing trainings with the teams, but also really reviewing the cases, doing quality control to make sure that the investigations are going properly, and then getting those cases to Panels quickly.

So I can't thank Roger and Laura and Brian

enough for their hard work in moving these cases along, too. So it really is a team effort from the team managers and supervisors, the investigators and then the team attorneys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. GRANT, JR.: Yeah. And the fact, just to emphasize, you know, we see Denis and Laura and, you know, you guys, we always compliment you guys for your hard work as well, it's well deserved, but I think any time we can take the opportunity to really thank the managers and the investigators who have been working extremely hard. And I got to tell you, the level of morale around here has just been on the high, and I hope to continue that.

So just know that the Board really appreciates the hard work, and please convey that to everyone.

MR. MCCORMICK: (Indicating.)

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Excellent. Dan, finished with your report?

MR. GITNER: Yes, thank you.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay. James.

MR. DONLON: Reports and Recommendations. already covered a lot of this, but I just wanted to commend Marcos and Linda and whoever else worked on the annual report, but this is the cover

(indicating). It's at the printer. The print product will be available shortly. The actual report is available on the website. The entire report is there. And there is, as Tracy mentioned, there is a press release going out today having to do with the issuance of the annual report.

2.1

2.5

So Marcos promised us at the last meeting that it would be going to the printer very shortly, and his promise was kept. So I appreciate that. And I recommend that everybody take a look at the annual report.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Thank you so much. Great work with that.

APU Unit? APU Unit. Dave Liston.

MR. LISTON: Sure. Thank you.

We had a very productive and positive meeting of the Administrative Prosecution Unit Committee this morning. Many of you were there. Just to briefly summarize, we talked about a number of items, but I think perhaps the two most interesting and important relate to the use of nolo pleas, as we call them, and the use of video to permit or to enable a complainant to testify in a case where the complainant happens to be incarcerated.

I'll just briefly summarize. As many of you

2.1

2.5

know, a nolo plea, or nolo contendere, refers to a plea in which a person accused of something essentially accepts a penalty, accepts responsibility and, yet, does not specifically acknowledge guilt. And in some cases, those sorts of pleas can be useful in resolving a case and bringing closure to a case. The person ends up being punished as if they had pled guilty; however, for the record, they have not specifically acknowledged the offense.

And there are certain situations in which an officer may be perfectly willing to resolve a case, but has the threat of a civil lawsuit and has the concern that by taking a plea, by, under oath, acknowledging what was charged, he or she may be put at a very substantial disadvantage in a related civil case. And so there are cases, and not all of them, but there are cases in which our unit is willing to empower to agree to a nolo plea in order to resolve the matter.

As we discussed in the meeting, that's a valuable and important discretion that has to be exercised carefully and wisely. And we talked about the criteria that, in the past, Commissioner, Police Commissioner Kelly used in deciding when to accept a

2.1

nolo plea and when not to. We now have a new Police Commissioner, and, also, now, we as an APU Committee and we with the APU Unit have to make those sorts of decisions. We had a very productive conversation about that. We're going to continue to look at the criteria and consider modifying them to the extent we think appropriate as we go forward.

And then, finally, we talked about the use of video to enable someone who's incarcerated to testify. We talked about how that can be difficult. It can be difficult to have a person actually appear, and, in the past, that just didn't seem to happen. Moving forward, we intend to make it possible for people to participate in the cases that they initiated as complainants whenever we can, whether by video or where possible in person. I think that's pretty much the summary of our meeting.

Laura, do you want to fill us in on some other details that I'm leaving out or any other points?

MS. EDIDIN: Sure. I'll just touch briefly on a few other items we discussed. I updated the Committee on the status of the APU docket. And in addition, we talked -- I gave thanks to Linda Sachs and Lincoln McVeigh for creating on our website a calendar where APU trials are listed. There are two

weeks' worth of trials posted at all times so that if people want to come and observe a trial, a member of the public wants to come, they know when the next trial is coming up.

And I also gave thanks to Manager of Community
Outreach and Partner Engagement Carlmais Johnson for
suggesting that observation of an APU trial be made
a formal part of investigator training. She shared
the experiences of her interns who found it a very
powerful experience. And I also gave thanks to
Executive Director Tracy Catapano-Fox for
implementing that.

And I believe those are the topics that we covered. Thank you.

MR. LISTON: Thanks for all the work you're doing. Thanks to John Darche as well and your whole team.

MS. EDIDIN: Thank you.

2.1

2.5

MR. LISTON: We're very grateful.

DR. KHALID: Mr. Chair, also in the morning discussion of the APU, we were also discussing about the getting in touch with the Panel and getting in touch with the Chair of the APU or with ED regarding emergency situation.

MR. LISTON: Right.

DR. KHALID: Do you want to mention that?

2.1

2.5

MR. LISTON: I'm glad you brought that up. The other -- when it comes to nolo pleas, because it's such an important balancing, right, on the one hand, we want to resolve cases, bring closure, then be able to focus our resources on other matters, but on the other hand, sometimes for the complainant the most important thing is not the penalty, but it's the fact that the officer, in court, under oath, with someone typing it down and recording it, acknowledged what they did wrong. And so we need to balance those competing concerns.

And because it's such an important decision, we talked to the Committee about wanting to be sure that the Board had input into that decision-making process while at the same time not hampering the process. These decisions sometimes have to be made very quickly.

And so at least for now, what we've proposed as a committee is that the APU -- Laura would contact both the Executive Director, Tracy, and me, to let us know, hey, in this particular case, we propose to agree to a nolo plea, and we're going to go forward under that basis. There may be cases where either the Executive Director or me say, hey, you know

what, this is a tough call, we really should get the Panel involved. And if time permits, we'll do so.

On the other hand, when time doesn't permit or it's a perfectly simple decision, we'll do our best to exercise our judgement.

DR. KHALID: Yes.

2.1

MR. LISTON: That's at least how we're going to do it for now. We may revisit that process as we move forward. I think that's a fair summary. I hope.

I'm glad you brought it up.

DR. KHALID: Absolutely.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: I just want to thank the Board for being so receptive. We often will contact Board members and Panel members ad hoc on an emergency basis, and you are always so generous with your time and receptive to meeting with us. When we have cases that are close to the SOL, we set up emergency panels, and every one of you has always been more than happy to meet with us, talk to us, get involved in these cases. And so I just can't thank you enough for really working so well with us and working with us to get us quick answers when we need it, even though you have all very busy schedules and lives going on. You've been wonderful

about being receptive to us, so, thank you.

2.1

MR. GRANT, JR.: I'm sorry, Commissioner Liston. I spaced out for a second. Are you saying that that is the proposal going -- that you will recommend at some point or is that how it's taking place now where --

MR. LISTON: I guess what's happening -- what's been happening to date is that Laura contacts the Executive Director, correct me if I'm wrong, and says, you know, in this particular matter, we'd like to agree to a nolo plea, and she gets approval from our Executive Director. That's fine.

The Committee's view was that because it's such an important decision, it would be helpful to have the Board involved in that decision-making. And at a minimum, and for now, what we proposed was to have the APU Chair, myself, be a part of that conversation. That's at least what we propose. I'd like to suggest we revisit that at a future meeting, but I think for now it's at least a way forward.

MR. GRANT, JR.: All right. Yeah, I mean -MR. LISTON: And we could, in theory -- by the
way, sorry to interrupt you -- we could, in theory,
pull together the Panel. And we did talk about that
in the Committee. It turns out these nolo pleas are

not completely unusual; they happen fairly regularly and they tend to happen -- if you can imagine what -- you know, I used to be a prosecutor, I think you were as well --

MR. GRANT, JR.: Yeah.

2.1

MR. LISTON: -- someone suddenly is ready to take a nolo and you have to make a quick decision. So we want to make sure the Board is represented and involved, but we also want to make sure this is a fluid process. And we think for now this may be the way forward. For now, we just want to try it.

MR. GRANT, JR.: No, I agree. And I agree with what you said before about the potential impact on the complainants, right, wanting -- that's a big part of it --

MR. LISTON: Sure is.

MR. GRANT, JR.: -- the police officer accepting responsibility. I guess, for me, what I think we should not wait on is having a set of criteria put together just for the way that you're proceeding now so that we're -- you know, it's very clear to the public how we are proceeding on these --

MR. LISTON: Yes.

MR. GRANT, JR.: -- in these matters. And ultimately, we will revisit it and vote on it fully,

```
1
       but I think we shouldn't waste any time with getting
2
       those criteria in place --
3
           MR. LISTON: I think --
4
           MR. GRANT, JR.: -- if they're not already.
5
       sorry.
6
          MR. LISTON: We agree. I think everyone --
7
          MR. GRANT, JR.: Okay.
          MR. LISTON: That issue came up as well in the
8
9
       Committee. We spoke about the fact that for now
10
      we've been looking to guidelines that were prepared
11
      by not this Commissioner, but a prior Commissioner,
12
       Commissioner Kelly. But now we have our own APU
13
      Unit, so we really should have our own criteria.
14
       They may very well look the same as the ones before,
15
      but they should be our own and we should be ready to
16
       change them as we see fit. And that's exactly what
17
      we'll do.
18
           MR. GRANT, JR.: And is the plan ultimately to,
19
       I quess, share the criteria with the PD for their
20
       comment or is it -- we're just going to have our
2.1
       criteria in place and so be it?
22
           MS. CATAPANO-FOX: We can put the cri- -- a
23
      proposed criteria together for the Board to
24
      review --
2.5
           MR. GRANT, JR.: All right.
```

1 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- and then if you're 2 comfortable with it, we could then, if the Board 3 wants us to, submit it to DAO for their review so 4 that they understand how we're handling our cases in 5 That's something. comparison. MR. LISTON: I mean, ultimately, it's our 6 7 criteria. It's ultimate -- I think it's our Board who has to bless it or modify it --8 9 MR. GRANT, JR.: Right. 10 MR. LISTON: -- but as with everything else, 11 it's always nice to have input. So as part of the 12 process, I suppose we could run it by someone at the 13 PD and see what they think. 14 MR. GRANT, JR.: Right. I'm just thinking, you 15 know, ultimately, PD imposes the ultimate penalty, 16 and I don't want us to be sort of hit at the end by 17 not really thinking it through. 18 MR. LISTON: Right. 19 MR. GRANT, JR.: So I'm not saying it's the 20 right thing to do, but let's at least put that on 2.1 the table to discuss. 22 MR. LISTON: It's always good to have it. 23 MR. GRANT, JR.: All right. MR. LISTON: That's for sure. 24 2.5 BISHOP TAYLOR: I think, just,

Commissioner Liston, just as a point of clarification, I think that what you meant was not that the importance of the cases, but the functionality of the Board. So it's not -- so now it's going to Executive Director, and you're saying that because of the importance of it. I don't think you meant that. What you meant was because of the function. And the function is that we as Board members need to look at these cases and adjudicate accordingly.

So I think it's not that it's too important for the ED, it's just the function. Just as a point of...

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And plus, we want -- I think Bishop's --

BISHOP TAYLOR: Right?

2.1

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- 100 percent right in terms of the Board made a certain recommendation for a reason. If you substantiated with charges and were expected a guilty plea to be taken, then it makes sense for us to have the Board's input through Commissioner Liston on whether or not, based upon a variety of circumstances and factors we can put together, whether or not a nolo plea would make sense. So, I think --

We can

1 MR. LISTON: Yeah. I mean, to be clear, I 2 didn't mean to suggest that important decisions come 3 to us and the unimportant ones go to --4 BISHOP TAYLOR: No, no, no. I know what you 5 That's why as a point of clarification, I 6 know what you meant. I know what you meant. 7 MR. LISTON: Yeah. I'm glad. I think what I 8 meant simply was it's important for us to have a 9 role in that decision. BISHOP TAYLOR: It's our function. 10 11 MR. LISTON: Yeah, I agree. 12 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Absolutely. 13 BISHOP TAYLOR: It's our function. 14 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And we want your -- again, we 15 want to fulfill the mission the Board is seeking for 16 us to do. So it's great to collaborate together on 17 these things. DR. KHALID: I think it will be a good idea as 18 19 well that the Panel should also be informed what has 20 taken place, because Panel is the one making the 2.1 decision about the substantiation of charges, 22 whatever. So I think when case is done by Laura 23 that we should at least be informed as a Panel, that 24 that case belonged to that Panel.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Okay. That's great.

2.5

```
1
      put together a forum and send it to the Panel.
2
           MS. EDIDIN: And just, Dr. Khalid, are you
3
       suggesting in -- for all APU cases that whatever the
4
      resolution of the case is, the Panel should be
5
      notified, or just in cases involving a nolo plea?
6
           DR. KHALID: A nolo plea, I mean.
7
           MS. EDIDIN: Okay.
           MR. GITNER: I'd like to suggest that in all
8
9
       cases.
10
           MS. EDIDIN: Okay. We can do that.
11
           MR. GITNER: I don't see why -- I think the
12
       Panel should -- I think it would be helpful for the
13
       Panels to see what happened to the cases --
14
           MS. EDIDIN:
                        That's a great idea.
15
           MR. GITNER: -- for going forward, assuming it's
16
      not a tremendous burden, which I don't think it
17
       should be.
           MS. EDIDIN: Not at all. We can do that,
18
19
       absolutely.
20
                           To make it easier, I mean, since
           BISHOP TAYLOR:
2.1
      APU is a new unit and it's a very exciting time
22
      right now, we'll open it up to the full Board.
23
       Everyone should have access to how cases were
24
       adjudicated in the trial room.
25
           MS. EDIDIN:
                        That's great.
```

MR. GITNER: That's a great idea. 1 2 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Excellent. 3 MR. LISTON: Good. 4 MR. PUMA: I have a question about the APU 5 calendar. I've actually looked at the calendar 6 online and I think the information's very clear, 7 except that I, unless I'm misreading it, I haven't 8 noticed -- it lists location, but I haven't noticed 9 if it lists the time of the trial. So just take a look at that. I'm not -- because I'm interested in 10 11 actually attending a trial this month --12 MS. EDIDIN: Okay. 13 MR. PUMA: -- so I wanted to know when I should 14 actually arrive. 15 MS. EDIDIN: Yes. I will be happy to review 16 that and make sure that that's posted as well. 17 MR. JOHN DARCHE: Sometimes it's very difficult because of the resources available to PD to predict 18 19 when they're going to start. That's part of the 20 issue. 2.1 MS. EDIDIN: We can certainly give you the 22 earliest time it would start. So, for example, 23 because there are only two trial rooms at Police 24 Headquarters on a day when there are other court

appearances, the trial might not start until the

25

court calendar is finished. So I wouldn't be able to tell you exactly what time it would start, but I could tell you the earliest it would start.

MR. PUMA: I see. I see. And, I mean, if that's the case, I mean, I would also -- I mean, I guess you'll have to think through, you know, what -- whether you should be listing a time or at least listing a way for people to find out when they should show up, because I don't notice that also in the calendar. But other than that, I think it's great that it's there and that you're, you know, considering of making it a part of training for investigators.

MS. EDIDIN: Thank you.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you, Mr. Puma.

BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. Okay, great. So I guess the Mediation Committee.

Jules.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

MR. MARTIN: Next month.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Next month.

Outreach. I'm going to ask, Brian, if you would just give us a brief update on Outreach.

MR. CONNELL: Outreach has been very, it has become a very robust program. We have scheduled 30 events for the month of March. We have another 28

events scheduled for the month of April. We've also diversified the organizations to which we do outreach. We have religious organizations, academic institutions, and also senior centers, as well as -- what's the other category, it escaped me --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Government agencies?

Prosecutors?

2.1

MR. CONNELL: Government agencies. So, thanks to the group of interns we have, they've been doing an excellent job pitching Outreach and the Agency's mission to these organizations, some of which have not heard about the CCRB. But once we communicate the message of the Agency and the mission of the Agency to them, they're more than happy to invite us in to do a presentation.

So I want to commend them as well and Carlmais Johnson, who is really spearheading that effort as well and doing the majority of these outreaches that are conducted each month.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. GRANT, JR.: Bishop, if I could just ask, because you're chairing the Outreach Committee and I know I'm on it, if we could just formalize a process where that schedule now, that is much more robust, is just circulated to the Committee. I know it's --

1 I know there have been times where you've given it 2 to me and I've tried to see if I can fit it in my 3 schedule, but just so we have, like, a formalized 4 process in place so that if we are able to attend 5 those events, we can just sort of show up. 6 MR. CONNELL: So, I'll be glad to circulate 7 that, but I should note that it's also available on the website, which Linda Sachs repeatedly updates. 8 9 BISHOP TAYLOR: Updating, yeah. 10 MR. CONNELL: And publish it as well. 11 MR. GRANT, JR.: All right. Thanks. 12 BISHOP TAYLOR: Thank you so much. 13 Any other Committee reports? 14 (No response.) No? Old business? 15 BISHOP TAYLOR: 16 (No response.) 17 BISHOP TAYLOR: Any new business? MR. LISTON: If I may, I just want to very 18 19 briefly commend Bishop Taylor and our Executive 20 Director, Tracy, for what I thought was such a 2.1 productive meeting with the Police Commissioner. 22 And I also thought it was very helpful that we met 23 with the senior staff beforehand, and they gave us 24 very valuable input. And as a result of that input, 25 we had a very productive meeting. But I

particularly wanted to thank you, Bishop Taylor and

1

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

2 Tracy, for your leadership and for a very productive 3 meeting. 4 BISHOP TAYLOR: Thank you. 5 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you. BISHOP TAYLOR: Excellent. 6 7 Any more new business? 8 (No response.) 9 BISHOP TAYLOR: No? All right. So we're moving 10 now to public comment. And we have, first speaker, 11 Mr. John Brown. 12 MR. JOHN BROWN: How you doing? 13 BISHOP TAYLOR: Great. MR. BROWN: I just want to say Happy New Year to 14 15 everybody. I haven't been down here in about three 16 months, but I just want to say -- my wife didn't 17 want to come down -- the Outreach situation and

stuff that I've heard about needs to be taken

have no idea of what goes on down here.

son with the City of New York.

uptown. You got to go to the Bronx because they

questions that I get are, you've been through the

process -- by the way, the case is settled with my

Y'all sent me a letter last week saying that the case was closed; I got the letter last week, case

was closed. Y'all didn't find anything, but the city found enough to give him almost \$100,000. What gets me is that y'all cannot find nothing wrong.

2.1

My son was an Explorer with the Police

Department, like I said. First of all, the case was closed right after Sandy, the first time, right after Sandy. There was a month that went by after Sandy where no one could get in touch with anyone from the CCRB, and I understand that. But to get a closing letter at that time, it was like, you can't -- I can't reach you, but you can send me a closing letter. That's -- that was wrong.

I've been waiting for Denis McCormick to call me, it's been like three years. But he promised me, I'm going to call you up, we're going to get to the bottom of this investigation because I'm the supervisor of investigation. He never called me. I'm just refreshing y'all's memory.

Identification. Dean Meminger interviewed me and my son. The identification now is such that y'all went to the extent to say, we got computers now that can do computer imaging. What do you need a computer image for if you take the pictures of the police officers that are working undercover? Why do we need to speculate about why -- how somebody looks

when you could take a picture of them and know how they look?

2.1

But I can't answer these things, only y'all can answer this, because all I'm saying is that it's not in y'all's power, the things I'm asking you, a lot of it. But it is in your power to sit in front of the Commissioner of Police, which y'all sit in front of, and say to him, why can't we take pic -- these are police officers. They are supposed to protect us. Why can't we have pictures of undercover officers in case they're picked out when a incident happens.

Mind you, there was two officers on my son's arrest, the officer that arrested him and another officer. My son has never seen a picture of the two officers. He's never seen a picture of neither one of the two officers that arrested him. When they did show pictures, which we don't even know now if they were the officers because he said he had a red beard and long hair, the pictures that y'all showed him were pictures of officers, like how they look when they come out of the academy, clean cut, all of them, Caucasian. You picked them out. I mean, that's so tainted. The identification is so tainted, it's ridiculous.

2.1

In a court of law, it would never stand up where you could -- if I slapped a police officer outside, they would never show a picture of me in high school, they would show a picture of me the way I look now. But you brought my son in 18 months, 14 months after this happened and showed him a photo array of officers with no facial hair, and he told you on every occasion the officer had a red beard.

You can't make this right. You can't make this right to me. My wife is in tears because she don't even want to come down because how can you make this right, in this day and age, where we take pictures of everything? Streaming things, you want to stream things online and all this other stuff, how come you don't got pictures of all -- it's not, like I said, in your power, but wouldn't it be more accurate so it would eliminate a whole lot of mistakes if you got pictures of the undercover officers?

I mean, people say all of these things about how it could affect them personally. Well, my son has been affected personally. My son wanted to be a police officer; he doesn't want to do that no more. And, by the way, last week, I got another letter from y'all saying the case is closed; that it's unfounded. There's only two officers there, the one

2.1

who had my son and the one who arrested -- arrested another kid that was there. But we never seen pictures of the two officers, not yet, and the case has been closed. And if the City of New York can give my black son a \$100,000 -- y'all can't find him. The officers did nothing wrong. Something's wrong with this picture. Something's wrong. Tell me, y'all tell me, something is wrong.

I mean, I started off in this in 2011. In 2011, I came down here thinking that we could get justice. All I've been given is promises, man. Every time I asked a question of the CCRB, I would get a form letter back. The letter is the one that y'all give the complaint -- it's the complaint repor- -- this report right here. See this? (Indicating.) This is all you get back. Every time I ask a question, all I get back is this one paper, that's all I get back, and nothing is any different on the paper.

Mr. Daw, who was y'all's attorney at one time, I got in to him. Mr. Daw, what do I need in order to find out what these police officers said when they brought my son to the car and my son was -- his face was ripped up, his face was ripped (indicating) when I brought -- when you brought him to the car, what did those police officers say? How did he get like

that? I can't get an honest answer.

2.1

2.5

And you want the public to think or to have confidence in you when they ask you a simple question as, what did the officer say when you brought -- when he brought my son to put him -- to transport him, or whatever it is, what did this officer say? How did that young man get like that, John Brown? How did he get like that? Y'all can't tell me.

What kind of justice is this? This is not making no sense where there's one justice for the police officers, or whatever it is, or the establishment, but then there's another justice where we can't know anything.

Now, when it comes to the investigation, what investigation? We're not included in the investigation. No one comes to -- never -- no one ever came to me. Even whenever I came down here and had the case reopened, I had one investigator, she went over the same thing again. I have never spoken to her again since then. Never spoken to her again. Never. I mean, this is an embarrassment, man, from the beginning to the end.

I filed 40 different complaint numbers with the Internal Affairs. They say -- I was wondering --

2.1

and, first, I filed it with y'all, with CCRB -- why is it that Lieutenant Morris, who is with the 23rd Precinct, integrity control officer, how come he got promoted, but he closed my son's case? How could he close it when he never spoke to my son? He never seen him, never spoke to him, nothing. So how could he close the case? I gave it to y'all. Could y'all find this out for me? Y'all gave it back to me and said the Internal Affairs will find out. Internal Affairs, it's taken me 40 ca -- 40 different complaints I had to make and they still didn't come.

I mean, this leaves a lot to be desired. You want to know why people don't have confidence, because when they come to somebody and they ask you -- I mean, we can't even find out anything about the case. Everything is under -- what is that, what is the word that they use? -- under some seal, some freedom of information thing that the police hide behind. Well, if y'all know that they hiding behind it, why don't y'all tell the Police Commissioner? Commissioner Bratton, we can't do the job because we can't get the pictures and we can't get -- we can't get honest answers to anything. It's all in y'all's hands.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Mr. Brown, could I just ask you,

do you have any specific point that you're kind of getting to?

2.1

MR. BROWN: Do you know what my particular point is? Just what you're doing to me right now. It never comes out. I can't never get it out because you're telling me what the specific point is. All the things that I said.

The identification, you don't let the public do anything toward knowing about the case. We can't contribute anything. Once we give you -- tell you what happened, or whatever it is, that's it. There can't be no investigation like that. People don't respond to stuff like that.

If that happened to your son, would you just want someone to tell you, you give them the report and that's it. Excuse me, Investigator. Can you tell me what happened when the Officer and so-and-so-and-so -- what happened? I can't tell you that. Then what are y'all here -- that's what I'm saying. What is the reason for this, then?

I mean, they get every consideration about hiding their information. What about my son's information? What about him? What about all these people that -- these are cases, or whatever it is. I mean, this is not -- my son, we didn't make this

2.1

up. They didn't give my son money because we made this up. They don't do that here in this city. But you're showing that you can get away with doing this. As long you're paying money, you can kick 'em, you can drag 'em, you can do anything that you want to do. That's y'all's job. I'm telling y'all, that's y'all responsibility. The public, we look to y'all to do something about it.

Take these officers' pictures. They -- we deserve that. We pay their salaries. Why can't you have the guts to say, Commissioner, we can make it 100 percent easier if we take the pictures of the undercover officers? But nobody has the guts to do that. Thank you.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Thank you so much, Mr. Brown.

Now we're moving to Mr. Dunn, Chris Dunn.

MR. CHRIS DUNN: Okay. All right. I'm a piece of cake.

All right. I'm glad to hear that it's -- spring is in the air. And I know you're not the weather, but I think about the Police Department, so I think about a little more sunshine and transparency. So, that report about the meeting with the PC is not nearly sufficient. So, I would like to hear, as we have heard in prior instances about what was

actually discussed at the meeting, and I don't mean the particulars, the back and forth, because that you don't have to disclose, but I would like to hear at least the topics that were discussed at the meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

BISHOP TAYLOR: So just as a recap, there were -- the meeting was couched in a way that because the new Commissioner was meeting with us for the first time, we didn't want to have a particular hot-and-heavy meeting with issues, but just to find out who the new players are around the table, meet the executive staff and feel out where we would be going in terms of working together.

But, however, before meeting with the Commissioner, we met with the teams and outlined all of the high-level impediments that if given the opportunity to really press into them, we would highlight. And so we delineated those things.

And so, Marcos, could you give us a recap? probably have a better photogenic memory than I do in terms of the four or five things that we outlined at the Commissioner's meeting that we discussed, and then I'll take the second part of that.

MR. GRANT, JR.: If I --

Is your memory as good as mine? BISHOP TAYLOR:

1 MR. SOLER: I --2 MR. GRANT, JR.: If I -- Bishop, because I see Marc -- you're putting him on the spot. 3 4 MR. SOLER: Yeah. BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay. 5 6 MR. GRANT, JR.: Why don't we do this. We have 7 an agenda, right, just an outlined agenda. BISHOP TAYLOR: Oh, yes. Where --8 9 MR. GRANT, JR.: Can we have somebody just get 10 that? 11 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: I mean, with the four items, 12 we started with investigations and the Board was 13 very strong in terms of talking about getting 14 documents. I think everyone agreed that timely 15 document exchange between the NYPD and the Agency 16 would be a benefit in terms of moving the cases 17 along and avoiding SOL issues. So everyone agreed to that, that that's something we need to work 18 19 towards. 20 The next topic the Bishop presented to the Board 2.1 was mediation in terms of meeting more with the new 22 Deputy Commissioner Susan Herman to talk about how 23 community policing and mediation can work together 24 to encourage both civilians and officers to pursue

mediation. So we agreed to that.

2.5

The third topic was APU. We talked about how APU and DAO can work together as a -- two groups moving forward with prosecutions. And there was a very robust discussion about the ways we could do that.

2.1

2.5

And then, in the end, the idea was presented by Bishop and the Board to have more meetings to meet at least twice a year with the Commissioner or with his staff. Bishop set up a great proposal to set up maybe subcommittee type of meetings where senior staff and executives from the Agency, along with Board members, would meet with the Police Commissioner's staff regularly throughout the year to apprise each other of actions that are going on, but then also to move forward with some of these items that came up before.

BISHOP TAYLOR: And also, too, with the mediation, well, with all of these points, the one thing that we wanted to walk away with with the Commissioner was a point person from his executive staff that would move each one of these issues with the appropriate staff at the CCRB. And so rather than whacking the weeds there, just give us a commitment for a follow-up meeting and keep those meetings consistent. And so that's what we're

trying to hold the Department to.

2.1

In terms of mediation, which is a real powerful tool, and trying to figure out why more officers are not really taking advantage of it, and so we talked about looking at the processes in mediation and maybe even considering renaming it. And Susan Herman, who worked on the mediation — the original mediation proposal for this Agency years back, is willing to work with us to make it more appealing for officers and marketable in that way.

So I think that the overall -- and please forgive me for not having the agenda, that's why I ran a blank here -- but -- and thank you, Tracy, for having a photogenic memory.

Marcos, I'm sorry for putting you on the spot. You normally have this in your mind.

So, yeah. So I think that it was -- this meeting was, I think, the years that I've been going to the Police Commissioner's meeting we've had productive meetings, but this meeting was just more granular, more comprehensive, and more communicative and results-oriented. I just felt there was more -- it wasn't smoke and mirrors, it was like, okay, let's get it done, where we tried to move on to other agendas, not to press it and be heavy on it.

1	The Commissioner, you know, pulled back and said,			
2	no, let's stay here for a minute and talk about it.			
3	So I think that was a very optimistic light for that			
4	meeting.			
5	MR. DUNN: Okay. I appreciate that.			
6	DR. KHALID: Basically, it was a meet-and-greet			
7	meeting that to get to know			
8	MR. DUNN: It's always easier to be friendly at			
9	meet-and-greets.			
10	BISHOP TAYLOR: It was more than that.			
11	MR. GRANT, JR.: More than that.			
12	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Definitely more			
13	BISHOP TAYLOR: It was much more than a			
14	meet-and-greet.			
15	MR. DUNN: We'll see how they feel when it's			
16	meet-and-demand.			
17	BISHOP TAYLOR: It wasn't a meet-and-greet.			
18	MR. LISTON: This was a little bit of both.			
19	BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah.			
20	MR. DUNN: Okay. And you mentioned the			
21	Commissioner's executive staff. Who was the			
22	executive staff who was there on their side?			
23	BISHOP TAYLOR: So we had Suzanne Herman, Chief			
24	Banks, Kevin Ward			
25	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: First Deputy Rafael Pineiro.			

1	MR. MARTIN: Ralph Pineiro.		
2	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Ralph Pineiro.		
3	BISHOP TAYLOR: Pineiro, First Deputy Ralph		
4	Pineiro.		
5	MR. GITNER: Head of IAD, Chief Reznick.		
6	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Julie Schwartz, deputy		
7	commissioner.		
8	BISHOP TAYLOR: Julie Schwartz.		
9	MR. MARTIN: Kevin Ward.		
10	BISHOP TAYLOR: I said Kevin.		
11	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Inspector Luciani		
12	BISHOP TAYLOR: Luciani.		
13	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: who's the commanding		
14	officer of DAO.		
15	DR. KHALID: Chief Reznick.		
16	MR. GITNER: Chief Reznick.		
17	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Chief Reznick, IAD.		
18	MR. DUNN: Okay. That's an impressive group.		
19	Terrific. And who from the Board went?		
20	BISHOP TAYLOR: Everyone.		
21	MR. DUNN: The entire Board was there?		
22	MR. DONLON: Well, I wasn't		
23	BISHOP TAYLOR: Except for		
24	MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Tony was not there because		
25	he's in Florida. Janette Cortes-Gomez is seven		

months' pregnant, and because it was a snow day and she had the flu. She had a confluence of things that prevented her.

MR. LISTON: The Board was well represented.

MR. DONLON: And I was out of town, for the record.

MR. LISTON: And we had a lot of senior staff there as well.

MR. DUNN: Great. Okay.

2.1

MR. LISTON: It was a full table.

MR. DUNN: That sounds great. Okay. It's very encouraging. I hope your notion about ongoing, scheduled meetings with them comes to fruition, not that everyone wants to have more meetings in their lives, they don't, but that's an institution that you guys need to have some face time with, and that's terrific. Okay. I appreciate that.

In terms of the report, the monthly report -and this relates to the APU business and the
investigations issue -- there are a couple of things
about the report that stood out. First, there
continue to be a lot of 18-plus month cases. By my
count, there are 9 cases where it is clearly the
Agency's responsibility, either the Board or
Investigations, where there's a blown statute of

limitations, and I just think that has to be a top priority for everybody to turn that number into zero. People file late, that's a different issue. These are all things that are filed promptly. You just can't have those.

2.1

I don't understand why there continue to be so few cases coming back from the Department. There were 7 -- 6 cases, 7 officers last month. We've talked about this in prior months, and maybe I missed it, but I keep raising this issue. You're basically getting no cases back from them. And I understand that a bunch of cases are going to the APU now, and maybe that affects the reporting coming back from them, but there's enough of a lag in this entire process, you should be getting more cases, I think. But, I just raise that again.

And then I do want to talk about the time for investigations. And, Dan, you were commenting on -- and Denis mentioned this -- about being able to cut the investigation time from 335 days to 270-some-odd days, which is -- that's great. Terrific. For a long time, the average investigation time was about 9 months, so there may have been a Sandy thing, but I think all you're doing at this point is perhaps getting back to where you were, not that that's

unimportant, but, put that in some context.

2.1

The other thing is, 9 months for an average time for investigations is just way too long. And that is a long time, given the nature of these investigations. And, again, that's the average. So, you know, that means you probably got a lot of cases that are much more than 9 months to get that average.

And I would just say, the idea of having an Investigations Committee, I think, is great because my guess is there are many things in the process that you have no control over or have little control over that with a new set of eyes, somebody might say, well, why are we losing 60 days here and why are we losing 90 days there and why are we losing 17 days there for things that can be fixed that are no reflection on the effort of the investigators. And I just want to say, 9 months is not, in my view, a happy place to be in terms of an average number for these investigations.

And the annual report, I want to say, it's great that you got it out so quickly. I've complained about that for years; I'm going to say, it's great that you got it out so quickly. I wish I had it in my hands, but I'll have it in my hands shortly

enough. Since I don't have it in my hands, I'll just ask the question, is there anything in there about recommendations or policy issues pertaining to policing by the NYPD?

BISHOP TAYLOR: I'm sorry. I zoned out. Say that again.

MR. DUNN: I said, is there anything in there about recommendations or policy issues pertaining to the NYPD.

MR. DONLON: You know, I would say, I -- my guess, I shouldn't guess, but my impression is no. But, Marcos, maybe you can --

MR. LISTON: Poor Marcos.

2.1

MR. DONLON: It's really -- you know, I don't know if this is different from previous reports, but it's primarily statistic-based. And in terms of policy recommendations, I don't know that we have any.

MR. SOLER: The purpose of the report is to report on the Board activities. As you know, the Board, during the year, has issues on policy recommendations, and, in fact, we have done some analyses. And the idea we have is to continue to do that, but we don't include it in part of the report because we have already released it.

2.1

2.5

So, for instance, there are discussions about some of our information for stop and frisk, there are some information regarding the housing study that we did and all the findings, that now they are called a substantiations rate and things like that, in which, certainly, there are some policy issues. But many of those issues are later addressed in the specific reports, like we did last month in which we released a report on vehicle stop and vehicle searches.

So we do that, we talk about vehicle stop and vehicle searches in the annual report, but then we decided to have a -- one separate memo addressing the discrepancies that we see between vehicle stops in which we have also a search of a person, versus vehicle stops in which we don't have that.

So our -- I think the approach is that we can work with the Committee, send them in specific policy recommendations and the Committee can look at them, and then continue to work on the specific items, rather then waiting to put them all together and aggregate them on the annual report.

BISHOP TAYLOR: And speaking of policy, one thing that really hit policy at that meeting was the Mediation Unit. And Susan Herman talked about

2.1

really working with us to expand -- make it more appealing, maybe even tweak the name a little bit so that it's more accommodating to what we're actually doing, you know. So I think that that's policy that can be rightly changed very easily just from that interchange that we had.

So I think those kinds of interchanges were, the interchanges and exchanges that we had at the meeting that, in the follow-up, we feel we'll nail down.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Well, let's go off on that tangent just for a moment. So this mediation business, I know you guys love mediation, and I don't know what the marketing buzzword you have in mind that's going to be friendlier to cops than "mediation," which sounds pretty friendly to me, maybe we will call it the "Officer Promotion" or "Extra Overtime Program," but, my point is, I want everyone to understand, we like mediation to a certain extent.

But the big downside to mediation is you do not investigate the case. And this relates to the policy issues because when you investigate cases, you find out about things. You know, we here are litigators, you all know about this. When you do

discovery, you find out about things. This is no secret. When we sue the Police Department, one of the big benefits we get, and we do it on occasion, is we find out about things they don't otherwise want to tell people about.

2.1

2.5

So the downside of mediation, and do not lose sight of it, is you end up with a case that is a black box. And that is not helpful when you're trying to figure out what's going on in the Police Department and what's going on with police misconduct.

So, to go back to the report and the issue of recommendations and policy issues -- and, Marcos, I know you're not the one who's making the decision on this, so this is not addressed to you -- but, you heard me say this many times before, an important part of what you do is not just investigate cases, but to figure out what's behind the cases and try to make recommendations about things behind the cases so people in the future don't have the experiences that people in the past should not have had.

And the fact that there may have been a three-pager issued in the course of a monthly meeting about a policy issue is no different along the line the fact that the monthly statistics every

month come out at these meetings, and you put them in the annual report, the fact that they've come out before is no reason you put it in there. The annual report is the single, most important document you put out. It is the piece of historical record that tells us all what the CCRB has done for that year.

2.1

And when I see year in and year out reports that have nothing but essentially numbers in them, and nobody who is smart and introspective and thoughtful, like you guys, saying, think about what's behind some of these numbers, think about some of the policies that these numbers implicate. When I don't see anything about that and the public doesn't see anything about that, what they are left with is the clear impression, which I think has been the case for too many years, that you guys have your heads down, you're investigating cases to your credit. But that's all you're doing. Okay?

So, it is spring, I look forward to a new day with both the Department and the CCRB, but part of that new day has got to be getting your heads up, saying what's actually going on out there in a way of practices and policies that we should be paying attention to so we can avert police misconduct in the future, and you have to speak out about that.

And the public annual report is the place to do that. Thank you.

2.1

BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dunn.

All right. If we're finished with public

comment --

MR. DONLON: You know, I just want to bring up one thing. I know Mr. Brown has left, but he mentioned, and, again, I don't want to get into a discussion of his specific case, but since he did mention that the case was unfounded, according to his statement, I'm just looking to see if maybe Denis or someone can confirm whether -- the implications, to my mind, from that statement is that these officers were eventually identified. Would that be correct?

MR. GITNER: I think that there shouldn't be any public comment on the specifics of his case. To me, what Mr. Brown said was important, but what he said, to me, is that we as a Board should think better about how we communicate with individual complainants because, clearly, we failed. Our investigation may have been fine, I don't know, I wasn't a part of it, I'm assuming it was fine, but clearly we failed in how we communicated to him, one way or the other. But I'm not sure that we should

1 be, without deep thought, communicating on the 2 merits or specifics of any individual case. 3 MR. LISTON: That's for the Executive Session. 4 MR. DONLON: Well, I appreciate that, but I 5 mean, the whole thrust of his appearances here have 6 been to the point that these officers were never 7 identified. And I thought it would be worth -- I'll withdraw my question. I think discretion is the 8 9 better part of valor. But I just --MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Mr. Donlon, I think that his 10 11 overarching theme has been -- I've spoken to him, I know a number of -- I know Denis has spoken to him 12 13 and other people and staff have spoken to him, 14 including the assigned investigators and the 15 supervisors -- is that he's concerned that there are 16 no photographs, recent photographs of undercover --17 MR. DONLON: Understood. MS. CATAPANO-FOX: -- officers. 18 19 MR. DONLON: That I know. 20 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: So that's -- that tends to be 2.1 a lot, not all of what he's talking about, what 22 you're saying is correct, too, but I think that 23 today he expressed that thought as well, that 24 NYPD --MR. DONLON: Well, I don't have any --2.5

 ${\tt MS.}$ CATAPANO-FOX: -- has some concerns about that.

2.1

MR. DONLON: I wasn't on the Panel that decided the case, I don't really have any information except what he said at these public meetings. But we can discuss it in Executive Session, if that's --

BISHOP TAYLOR: All right. Commissioner
Donlon --

MR. DONLON: -- the better way to go.

BISHOP TAYLOR: -- I agree with you, though, that we, and Dan as well, just the way we communicate with the public, you know. We certainly -- I'm not sure if we could, from this particular case, extrapolate an opinion on how we actually communicate with him because obviously this is a very highly sensitive case. He was very agitated and irritated about the process and there was some extenuating circumstances that made it that way.

But we should certainly always try to have a happy and a meaningful communication and resolve with the public because we serve the public and we're their arm to investigate their concerns. And so, you're right, we cannot have the public so angry at us.

MR. GITNER: There's clearly a problem with --

BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah.

2.1

MR. GITNER: Regardless of the merits of the case --

BISHOP TAYLOR: Right.

MR. GITNER: -- his son was clearly injured.

And everybody in the room can understand how he would feel about that. And to get a -- essentially what he's saying is he got a form letter saying "unfounded," or whatever it said.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Right.

MR. GITNER: That is probably insufficient and is a failure on the system's part. In cases like that where there's physical injury and it's so emotional, there probably should be a more intimate form of communication even if the message is an unhappy one.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Excellent. Yeah. Well, I'm not sure how much of that kind of feeds into the Investigations Committee. It might have some connection to it, but I think that you're dead on with the way we communicate with the public.

MR. LISTON: Would it be -- let me say this. You know, we don't have a full blow on others. We don't -- we hear his allegations and they're very serious and he seems very sincere, but we haven't

heard everybody else's side of the story.

The issues he raises are important enough. I wonder if it would make sense for us to create a subcommittee to look at the issues he's raised, perhaps in an Executive Session, because it deals with a specific case.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah. I think that we've done this already --

MR. LISTON: Okay.

2.1

BISHOP TAYLOR: -- if you remember. I mean, I don't know if we want to go back -- we can certainly discuss this. In his case particularly, I know that I've went back over it with other people that have gone back. And, you know, so -- I mean, but, of course, if you want to go back into this again --

MR. LISTON: Well, I don't want to revisit something we've already visited.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Yeah. We've -- I mean, all of us have kind of, at different intervals, chimed in because, you know, you're right. You know, we all have children, we all -- but besides the fact, I mean, we serve the public and there's an impassioned a plea for, you know, further investigation. I'm going to respond -- we're all going to naturally respond to it. But I think that we've kind of rode

that horse, and, but, we certainly can revisit it again.

DR. KHALID: Mr. Chair, also, the question of identity, I think that's the policy of the Police Department, that they implement that. I don't know if CCRB perhaps can request the current picture of the police officer, but I don't know if that's our jurisdiction. That's probably the policy of the NYPD.

MR. MARTIN: Well, when you talk about undercover officers, you have to think about their safety as well.

DR. KHALID: Absolutely.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

2.5

MR. MARTIN: And it's an uber-sensitive issue when you're dealing with those types of identities. So it's not just a simple -- it's not simple --

DR. KHALID: My question is --

MR. MARTIN: -- at all.

DR. KHALID: -- about Mr. Brown, that he was insisting upon the identity issue, which is a policy by the Police Department. And I guess CCRB has no power over it. Like you said, the identity of the officers, undercover especially, has to be protected.

MR. MARTIN: And you got to remember that there

are different levels of undercover. And I have no -- I have to go and refresh my recollection on that particular case, but whenever you talked about -- talk about undercover, it is an extremely sensitive issue.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And pursuant to the Board's request, we were able to confirm with the NYPD that they take pictures every couple of years, and it is the ICO's responsibility to ensure that the officers are routinely getting their pictures updated. So the issue that the photos that were shown would be someone who had just come out of the academy and then had been on the job for a number of years, we were able to resolve that, that that was not the way that these cases -- that the photographs were showing.

DR. KHALID: Was that communicated to Mr. Brown?
MS. CATAPANO-FOX: It was.

MR. DUNN: Can I get back on the soapbox just for one second?

BISHOP TAYLOR: Yes.

2.1

MR. DUNN: Okay. I think it is important to look at the communications to go to -- to complainants, and this is something we've talked about in past years. You look at those letters that

a complainant gets at the conclusion of a case, and a lawyer getting that would not be pleased with it. A typical complainant is going to be immensely unpleased and is actually going to have a difficult time even figuring it out. I realize there are categories and there are definitions, and, you know, the lawyers can figure it out; it's not a complainant-friendly letter.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Okay.

2.1

MR. DUNN: The other thing, which I forgot to mention and I will just do it quickly, and this will not be a standard feature of my shtick, but, and I met with Tracy about this, there was a memo that went out from a team leader, I don't know, end of January, about the issue of whether or not a frisk done in conjunction with a summons was permissible or not as a matter of law. And it took the position that it was permissible, and, therefore, it was not misconduct by an officer to conduct a frisk in conjunction with a summons, nontraffic summons, even without any suspicion of the person presenting a danger or having a weapon.

This is a pure policy memo. It, I am told, it represented the position of a person in a particular case, got put in a file and that was it. But when I

see something like this (indicating), this is pure policy, this is something the Board should be aware of, this is something the Board should weigh in on. It is, at some level, a pure issue of law. There is no discussion of the facts of any case in here, it is a straightforward legal memo: Can cops frisk, without suspicion, people to whom they give summonses.

Tracy -- it says -- told me that this is something the Agency is looking at, and I am just saying it for the public record that I am concerned about this and I look forward to hearing a public report about what the Agency ends up doing on this policy issue.

BISHOP TAYLOR: That's a very good point that you raise, and we talked about that in an earlier Panel meeting, whether or not search or frisk is, when a person is receiving a summons, the same as a person being in custody. So it's a very gray area. We discussed that this morning, so that's -- so that did not get buried; that's on the top of our list.

Okay. I think that we're ready to adjourn. Thank you so much for a great meeting.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 11:44 a.m.)

2.1

1			
2	CERTIFICATION		
3	STATE OF NEW YORK)		
4) ss.:		
5	COUNTY OF KINGS)		
6	I, MARGARET CRANE, a Notary Public		
7	within and for the State of New York, do hereby		
8	certify:		
9	I reported the proceedings in the		
10	within-entitled matter, and that the within		
11	transcript is a true record of such proceedings.		
12	I further certify that I am not related to any		
13	of the parties to this action by blood or marriage		
14	and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of		
15	this matter.		
16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand		
17	this 24th day of March, 2014.		
18			
19			
20			
21	MARGARET CRANE		
22			
23			
24			
25			

\$100,000 (2) 62:2 65:5 a.m (2) 1:4 92:24 ability (1) 26:13 able (9) 24:17 27:4 38:2 48:6 58:1 60:4 77:19 90:7,14 abreast (1) 10:18 **absence (1)** 3:10 absolutely (4) 49:12 55:12 56:19 89:13 academic (1) 59:3 academy (2) 63:22 90:12 accept (1) 45:25 accepting (1) 51:17 accepts (2) 45:3,3 access (1) 56:23 accommodate (1) 26:14 accommodating (1) 81:3 accomplished (1) 38:17 accurate (1) 64:16 accurately (1) 24:5 accused (1) 45:2 achieve (1) 29:16 acknowledge (2) 18:6 45:5 acknowledged (2) 45:10 48:11 acknowledging (1) 45:15 acquired (1) 28:15 act (1) 20:22 **ACTING (1)** 1:8 action (3) 7:22 36:18 93:13 actions (1) 72:14 active (1) 39:17 activities (1) 79:20 actual (3) 25:2 34:22 44:2 ad (1) 49:15 added (1) 8:2 addition (1) 46:23 address (2) 24:22,23 addressed (2) 80:7 82:15 addressing (1) 80:13 adjourn (1) 92:22 adjudicate (1) 54:9 adjudicated (1) 56:24 **Administrative (2)** 29:15 44:17 administratively (2) 23:12 24:13 adopt (2) 4:11 20:12 adoption (2) 1:15 4:9 advantage (1) 73:4 advantages (1) 11:7 advice (1) 6:14 Affairs (3) 66:25 67:9,10 affect (1) 64:20 age (1) 64:12

59:6,8 **Agency (10)** 4:25 22:5 23:7 59:13 59:14 71:15 72:11 73:8 92:10,13 Agency's (3) 6:19 59:10 76:24 agenda (4) 1:12 71:7,7 73:12 agendas (1) 73:25 aggregate (1) 80:22 agitated (1) 86:16 agree (10) 3:16 17:18 45:19 48:23 50:11 51:12,12 52:6 55:11 86:10 agreed (3) 71:14,17,25 agreement (1) 12:4 agrees (1) 16:24 air (3) 4:5,5 69:20 AI (1) 23:22 allegation (11) 34:21 35:1,1,2,3,4 35:5,19,22,24 36:6 allegations (11) 32:20 33:10 34:20 35:9,15,16 36:3,7,7,8 87:24 allowed (1) 28:2 Alphonzo (2) 2:8 12:14 ameliorate (1) 3:23 amount (1) 40:7 analyses (1) 79:23 angry (1) 86:23 annual (10) 25:5 43:25 44:6,10 78:21 80:12,22 83:2,3 84:1 answer (5) 36:19,21 63:3,4 66:1 answers (2) 49:23 67:23 anybody (3) 12:11 13:25 17:12 **apologizes (1)** 24:16 appealing (2) 73:9 81:2 appear (1) 46:12 appearance (12) 8:13 30:10,23 31:11,14,17,19,21,22 32:3,8,11 appearances (4) 8:11 32:12 57:25 85:5 **Applause (1)** 29:23 **appointed (1)** 3:6 **appoints (1)** 3:11 appreciate (4) 44:9 74:5 76:17 **appreciates (1)** 43:14 appreciation (1) 29:10 apprise (1) 72:14 approach (1) 80:17 appropriate (3) 3:23 46:7 72:22 approval (4) 8:5,7 10:3 50:11 **approve (1)** 10:5 approximately (1) 32:23 **April (2)** 26:21 59:1 **APU (39)** 4:1 8:2,3 9:9,19 11:5,21 11:21 13:9 14:3 15:2,19 16:14 19:20 20:24 30:6,7,11 36:23 37:5

44:14,14 46:2,3,22,25 47:7,21,23 48:20 50:17 52:12 56:3,21 57:4 72:1,2 76:19 77:13 APU's (1) 38:10 archived (1) 26:1 area (1) 92:19 arm (1) 86:22 array (1) 64:7 arrest (1) 63:14 arrested (4) 63:14,17 65:1,1 arrive (1) 57:14 asked (1) 65:12 asking (1) 63:5 assigned (1) 85:14 **assuming (2)** 56:15 84:23 atmosphere (1) 3:18 attempt (1) 40:17 attend (1) 60:4 attending (1) 57:11 attention (1) 83:24 attorney (1) 65:19 attorneys (3) 42:17,19 43:4 **August (1)** 40:4 authority (2) 16:21,25 automatically (1) 41:2 available (4) 44:2,3 57:18 60:7 **AVENUE (1)** 1:23 average (7) 39:14,16 77:22 78:2,5 78:8.19 avert (1) 83:24 avoiding (1) 71:17 awaiting (6) 7:1 8:5,7,9,12,15 aware (1) 92:2 ayes (3) 4:15 21:23 29:4

В back (24) 8:19 14:2 41:2,4,5,23 65:13,16,17,18 67:8 70:2 73:8 74:1 77:7,11,14,25 82:12 88:11 88:13,14,15 90:19 **balance (1)** 48:12 **balancing (1)** 48:4 bandwidth (2) 26:12 27:4 Banks (1) 74:24 barriers (1) 3:19 based (1) 54:22 bases (1) 18:1 **basically (3)** 37:4 74:6 77:11 basis (2) 48:24 49:16 beard (2) 63:20 64:8 beautiful (2) 23:2,6 beginning (2) 40:13 66:23 **behalf (3)** 18:15 22:14 37:19 believe (1) 47:13

agencies (5) 23:18 25:18 27:19

belonged (1) 55:24 **benefit (1)** 71:16 benefits (6) 23:6 27:10,14,20 38:13 82:3 best (4) 10:24 14:8 35:23 49:4 better (8) 26:14 28:20 38:21 39:25 70:20 84:19 85:9 86:9 big (4) 29:22 51:14 81:21 82:3 **Bishop (114)** 1:8 3:1 4:7,12,14,16 4:20 12:12,13 14:1,6,11,18,20,25 15:7,25 16:12 18:8,12 20:14,17 21:3,13,18,22,24 22:1,3,10,15,18 22:21 26:4,8,11,16,22,25 29:3,5 29:6,8,24 30:1,2,3 33:15 37:16 37:21 38:16,20 39:24 40:9 41:14 43:18,21 44:12 53:25 54:16 55:4 55:10,13 56:20 58:16,20 59:20 59:21 60:9,12,15,17,19 61:1,4,6 61:9,13 67:25 69:15 70:6,25 71:2 71:5,8,20 72:7,9,17 74:10,13,17 74:19,23 75:3,8,10,12,20,23 79:5 80:23 84:3 86:7,10 87:1,4,10,17 88:7,10,18 90:21 92:15 Bishop's (1) 54:15 bit (4) 15:24 17:24 74:18 81:2 black (2) 65:5 82:8 blank (1) 73:13 bless (2) 19:21 53:8 blockages (1) 3:24 blood (1) 93:13 blow (1) 87:23 blown (1) 76:25 board (91) 1:1,2 2:1 3:8,16 4:21 5:1,16,18 7:12,13,16 8:1,16,18 8:20,22 9:2 10:4,15,23 13:23 15:14 17:1,3,4,7,10,19 18:11 19:5,7 20:6,7,7,15,25 21:7 22:6,8 22:8,14,19,20 23:5,25 24:7,11,16 24:21 25:22 26:2,24 28:4,23 29:12,13 32:22 34:18 35:18 36:21,22,24 39:1 43:14 48:15 49:14,15 50:15 51:8 52:23 53:2,7 54:4,8,18 55:15 56:22 71:12,20 72:7,12 75:19,21 76:4,24 79:20 79:21 84:19 92:2,3 Board's (5) 17:14 22:4 32:22 54:21 90:6 **boards (1)** 19:11 **bottom (1)** 62:16 **bounce (1)** 10:24 box (1) 82:8 **Bratton (1)** 67:21 breakdown (4) 6:10 7:9 34:20 35:25

Brian (4) 22:12,18 42:25 58:21 brief (1) 58:22 briefly (5) 3:13 44:18,25 46:20 60:19 bright (1) 23:1 bring (3) 27:23 48:5 84:6 bringing (2) 3:2 45:7 broad (2) 13:10,11 Bronx (1) 61:19 brought (9) 20:11 48:2 49:11 64:5 65:22.24.24 66:5.5 Brown (11) 61:11,12,14 66:8 67:25 68:3 69:15 84:7,18 89:19 90:17 **bump (2)** 38:6 39:4 **bunch (1)** 77:12 burden (1) 56:16 buried (1) 92:21 **business (7)** 1:19,20 60:15,17 61:7 76:19 81:13 busy (1) 49:24 **buzzword (1)** 81:14

C (2) 93:2,2 ca (1) 67:10 cake (1) 69:18 calendar (6) 30:9 46:25 57:5,5 58:1,10 calendared (6) 8:11 30:19 31:8,9 31:11,20 call (7) 1:14 40:18 44:21 49:1 62:13,15 81:17 called (3) 33:9 62:17 80:5 car (2) 65:22,24 carefully (1) 45:23 **Carlmais (2)** 47:6 59:16 carried (1) 29:5 carries (1) 22:1 carrying (1) 29:17 case (60) 5:25 6:7 7:12 8:6 24:9,24 24:25 33:11 34:22.22.23.23.24 34:25,25 35:7,20 38:3,4 39:1 41:4 44:23 45:6,7,12,17 48:22 55:22,24 56:4 58:5 61:22,25,25 62:5 63:11 64:24 65:3 66:19 67:4 67:7,16 68:9 81:22 82:7 83:16 84:9,10,17 85:2 86:4,14,16 87:3 88:6,12 90:3 91:1,25 92:5 caseload (2) 39:14 41:11 cases (125) 4:2 5:16,17,20,23 6:3 6:9,10,20,22 7:1,3,4,6,9,10,11,12 7:14,15,18,25 8:4,4,4,11,12,14 8:14 10:18,21 11:24 12:23,25 23:12,13,15,16,19 24:2,5,7,25

25:2,4 30:6,9,9,10,13,17,18,22 30:25 31:2,3,8,12,13,16,18,20,25 32:2,6,7,23 33:18,21,25 34:1,7,8 34:19 36:3,4,5 37:9 38:7 39:6,8 39:10,17,18,23 40:1 41:10,25 42:18,22,24 43:1 45:5,17,18 46:14 48:5,24 49:18,21 53:4 54:3 54:9 56:3,5,9,13,23 68:24 71:16 76:22,23 77:7,8,11,12,15 78:7 81:23 82:17,18,19 83:17 87:12 90:15 Catapano-Fox (78) 1:9 4:20 9:10 9:16,23 10:9,11,21 18:14 19:22 20:3,16 22:3,11,17,21 24:20

20:3,16 22:3,11,17,21 24:20 25:13 26:6,9,15,19,23 27:3,8 28:6,9,13,17,20,23 30:1,13,21 31:2,10,15,20,25 32:3,6,10,14 33:11,14 34:6,15 42:16 43:17 47:11 49:13 52:22 53:1 54:14,17 55:12,14,25 57:2 58:15 59:6 61:5 71:11 74:12,25 75:2,6,11,13,17 75:24 85:10,18,20 86:1 90:6,18 91:9 categories (2) 30:11 91:6 category (1) 59:5 Caucasian (1) 63:23 caused (1) 3:24

cautious (1) 18:1 CCRB (19) 5:4,8,10,23 29:14,16 32:20 33:9 36:2,3 59:12 62:9 65:12 67:1 72:22 83:6,20 89:6,21 CCRB's (2) 7:6 36:4 cell (1) 34:21

cells (2) 34:4 35:13 centers (1) 59:4 certain (4) 10:13 45

certain (4) 10:13 45:11 54:18 81:20

certainly (7) 14:6 57:21 80:6 86:12 86:19 88:11 89:1 certify (2) 93:8,12

chair (11) 1:8,16 3:6,10 4:18 19:12 29:9 47:20,23 50:17 89:3 **chaired (1)** 8:22

chairing (1) 59:22 Chairman (3) 19:23 22:5 29:12

Chairman (3) 19.23 22.3 29.12

chance (1) 16:10 **change (3)** 25:1 2

change (3) 25:1 27:25 52:16

changed (1) 81:5 charge (1) 10:4

charged (1) 45:15

charges (20) 8:1,13,14,15 11:17 12:1,24,25 32:25 34:17 36:7,11 36:17,20,22,24 37:1 38:10 54:19 55:21

chart (1) 35:24 **Charter (1)** 17:8 Chief (5) 74:23 75:5,15,16,17 children (1) 88:21 **chimed (1)** 88:19 **chooses (1)** 26:24 Chorus (3) 4:15 21:23 29:4 Chris (2) 69:16,17 Chu (3) 19:24 22:5 29:9 Church (2) 22:22 27:24 circulate (1) 60:6 circulated (1) 59:25 circumstances (2) 54:23 86:18 city (7) 27:19 29:12,20 61:23 62:2 65:4 69:2 civil (2) 45:13,17 civilian (3) 1:2 23:17 29:13 civilians (2) 23:16 71:24 clapping (1) 15:21 clarification (3) 40:10 54:2 55:5 clarify (1) 23:13 clarity (2) 9:2 20:10 clean (1) 63:22 clear (8) 17:9,16 27:17 30:6 51:21 55:1 57:6 83:15 clearly (6) 21:1 76:23 84:21,24 86:25 87:5 clog (1) 3:24 close (4) 37:1 49:18 67:5,7 closed (14) 5:16,18 6:3,9,10 7:17 23:12 24:13 61:25 62:1,6 64:24 65:4 67:4 **closely (1)** 15:3 closer (1) 37:1 closing (2) 62:10,12 closure (2) 45:7 48:5 co-chairs (4) 11:9,14 13:22 15:17 co-locating (1) 14:7 collaborate (1) 55:16 combine (1) 19:4 combining (2) 11:8 15:14 come (18) 10:1 16:20 17:5 38:3,8 47:2,3 55:2 61:17 63:22 64:11,14 67:3,11,14 83:1,2 90:12 comes (7) 38:4 40:16 48:3 66:15 66:17 68:5 76:13 comfortable (1) 53:2 coming (3) 47:4 77:7,13 command (3) 7:20 36:8,12 **commanding (1)** 75:13 commenced (1) 8:10 commend (3) 43:24 59:16 60:19 comment (5) 1:21 52:20 61:10 84:5,17

commenting (1) 77:18 commissioner (27) 3:15 4:22 8:6,8 30:8 45:24,25 46:2 50:2 52:11,11 52:12 54:1,22 60:21 63:7 67:20 67:21 69:11 70:8,15 71:22 72:8 72:20 74:1 75:7 86:7 Commissioner's (4) 70:22 72:13 73:19 74:21 Commissioners (1) 17:19 **commitment (1)** 72:24 committed (1) 13:14 committee (67) 1:18 3:7,8 8:21,21 8:24 9:3,8,9,24 10:2,15,16,17 12:15 13:3,8,10,11,13,22 15:5,11 16:3,9,14,16 17:2,5,13,23 18:3,7 18:14,16 19:12,18,20,25 20:1,4,8 20:13,19,22 21:17,19 22:2 37:18 37:20,25 38:25 44:17 46:2,22 48:14,20 50:25 52:9 58:17 59:22 59:25 60:13 78:10 80:18,19 87:19 Committee's (1) 50:13 committees (9) 11:8 12:17 13:4,14 13:19 14:11 17:22 18:4 19:9 communicate (5) 59:12 84:20 86:12,15 87:21 communicated (3) 20:24 84:24 90:17 communicating (2) 13:15 85:1 communication (2) 86:20 87:15 communications (2) 4:24 90:23 communicative (1) 73:21 community (2) 47:5 71:23 compare (1) 37:2 compared (1) 36:17 comparison (1) 53:5 competing (1) 48:12 complainant (5) 44:23,24 48:7 91:1,3 complainant-friendly (1) 91:8 complainants (6) 6:12 40:17 46:15 51:14 84:21 90:24 **complained (1)** 78:22 complaint (9) 1:2 6:4,9,16 29:13 40:16 65:14,14 66:24 complaints (13) 5:4,5,7,8,9,11,19 6:18,23 23:17 29:19 34:14 67:11 complete (2) 38:24 41:12 completed (2) 8:9,10 completely (1) 51:1 compliance (1) 28:25 compliment (1) 43:7 comprehensive (2) 3:14 73:21 computer (2) 62:22,23

concentrate (1) 39:23 **conception (1)** 18:13 conceptually (1) 18:13 concern (2) 16:20 45:14 concerned (2) 85:15 92:11 concerns (3) 48:12 86:1,22 concluded (1) 92:24 conclusion (1) 91:1 **concretely (1)** 16:23 conduct (1) 91:19 **conducted (1)** 59:19 **conducting (1)** 40:25 **confidence (2)** 66:3 67:13 **confirm (3)** 24:6 84:12 90:7 **confluence (1)** 76:2 confused (1) 40:12 congratulate (1) 4:1 **conjunction (2)** 91:16,20 connection (2) 10:7 87:20 **CONNELL (4)** 58:23 59:8 60:6,10 consider (2) 8:18 46:6 consideration (1) 68:21 considering (2) 58:12 73:6 consistent (1) 72:25 constantly (1) 13:15 contact (2) 48:20 49:14 contacts (1) 50:8 contendere (1) 45:1 context (1) 78:1 continue (7) 19:6 43:13 46:5 76:22 77:6 79:23 80:20 continued (1) 36:24 Contrary-wise (1) 21:24 contribute (1) 68:10 control (4) 42:22 67:3 78:12,12 convene (1) 17:22 convenience (1) 22:9 conversation (4) 3:21 14:21 46:4 50:18 **conversely (1)** 11:23 **convey (1)** 43:15 cops (2) 81:15 92:6 cordial (1) 3:14 correct (9) 10:9 12:3 30:20 35:11 36:15 37:13 50:9 84:15 85:22 **Cortes-Gomez (1)** 75:25 cost (5) 27:9,10,21,22 28:11 couched (1) 70:7 counsel (1) 6:15 count (2) 33:19 76:23 **COUNTY (1)** 93:4 **couple (4)** 8:17 38:5 76:20 90:8 course (2) 82:23 88:15

computers (1) 62:21

courses (1) 36:17 court (8) 8:12 31:11,21 32:3 48:9 57:24 58:1 64:1 cover (2) 18:1 43:25 covered (2) 43:23 47:14 **CRANE (2)** 93:6,21 create (8) 8:24 9:3 15:10 16:3 18:10 19:12,25 88:3 created (4) 15:5,8 18:7,13 creating (5) 18:2 20:19 21:2,4 46:24 credit (2) 5:2 83:18 cri (1) 52:22 criteria (9) 45:24 46:6 51:19 52:2 52:13,19,21,23 53:7 CTS (1) 41:10 current (1) 89:6 currently (2) 30:7 31:10 custody (1) 92:19 cut (4) 39:3 41:21 63:22 77:19

D

D (1) 29:9 **DA (2)** 7:10 9:19 Dan (13) 8:22 9:10 11:2 12:21 13:5 19:24 22:5 29:21,22 33:24 43:18 77:18 86:11 Dan's (1) 14:2 danger (1) 91:22 Daniel (3) 2:3 9:11 29:9 **DAO (3)** 53:3 72:2 75:14 Darche (2) 47:16 57:17 date (4) 6:22 7:6,11 50:8 Dave (3) 4:12 18:25 44:14 David (3) 2:5 3:9 4:11 **Daw (2)** 65:19,20 day (12) 13:21 16:15 20:6 22:6,19 23:8 57:24 64:12 76:1 83:19,21 93:17 days (11) 38:5,23,24 39:3 41:7 42:2 77:20,21 78:14,15,16 dead (1) 87:20 dealing (2) 38:9 89:15 deals (1) 88:5 **Dean (1)** 62:19 decent (1) 40:7 decide (2) 13:21 26:16 decided (4) 8:20 23:23 80:13 86:3 deciding (1) 45:25 decision (10) 17:25 19:6 21:7 48:13 49:4 50:14 51:7 55:9,21 82:14 decision-making (2) 48:15 50:15

decisions (4) 11:3 46:4 48:17 55:2

decline-to-prosecute (1) 7:23 declined (1) 7:19 decrease (1) 6:21 dedication (1) 29:14 deduction (1) 41:24 deep (1) 85:1 deeper (1) 37:14 deepest (1) 29:10 definitely (2) 12:16 74:12 definitions (1) 91:6 delay (1) 7:15 delays (1) 39:5 delegating (1) 16:21 delineated (1) 70:18 **Denis (11)** 9:11 10:3,16 37:24 38:13,20 43:6 62:13 77:19 84:12 85:12 **Department (13)** 7:17,19,23 35:22 62:5 69:21 73:1 77:7 82:2,10 83:20 89:5.21 **Department's (1)** 35:20 departments (1) 3:22 deputy (5) 24:9 71:22 74:25 75:3,6 deserve (1) 69:10 deserved (1) 43:8 deserves (1) 5:1 desire (1) 6:12 desired (1) 67:12 despite (1) 25:19 details (1) 46:19 determine (1) 24:12 difference (2) 13:16 15:22 different (11) 30:11 34:13,13 65:18 66:24 67:10 77:3 79:15 82:24 88:19 90:1 differently (1) 19:13 difficult (4) 46:10,11 57:17 91:4 direction (1) 21:4 director (12) 1:9,17 4:19 23:3 24:10 47:11 48:21,25 50:9,12 54:5 60:20 Director's (2) 30:5 33:6 disadvantage (1) 45:16 disciplinary (1) 7:22 discipline (3) 7:20 35:21 36:8 disclose (1) 70:3 discovery (1) 82:1 discrepancies (1) 80:14 discretion (2) 45:22 85:8 discuss (4) 19:5 53:21 86:6 88:12 discussed (8) 9:24 25:22 45:21 46:21 70:1,4,22 92:20 discussing (1) 47:21 discussion (11) 14:12 15:14,25

16:1 17:20 23:15 37:17 47:21 72:4 84:9 92:5 discussions (3) 18:18 25:17 80:1 disposition (5) 5:23 35:24 36:2,3,4 dissolve (1) 19:8 distinct (1) 14:2 diversified (1) 59:2 divided (1) 11:10 docket (9) 6:19,21 7:2,4,5,7,8 8:2 46:22 document (3) 33:4 71:15 83:4 documents (5) 17:9 41:18,20 42:1 71:14 dogged-head (1) 38:1 doing (19) 4:21 27:10,20,22 41:8,8 42:17,20,22 47:16 59:9,18 61:12 68:4 69:3 77:24 81:4 83:18 92:13 **Donlon (21)** 2:4 4:13 16:2,6,13 21:12,16 43:22 75:22 76:5 79:10 79:14 84:6 85:4,10,17,19,25 86:3 86:8.9 downside (2) 81:21 82:6 **Dr (25)** 2:2 15:13,17,23 16:1 27:1,6 28:5 33:21 34:1 35:16 47:20 48:1 49:6,12 55:18 56:2,6 74:6 75:15 89:3,13,17,19 90:17 drag (1) 69:5 drastic (1) 41:11 **Dunn (17)** 69:16,16,17 74:5,8,15 74:20 75:18,21 76:9,11 79:7 81:11 84:3 90:19,22 91:10 duties (2) 41:8,8

Ε

E (1) 93:2 e-mail (2) 1:25 23:20 earlier (1) 92:16 earliest (2) 57:22 58:3 early (1) 42:1 easier (4) 38:10 56:20 69:12 74:8 easily (1) 81:5 easy (2) 3:21 42:7 ED (2) 47:23 54:12 **EDIDIN (15)** 30:20,25 31:4 46:20 47:18 56:2,7,10,14,18,25 57:12 57:15.21 58:14 edit (1) 28:2 effectively (2) 18:7 19:17 **efficient (1)** 9:13 efficiently (1) 18:3 effort (3) 43:2 59:17 78:17 eight (6) 7:15 30:16,16 37:4 38:23 40:3 either (6) 11:7 18:17 25:25 41:8

48:24 76:24 eliminate (1) 64:17 else's (1) 88:1 em (2) 69:5,5 embarrassment (1) 66:22 emergency (3) 47:24 49:16,19 emotional (1) 87:14 **emphasize (1)** 43:6 empower (1) 45:19 enable (2) 44:22 46:9 encourage (1) 71:24 **encouraging (1)** 76:12 ends (3) 35:10 45:7 92:13 **Engagement (1)** 47:6 enjoying (1) 24:18 **ensure (3)** 9:14 39:9 90:9 entered (1) 8:5 entire (3) 44:3 75:21 77:15 entitled (1) 32:19 equipment (2) 26:20 27:23 escaped (1) 59:5 **especially (1)** 89:23 **Esq (8)** 1:9 2:3,4,5,6,7,8,9 essentially (9) 6:2 18:22 27:22 30:16 31:13 40:15 45:3 83:8 87:7 establish (2) 21:16,18 establishment (1) 66:13 event (2) 19:16 38:9 events (3) 58:25 59:1 60:5 eventually (1) 84:14 everybody (6) 16:24 44:10 61:15 77:2 87:6 88:1 exactly (5) 15:20 24:1 42:6 52:16 58:2 example (2) 35:7 57:22 **excellence (1)** 29:17 excellent (13) 4:16,22 29:24,24 37:16 41:14 42:17,20 43:18 57:2 59:10 61:6 87:17 exchange (1) 71:15 **exchanges (1)** 81:8 exciting (2) 3:3 56:21 **excluding (1)** 6:3 Excuse (1) 68:16 executing (1) 3:25 **executive (24)** 1:9,17 3:7,8,15 4:19 23:3 24:10 30:5 33:6 47:11 48:21 48:25 50:9,12 54:5 60:19 70:12 72:20 74:21,22 85:3 86:6 88:5 **executives (1)** 72:11 **exercise (1)** 49:5 **exercised (1)** 45:23 **Exist (1)** 16:5 **existence (2)** 16:6,9

exists (2) 18:16,18 expand (1) 81:1 expected (1) 54:20 expense (2) 27:1,7 **experience (1)** 47:10 **experiences (2)** 47:9 82:20 **explain (1)** 40:10 **Explorer (1)** 62:4 expressed (1) 85:23 **expressly (1)** 17:20 extent (8) 10:22 11:16 16:11 19:19 38:9 46:6 62:21 81:20 **extenuating (1)** 86:18 Extra (1) 81:18 extraordinary (2) 29:11,17 **extrapolate** (1) 86:14 extremely (2) 43:11 90:4 eyes (1) 78:13

F **F (1)** 93:2 face (3) 65:22,23 76:16 facial (1) 64:7 facilitate (2) 3:10 42:5 **FACSIMILE (1)** 1:24 fact (10) 14:13 19:24 43:5 48:9 52:9 79:22 82:22,25 83:2 88:21 factors (1) 54:23 facts (1) 92:5 failed (2) 84:21,24 failure (1) 87:12 fair (1) 49:9 fairly (1) 51:1 far (1) 4:3 fashion (2) 10:5 17:7 faster (1) 9:15 favor (5) 4:14 20:18 21:1,22 29:3 **feared (1)** 6:17 feature (1) 91:12 **February (13)** 5:4,7,16 6:2,6,19 7:25 8:3 31:4 32:23 33:10 36:5 36:16 feeds (1) 87:18 feel (6) 3:20 11:6 70:12 74:15 81:9 87:7 feeling (1) 12:20 feels (1) 24:15 **fellow (1)** 17:18 **felt (2)** 10:15 73:22 **fielding (1)** 4:3 figure (7) 10:24 12:10 18:25 73:3 82:9,18 91:7 figuring (1) 91:5 file (2) 77:3 91:25

filed (8) 6:24,25 7:11 8:13,14 66:24 67:1 77:4 filing (1) 8:15 fill (1) 46:18 final (1) 17:25 finally (1) 46:8 find (12) 58:8 62:1,3 65:5,21 67:8,9 67:15 70:10 81:24 82:1,4 findings (1) 80:4 fine (4) 13:6 50:12 84:22,23 finished (3) 43:18 58:1 84:4 first (24) 5:17 6:25 30:10,23 31:14 31:17,19,21 32:7,8,11 34:24,25 35:7 37:22 38:23 61:10 62:5,6 67:1 70:9 74:25 75:3 76:21 **fit (2)** 52:16 60:2 five (6) 7:10 8:9 36:22 37:3 42:11 70:21 fixed (1) 78:16 **Floor (1)** 1:5 Florida (2) 24:18 75:25 flu (1) 76:2 fluid (1) 51:10 focus (1) 48:6 follow (1) 6:12 follow-up (3) 32:17 72:24 81:9 follows (2) 6:11 7:10 forgive (1) 73:12 forgot (1) 91:10 form (3) 65:12 87:8,15 formal (2) 18:20 47:8 formalize (1) 59:23 formalized (4) 18:24 20:5 23:24 60:3 formally (3) 9:3 16:7 20:12 formed (3) 3:7,8 16:17 Former (3) 22:5 23:3 29:9 forms (1) 5:22 forth (1) 70:2 forum (1) 56:1 forward (16) 3:11 4:25 10:25 25:17 40:1 46:7,13 48:23 49:9 50:20 51:11 56:15 72:3,15 83:19 92:12 found (2) 47:9 62:2 four (4) 41:7 42:11 70:21 71:11 Fourteen (1) 31:20 frankly (4) 9:15 11:6 18:21 38:1 freedom (1) 67:18 fresher (1) 38:11 Friday (1) 23:8 friendlier (1) 81:15 friendly (2) 74:8 81:16 frisk (6) 35:5 80:2 91:15,19 92:6 92:17

fruition (1) 76:13 fulfill (1) 55:15 full (6) 5:18 20:25 23:25 56:22 76:10 87:23 full-Board (4) 8:23 19:14 20:5,9 fully (2) 5:13 51:25 fulsome (1) 9:14 function (6) 11:22 54:8,8,12 55:10 55:13 functional (2) 13:16 18:17 functionality (1) 54:4 functioning (1) 18:22 functions (3) 3:20 11:21 14:3 further (4) 7:13 17:20 88:23 93:12 future (4) 25:3 50:19 82:20 83:25

front (2) 63:6,7

G **G (2)** 1:8 2:5 **generous (1)** 49:16 getting (15) 24:9 39:10 41:23 42:24 47:22,22 52:1 68:2 71:13 77:11,15,25 83:21 90:10 91:2 Gitner (73) 2:3 8:22 9:11,17 10:8 10:22 11:11,14,19,25 12:3,6,10 13:6,9,23 16:18,25 17:12,16 18:15 19:3 28:7,11,14,18,22,25 31:7,13,18,23 32:2,5,9,13,16 33:2,5,8,13,16,22 34:2,8,10,12 34:16 35:6,9,12 36:1,13,20 37:7 37:11,14,19,22 38:18,21 43:20 56:8,11,15 57:1 75:5,16 84:16 86:25 87:2,5,11 give (14) 29:22 35:25 38:20 57:21 58:22 62:2 65:5,13 68:10,15 69:1 70:19 72:23 92:7 given (5) 15:4 60:1 65:11 70:16 78:4 gives (1) 39:17 giving (1) 39:11 glad (5) 48:2 49:11 55:7 60:6 69:19 **go (16)** 10:25 24:7,7 38:12 39:18 46:7 48:23 55:3 61:19 81:11 82:12 86:9 88:11,15 90:2,23 qoal (1) 12:22 goes (5) 12:9,10 33:22 41:4 61:20 going (41) 3:5 4:9,17 11:1,5 14:1 18:3 20:22 25:3 29:6 37:17 41:20 42:11,23 44:5,8 46:5 48:23 49:7 49:25 50:4 52:20 54:5 56:15 57:19 58:21 62:15,15 70:13 72:14 73:18 77:12 78:23 81:15 82:9,10 83:22 88:24,24 91:3,4

good (11) 4:8 11:11 13:7,17 14:17

17:6 53:22 55:18 57:3 70:25 92:15 Gotcha (1) 40:13 gotten (2) 32:11 39:25 Government (2) 59:6,8 Grant (47) 2:8 12:14,19 13:5,8 16:19 17:11,15 20:18 21:15,21 23:22 29:2,6 33:1,4,7,24 34:9,11 41:16 42:3,9,12,15 43:5 50:2,21 51:5,12,17,24 52:4,7,18,25 53:9 53:14.19.23 59:21 60:11 70:24 71:2.6.9 74:11 granular (1) 73:21 grateful (1) 47:19 gray (1) 92:19 great (18) 24:21 44:12 55:16,25 56:14,25 57:1 58:11,16 61:13 72:9 76:9,11 77:21 78:10,21,23 92:23 greatly (1) 39:21 group (3) 37:24 59:9 75:18 groups (1) 72:2 guess (14) 15:5,11 18:8 21:8 42:3 50:7 51:18 52:19 58:6,17 78:11 79:11,11 89:21 guessed (1) 41:6 guidance (1) 39:11 guided (1) 29:14 guidelines (1) 52:10 guilt (1) 45:5 guilty (4) 8:4 30:14 45:8 54:20 gut (1) 12:20 guts (2) 69:11,13 guys (7) 14:8 43:7,7 76:16 81:13 83:10,16

Н hair (2) 63:20 64:7 hampering (1) 48:16 hand (5) 29:22 48:4,7 49:3 93:16 handles (1) 15:11 handling (1) 53:4 hands (5) 15:20 67:24 78:25,25 happen (4) 40:21 46:13 51:1,2 happened (6) 56:13 64:6 68:11,14 68:17.18 happening (3) 3:4 50:7,8 happens (2) 44:24 63:12 happy (7) 28:15 49:20 57:15 59:14 61:14 78:19 86:20 hard (11) 15:21 22:13 23:4 25:7,19 38:19 39:19 43:1,8,11,15

heading (1) 18:5 Headquarters (1) 57:24 heads (2) 83:17,21 hear (5) 31:8 69:19,24 70:3 87:24 heard (6) 30:11 59:12 61:18 69:25 82:16 88:1 hearing (2) 92:12,24 heavy (1) 73:25 help (1) 17:6 **helped (1)** 39:21 helpful (5) 42:4 50:14 56:12 60:22 82:8 hereunto (1) 93:16 Herman (4) 71:22 73:7 74:23 80:25 hev (2) 48:22,25 hide (1) 67:18 hiding (2) 67:19 68:22 high (2) 43:13 64:3 high-level (1) 70:16 **highlight (2)** 4:4 70:18 highly (1) 86:16 **historical (1)** 83:5 hit (2) 53:16 80:24 hoc (1) 49:15 hold (3) 7:10 22:16 73:1 honest (2) 66:1 67:23 Honestly (1) 38:18 hope (3) 43:13 49:10 76:12 hopefully (1) 38:7 hopes (1) 41:22 horse (1) 89:1 host (1) 38:12 hot-and-heavy (1) 70:10 hours (4) 26:1,5,7,10 house (1) 11:10 housing (1) 80:3 huge (1) 39:4 Hurricane (2) 5:14 25:19

IAD (2) 75:5,17 ICO's (1) 90:9 ID (3) 34:25 35:6,10 idea (17) 9:24 11:12 13:6,7,17,19 15:1 17:6 23:21 25:22 55:18 56:14 57:1 61:20 72:6 78:9 79:23 ideas (1) 10:24 identification (5) 41:25 62:19,20 63:24 68:8 identified (3) 34:19 84:14 85:7 identities (1) 89:15 identity (3) 89:4,20,22 image (1) 62:23 imagine (1) 51:2

Head (1) 75:5

imaging (1) 62:22 immediately (2) 40:19 42:2 **immensely (1)** 91:3 impact (1) 51:13 **impassioned (1)** 88:22 **impediment (1)** 27:9 impediments (4) 3:19 17:21 25:20 70:16 **implement (1)** 89:5 implementation (3) 29:15 36:23 implementing (1) 47:12 implicate (1) 83:12 implications (2) 11:4 84:13 **importance (2)** 54:3,6 important (16) 4:4 5:12 44:20 45:22 48:4,8,13 50:14 54:11 55:2 55:8 82:16 83:4 84:18 88:2 90:22 imposes (1) 53:15 impression (2) 79:11 83:15 **impressive (1)** 75:18 **improving (1)** 40:8 inaudible (2) 31:5 41:25 incarcerated (2) 44:24 46:9 incident (3) 7:6,11 63:11 include (1) 79:24 included (2) 6:11 66:16 includes (2) 5:19,22 including (1) 85:14 increase (1) 5:11 indicating (7) 29:21 33:13 43:16 44:1 65:15,23 92:1 individual (4) 29:19 33:11 84:20 85:2 information (9) 22:4 24:14 35:25 67:18 68:22,23 80:2,3 86:4 information's (1) 57:6 informed (2) 55:19,23 initial (2) 8:12 32:3 initiated (1) 46:15 injured (1) 87:5 injury (1) 87:13 input (5) 48:15 53:11 54:21 60:24 60:24 inputting (1) 41:10 insisting (1) 89:20 Inspector (1) 75:11 instance (1) 80:1 instances (1) 69:25 instituted (1) 41:13 institution (1) 76:15 institutions (1) 59:4

intake (9) 39:13,21,22 40:10,14 41:6,8,16,21 items (5) 44:19 46:21 71:11 72:16 integrity (1) 67:3 intend (1) 46:13 interchange (1) 81:6 **interchanges (2)** 81:7,8 interest (1) 9:2 interested (2) 57:10 93:14 **interesting (1)** 44:20 Internal (3) 66:25 67:9,9 interns (2) 47:9 59:9 interpretation (1) 42:14 interrupt (1) 50:23 intervals (1) 88:19 interventions (1) 4:2 interview (1) 6:14 interviewed (2) 10:2 62:19 interviews (2) 10:14 40:25 intimate (1) 87:14 introspective (1) 83:9 invaluable (1) 29:19 investigate (4) 81:22,23 82:17 86:22 investigated (2) 7:3 12:24 investigating (2) 29:18 83:17 investigation (14) 7:14 15:1,18,19 62:16,17 66:15,16,17 68:12 77:20,22 84:22 88:23 investigations (44) 5:18 6:23 8:20 8:21 9:3,6,8,13,19 10:16,23 11:4 11:16 13:11 14:3 15:5 16:3,16 17:2,4,6 18:16 19:17 20:1,19,22 21:5,16,19 24:10 37:20,25 38:25 39:1 42:23 71:12 76:20,25 77:18 78:3,5,10,20 87:19 Investigations/APU (1) 12:15 investigative (3) 7:15 10:19 22:2 investigator (6) 24:9 39:14 41:3 47:8 66:19 68:16 investigators (6) 40:15 43:3,10 58:13 78:17 85:14 invite (1) 59:14 involved (4) 49:2,21 50:15 51:9 involving (4) 5:25 7:14,18 56:5 irritated (1) 86:17 **issuance (1)** 44:6 issue (20) 15:12 17:14 23:23 24:24 25:21 28:2 52:8 57:20 76:20 77:3 77:10 82:12,24 89:14,20 90:5,11 91:15 92:4,14 issued (2) 12:25 82:23 issues (22) 3:18,24 4:25 5:2 10:12

80:21 James (5) 2:4 4:13 16:12 21:13 43:21 Janette (1) 75:25 **January (8)** 5:7 6:2,6,21 7:9,17 40:14 91:15 Joan (1) 23:3 job (9) 4:22 38:10,14 42:17,20 59:10 67:21 69:6 90:13 **John (5)** 47:16 57:17 61:11,12 66:8 **Johnson (2)** 47:6 59:17 joint (2) 13:8,13 jointly (2) 13:20 16:14 Joseph (1) 2:10 **Jr (46)** 2:8 12:14,19 13:5,8 16:19 17:11,15 20:18 21:15,21 29:2,6

80:7 81:23 82:13 88:2,4

33:1,4,7,24 34:9,11 41:16 42:3,9 42:12,15 43:5 50:2,21 51:5,12,17 51:24 52:4,7,18,25 53:9,14,19,23 59:21 60:11 70:24 71:2,6,9 74:11 judgement (4) 17:3,13,14 49:5 Jules (5) 2:6 3:9 4:6 19:4 58:18

Julie (2) 75:6,8 jurisdiction (1) 89:8 justice (4) 65:10 66:10,11,13

keep (3) 10:18 72:24 77:10 Kelly (2) 45:25 52:12 **kept (1)** 44:9 **Kevin (3)** 74:24 75:9,10 Khalid (25) 2:2 15:13,17,23 16:1 27:1,6 28:5 33:21 34:1 35:16 47:20 48:1 49:6,12 55:18 56:2,6 74:6 75:15 89:3,13,17,19 90:17 kick (1) 69:4 kid (1) 65:2 kind (6) 20:8 66:10 68:1 87:18 88:19.25 kindness (1) 22:25 **kinds (1)** 81:7 KINGS (1) 93:4 know (81) 3:6 13:3 14:3,6,22 16:8 16:10,15,21 18:15,21,24 19:11 19:13,14 22:23 30:12 32:18 37:4 39:5,9 41:10 43:6,7,14 45:1 47:3 48:22,25 50:10 51:3,21 53:15 55:4,6,6 57:13 58:6,11 59:23,25 60:1 63:1,18 66:14 67:13,19 68:3 69:20 74:1,7 78:6 79:10,14,15,17

70:10 71:17 72:21 79:3,8,21 80:6

10:18 21:9 24:24 38:8 41:25

instructions (2) 7:21 36:9

insufficient (1) 87:11

79:20 81:4,13,14,24,25 82:14 84:6,7,22 85:12,12,19 86:12 87:23 88:11,12,14,20,20,23 89:5 89:7 91:6,14

knowing (1) 68:9

lag (1) 77:14 laid (1) 20:20 **Landin (1)** 2:7 lang (1) 27:11 language (1) 27:12 large (2) 10:22 18:2 late (2) 7:13 77:3 Laura (7) 30:20 42:25 43:6 46:18 48:20 50:8 55:22 law (5) 9:18 25:21 64:1 91:17 92:4 lawsuit (1) 45:13 lawyer (1) 91:2 lawyers (1) 91:7 leader (1) 91:14 leadership (2) 29:11 61:2 leads (1) 15:18 leaves (1) 67:12 leaving (1) 46:19 **left (2)** 83:14 84:7 legal (1) 92:6 let's (6) 29:22 40:23 53:20 73:24 74:2 81:11 letter (9) 61:24,25 62:10,12 64:23 65:13,13 87:8 91:8 letters (1) 90:25 level (3) 29:17 43:12 92:4 levels (1) 90:1 lieu (1) 14:13 **Lieutenant (1)** 67:2 light (1) 74:3 limitations (2) 38:8 77:1 Lincoln (1) 46:24 **Linda (6)** 25:7,9,12 43:24 46:23 60:8 line (2) 35:6 82:25 list (2) 33:12 92:21 listed (2) 25:15 46:25 listing (2) 58:7,8 **Liston (74)** 2:5 3:9 4:11,12 9:5 10:6,10,20 11:1,13,18,23 12:1,4 12:9,11,16,20 13:18,24 14:5,10 14:16,19,24 15:4,9,16,20 16:5 18:5,11 19:2,10 20:2 21:11 24:19 44:14,15 47:15,19,25 48:2 49:7 50:2,7,22 51:6,16,23 52:3,6,8 53:6,10,18,22,24 54:1,22 55:1,7

79:13 85:3 87:22 88:9,16 lists (2) 57:8,9 litigators (1) 81:25 little (7) 14:12 15:24 17:24 69:22 74:18 78:12 81:2 live (14) 25:24 26:13,17,22 27:1,5 27:10,13,18 28:1,5,7,10 29:1 lives (2) 49:25 76:15 Local (1) 25:21 location (2) 26:12 57:8 long (5) 63:20 69:4 77:22 78:3,4 look (18) 20:18 37:14 40:6 44:10 46:5 52:14 54:9 57:10 63:2,21 64:5 69:7 80:19 83:19 88:4 90:23 90:25 92:12 looked (2) 39:2 57:5 looking (5) 33:25 52:10 73:5 84:11 92:10 looks (2) 32:22 62:25 lose (1) 82:6 losing (3) 78:14,15,15 **lot (16)** 3:4,5,18 5:2 24:3 39:17,19 41:20 43:23 63:5 64:17 67:12 76:7,22 78:6 85:21 love (1) 81:13 Luciani (2) 75:11,12

М

magic (1) 37:25 majority (2) 34:16 59:18 making (4) 55:20 58:12 66:11 82:14 **MAMARONECK (2)** 1:23,23 man (3) 65:11 66:7,22 Manager (1) 47:5 managers (3) 39:20 43:3,10 mandate (1) 20:20 manner (1) 5:3 manning (1) 41:9 **Marc (1)** 71:3 March (3) 1:3 58:25 93:17 Marcos (11) 22:12 25:7 34:15,18 43:24 44:7 70:19 73:15 79:12,13 82:13 MARGARET (2) 93:6,21 **marketable (1)** 73:10 marketing (1) 81:14 marriage (1) 93:13 **Martin (18)** 2:6 3:9 4:6 17:18 30:2 30:4,18,22 31:1,3,5 58:19 75:1,9 89:10,14,18,25 matter (9) 11:15 16:5 25:2 27:25

Mayor (2) 3:7,11 Mayor's (1) 27:18 McCormick (9) 38:22 40:2,13 41:19 42:6,10,13 43:16 62:13 McVeigh (1) 46:24 mean (32) 14:17 18:17 27:3 30:8 30:24 34:2 39:4 42:6 50:21 53:6 55:1,2 56:6,20 58:4,5,5 63:23 64:19 65:9 66:22 67:12,15 68:21 68:25 70:1 71:11 85:5 88:10,14 88:18.22 meaningful (1) 86:20 means (1) 78:6 meant (7) 54:2,7,7 55:5,6,6,8 mediated (1) 5:20 mediating (1) 29:18 mediation (17) 7:4 58:17 71:21,23 71:25 72:18 73:2,5,7,8 80:25 81:12,13,16,19,21 82:6 mediation-eligible (1) 41:24 meet (7) 10:16 13:4,20 49:20 70:11 72:7,12 meet-and-demand (1) 74:16 meet-and-greet (3) 74:6,14,17 meet-and-greets (1) 74:9 meeting (55) 1:1,12 3:2,14,22 4:22 8:17,19 9:1 12:7 14:14 15:6 19:23,25 22:6,19,20 23:14 24:1 24:15,21 26:2,19,21 28:24 38:15 44:7,16 45:21 46:17 49:17 50:19 60:21,25 61:3 69:23 70:1,5,7,8 70:10,14,22 71:21 72:24 73:18 73:19,20 74:4,7 80:24 81:9 82:24 92:17,23 meetings (11) 14:7 18:19 25:24 72:7,10,25 73:20 76:13,14 83:1 86:5 member (2) 29:12 47:2 members (7) 2:1 8:22 17:19 49:15 49:15 54:9 72:12 **Meminger (1)** 62:19 memo (5) 23:20 80:13 91:13,23 92:6 memories (1) 38:11 memory (4) 62:18 70:20,25 73:14 mention (3) 48:1 84:10 91:11 mentioned (5) 23:20 44:4 74:20 77:19 84:8 merged (1) 16:14 merits (2) 85:2 87:2 message (2) 59:13 87:15 met (3) 60:22 70:15 91:13 method (1) 27:15 middle (1) 33:8

45:20 50:10 91:17 93:10,15

matters (2) 48:6 51:24

55:11 57:3 60:18 74:18 76:4,7,10

mind (4) 63:13 73:16 81:15 84:13 mine (1) 70:25 **minimum (1)** 50:16 minute (3) 6:2 9:7 74:2 minutes (7) 1:15 4:10 8:25 14:14 19:23 20:15 23:14 mirrors (1) 73:23 misconduct (3) 82:11 83:24 91:19 misreading (1) 57:7 missed (1) 77:10 missing (1) 41:7 mission (4) 29:18 55:15 59:11,13 mistakes (1) 64:17 MITCHELL (2) 1:8 3:1 modify (1) 53:8 **modifying (1)** 46:6 Mohammad (2) 2:2 15:13 moment (2) 14:22 81:12 momentarily (1) 25:6 Monday (1) 23:8 money (2) 69:1,4 month (21) 3:4 23:10,11 25:22 34:23 36:10,16,25 37:4 41:7 57:11 58:19,20,25 59:1,19 62:7 76:22 77:8 80:8 83:1 month's (1) 26:19 monthly (3) 76:18 82:23,25 months (29) 5:10,12,17 6:25 7:1,7 7:11 22:24 37:4,5,24 38:5,23 39:2,8,16 40:4 41:12 42:11,13 61:16 64:5,6 76:1 77:9,23 78:2,7 78:18 **morale (1)** 43:12 morning (3) 44:18 47:20 92:20 morphed (1) 20:8 Morris (1) 67:2 motion (4) 21:10,12,14 28:6 move (13) 3:11 4:11,25 16:3,16 21:6 25:17 28:25 37:17 49:9 72:15,21 73:24 moves (1) 4:12 moving (10) 9:4 21:4 22:22 40:1 43:1 46:13 61:9 69:16 71:16 72:3 multiple (1) 34:7

Ν

N (1) 93:2 nail (1) 81:9 name (1) 81:2 naturally (1) 88:24 nature (2) 37:9 78:4 nearly (1) 69:24 necessarily (1) 19:14 need (13) 13:12 19:14 20:23 26:17

42:11 48:11 49:24 54:9 62:22,25 65:20 71:18 76:16 needs (1) 61:18 negligible (3) 27:3,21 28:12 neither (1) 63:16 never (19) 8:23 16:7 20:5 62:17 63:15,16 64:1,3 65:2 66:17,20,21 66:22 67:5,5,6 68:5,5 85:6 new (27) 1:6,6,20,23 3:15 26:11 29:12,20 38:1 39:13,21 40:14 46:1 56:21 60:17 61:7.14.23 65:4 70:8.11 71:21 78:13 83:19.21 93:3.7 nice (3) 22:16 23:6 53:11 nine (1) 37:5 **no-brainer (1)** 28:18 nolo (13) 44:21 45:1,1,19 46:1 48:3 48:23 50:11,25 51:7 54:24 56:5,6 **nontraffic (1)** 91:20 normally (2) 36:10 73:16 Notary (1) 93:6 **note (2)** 5:12 60:7 **notice (1)** 58:9 noticed (2) 57:8,8 **notified (1)** 56:5 **notion (1)** 76:12 Nov (1) 9:16 November (5) 8:19 9:23 19:23 20:15 23:13 number (19) 24:8 32:19 33:3,12 34:22,22,23,23 36:11,11,16 38:7 41:22 42:18 44:19 77:2 78:19 85:12 90:13 numbers (7) 25:2 38:22 42:7 66:24 83:8,11,12 NYPD (10) 3:23 4:24 10:13 23:18 71:15 79:4,9 85:24 89:9 90:7

0

O (1) 93:2 oath (2) 45:14 48:9 objection (1) 4:10 observation (1) 47:7 observe (1) 47:2 obtaining (2) 41:18,19 obviously (3) 11:20 20:24 86:15 occasion (2) 64:8 82:3 offense (1) 45:10 Office (1) 27:18 officer (22) 34:24 35:3,6,10,10,17 45:12 48:9 51:17 63:14,15 64:2,8 64:22 66:4,7 67:3 68:17 75:14 81:17 89:7 91:19 officers (42) 7:18,20,20,21 32:19

32:24 33:9 34:3,7,8,13,19 35:13 35:14 62:24 63:9,11,13,16,17,19 63:21 64:7,18,25 65:3,6,21,25 66:12 69:9,13 71:24 73:3,10 77:8 84:14 85:6,18 89:11,23 90:9 official (3) 22:2 37:20,22 officially (2) 19:21 21:5 officials (1) 10:13 Oh (6) 30:21 32:2,5 33:7 34:9 71:8 okay (43) 11:13 12:11,19 14:10 17:11,15 20:2,17 21:22 26:25 28:22 30:13 31:6 32:13 33:7.14 34:6,9 37:14,16,21 43:21 52:7 55:25 56:7,10 57:12 58:16 69:17 71:5 73:23 74:5,20 75:18 76:9,11 76:17 81:11 83:18 88:9 90:22 91:9 92:22 old (3) 1:19 39:8 60:15 **older (2)** 7:7 39:10 once (3) 5:12 59:12 68:10 ones (2) 52:14 55:3 ongoing (1) 76:12 online (2) 57:6 64:14 open (7) 6:21,23 7:1,6,8 23:2 56:22 opened (1) 30:7 operate (1) 16:14 operating (1) 16:7 operational (3) 3:20 5:14 14:14 operations (13) 8:19 9:1,23 10:15 15:6 18:14 19:25 20:3,8,12 23:14 25:18 38:1 opinion (1) 86:14 opportunity (3) 24:22 43:9 70:17 opposed (1) 14:9 optimistic (1) 74:3 option (1) 26:5 order (6) 1:14 3:2 9:18 27:4 45:19 65:20 organically (1) 39:25 organizations (3) 59:2,3,11 orientation (1) 15:3 original (1) 73:7 ought (2) 12:25 19:18 outcome (1) 93:14 outlined (3) 70:15,21 71:7 outreach (8) 47:6 58:21,22,23 59:3 59:10,22 61:17 outreaches (1) 59:18 outside (1) 64:2 overall (1) 73:11 overarching (1) 85:11 **Overtime (1)** 81:18 overwhelming (1) 34:16 overwhelmingly (1) 36:20

Р				
packet (1) 6:11				
packets (1) 25:11				
page (5) 17:17 24:4 32:18,20 33:2				
pages (1) 33:22				
Panel (16) 7:2 24:11 38:4 47:22				
49:2,15 50:24 55:19,20,23,24				
56:1,4,12 86:3 92:17				
panels (3) 42:24 49:19 56:13				
paper (2) 65:17,18				
part (16) 4:4 9:19,20 47:8 50:17				
51:15 53:11 57:19 58:12 70:23				
79:24 82:17 83:20 84:23 85:9				
87:12				
participate (1) 46:14				
particular (10) 36:10,12,25 48:22				
50:10 68:3 70:9 86:13 90:3 91:24				
particularly (2) 61:1 88:12				
particulars (1) 70:2				
parties (1) 93:13				
Partner (1) 47:6				
pass (1) 3:21				
patience (1) 22:24				
pattern (1) 36:9				
pay (1) 69:10				
paying (2) 69:4 83:23				
PC (1) 69:23				
PD (4) 52:19 53:13,15 57:18				
penalty (5) 35:19,21 45:3 48:8 53:15				
pending (1) 7:15 people (18) 29:20 40:12 41:1,1				
46:14 47:2 58:8 64:19 67:13				
68:12,24 77:3 82:5,20,21 85:13				
88:13 92:7				
percent (29) 5:11,21 6:4,6,7,8,12				
6:13,14,15,16,16,17,20,22,24 7:2				
7:3,5,8,22,24 36:23,25 37:2				
39:15 40:11 54:17 69:12				
percentage (1) 7:8				
perfectly (2) 45:12 49:4				
period (2) 6:5 38:2				
periods (1) 40:3				
permanently (1) 26:1				
permissible (2) 91:16,18				
permit (2) 44:22 49:3				
permits (1) 49:2				
person (10) 45:2,7 46:11,16 72:20				
80:15 91:21,24 92:18,19				
personally (4) 11:11 14:1 64:20,21				
pertaining (2) 79:3,8				
phones (1) 41:9				
photo (1) 64:6				
photogenic (2) 70:20 73:14				
i				

```
photographs (3) 85:16,16 90:15
photos (1) 90:11
physical (1) 87:13
pic (1) 63:8
picked (2) 63:11,23
picture (7) 63:1,15,16 64:3,4 65:7
pictures (14) 62:23 63:10,18,20,21
  64:12,15,18 65:3 67:22 69:9,12
  90:8.10
piece (2) 69:17 83:5
Pineiro (5) 74:25 75:1,2,3,4
pitching (1) 59:10
place (9) 16:23 39:14 50:5 52:2,21
  55:20 60:4 78:19 84:1
plain (1) 27:12
plan (1) 52:18
plaque (2) 22:4 29:8
players (1) 70:11
plea (12) 45:1,2,14,19 46:1 48:23
  50:11 54:20,24 56:5,6 88:23
pleas (6) 8:5 30:14 44:21 45:6 48:3
  50:25
please (2) 43:15 73:11
pleased (1) 91:2
pled (1) 45:8
plus (1) 54:14
point (22) 11:2 14:2,17 16:12
  18:17 19:1,5 28:3 39:11 40:9
  50:5 54:1,12 55:5 68:1,3,6 72:20
  77:24 81:18 85:6 92:15
points (2) 46:19 72:18
police (34) 3:15 4:22 7:17,19 8:6,8
  30:7 35:20 45:24 46:1 51:17
  57:23 60:21 62:4,24 63:7,9 64:2
  64:22 65:21,25 66:12 67:18,20
  69:21 72:12 73:19 82:2,9,10
  83:24 89:4,7,21
policies (2) 83:12,23
policing (2) 71:23 79:4
policy (18) 79:3,8,17,21 80:6,19,23
  80:24 81:4,23 82:13,24 89:4,8,20
  91:23 92:2,14
Poor (1) 79:13
position (2) 91:17,24
positive (2) 3:5 44:16
possible (2) 46:14,16
post (1) 26:6
post-Sandy (1) 39:24
posted (2) 47:1 57:16
posting (1) 26:5
potential (1) 51:13
potentially (1) 8:18
power (5) 21:7 63:5,6 64:16 89:22
```

powerful (2) 47:10 73:2 practic (1) 27:13 practicable (3) 27:14 28:10,12 **practical (1)** 16:5 practices (1) 83:23 pre-Board (1) 10:21 preamble (1) 14:4 **Precinct (1)** 67:3 predict (1) 57:18 preference (1) 28:3 preferred (2) 27:15 28:8 prefers (1) 27:12 pregnant (1) 76:1 prepared (1) 52:10 present (4) 2:1 17:7 22:7 24:17 presentation (2) 23:21 59:15 presented (3) 5:1 71:20 72:6 presenting (2) 5:2 91:21 press (4) 25:9 44:5 70:17 73:25 pretrial (1) 10:7 pretty (4) 17:9 41:11 46:17 81:16 **prevented (1)** 76:3 previous (2) 37:3 79:15 primarily (1) 79:16 print (1) 44:1 printer (3) 25:6 44:1,8 prior (4) 41:21 52:11 69:25 77:9 priority (1) 77:2 probably (10) 13:2,10,11 26:12,14 70:20 78:6 87:11,14 89:8 problem (3) 12:6 13:13 86:25 procedures (1) 38:2 proceed (4) 23:18 24:1 25:3 26:3 proceeding (2) 51:20,22 proceedings (2) 93:9,11 process (13) 3:12 17:23 48:16,17 49:8 51:10 53:12 59:23 60:4 61:22 77:15 78:11 86:17 processes (2) 3:25 73:5 product (1) 44:2 productive (9) 3:17 4:23 17:22 44:16 46:4 60:21,25 61:2 73:20 program (3) 7:5 58:24 81:18 progress (1) 24:3 prohibitive (1) 27:5 promise (1) 44:9 promised (2) 44:7 62:14 promises (1) 65:11 promoted (1) 67:4 **Promotion (1)** 81:17 promptly (1) 77:4 proper (1) 3:22 properly (1) 42:23 proposal (3) 50:4 72:9 73:8

propose (3) 13:23 48:22 50:18 proposed (3) 48:19 50:16 52:23 proposing (1) 12:14 prosecute (1) 7:19 prosecution (3) 11:5 29:15 44:17 prosecutions (1) 72:3 **prosecutor (1)** 51:3 Prosecutors (1) 59:7 protect (1) 63:9 protected (1) 89:24 **provided (1)** 6:16 **providing (1)** 29:19 proviso (1) 21:5 public (24) 1:1,12,21 40:9 47:3 51:22 61:10 66:2 68:8 69:7 83:13 84:1,4,17 86:5,12,21,21,23 87:21 88:22 92:11,12 93:6 **publish (1)** 60:10 **pull (1)** 50:24 **pulled (1)** 74:1 **Puma (5)** 2:10 57:4,13 58:4,15 punished (1) 45:8 punishment (1) 27:15 pure (3) 91:23 92:1,4 purely (1) 38:18 purpose (1) 79:19 pursuant (1) 90:6 pursue (1) 71:24 put (17) 16:9 23:24 39:13 41:2 45:15 51:19 52:22 53:20 54:23 56:1 66:5 78:1 80:21 83:1,3,5 91:25 putting (5) 22:13 23:5 25:10 71:3 73:15 Q qualifications (1) 27:16

quality (1) 42:22 question (17) 9:6 15:9 18:9,23 19:19 30:4 32:17 33:15 36:13 57:4 65:12,16 66:4 79:2 85:8 89:3,17 questions (2) 41:14 61:21 quick (3) 33:19 49:23 51:7 quickly (5) 42:24 48:18 78:22,24 91:11

R

R (1) 93:2 Rafael (1) 74:25 raise (2) 77:16 92:16 raised (2) 3:18 88:4 raises (1) 88:2 raising (1) 77:10

Ralph (3) 75:1,2,3 ran (1) 73:13 rate (13) 5:21,25 6:1,3,5,7 7:22,23 25:1 36:22,24 37:1 80:5 raw (1) 25:2 reach (1) 62:11 read (4) 29:6 32:21 33:17 34:17 reading (4) 32:21,25 33:17 36:14 ready (4) 26:21 51:6 52:15 92:22 real (2) 33:19 73:2 realize (1) 91:5 really (27) 5:2 12:22 18:2 22:12 23:2,23 28:3,14 36:13 37:25 39:6 39:9 42:21 43:2,9,14 49:1,22 52:13 53:17 59:17 70:17 73:4 79:14 80:24 81:1 86:4 reaping (1) 23:5 reason (5) 6:16 20:11 54:19 68:20 83:3 reasonable (1) 5:3 reasons (1) 6:18 recap (2) 70:6,19 receive (1) 22:6 received (8) 5:4,5,6,8,9,10 7:20,21 receiving (1) 92:18 receptive (4) 3:17 49:14,17 50:1 recognized (1) 38:15 recollection (1) 90:2 recommend (3) 35:21 44:10 50:4 recommendation (3) 35:18,19 54:18 **recommendations (8)** 43:22 79:3 79:8,17,22 80:19 82:13,19 recommended (2) 32:25 36:17 recommending (1) 8:1 record (8) 21:1 25:25 27:24 45:9 76:6 83:5 92:11 93:11 recorded (2) 14:14 27:2 recording (6) 26:4,9 27:20,22 28:1 48:10 **Rector (1)** 1:5 red (2) 63:19 64:8 reduce (3) 38:2,7 39:22 reduction (2) 38:17 41:11 referenced (1) 19:24 referred (2) 23:16,17 refers (1) 45:1 reflect (1) 24:5 reflected (2) 20:15 23:21 **reflection (1)** 78:17 refresh (3) 14:15,21 90:2 refreshing (1) 62:18 regard (3) 10:12 24:24 25:18 regarding (2) 47:23 80:3

Regardless (1) 87:2 regularly (2) 51:1 72:13 relate (1) 44:21 related (4) 11:3 13:1 45:16 93:12 relates (5) 21:7 30:6 32:17 76:19 81:22 relative (1) 3:19 release (2) 25:9 44:5 released (2) 79:25 80:9 relieves (1) 40:11 religious (1) 59:3 remember (4) 18:21 41:17 88:10 89:25 renaming (1) 73:6 **rendered (1)** 8:7 reopened (2) 7:12 66:19 repeatedly (1) 60:8 repor (1) 65:14 report (47) 1:16,17 4:17,18 5:22,23 5:24 6:15,22 10:3 23:11 24:25 25:5 30:5 32:18 33:6,23 34:4,5 36:12 37:11,22,23 43:19,25 44:3 44:4,6,11 65:15 68:15 69:23 76:18,18,21 78:21 79:19,20,24 80:9,12,22 82:12 83:2,4 84:1 92:13 reported (1) 93:9 reporting (5) 1:23 5:22,24 24:6 77:13 reports (9) 1:18 18:15,19 37:18 43:22 60:13 79:15 80:8 83:7 represented (3) 51:8 76:4 91:24 request (2) 89:6 90:7 requests (4) 8:16 41:20,22,23 reset (1) 14:21 resolution (4) 6:1,7 25:1 56:4 resolve (5) 45:12,20 48:5 86:20 90:14 resolving (2) 40:1 45:6 resources (2) 48:6 57:18 respond (3) 68:13 88:24,25 response (4) 21:25 60:14,16 61:8 responsibilities (1) 39:22 responsibility (5) 45:4 51:18 69:7 76:24 90:9 **responsible (1)** 40:25 result (2) 9:14 60:24 resulting (1) 11:16 results-oriented (1) 73:22 retaliation (1) 6:17 **returned (1)** 7:13 review (11) 1:2 7:2,16 10:21 23:25 24:8 29:13 42:19 52:24 53:3 57:15

reviewing (2) 42:17,21 revisit (5) 49:8 50:19 51:25 88:16 89:1 **Reznick (4)** 75:5,15,16,17 ridiculous (1) 63:25 right (77) 3:1 4:12,16 9:14 10:8,10 11:18,25 12:9,16,23 13:24 14:5 14:19,24 15:9,16,22,23 18:20 19:2 21:3,13 22:1 26:4,5,8,11 27:23 29:5,25 30:17,22 32:22,25 33:17 35:8 37:10 40:1.18.18 42:9 42:12.15 47:25 48:4 50:21 51:14 52:25 53:9,14,18,20,23 54:16,17 56:22 58:16 60:11 61:9 62:6.6 64:9,10,12 65:15 68:4 69:17,19 71:7 84:3,4 86:7,23 87:4,10 88:20 rightly (1) 81:5 ripped (2) 65:23,23 robust (3) 58:24 59:24 72:4 rode (1) 88:25 Roger (1) 42:25 role (2) 41:17 55:9 room (2) 56:24 87:6 rooms (1) 57:23 routinely (1) 90:10 Rudolph (1) 2:7 Rules (1) 17:9 run (1) 53:12 running (1) 38:22

S

Sachs (4) 25:9,12 46:23 60:8 safety (1) 89:12 sake (1) 20:10 **salaries (1)** 69:10 **Sandy (9)** 5:15 25:19 39:5 40:4,8 62:6,7,8 77:23 saying (15) 22:23 33:17 50:3 53:19 54:5 61:24 63:4 64:24 68:20 83:10.22 85:22 87:8.8 92:11 says (6) 28:7,9 29:9 33:25 50:10 92:9 schedule (6) 40:17,19,22,23 59:24 60:3 **scheduled (7)** 8:11 31:12,16 32:15 58:24 59:1 76:13 schedules (1) 49:25 **Scheduling (2)** 41:2,4 school (1) 64:4 **Schwartz (2)** 75:6,8 seal (1) 67:17 search (3) 35:3 80:15 92:17 searches (2) 80:10,12

second (12) 4:13,14 9:4 16:18,19 21:15,20,21 29:2 50:3 70:23 90:20 secret (1) 82:2 see (30) 5:24 12:9 13:13,16,20 22:16 23:1 25:16 29:21 35:18 36:6 40:8 42:4 43:6 52:16 53:13 56:11,13 58:4,4 60:2 65:15 71:2 74:15 80:14 83:7,13,14 84:11 92:1 seeing (2) 14:7 41:11 seeking (1) 55:15 seen (6) 4:23 41:24 63:15,16 65:2 67:6 **selected (1)** 40:2 send (3) 56:1 62:11 80:18 sending (1) 42:1 senior (4) 59:4 60:23 72:10 76:7 sense (6) 16:9 19:4 54:21,25 66:11 88:3 sensitive (4) 10:18 21:9 86:16 90:5 sent (1) 61:24 separate (6) 9:8,20 12:17 15:21 18:4 80:13 **separately (1)** 19:7 serious (1) 87:25 serve (2) 86:21 88:22 serves (1) 17:3 service (1) 29:20 services (2) 1:23 29:11 session (4) 20:9 85:3 86:6 88:5 set (6) 49:18 51:19 72:9,9 78:13 93:16 settled (1) 61:22 seven (5) 7:18 8:4 30:13,15 75:25 **share (1)** 52:19 **shared (1)** 47:8 **shortly (3)** 44:2,8 78:25 **show (7)** 41:1,1 58:9 60:5 63:18 64:3,4 **showed (2)** 63:20 64:6 showing (2) 69:3 90:16 **shown (1)** 90:11 shtick (1) 91:12 side (2) 74:22 88:1 sight (1) 82:7 signed (1) 30:8 significant (2) 4:24 38:6 Simonetti (1) 23:22 simple (4) 49:4 66:3 89:16,16 simply (2) 17:3 55:8 sincere (1) 87:25 single (1) 83:4 sir (1) 26:6

sit (3) 39:7 63:6,7 situation (2) 47:24 61:17 situations (1) 45:11 six (5) 7:18 8:13 39:2 42:13,19 slapped (1) 64:2 slows (1) 17:23 small (1) 27:9 smaller (1) 36:11 smart (1) 83:9 smoke (1) 73:23 **smooth (1)** 3:19 **snow (1)** 76:1 so-and-so (1) 68:18 **soapbox (1)** 90:19 **SOL (2)** 49:18 71:17 **SOLER (13)** 34:18 35:8,11,14,17 36:2,19,21 37:10,13 71:1,4 79:19 somebody (4) 62:25 67:14 71:9 78:13 **Something's (2)** 65:6,7 son (17) 61:23 62:4,20 63:15 64:5 64:20,21 65:1,5,22,22 66:5 67:5 68:14,25 69:1 87:5 son's (3) 63:13 67:4 68:22 sorry (16) 9:7 11:23 12:4,11 24:19 30:5 31:7 32:5 33:24 34:10,11 50:2,23 52:5 73:15 79:5 **sort (5)** 9:17 32:16 33:8 53:16 60:5 sorts (2) 45:5 46:3 sound (1) 29:11 **sounding (2)** 10:23 17:4 **sounds (6)** 12:21 19:17,18 21:3 76:11 81:16 space (2) 23:2,6 **spaced (1)** 50:3 speak (1) 83:25 speaker (1) 61:10 **speaking (1)** 80:23 spearheading (1) 59:17 **specific (10)** 34:20 35:18,21 68:1,6 80:8,18,20 84:9 88:6 specifically (4) 9:12 21:8 45:4,9 specifications (1) 8:2 specifics (2) 84:17 85:2 speculate (1) 62:25 **speeding (1)** 41:22 spoke (3) 52:9 67:5,6 **spoken (5)** 66:20,21 85:11,12,13 **spot (2)** 71:3 73:15 **spring (4)** 4:5,5 69:19 83:19 **ss (1)** 93:4 staff (14) 3:16,23 22:25 60:23 70:12 72:9,11,13,21,22 74:21,22 76:7 85:13

stage (3) 11:4,5,5 stand (1) 64:1 **standard (1)** 91:12 start (6) 12:7 57:19,22,25 58:2,3 started (3) 40:14 65:9 71:12 stat (1) 27:11 State (2) 93:3,7 stated (2) 20:21 21:1 **statement (2)** 84:11,13 statistic-based (1) 79:16 statistical (2) 24:6 35:24 **statistics (3)** 33:5 37:8 82:25 status (1) 46:22 **statute (6)** 27:12 28:7,15 29:1 38:8 76:25 stay (1) 74:2 **steered (1)** 29:16 stem (1) 6:23 **STENO-KATH (1)** 1:23 Stenokat@verizon.net (1) 1:25 Stenokath@verizon.net (1) 1:25 **steps (3)** 20:23 24:8 40:20 stood (3) 6:20,22 76:21 stop (5) 35:1,4 80:2,9,11 stops (2) 80:14,16 story (1) 88:1 straightforward (1) 92:6 stream (11) 25:24 26:17,22 27:5 27:10,13,18 28:1,7 29:1 64:13 streaming (3) 26:13 28:10 64:13 Street (1) 1:5 **strong (2)** 5:3 71:13 **strongly (1)** 24:15 study (1) 80:3 **stuff (4)** 42:10 61:18 64:14 68:13 subcommittee (2) 72:10 88:4 submit (1) 53:3 subpoena (3) 16:21,25 17:10 subpoenaing (1) 10:5 subpoenas (4) 9:25 10:6,10 21:8 subsequent (1) 32:12 substantial (2) 36:16 45:16 substantiated (12) 5:19 7:18,25 32:20,23 33:9,18,25 34:12,18 36:5 54:19 substantiation (2) 5:20 55:21 substantiations (1) 80:5 substitute (1) 17:2 **substitutes (1)** 17:13 **successful (2)** 3:13 4:2 **suddenly (1)** 51:6 sue (1) 82:2 sufficient (3) 40:6,7 69:24 suggest (3) 50:19 55:2 56:8

suggested (1) 15:7 suggesting (2) 47:7 56:3 summarize (2) 44:19,25 summary (2) 46:17 49:9 summons (4) 91:16,20,20 92:18 summonses (1) 92:8 sunshine (1) 69:22 supervisor (1) 62:17 supervisors (3) 39:20 43:3 85:15 **supervisory (1)** 10:13 supported (1) 12:24 **suppose (3)** 19:7 37:7 53:12 supposed (1) 63:9 sure (22) 10:20 13:4 16:20,22 18:1 18:2 24:5 32:21 33:16 39:9 42:22 44:15 46:20 48:14 51:8.9.16 53:24 57:16 84:25 86:13 87:18 **Susan (3)** 71:22 73:6 80:25 suspicion (2) 91:21 92:7 **Suzanne (1)** 74:23 synergies (1) 14:8 **synergize (1)** 15:2 system's (1) 87:12

Т

T (2) 93:2,2 table (3) 53:21 70:11 76:10 tainted (2) 63:24,25 take (15) 6:13 12:11 17:21 43:9 44:10 51:7 57:9 62:23 63:1,8 64:12 69:9,12 70:23 90:8 taken (6) 8:25 20:23 54:20 55:20 61:18 67:10 takes (1) 38:3 talk (16) 6:1 9:12 10:17 11:20 17:24 22:7,8 24:1 49:20 50:24 71:22 74:2 77:17 80:11 89:10 talked (14) 16:22 44:19 45:23 46:8 46:10,23 48:14 72:1 73:4 77:9 80:25 90:3.24 92:16 talking (4) 10:6 23:11 71:13 85:21 tangent (1) 81:12 **Taylor (102)** 1:8 3:1 4:7,12,14,16 12:13 14:1,6,11,18,20,25 15:7,25 16:12 18:8,12 20:14,17 21:3,13 21:18,22,24 22:1,10,15,18 26:4,8 26:11,16,22,25 29:3,5,8,24 30:3 33:15 37:16,21 38:16,20 39:24 40:9 41:14 43:18,21 44:12 53:25 54:16 55:4,10,13 56:20 58:16,20 59:20 60:9,12,15,17,19 61:1,4,6 61:9,13 67:25 69:15 70:6,25 71:5 71:8 72:17 74:10,13,17,19,23

75:3,8,10,12,20,23 79:5 80:23 84:3 86:7,10 87:1,4,10,17 88:7 88:10,18 90:21 92:15 team (12) 39:20 40:15,24,24 41:3 42:16,19 43:2,3,4 47:17 91:14 teams (7) 39:7,19 40:22 41:5 42:19 42:21 70:15 tears (1) 64:10 tell (16) 15:22 19:22 37:11 38:16 43:11 58:2,3 65:7,8 66:9 67:20 68:10,15,17,18 82:5 telling (3) 28:11 68:6 69:6 tells (3) 35:6 37:8 83:6 tend (1) 51:2 tends (1) 85:20 terms (14) 8:16 22:22 27:9 39:25 54:17 70:13,21 71:13,16,21 73:2 76:18 78:19 79:16 terrific (3) 75:19 76:17 77:21 testify (2) 44:23 46:10 thank (41) 3:2 4:20,21 22:3,10,12 22:21,24 23:3,7,22 25:7,9,13 30:1 36:14 37:15 42:25 43:10,17 43:20 44:12,15 47:14,18 49:13 49:22 50:1 58:14,15 59:20 60:12 61:1,4,5 69:14,15 73:13 84:2,3 92:23 thanks (7) 46:23 47:5,10,15,16 59:8 60:11 theme (1) 85:11 theory (2) 50:22,23 thing (13) 4:8 30:24 37:19 48:8 53:20 66:20 67:18 72:19 77:23 78:2 80:24 84:7 91:10 things (22) 3:5 8:17 9:12 55:17 63:3,5 64:13,14,19 68:7 70:18,21 76:2,20 77:4 78:11,16 80:5 81:24 82:1,4,19 think (111) 3:16,21 4:3 5:1 9:17,18 9:20,20,21 11:11,15 12:17,22 13:6,6,9,16 14:1,4,11,17,20,25 15:4,13,14,23 16:2,8 17:5,8,12 17:16 18:5,23 19:3 21:11 22:11 22:25 24:4,21 25:8,16 28:17,20 31:5 33:23,23 34:4 38:13,18 39:4 43:9 44:20 46:7,17 49:9 50:20 51:3,10,18 52:1,3,6 53:7,13,25 54:2,6,11,14,25 55:7,18,22 56:11 56:12,16 57:6 58:6,10 66:2 69:21 69:21 71:14 73:11,17,18 74:3 77:1,16,24 78:10 80:17 81:4,7 83:10,11,15 84:16,19 85:8,10,22 87:20 88:7,25 89:4,11 90:22 92:22

thinking (3) 53:14,17 65:10 third (1) 72:1 Thirty-five (1) 35:14 **Thompson (1)** 23:4 thorough (1) 42:14 thought (8) 31:23 40:3,6 60:20,22 85:1,7,23 thoughtful (1) 83:10 thoughts (1) 13:5 threat (1) 45:13 three (11) 7:10,19 8:8 35:9 36:7,8 37:24 41:7 42:19 61:15 62:14 three-page (2) 33:23 34:3 three-pager (1) 82:23 throw (3) 11:1,6 13:18 **throwing (1)** 11:9 thrust (1) 85:5 **Thursday (1)** 40:23 till (2) 4:6,7 time (42) 5:6 6:13 8:25 10:11 14:23 18:20 19:24 20:4 38:3,4,12,17 39:18,25 40:3,7 42:3 43:9 48:16 49:2,3,17 52:1 56:21 57:9,22 58:2,7 62:6,10 65:11,16,19 70:9 76:16 77:17,20,22,22 78:2,4 91:5 timely (2) 17:7 71:14 times (5) 9:25 41:12 47:1 60:1 82:16 today (11) 3:3 4:4 11:20 15:10 20:11 24:17 26:16,18 27:6 44:5 85:23 told (3) 64:7 91:23 92:9 tomorrow (4) 4:6,7 40:19,24 Tony (3) 23:22 24:15 75:24 tool (1) 73:3 top (3) 32:15 77:1 92:21 topic (2) 71:20 72:1 topics (3) 23:10 47:13 70:4 total (4) 5:8 30:12 35:13 36:4 touch (4) 46:20 47:22,23 62:8 tough (1) 49:1 town (1) 76:5 track (2) 42:4,8 **Tracy (13)** 1:9 4:20 27:1 39:6 43:22 44:4 47:11 48:21 60:20 61:2 73:13 91:13 92:9 training (2) 47:8 58:12 trainings (1) 42:21 transcript (1) 93:11 transparency (1) 69:22 **transport** (1) 66:6 tremendous (1) 56:16 trenches (1) 19:3

47:4,7 56:24 57:9,11,23,25 trialed (1) 31:16 trials (8) 8:8,9,10 31:11 32:4,14 46:25 47:1 tried (3) 33:19 60:2 73:24 true (1) 93:11 truncated (3) 23:12 24:23,25 truncation (2) 5:25 6:3 try (7) 3:10 10:24 39:9 40:19 51:11 82:18 86:19 trying (4) 39:7 73:1,3 82:9 turn (1) 77:2 turns (1) 50:25 tweak (1) 81:2 Twenty-four (2) 33:21 34:1 twice (1) 72:8 two (33) 5:9,17,22 7:12,14,20,21 11:8,14 13:3,14,22 14:2,9 15:17 15:20 17:21 18:4 33:19 37:23 39:16 40:2.20 41:12 44:20 46:25 57:23 63:13,15,17 64:25 65:3 72:2 type (1) 72:10 types (2) 10:17 89:15 typical (1) 91:3 typically (1) 19:12 typing (1) 48:10

uber-sensitive (1) 89:14 **ultimate (2)** 53:7,15 ultimately (6) 15:18 24:11 51:25 52:18 53:6,15 undercover (9) 62:24 63:10 64:18 69:13 85:16 89:11,23 90:1,4 understand (7) 42:9 53:4 62:9 77:6 77:12 81:19 87:6 understanding (2) 20:20,21 **Understood (1)** 85:17 Unfortunately (1) 33:2 unfounded (3) 64:25 84:10 87:9 unhappy (1) 87:16 unidentified (1) 17:21 unilaterally (2) 20:23 21:6 unimportant (2) 55:3 78:1 unit (24) 4:1 10:23 17:4,7 21:5 29:16 36:24 37:6 39:1,13,21 40:10,14 41:2,16,21 44:14,14,17 45:18 46:3 52:13 56:21 80:25 unpleased (1) 91:4 unusual (4) 36:9,25 37:2 51:1 update (1) 58:22 updated (3) 6:3 46:21 90:10 **updates (1)** 60:8

Updating (1) 60:9 uptown (1) 61:19 use (4) 44:21,22 46:8 67:17 useful (1) 45:6 usurp (1) 21:6

V

vaguely (1) 41:17 valid (1) 16:12 valor (1) 85:9 valuable (2) 45:22 60:24 variety (1) 54:23 various (1) 8:22 vehicle (6) 80:9,9,11,12,14,16 verdict (3) 8:6,9 30:15 versus (4) 23:12 24:25 27:2 80:15 video (4) 27:25 44:22 46:9,16 view (11) 12:18,21 14:13 16:25 17:8 18:18 19:1,5 38:6 50:13 78:18 views (1) 13:25 visited (1) 88:17 vote (25) 8:18,23 9:3 14:16 16:1,3 16:8,10,16 17:1,10 18:20 19:7,8 19:15,25 20:5 25:23 26:2,18 27:6 28:14,16,21 51:25 voted (2) 16:7 20:4

W

wait (2) 16:15 51:19 waiting (8) 30:14,17 31:21 32:1,7,7 62:13 80:21 walk (1) 72:19 walk-in (1) 41:8 want (62) 4:1,4 6:13 9:10,25 11:10 11:19 15:10,10 16:22 17:12 18:6 21:20 22:7 23:3,11,22 24:4,25 25:5,7,9,24 26:13,17 33:16 40:12 46:18 47:2 48:1,5 49:13 51:8,9 51:11 53:16 54:14 55:14,15 59:16 60:18 61:14.16.17 64:11 64:13.22 66:2 67:13 68:15 69:6 70:9 77:17 78:18,21 81:18 82:5 84:6,8 88:11,15,16 wanted (10) 6:15 18:9 37:23 38:14 40:5 43:23 57:13 61:1 64:21 72:19 wanting (2) 48:14 51:14 wants (7) 21:10 24:15 25:23 26:3 47:3 53:3 76:14 Ward (2) 74:24 75:9 wasn't (5) 73:23 74:17 75:22 84:23 86:3

waste (1) 52:1

trial (13) 8:6 30:15,19 31:9,17 47:2

40.55.5
wave (1) 22:17
way (26) 10:25 12:12 25:25 26:3
35:18,23 40:21 50:20,23 51:11
51:20 58:8 61:22 64:4,23 70:7
73:10 78:3 83:22 84:25 86:9,11
86:18 87:21 90:14 93:14
ways (1) 72:4
we'll (7) 13:23 49:2,4 52:17 56:22
74:15 81:9
we're (32) 3:1 4:9 8:7 9:18 17:16
18:5 21:4 22:15 25:3,19 28:1
37:17 38:9 39:10 41:10 46:5
47:19 48:23 49:7 51:21 52:20
53:4 61:9 62:15 66:16 69:16
72:25 81:3 84:4 86:22 88:24
92:22
we've (23) 4:23 16:10 18:18,18,19
23:23 24:3 32:6 39:6,6,7,13
41:12 48:19 52:10 59:1 73:19
77:8 88:7,17,18,25 90:24
weapon (1) 91:22
weather (1) 69:20
webcammed (1) 22:15
website (8) 25:12,13,15 26:1,10
44:3 46:24 60:8
Wednesday (1) 1:3
weeds (1) 72:23
week (3) 61:24,25 64:23
weekend (1) 22:23
weeks (1) 47:1
weigh (1) 92:3
went (6) 62:7,21 66:20 75:19 88:13
91:14
weren't (1) 8:24
whacking (1) 72:23
WHEREOF (1) 93:16
wife (2) 61:16 64:10
willing (4) 10:1 45:12,19 73:9
wisdom (1) 29:14
wisely (1) 45:23
wish (1) 78:24
withdraw (1) 85:8
withdrawn (2) 6:4,9
withdrew (2) 6:14,17
within-entitled (1) 93:10
WITNESS (1) 93:16
witnesses (2) 10:1,5
wonder (1) 88:3
wonderful (2) 38:14 49:25
wondering (1) 66:25
word (1) 67:17
work (24) 9:11,21 13:17 14:8 15:23
18:3,24 19:19 23:4 38:1,19 39:19
41:3 43:1,8,15 44:12 47:15 71:18
71.0 70.1,0,10 77.12 77.10 71.10

```
71:23 72:2 73:9 80:18,20
worked (3) 23:23 43:24 73:7
working (13) 9:21 12:22 13:15
  15:2 22:13 25:7,19 43:11 49:22
  49:23 62:24 70:13 81:1
works (1) 13:21
worth (3) 14:25 47:1 85:7
wouldn't (3) 27:17 58:1 64:16
wrong (9) 36:14 48:11 50:9 62:3
  62:12 65:6,7,7,8
y'all (22) 61:24 62:1,3,21 63:3,7,20
  64:24 65:5,8,13 66:8 67:1,7,7,8
  67:19,20 68:19 69:6,7,8
y'all's (5) 62:18 63:5 65:19 67:23
  69:6
yeah (20) 4:7 14:18 31:1 34:2 40:2
  41:16 43:5 50:21 51:5 55:1,7,11
  60:9 71:4 73:17 74:19 87:1,17
  88:7.18
year (15) 5:7,13,18 6:5,6,20,24
  38:23 61:14 72:8,13 79:21 83:6,7
  83:7
year-to-date (3) 5:17,20 6:10
years (11) 29:10 36:22 37:3 62:14
  73:8,18 78:23 83:16 90:8,13,25
Yoon (1) 2:9
York (9) 1:6,6,23 29:12,20 61:23
  65:4 93:3,7
young (1) 66:7
younger (1) 39:12
Youngik (1) 2:9
                 Ζ
zero (1) 77:3
zoned (2) 9:7 79:5
                 0
0.5 (1) 7:7
02 (2) 35:2,10
                 1
1 (1) 1:14
10 (1) 6:14
10:12 (1) 1:4
100 (5) 22:22 27:24 31:13 54:17
  69:12
10006 (1) 1:6
103 (1) 25:21
10543 (1) 1:23
11:44 (1) 92:24
```

```
12 (3) 1:3 37:3 39:8
139 (1) 1:23
14 (5) 8:11 31:10,19 32:10 64:6
153 (4) 8:4 31:2,3,24
16 (1) 5:20
17 (5) 5:21 6:17 8:14 39:16 78:15
170 (1) 5:5
18 (4) 7:2,7 40:15 64:5
18-plus (1) 76:22
1889 (1) 7:2
195 (1) 5:18
2 (3) 1:15 6:16,16
2,599 (1) 6:20
2,706 (1) 6:22
20 (1) 7:25
2000 (1) 36:5
2008 (1) 29:13
2011 (2) 65:9,9
2013 (5) 5:6,10 6:8 29:13 40:5
2014 (9) 1:3 5:5 7:9,17,25 33:10
  34:22 36:5 93:17
20140201 (1) 34:24
2014020101 (1) 34:25
21 (2) 6:13 7:6
212 (2) 1:24,24
23 (1) 6:8
23rd (1) 67:2
24 (4) 7:9 33:25 34:18 36:4
248 (1) 7:4
24th (1) 93:17
25 (1) 39:16
270 (1) 5:6
270-some-odd (1) 77:20
274 (1) 39:3
275 (1) 39:3
28 (1) 58:25
2nd (1) 1:5
                 3
3 (1) 1:16
30 (1) 58:24
33 (2) 39:15 40:11
335 (4) 38:24,24 40:5 77:20
34 (1) 5:19
35 (2) 34:19 35:12
38 (1) 6:7
381-2061 (1) 1:24
381-2064 (1) 1:24
4 (4) 1:17 6:20,25 7:1
```

40 (10) 1:5 8:10 31:11,15,16,18

	16
32:14 66:24 67:10,10 410 (1) 5:16 43 (2) 6:11 7:24 440 (1) 5:4 447 (1) 5:9 456 (1) 5:10 462 (1) 7:1 5 5 (2) 1:18 6:15 50 (2) 32:24 36:6 52 (1) 6:4 54 (1) 31:12 56 (9) 32:23,24 33:18 34:4,12,12 34:13 35:13,14 561 (1) 5:16	
57 (1) 7:22 6	
6 (5) 1:19 40:24,24 41:3 77:8 60 (7) 8:12 31:25 32:2,7 38:5 39:3 78:14 64 (1) 6:24 65 (1) 6:5 66 (2) 36:23,25 681-1985 (1) 1:24	
7 (3) 1:20 77:8,8 72 (4) 26:1,5,7,10 73 (1) 7:3	
8 8 (1) 1:21 9	
9 (6) 7:5 76:23 77:23 78:2,7,18 90 (2) 37:2 78:15 903 (1) 5:8 914 (2) 1:24,24 95-DEPOS (1) 1:24 953-3767 (1) 1:24 96 (1) 6:22 98 (1) 5:11	