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CHAIR EMERY: Well, we will call the February meeting of the Civilian Complaint Review Board to order. First order of business is adoption of the minutes. Anybody have a motion?

COMMR. CAPERS: I will move for adoption.

COMMR. TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIR EMERY: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: Okay, the minutes are adopted.

I just have a couple of things that we can start with -- Sorin, I didn't ask you, are you ready? We're all set? Okay, thank you.

First thing and foremost, yesterday was Mina Malik's one-year anniversary at the Agency.

(Applause.)

CHAIR EMERY: And it was properly, I think, recognized -- first of all at the All-Hands Meeting, but I want to do so similarly tonight with the Board. It's
been an exceptional year, largely due to her leadership and the people she's brought in, and the hard work that they have undertaken, and the people who she inherited who also have rallied to the cause in a very impressive way at the Agency and accomplished what I can only describe as remarkable progress for this Agency. It's not that we don't have a long way to go, and that we aren't going to go a long way more, but Mina gets enormous credit.

And you'll see privately -- just so you know, I don't think it's for public consumption at this point, but it will probably be turned into something for public consumption at some point -- an e-mail that was sent out to Board members, with a kind of summary of the things that have occurred during the last year while Mina has directed the Agency. And therefore, I just think it's important that we publicly and officially recognize Mina's accomplishments for this last year.
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(Applause.)

CHAIR EMERY: She can address anything she wants to say during the Executive Director's Report.

There are a couple of substantive things I wanted to throw out for discussion if members of the Board want to discuss it, it's not necessarily -- we don't have to go into any deep issues, but we sent out a memo -- sent a memo out early today, that I think is something we ought to take cognizance of and that is, when we make decisions as panels that, what we call flip recommendations by staff or investigators. In the past we have -- the Board has simply flipped them and not had any ceremony about that, just passed them on to the New York City Police Department in the form that the Board finalized allegations. These are on specific allegations in our reports. But for the last year or so we have believed and undertaken to respect those recommendations in a new way by explaining
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ourselves to investigators when we flip an
allegation as a matter of courtesy and as
a matter of justification and as a matter
for the integrity of the process of having
those investigators perhaps point out why
we might be wrong in the flip and
pointing out some information in the
record that the panel may have omitted or
failed to recognize, so that there can be
corrections of improper flips if that
occurs.

Now it came up at the All-Hands
Meeting that some of our panels are not
thoroughly or carefully explaining the
basis for flips, and that investigators
want more information, or I should say
more specific information, where possible,
as to the basis for flips. So I would
just urge you that we have staff in these
panels, and hopefully we're going to have
staff with continuity in each of these
panels -- we're working on that -- so that
one person is really responsible for the
whole panel process, and there to answer
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Board questions, and work on Board cases, and be there to draft memos in response to Board actions, and that person can certainly do what I'm trying to urge here. But I think that when we're on panels, it behooves us to really do the best we can to focus in on the reason we're changing a recommendation. Obviously if we're not changing it we don't have to say anything. But if we are changing it and responding, of course, if the investigators come back with some counter-information that may effect our change, to either reconvene or somehow, at least on e-mail, make clear why we changed what we did.

So I just think it's important that we think about this process so that the integrity of this process both is preserved, and second of all, that the hard work that the investigators do to reach recommendations is recognized, and respected, and enough that we explain our results.

Any thoughts on that? Any disagreement?
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Anything we should be doing differently in that regard?

COMMR. TAYLOR: I think that it's a very good recommendation to make it formal. Some of us have been giving our commentary on why we feel that a case should be flipped, but to formalize the process I think is good.

CHAIR EMERY: We don't need a resolution, I don't think, but I think among us we ought to have an understanding that we feel that it's appropriate to be specific as possible about why we're changing a recommendation by an investigator that comes to us. And I think we don't have to do any more than that at this point.

You also have received a memo from the staff about two issues that came up in cases this last month, that are really separate from one another, and that is trying to get some continuity, first of all, in our decisions on discourtesy. And second of all—we can talk about them one
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by one -- thank you, Brian -- trying to
get some understanding of what our role is
in cases where there are allegations of
retaliation for making a complaint to the
CCRБ.

So taking the first one first, the
discourtesy issue, I have found the Board,
in the decisions that I've reviewed-- but of
course I'm not on a lot of the panels where
other Mayoral appointees are on the panels
-- that the Board has been pretty careful
about requiring fairly extreme circumstances
before discourtesies, that are serious
discourtesies, are considered not misconduct
In other words, the situation between a
civilian and/or a complainant and a police
officer has to be pretty extreme in order to
permit -- in order for us to permit or say
that it's not misconduct to use the F word
or other serious words. Now we're not
talking about racial, ethnic, or sexual
words, that really go in the offensive
language
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category. This is the discourtesy category, and I guess the typical one we see regularly is the F word. And the issue is how serious or how intense or how extreme or how pressured the officer is before we would excuse the use of such a word. It certainly doesn't serve de-escalation, which of course is the point of the Department -- the point that the Department emphasizes about the use of words, but there are circumstances where it has been recognized, certainly at the Trial Bureau, that those words are appropriate for taking control of a situation that's a bit out of control.

And so this is an area where I guess panels do it as they see it, you know, it's ad hoc, it's case-by-case, on the one hand. On the other hand, I'm just simply urging that there not be a zero tolerance for discourtesy, but there should be a very, very low tolerance for discourtesy in my view by our decisions. And I'm open to discussion about that. I think, you know,
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people like Sal and Lindsay who've been in the street in situations where they're being abused verbally and otherwise by people in a very intense situation may feel differently about this. And I'm not pretending that I have a patent on the solution here; it's just I don't think as a Board we should only rarely be tolerating the use of such language.

So I throw it open for the Board to discuss what other people's views are on this as well 'cause I don't think, as I said, I don't think I have a patent on this issue.

COMMR. CARCATERRA: If I could just make a couple statements.

CHAIR EMERY: Sure.

COMMR. CARCATERRA: I agree with you that it should be used very sparingly, if it's used at all. I disagree with the fact when you talk about de-escalation. It actually, depending upon when in the situation it's used and how it's used, it can de-escalate the situation right from
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the beginning, because that command said in that manner, with those words, many times stops the forward behavior right at that moment. And again, this is very scenario-based, very specific, and to comment on it in a broader way makes it seem like we don't take it seriously, we really do, and I do.

So I think you have to take each instance and everyone looks at it. The panels I've been on, I think, we've all been on, it's very close, even from my perspective as far as, yeah, that's over the top, or -- and, you know, and we've had one where we said, yeah, she lost it, we get it, we got it, there was a lot going on, it was no good, but she lost it.

But the point I'm making is it's very scenario-based, very specific, and just keeping in mind what you said when you looked at it. But I do believe that in certain situations it really does de-escalate it from the beginning -- many times it does the other way. It depends,
again, the timing of it, when it was used, how it was used, it's very specific to the situation. But keeping it extremely limited and being courteous is always the best way to go, but keeping in mind what I just said how the other ones fit in.

CHAIR EMERY: I agree with you.

Any other thoughts on this?

COMMR. CAPERS: Yes. I think you're both so correct that it's very case-specific and I'm not sure -- other than sort of your suggestions, not much more we can do sort of in general to talk about discourtesy. The only thing I would add is it's also inseparable from the recommendation of punishment. So I think lots of us, as we're looking at discourtesy, depending on the fact pattern and the case specifics, we also factor in whether we're going to recommend a particular penalty or not.

CHAIR EMERY: That makes a lot of sense. Lindsay?

COMMR. EASON: Richard, you and I
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have had this discussion about discourtesy on panels, right, so each case should be --

CHAIR EMERY: That's when you call me names, right?

COMMR. EASON: That's when I use the same voice that I would use in the street when I'm trying to make a point without profanity, 'cause that's my position, I can get my point across without profanity. But if it is used -- we've come a long way with it, there was a point where it was used and it was never recognized as being a discourtesy, we were just allowed to use it. So we've come to the point now where certain agencies and government bodies are allowing police officers to use it, but it should be judged on the individual merits of that particular case.

When we start to say low tolerance, high tolerance, this tolerance, now we may be prejudging or guiding influence of others who may be looking at this. Like I said again, I do not or would not use it. The commanding voice can accomplish the
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same thing with throwing a couple of

profanity-laced comments in there. And as

Sal said, sometimes it can de-escalate and

sometimes it can escalate situations, and

that's why we should judge each case on

the merits of the case.

When there's video, when there's other

stuff, I mean, it's a collusion, foregone

conclusion, it was unnecessary, we have no

problem with that. But I think it should be

approached very carefully because we all

want to be fair to the process.

CHAIR EMERY: Any other comments on

this? I have one other thought that Sal

made me think about, and I think --

COMMR. TAYLOR: I think that most of

the deliberating that we do over

discourtesy is centered around

discourtesy. I think that the overarching

cases where there's a lot going on, where

there's out-of-control situations, we -- I

think all of us make allowances for that.

The ones we're focusing on are the ones

where there's nothing happening and the
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guy says, get the F out of here, go home now. And we can substantiate that that happened and whether there was no reason for it. So those are the kind of discourtesies that we're wholesaling, not the ones that are based on things going on in the moment.

COMMR. EASON: That's the one that you and I were discussing, Richard, not the one where the desk officer said, get the F out of my stationhouse. No, that's never acceptable.

CHAIR EMERY: So I agree. The one thing that Sal said that caused me to think of one other way that we're going to look at this in a general sense, and I agree we can't really look at it in a general sense, it has to be case-specific, is that one of the guiding lines, it seems to me about these judgements is, is the police officer who uses such a word doing it out of disrespect, anger, emotion, frustration, versus doing it in the way that Sal was describing, very thought --
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doing it as a tactic. And you can usually
tell if it's tactic and the person is
being cool-headed about it versus doing it
out of self-indulgence or out of
frustration. And I think that's a kind of
a guiding line for me, at least, and might
make some sense to think about. Bishop?

COMMR. TAYLOR: I was just laughing
about the way a guy might say like, excuse
me, can you please sit the F down, or
something like that. Is that the way, no,
I mean, it's not an appropriate way to do
that I don't think.

CHAIR EMERY: Right.

COMMR. CAPERS: But at the end of the
day, it's a judgement call. It's what we
think the officer intended, it's the way
we think the complainant experienced it,
it's situations where you have
complainants also using profanity,
complaining about the profanity of the
officer. So at the end of the day, it's
so context-specific, I don't know if
there's much more we can say about it.
Proceedings

CHAIR EMERY: Fair enough.

The one thing I would say is the recommendations often come in on these cases with decisions from DCT. And I think it's worth emphasizing, as the memo that Mina distributed emphasizes, that the Trial Bureau decisions are not binding on us, and they're constructive, and they're useful, and they're worth reading, but they're not in any way binding on us. And they shouldn't be binding on us, because we're an independent agency overseeing that whole entire system, and we do what we believe is right, and we're thinking about the best way to discipline officers who violate the patrol guide and other guidelines.

So I don't think -- I think it's important that when we read -- when we hear about legal authority that comes out of the Trial Bureau, we take it for what it's worth. We don't take it like a case law, or something that comes out of a court. Obviously lower courts are less
Proceedings

influential than higher courts, but still it's not quite as persuasive, in my view at least.

On retaliation -- unless there's something more to say about this? Mina, do you want to --

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: No, I think you covered them.

CHAIR EMERY: Okay, good.

On retaliation, I haven't experienced a whole lot of cases where there have been allegations of retaliation, but there are some. And I think that there has been a past practice -- and again I open this up for discussion 'cause I'm not pretending I have the right answer here at all -- there's been a past practice of simply referring retaliation cases -- or allegations of retaliation I should say, allegations of retaliation, to IAB because there has been a view that that is outside our jurisdiction. I don't agree with that. I think that when our investigative processes are tampered with in any way by any witness or any person, we have the
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right to make sure that our investigative
integrity is preserved, and that
retaliation is one of those forms that
potentially undermining our -- the
accuracy and integrity of our
investigation, and that we should fully
investigate that. Either just make an OMN
referral or -- and/or I should say, refer
to IAB at that point with the
investigation that we've done, and
whatever conclusions we may have reached,
or whatever marshalling of the evidence
that we've may articulate so --

COMMR. CORTES-GOMEZ: Wouldn't
retaliation be an abuse of power, which is
--

CHAIR EMERY: It could be an abuse of
authority. It's arguably an abuse of
authority. Traditionally, I think it's
wrong, but traditionally the Agency has
referred these cases to IAB, and I think
that's a mistake. I think that we should
ultimately perhaps refer them to IAB, but
we should investigate them and reach our
own conclusions before we do so

COMMR. CARCATERRA: What kind of numbers are we speaking of 'cause I've never seen one in an of my cases, so I'm just curious as to --

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: They are very small numbers.

COMMR. TAYLOR: Can I just share something. I think that we've seen them, but we've seen them in a different way. 'Cause retaliation is not always planned, it's probably 99 percent not planned. It's when I see you again, and I know -- when an officer gets a CCRB, he knows who he's got a case with. So when I see you again, it's a person that's local or involved in criminal activity again, then there's that opportunity for retaliation.

The other type of retaliation is if there's an interaction, a summons shouldn't have been written, but it was written. It may seem retaliatory to something that the civilian said. So I think that retaliation is kind of captured in
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so many different ways, several different ways.

COMMR. CARCATERA: We do have situations where we've seen officers rearresting drug dealers, let's use that as an example. That's what they're there for, they're selling drugs, that's not retaliation. Would you expect the officer not to go and enforce that again? I'm curious what the wording how we clarify that.

COMMR. CAPERS: Just so I'm clear. I thought he was talking about retaliation for bringing a complaint to CCRB?

CHAIR EMERY: It is, but, you know, there's a hard case there, right. An officer might let somebody off who brought -- who didn't bring a case to CCRB, but an officer may have probable cause to arrest somebody, and not let that person off because they did, in a local situation, bring a case to CCRB. And I'm not sure we can do much about that, if there's probable cause for the arrest, but if the animating force is
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retaliatory, it ought to be noted if we can really find that, maybe there are expressions to that, so it can get tricky. But I think the ordinary cases where somebody gets a summons and there isn't probable cause, and there's evidence that occurred -- not the ordinary cases, the cases that we see -- that that occurs without probable cause.

So in any event, I think it's just worth keeping an eye out because we were alerted to it. And it's something that we don't want to let get away from us because we are somehow hesitant to do the proper investigation on an allegation of retaliation.

Do you want -- Mina, do you want to say something about the Richard Jerome Request and the outcome of the monitors, the new procedures that have--I just thought of this--the new procedures that have arisen from our discussions of the monitor about --

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: It's something
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that is still pending.

CHAIR EMERY: It is? All right. We
don't have to go into that until we know
it's final. If anybody wants to talk about
it in an Executive Session, we can report on
that, but it may not be ready for public.

Now I guess that is all that I had to
discuss in the Chair's Report. I'm a
little interested to discuss truncations,
you know, and Mina's statistics will
highlight the fact that truncations are
still a very high percentage of our cases.
And one of the things that I think we
should be thinking about, at the staff
level, at least, but certainly the Board as
well, is -- and I think it's hard -- is
how we address truncations. Whether
there's a way that cases are being
truncated that shouldn't be, which I don't
think is happening, but I just wonder about
it because it's traditionally been very
high, and it continues to be very high even
though we're doing investigations so much
faster.
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COMMR. TAYLOR: Can I just say, it's an age-old problem of classification. If you can find a way to come up with the proper classification, truncation would not be as high.

CHAIR EMERY: What do you mean by that?

COMMR. TAYLOR: Because, we're -- all right, just pulling this, not exactly, cases that are withdrawn, right, that truncs, right. Victims that are uncooperative, that truncs, right. That's not a true classification what we're considering a real truncation rate, you know what I mean? 'Cause, I mean, truncation, if you think about it, what would be a true truncation?

CHAIR EMERY: I would think withdrawing is a true truncation. Where uncooperative may not be. Where a lawyer says please do not go to the Agency and talk.

COMMR. TAYLOR: But it's lumped in, so it does move the numbers. So I think
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we have to be meticulous about classification, that's what I'm thinking.

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: So I think we're actually doing that. And I'll take this opportunity to call on Robia. Robia,aren't we classifying the truncations in that way?

MS. CHARLES: Yeah. So we're actually in the research process right now, and it's one -- it's actually one of three of the highest priorities that we're working on.

CHAIR EMERY: To try and analyze truncations and --

MS. CHARLES: To try to understand what types of situations they come from and what we can do in particular cases.

CHAIR EMERY: Good.

COMMR. TAYLOR: Can I ask another question. So can you kind of explain, or anyone can explain, obviously when you see a high truncation rate it suggests that maybe something's wrong, right, for lack of a better explanation?
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CHAIR EMERY: People giving up, that's what it suggests, right?

COMMR. TAYLOR: And which historically has made us look like, maybe we're not doing a good job. So what would truncation look like -- what should it look like, what should it really being telling us? What should the truncation rate really be telling us that should send up flags and send off alarms?

CHAIR EMERY: Well I suppose if we are truncating cases too early, that would be one thing, and I don't think we are, but that would be one thing that it might indicate. I suppose it would raise questions about whether people are being properly treated when they come in and given the respect and due that they're entitled to in order to want to proceed. I suppose -- you know, these are the self-analytical ways that we would look at truncations, as opposed to there could be all kinds of external forces. All kinds of things that could enhance it.
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The case, I think people sometimes are angry in the beginning, and I think the main reason for truncations is that people are immediately angry, and then they have a little time go by, even a week, and their perspective on the matter changes and I'm not sure they want to spend the time and effort to do even now what they have to do, which is not nearly as much as they used to over a nine-month period, over a two- or three-month period to get the case to a point where it's fully investigated. And I suppose other people are afraid.

So I mean, you're right, there are a lot of reasons that truncation -- that underlie truncations. And I agree with your analysis, and what Robia is doing now, which is to try and get past the gauze of that word.

COMMR. CAPERS: Can I ask, this might be related. I seem to recall that we have in place, sort of, periodic checks and audits about truncations, so they're
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reviewed and also we looked to see if investigators have a disproportionate number of truncations so maybe particular investigators are truncating cases they shouldn't be.

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: That's correct. The team attorneys work on that.

CHAIR EMERY: And also when we get cases, you know, that Roger is signing off on truncations after having analyzed the particular file. So there's kind of a double level of audit initially. I mean, probably -- I think Robia is looking into this as well what she's doing, we're doing a real audit of truncations by analyzing what's going on.

So I don't think we're accepting these stats in the form that they're presented to us, we're getting behind them.

COMMR. TAYLOR: But I like the way you put it, removing the gauze over the term. Because it may be a cost of doing business. You said something, that I always forget but it's so true, you're
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angry at first. Couple weeks, you're like, you know what, it's not worth it. I'm not wasting my time going down and taking off work, doing this, doing that, and that's a large percentage of the cases.

CHAIR EMERY: Right. Or somebody may talk to them and say, you know, what happened here was your fault. Who knows, you don't know what's behind these complaints, so it's complicated. It's obviously a deeply human situation, where lots of things change fast.

COMMR. TAYLOR: I just think that some kind of way the label of truncation should not be punitive to the agencies production. That's what it always has been, the overarching thing, well yeah, but look at your truncation. As if that's the tell-all of our effectiveness, and it's not.

CHAIR EMERY: Good. So I believe -- any other comments before we move on to the Executive Director's Report?

(No response.)
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CHAIR EMERY: Do you want to do public comments first? Let's do the Executive Director's Report tonight first and then we will do public comment. All right.

COMMR. TAYLOR: Richard, you might want to have the staff change this 'cause every month we do this, we switch it.

CHAIR EMERY: It's funny. We can comment on -- if people need to -- I think it's good to have people here for monthly reports so if they want to comment on it, they can.

COMMR. TAYLOR: Absolutely.

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: Good evening, ladies and gentleman. I'm Mina Malik, the Executive Director of the Civilian Complaint Review Board. I would like to thank Hugh Hamilton, Director of Program Development; Maureen Johnson, Director of Educational Services; and Vaughn Toney, President and CEO of the Friends of Crown Heights Educational Center for assisting us in being here tonight. I would also like to thank Brandon Emmanuel for his special technical assistance and setting
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us up tonight, recognize Samuel Clark from Assemblywoman Richardson's office, as well as Laurie Wang from the Speaker's office.

Tonight I'm going to discuss the operations of our agency and provide you with highlights from our Monthly Statistical Report. I note that our monthly and year-to-date statistics are the same for this month, and for the full review of our agency's monthly statistics, please visit our website.

In January 2016, the CCRB initiated 356 new complaints, which reflects an increase from 334 in December and 265 in January of 2015, and you can see it on the chart above us in the background here. It is important to note that New York City experienced extremely bad weather during December 2014 to mid-January 2015, around the time of the officers slow down which continued to be noticeable in February of 2015. The January of 2016 complaint number is a decrease from 384 in January of 2014.
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By category of allegation, when comparing January 2016 to January 2015 during the officers slow down, discourtesy complaints have increased by 32 percent, force complaints by four percent, offensive language complaints by 18 percent, and abusive authority complaints by 52 percent. When comparing January 2016 to December 2015, discourtesy complaints have increased by ten percent, force complaints by four percent, abusive authority complaints by ten percent, and offensive language complaints have decreased by 26 percent.

In January, the CCRB total open docket was 1,005 cases. By the end of January, 544 of these cases were the Investigations Division representing 54 percent of the total, up from 537 in November. Of the total docket, 299 cases were pending Board and/or Executive Staff review, representing 30 percent, which was down from 340 cases pending in December.

The Mediation Program handled 145
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cases representing 14 percent of the open
docket, under the direction of Lisa Cohen,
and that was up from 132 cases in
December. There were an additional 17
cases on DA hold in January. The January
2016 docket includes 12 reopened cases,
eight of these cases are active
investigations and four are pending Board
review.

The CCRB continues to close its cases
more efficiently. Of the cases that
remain in the CCRB active docket, 94
percent have been opened for four months
or less, and 99 percent have been opened
for seven months or less. These dockets
continue to represent the best docket
numbers in the agencies 23-year history.

Investigators closed 134 full
investigations for the month of January
compared to 139 for the same period last
year, which resulted in 3.6 percent fewer
full investigations. Year-to-date,
meaning for the month of January, the
average days to close a full investigation
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has decreased 56 percent from 2014 before the reforms were implemented.

In January 2016, the CCRB fully investigated 35 percent of the cases it closed and resolved 41 percent of the cases it closed. The Agency continues to face the challenge of truncations, which we just discussed, with a rate of 58 percent for the month of January. I would like to now highlight other key specifics for January 2016.

Although down two percent from January -- from December 2015, the January 2016 case substantiation rate of 28 percent marks the tenth straight month that the CCRB had substantiated more than 20 percent of the cases it fully investigates. The CCRB also substantiated 16 percent of its allegations in January.

With regard to fully investigated allegations in January, the Board substantiated four percent of force allegations, 26 percent of abusive authority allegations, 11 percent of
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discourtesy allegations, and seven percent
of the offensive language allegations.

In Figure 4, investigations with
video evidence, substantiated allegations
in 33 percent of the cases, compared to 25
percent of substantiated cases in which
video was not available. The discipline
rate for non-APU cases was 91 percent in
December for cases in which policeman's
conduct was substantiated by the Board and
sent to the Police Department Advocate's
Office with penalty recommendations. The
Department's decline-to-prosecute rate for
non-APU cases for this time period was
five percent.

In January, the Police Commissioner
finalized penalty decisions against eight
officers; five of these were guilty
verdicts after trial, one by our
Administrative Prosecution Unit, and one
was resolved by a plea. The APU has
conducted trials against 18 officers in
January.

The average number of days it takes
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for panels to vote after they've received
a complete case load has continued to
decrease over time. It took 17 days for
the first quarter of 2016, below the
Agency's benchmark of 21 days.

Finally, to mark the anniversary of
my first year as Executive Director of
this Agency, I would like to highlight a
few changes that have taken place this
year. The Investigations Unit decreased
the average number of days to close a full
investigation by 28 percent compared to
2014, and ended the year with 95 percent
of the active docket open for four months
or less.

The APU tried 130 officers during
2015, which is an increase of 59 percent
from 2014, and closed 182 cases, an
increase of 65 percent from 2014. The
Policy Unit developed an Automated
Internal Performance Tracking System for
the first time in this Agency's history,
and finished a report regarding
warrantless entries, the first of
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approximately six major forthcoming reports on various important issues related to police misconduct.

The Outreach team gave 272 presentations, visited more educational institutions, precinct council meetings, probationary groups, homeless organizations, residents of NYCHA, and LGBTQ organizations than any other year in the history of this Agency.

In our efforts to make the CCRB process more accessible to all New Yorkers, as of January 2016 our Complaint Walk-In Forms are now available in Arabic, Chinese, Haitian/Croole, and Russian. These additions help to round out the Agency's language access and compliment forms that have traditionally been available only in English and Spanish. We also offer live interpretation and website translation in eight languages for complaint forms online.

On February 1, 2016 I'm proud to say that the Agency extended its Community
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Partners Initiative in partnership with the New York City Council, in which CCRB will hold special evening office hours in participating Council Member's District offices across the entire city, the five boroughs, to accommodate individuals who do not have access to our main office during regular office hours.

The Council Members participating in this very important and long-awaited initiative, include Speaker Mark-Viverito, Council Member Gibson, Council Member Richards of Queens, Council Member Rose of Staten Island, Council Member Menchaca of Brooklyn, and Council Member Cornegy of Brooklyn. And I want to thank the Council, the Speaker, and all the Council Members participating in this very important initiative.

The Agency is on the verge of issuing its first report this year, and we plan to have various other reports forthcoming and will keep you informed.

As we talked about earlier, it was my
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one-year anniversary yesterday, and since
I took office and was in this position as
of February 9th of 2015, this Agency has
gone under a tremendous transformation,
and it started under the Chair when he
took office in June -- July of 2014.

And I really want to recognize a few
people who have been part of this
tremendous C-change, who have made this
happen. And I want to start with the
Executive team who's always been there,
and has always made sure that whatever we
wanted to do, and whatever we needed to
get done, got done. And so I thank Brian
Connell, Thomas Kim, Robia Charles,
Jonathan Darche, for doing all the hard
work and making sure that our initiatives
have gotten done. I also want to thank
the people who are here tonight as part of
the Agency, and I recognize that each and
every one of you have played a very
important role. And that's Nina Mickens,
Director of Case Management; Chris Duerr
and Winsome Thelwell, who are the Deputies
Proceedings of Investigations, who are not here; Vivian Cedeno, Deputy Chief Prosecutor of the Prosecution Unit; Lisa Cohen, Head of Mediation; Nicole Junior; Brian Krist; Lindsey Flook; Janos Marton; and our new Press Secretary, Edison Alban. And I want to thank all the members of the Outreach Unit who are here today. Without you all of these changes and these accomplishments would not be possible.

And finally I want to thank the Chair, Mr. Emery, and this entire Board because without your continued support, all of these positive changes in this Agency would not be possible either.

(Applause.)

CHAIR EMERY: One further piece of information -- thank you, Mina, that's very important.

One further piece of information that we should go into before we have public comment. Can I call on Brian Krist to give us a litigation update. There are a number of outstanding litigations that
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this Board, I don't think, has recently been informed of, and Brian has the overview of all this. Thanks, Brian.

MR. KRIST: You're welcome.

Within the confines of most of this being open and pending litigation, of course, we do have a number of defensive and affirmative matters pending in courts.

Affirmatively, we are seeking to get information from as many sources as we can and as effectively and quickly as we can, and we've been enforcing subpoenas initially on the issue with great success, and also challenging some decisions that in particular other State agencies have made denying access to information for us. So those issues are continuing, they are pending in court at the moment.

And also defensively, in order to encourage people to give us information, in a full and frank way, we've also been ensuring that when people give us information in confidence, that we're holding it in confidence when we can, when
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it's appropriate to do so. So we've been engaging in those efforts in the courts as well.

CHAIR EMERY: So there is also some pending FOIL litigation. The 50-h litigation in the Luongo matter, maybe you can just report on the status of those, since they're very much at the center of our activities. Maybe describe what they are quickly and then tell us where both of those cases are in the system.

MR. KRIST: Certainly. There are actually three pending Article 78 actions concerning FOIL decisions in the Agency. Two of them filed by the Legal Aid Society, both captioned Luongo v. Records Access Officer, one in Manhattan the other in Queens.

CHAIR EMERY: Where's the third?

MR. KRIST: In Brooklyn, Hughes, Hubbard & Reed v. CCRB.

In the Luongo cases, the Legal Aid Society has asked for, what they've characterized as, limited statistical
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information, concerning two active members of the New York City Police Department. The Law Department is representing us in those matters. In the Manhattan Luongo case, decision was issued in July of 2015, ordering the Agency to produce what the court characterized as limited statistical information. That case is currently stayed pending appeal, and it's due sometime before the end of May.

In the Queens case, again also Luongo v. Records Access Officer, decision was issued last month, again demanding disclosure of what was characterized limited statistical information, and that case is being considered for appeal at this time.

CHAIR EMERY: So let me ask you quickly. When you say limited statistical information, Justice Schlesinger in New York, which I think was adopted by the Queens Court as well, required the production exactly of what of that particular officer, whose name can remain
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not part of this record.

MR. KRIST: A compilation of the number of substantiated complaints against the officers is at issue in those cases, the number of times the Agency had sought discipline against the officers, and I believe the outcome of those attempts to seek discipline.

CHAIR EMERY: Did it involve any Police Department information or was it only CCRB information?

MR. KRIST: From us, it concerns CCRB information, but it's obviously information -- in the course of disciplinary process, it was provided in the Police Department.

CHAIR EMERY: Did it require production of the nature of the complaints or any of the specifics of the complaints?

MR. KRIST: It is requiring the outcomes of them, but nothing -- not in terms of who a complainant was or what product from the court. It was particularly a distinction between work
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product and statistics in the Manhattan
Luongo case.

CHAIR EMERY: Did it have the dates
of the complaints? What the nature of
allegation was? Other than just saying
force or abusive authority, did it have
facts? That, I think, is what's --

MR. KRIST: It did not include dates.
In that regard it was a statistical
compilation essentially asking us to run a
database check in producing numbers.

CHAIR EMERY: And the third case,
with Hughes Hubbard, what's the status of
that?

MR. KRIST: That case is still
pending the initial findings in the
Supreme Court in Kings County. Hughes,
Hubbard & Reed has filed seeking records
concerning Detective Louis Scarcella.

CHAIR EMERY: Oh, I see, in Brooklyn?
MR. KRIST: Yes.

CHAIR EMERY: Just one more question.
And by the way, if I'm asking you anything
that is beyond, just say you can't answer,
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whatever it is.

The case against -- that we have seeking 50-h hearings against the Comptroller. We -- at the first level, the Supreme Court denied our request, believe it or not, to get 50-h hearings -- transcripts on people who have made complaints to the Agency, their statements to the Comptroller; is that a correct statement?

MR. KRIST: Yes, it is.

CHAIR EMERY: And what's the status of that case at this point?

MR. KRIST: As you stated, initially the court below had found that while we are a City Agency and obviously everyone one here is a City official in that official regard, the court determined that the Board members themselves were, yourselves, are members of the public in regard of making this request.

We obviously disagree with that because we are asking in everyone's official capacity here. We have sought
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reargument of that decision, and we've filed Notice of Appeal on it. So the motion to reargue is still pending, it's been fully submitted at this point, but we await the court's decision.

CHAIR EMERY: Okay. Anything else, any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: Okay. Thank you, Brian. Appreciate it.

So unless anyone has anything else at this point, we'll go to public comment.

EXEC. DIR. MALIK: Actually, Brian Connell has the Outreach Report.

CHAIR EMERY: Okay, we can do that now and then we'll have public comment. Thanks, Brian.

MR. CONNELL: Good evening, everyone. For the Outreach Report, 2016 Year-to-Date Presentations, the Outreach Unit achieved, yet again, the highest mark in recent years, since 2011, with 54 presentations in January of this year. Presentations by borough, Queens has 26; Manhattan and the
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Bronx have 11; Brooklyn has six; and Staten Island has none to date.

By precinct, we covered 30 precinct areas in just one month; 12 in Queens, nine in Manhattan, five in Brooklyn, four in the Bronx. Half of these precincts had high levels of CCRB complaints, that is, more than 50 complaints annually in 2015, which shows that we are focusing on areas where complaints are at the highest.

By organizations and locations, the majority of the presentations took place at schools, Adult Learning Center Programs, which hosted 17 events in January, and in libraries, which hosted 11 events. We paid attention to special groups, which we have specific concerns from the CCRB; LGBTQ community, four events; ARCHES/Probationers, six events; NYCHA, three events; Homeless Organizations, two; Precinct Council Meetings, we did five; Community Boards, we conducted five; and Youth Groups we did one. That's a total of 26 presentations
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to these groups within the first month of the year, and already that represents 25 percent of the total presentations made to those same groups in 2015. We'll continue to expand the Outreach efforts by focusing on these groups and others citywide.

For the staffing update, with the recent increase in funding that the Outreach Unit received, we've expanded the Unit and have almost reached the staffing level budgeted, which is six positions; five Outreach Coordinators and one Director. We currently have four Outreach Coordinators on board and we've hired one candidate to fill the last vacant Outreach position. The new employee is scheduled to start in the beginning of March. We have selected an Outreach Director whom we hope to hire in the upcoming weeks. This would complete the staffing for the Outreach Unit.

Also in regard to staffing, I would like to introduce our newest member of the Outreach Unit, Yojaira Alvarez, who
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started three weeks ago.

(Indication by Ms. Alvarez.)

MR. CONNELL: Thank you and welcome aboard.

She has been training to do CCRB Outreach presentations and has already conducted presentations. She's a graduate of Columbia University, a fluent Spanish speaker, and has previously done community outreach in neighborhoods where the majority of our CCRB complainants reside.

There was one notable event that we had regarding outreach. It's the Hetrick-Martin Institute LGBT Bronx Youth Summit, that took place on January 30, 2016. This event was also sponsored by the City Council Speaker Melissa Mark-Viverito, Council Member Menchaca, and Council Member Richie Torres, among others. Three members of our Outreach Unit were present for that event, it was very successful and well attended.

That concludes my report.

COMMR. EASON: Brian, what, if you
can tell me now or later, are the current status of the efforts to get before -- recruit class before they graduate, or sometime after they enter outreach to do a presentation to them?

MR. CONNELL: We have not had a conclusion on that. We did raise it at the LGBT Advisory Panel, and they're willing to give us some assistance in pursuing that.

COMMR. EASON: Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you, Brian. Are we ready for public comment? I believe the first person is Dan Purcell.

Is that a selfie or is that of us?

MR. PURCELL: It's of you. I like to have my own video.

COMMR. EASON: You have to make sure that you can see --

MR. PURCELL: You look pretty good, you're forefront.

Well thank you for tonight. I don't want to be full of congratulations, but this is -- I moved to New York six months
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ago, most recently I was in Honolulu, Hawaii, on a couple of islands in Hawaii, and I was a regular at the Police Commission Meetings, so I can tell you this was a breath of fresh air. When I would go into those meetings, they were at police headquarters. When I first started going, they would screen you, search you, ask for photo -- valid photo ID before going in with the Chief of Police. And the whole room is filled with police officers, with the exception of the Board, and virtually no one from the public was there. I was able to get that changed because it was a Violation of Meetings Law, and so they no longer ask for IDs, they no longer search you, they no longer send you through screening, and you can go in and make some improvements.

I, a member of the, public, up until six months ago when I moved to New York, attend government meetings full-time as a member of the public. Quite literally full-time; Boards and Commissions, State
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Legislators, Supreme Court Hearings, you name it. Literally three, four meetings a day for years. I moved here out of interest to follow the United Nations, and that is my primary reason for being here in New York. Normally I would be attending meetings like yours regularly, City Council, all kinds of Boards and Commissions. I will be attending those, I've been following your group since prior to moving out here. But I will be following your group.

I had submitted, I had published a one-minute video on an unfortunate incident of Precinct 17 that I had submitted by e-mail to Brian, but my understanding is you're a quasi-traditional lobby, and he didn't forwarded it to you, I had asked if you would view that one-minute video prior to this meeting, but I understand you didn't view it, you didn't receive it. In the video I was told for the second time to just leave the precinct headquarters when
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I was inquiring about something that's very, very, very important to me, and very important to about 7 billion people on the face of this earth, and that is the this, kind of, security zone that surrounds the United Nations, which is the City of New York public sidewalks.

Protests are very limited. When you walk into the 17th Precinct, which covers the United Nations, they hand out this really shoddy tri-fold brochure filled with grammatical errors, misspelling, misinformation, and questionable, maybe legal, statements coming from the Police Department. And when it gets to the United Nations area it says that basically the area around the perimeter of the United Nations is restricted for security concerns as per the United Nations Treaty Agreement with the United States.

And so they just say there's designated demonstration areas, kind of in these little parks, which are away and removed. So when you walk into Precinct
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17, they don't tell you that either they have the legal discretion to decide whether the people who are there are protesting. The head of Community Affairs there, who refused to answer my questions, I was shouted at to leave the precinct, makes you believe that this is way over his pay scale, way over his head, these are international treaties, this is the United States, this is the United Nations, these are treaties from the 40s, you know, which I have since found out is not true.

CHAIR EMERY: Let me interrupt you there for a second because there are two things that you're talking about here. One of which has something to do with us, the other of which has nothing to do with us.

Obviously the underlying treaty issues and the Police Department's regulatory control of the United Nations is something that we have nothing, no jurisdiction over whatsoever. The extent to which you were mistreated at the
precinct is something about which you can certainly complain, and we can take your complaint tonight, and we can take the video as part of a complaint, and have you -- have that video and investigate that entire interaction, because you have every right, presumably, to be treated just as any other member of the public when you go into the precinct. So that part of this, we are perfectly willing and it's our duty to address.

I don't think spending time here tonight, with all do respect, on the issue of the underlying question of what the Police Department's obligations either are or are not, given the treaties, is an issue which you'll get any satisfaction from us about. I think maybe the OIG might have something where you can go, you could complain to Commissioner's Office, you could complain to -- I think there's sections of the Police Department devoted to the United Nations and to those types of patrols. So if you have a brief with
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them, that's all well and good, but you're not going to get any traction with that here tonight.

MR. PURCELL: I understand the purview of this Board, but I will tell you that these are constitutional issues. And we have coming up in two weeks, we have Black Lives Matter protesting at the United Nations with Native Americans. So I would encourage at least some of you, if you can, to get down and observe because what you might experience down there when that protest occurs is violations by officers of your Police Department down there.

This is very concerning because I can't get a straight and legal answer about whether I'm even entitled to walk down that sidewalk as a member of the public, and I shouldn't have to get a law degree to find out that answer, where I can legally walk down a New York City sidewalk in front of the United Nations. And the Community Affairs Office there is
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not helping that. And so -- and the NYPD is the quasi Police Department and sometimes military for the United Nations headquarters, they don't have jails in there, they just have security guards, so this is definitely the purview of the New York Police Department.

And I'm talking about what occurs, not behind the fence of the organization that has complete immunity as an organization. As an organization has immunity in the case of Haiti, 10,000 people dieing of Cholera, hundreds of thousands infected by a U.N. camp drained their Cholera-infested toilets directly into the river that was the drinking water in Haiti, they have claimed legal immunity as an organization. I'm not talking about the individual immunity of the people who work for the United Nations, who are immune from all laws of the world in the case of raping, sodomizing young boys in Central African Republic.

So we have an entity there, but the
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New York Police Department is prohibiting people from protesting on the City sidewalks in front of that area, they're telling you you cannot --

CHAIR EMERY: I would suggest to you that you talk -- this is an issue that very well may interest the New York Civil Liberties Union. And it makes a lot of sense -- there's a representative here tonight from the New York Civil Liberties Union on the list, Becca Cadoff. You should sit down and talk with Becca Cadoff and see whether there's any basis 'cause they're interested in demonstrations and preserving the First Amendment rights so people could demonstrate outside of the United Nations. They have a long history, when I worked there we did a lot of representation of people who were at the -- who were demonstrating outside of the U.N., they have a long tradition of making sure that people have that right. And I think, but right here you're barking up the wrong tree. And you're time is really
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up, so thank you very much for your --
feel free to make a complaint, if you
wish, about what happened at the precinct.

MR. PURCELL: I will close, and thank
you. I would respectfully disagree that this
isn't related, and I will close by saying if
anyone -- this is foresight on your part,
it's coming up in two weeks, February 17th to
19th, it's three days at the United Nations.

CHAIR EMERY: Good notice, we
appreciate that.

MR. PURCELL: Just wrapping this up,
and I can think of no two groups that have
more standing to exercise their
constitutional rights than black Americans
who were enslaved, and Native Americans
who definitely suffered genocide, and
black Americans who suffered genocide as
well, this is critically important. I do
believe it's under your purview.

Thank you for your time this evening,
and I will be attending these meetings in
the future. Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you, Mr. Purcell
MR. O'GRADY: There are two typos. Page 36, line 15, "April," it makes no sense. The month of April, I think it's 7A administrator is the word I used. Page 37, line 20, "that's the way" should be, that's where -- that's where Sodom exists.

Okay, now Tenant B -- telephonic impersonations, telephone guises. Tenant B impersonates Tenant A, building premises E, over telephone. Over telephone orders tens of thousands of dollars of merchandise shipped to Tenant A. Building superintendent daughter inquires why so much merchandise shipped to lobby. Merchandise company demands payment from Tenant A, threatens lawsuit unless merchandise is paid for. This merchandise is shipped or ordered over the telephone.

Building condemned by City of New York. Rebuilt as a residential, rebuilt from ground, original building that is completely disassembled.

I have the name of the Chinese
bankruptcy City Director. This Negra developer pushed the Chinese bankruptcy City Director back into a closet and said the tenant voted him back on the premises. The senior tenant -- the fact is, the senior tenants put this Negra developer off the property twice through 111 Centre Street.

Corporation Counsel indicated in their summary, tenants vote on whether the Negra developer who pocketed $200,000 return to the property, they supposed to vote on that. Corporation Counsel has removed this Negra developer from the property. Corporation Counsel installed their job foreman for the building premises.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you, sir. Sam Clark from Assemblywoman Richardson's office. Thank you very much for being here.

MR. CLARK: Thank you all. My name is Sam Clark, I'm the Community Relations Officer for Assemblywoman
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Diana Richardson. She sends her greetings, salutations, but she's sorry she couldn't be here. At this moment she's up in Albany fighting for her District.

Again, welcome to our District, and thank you for the great work you're doing.

Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you very much for having us.

Any other business? Committee, any other Committee issues?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: No. So unless anybody from the Board wants anything discussed or anything to add or subtract?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: Okay. So I believe we can make a motion to adjourn to Executive Session.

COMMR. CAPERS: So moved.

COMMR. TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIR EMERY: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: We have a bunch of
Proceedings

Executive Session matters that we have to handle tonight. Just a few things, not a lot. So let's get something to eat and then come back.

(Time noted: 7:48 p.m.)
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