

OPOC Regular Meeting Minutes

5/2/17

Welcome

Commissioner Deb Conklin welcomed everyone. Commissioners Scott Richter and Ladd Smith were present. Commissioner Jenny Rose had an excused absence.

Ordinance Discussion with Council Member Breean Beggs

Council Member Beggs provided an update on the Ordinance. He said typically management puts together a memo saying here are the items we want to discuss in bargaining for changes in the new contract, and the Guild responds with their list. The two attorneys bargain, and reach a tentative agreement. That agreement goes to City Council. If the Council passes that tentative agreement, they then change the Ordinance to reflect the terms of that agreement.

Even though there's a presumption that things from the last agreement will carry over into the new, it is not guaranteed. Management prerogatives (items that don't affect daily working conditions) don't have to be bargained for, and the Guild can't insist on them being included in the next contract even if they are in the current contract. The last time around, the bargaining teams from management and the Guild mixed in a lot of management prerogatives into the bargaining agreement. Once they got the new agreement and passed the ordinance, you couldn't do much to change it. This time in proposing ordinance revisions, we divided it into management prerogatives and mandatory bargaining issues, but we did not get 4 votes to pass the revision ahead of the bargaining.

Council wrote a letter to the Mayor making it clear that Council wanted independent closing reports on all investigations and independent investigations if the police department didn't do the full Internal Affairs (IA) investigation. The Mayor said we need something more specific – either you have to commit to passing something with 4 votes, or say that you won't pass an ordinance until the union negotiations are over. This latest draft meets most of the concerns that I've heard from the Commissioners and the OPO.

We've gotten detailed language requests over the year, hundreds of them, and we've incorporated many of them. Council hasn't voted on this draft, but generally the feedback is pretty positive.

Conklin then said that her understanding of the plan is to have a draft that at least 4 Council Members have said they support, even though there hasn't been a vote, and then that draft gets used by the administration to do the negotiating.

Logue said it has been a very painful process in OPO. We have spent untold amounts of hours working on different drafts. The bottom line is, we're pretty close. He said the city charter has specific language about what the Ombudsman's Office is established "in order to." and it's different in the draft ordinance. Beggs responded that he doesn't think that there's anything that conflicts with the charter;

that the charter is the core of it, and the ordinance is supposed to expand out, and then policies and procedures expand out further.

Logue said he had a concern about having to publish a closing report where he doesn't have access to all the facts. Conklin said you'll never know everything, and here's the best we can do under the circumstance. Beggs said it's the community telling the OPO "tell us what you think happened, with the best evidence you have." They want a civilian's view of what happened.

Logue said he and Beggs agree completely on closing reports. He has been advocating for the same amount of protections for removal process of the Ombudsman as has been newly placed for removal of a Commissioner. That hasn't been taken into consideration. Then we add technical language that says "you have to do this" but the Ombudsman could be removed if he doesn't do that based on a simple majority vote. He'd love to give his opinion. He doesn't want to get caught up in an ordinance that gets so technical that he can't accomplish it and could be removed for it.

Conklin said her conversations with the public have been similar to what she hears Breean saying, "we thought Proposition (Prop) 1 would result in an Ombuds office that would tell us what happened, to the best we can figure out what happened." It seems to her that this is our best shot at trying to do that. She said she heard his concern about what he could be removed for, and maybe we could do some work on that rather than on this part, because it seems this part is about trying to give the public what she hears them asking for.

Beggs said employees in the Ombuds office have a lot of protections under city policy and law, and they have constitutional protections. What we found out was the Commissioners had zero protection; none under city policy, city law, or under the Constitution. He did add some language that would provide some protections for them. There are existing robust protections for city employees, including the Ombudsman.

Richter said that Prop 1 passed overwhelmingly. He said the issue is that you have different interpretations of Prop 1 and you will have a problem with getting everybody on the same page as far as what the interpretation of Prop 1 is. He disagrees with Conklin's statement as it came out that she is talking to the entire community – you're talking to a segment of the community, so you can't base what you're hearing from the community as that's what the entire community is saying. He doesn't think anybody can speak to that. Conklin said that none of us hear from the entire community. After further discussion she said we're going to move on.

Beggs said that he spent a lot of time creating power for the office, but not mandates, so they can do things, or not. In the past, OPO has been told by the police department (PD) "You can't do that" because it's not authorized in the ordinance. He heard loud and clear from OPO that given staffing and expectations, they didn't want to feel like they had been mandated to do things like independent investigations. It's written to broaden the power and discretion of the OPO - not to burden it.

Conklin said it's already 4:30pm, and she is going to start focusing on the red portions of the document that Logue has the most concerns about. Logue asked "does OPOC exist to empower the work of OPO,

or is the OPO in existence to empower the work of the OPOC?” It doesn’t matter to him; he just needs to know. The way he reads the draft is that the OPOC Coordinator will coordinate how the Ombudsman provides the assistance to the OPOC. Beggs said the intent is to have the Coordinator assist OPOC, and if she doesn’t have enough to do, she can assist the OPO.

Conklin said to Logue that his question is not an either/or question; this relationship is more complex than that. There is a sense that OPOC is over OPO because it does hire and fire the Ombuds. On the other hand, the Ombudsperson is the specialist, with specific skills and understanding, whereas the OPOC commissioners are probably lay people who have less understanding and experience. There’s an expectation that the OPO will help educate the Commissioners, but the Commissioners will hire the position and take responsibility for making sure that the OPO is doing the work the citizens expect.

Logue said he agreed with that 100%, but there’s a difference between being empowered to do the job and having to ask approvals, and placing approvals for the ability to do the job on the Commission. He said we are an office of 2, and we don’t have the people or the time to start adding a layer of bureaucracy. He wants to be empowered to “see the thing and do the thing”, which is kind of how we’ve been doing it all along, without violating the ordinance. Give him the power to do the work in a timely fashion. There’s 45 days of bureaucracy added throughout this, which is going to slow down our process.

Conklin said let’s deal with that when we get there in the document; she doesn’t want to miss the part about reconciliation. Logue said he was told that this was removed from the Ordinance, but it hasn’t been. Beggs said the last line under mediations says that nothing in this ordinance precludes the OPO and OPOC from offering reconciliation services beyond mediation. So again, it creates space for future people if they want to do it, but it’s not an expectation.

Logue said Beggs and I have talked about this and we understand the other’s opinions. He asked Beggs to attend because he wanted him to hear the Commissioners’ opinions. He wanted him to hear that it wasn’t just me saying this. This is turning into a Logue vs. Beggs thing and he doesn’t think that’s correct, because we’ve had some very professional conversations. My 2 big things I cared about: inclusion in the IA process and the ability to ask questions, and the certification process, are there. Everything else is minutiae.

Logue said some of the things he highlighted are because he thinks the language is inflammatory, and it’s going to make it harder for the city to bargain with the police. Things like: “we’re doing this report to reduce future harm.” When you tell that to a police officer who doesn’t feel like he or she is out there causing harm on a regular basis, that’s inflammatory, and it’s going to unbalance those scales a little bit. In a previous version of the ordinance, we used language like we write reports to improve police services, training and policy. That’s a different way to say the same thing, but it’s less inflammatory. It’s on City Council to determine whether that’s the best language to use to get to the bargaining table and achieve what they’re trying to achieve.

Conklin said that’s a good point, and she also thinks it’s important to recognize that where the language is, it was talking about policies and procedures, and never an investigation of a specific complaint or a

person. Beggs said the language “future harm” is not fault-based; it’s injury-based. Portland has been leading the way on this. They’ve said, of course, we want our officers to follow the law, but we want to go beyond that. Officers can follow the law and kill people, which causes harm, but there are steps that can be taken, so that even if the officer had the right to kill the person, you can do policies, training and procedures that reduce the chance of someone dying, even if they legitimately could have been killed. Reduction of future harm is a public health term. The intent is to get beyond good and bad, and have fewer people shot, including fewer officers, civilians, and victims of crimes. It’s not just the victims but the officers who suffer PTSD even though they were legitimately involved. At the end of the day there may be changes to the language in the negotiations, although hopefully the core will be there.

Conklin noted the time of 4:45pm and proposed that if Commissioners have specific points of view, let’s be sure to address that now, and if Beggs has specific questions for Commissioners, she would like to also do that.

Richter said that in no way should the OPO embolden the OPOC. The OPOC is the community role and the community voice which adds muscle behind the OPO when he needs it. And when the Ombudsman has questions on where to go, it’s the OPOC that would give him the guidance, but that guidance cannot be mistaken for experience.

Beggs said he would love to hear ongoing feedback from the majority of the Commission on things they would like to see changed. OPOC is the governance role, and also the backstop and support for the OPO. When the OPO is doing something, the police can’t just say “oh, he’s just one guy.” OPOC can say they’re really glad he’s speaking up on this latest incident, and glad he’s doing an independent investigation.

Smith said he wants the OPO to do their jobs in a nimble, professional way, and not have others who are not in the office to micromanage what they’re doing. He has some concerns about the cost of some of these things, and asked Beggs for clarification about mediation. Beggs said there’s no guarantee that just because you ask for mediation, you’ll get it. The first Ombudsman wanted to be the mediator. The idea is that if there’s no funding for it, there’s no time for it. The reason that language is a little more expansive is to empower the OPO.

Conklin said on one hand, she thinks it’s a good idea to have the Chief involved in helping to establish the training program for OPOC, but on the other hand, she’s a little worried that if we were to get a Chief who thought Commissioners should have all sorts of training that became too burdensome for volunteer citizens, she would not like the Chief to have the power to say “you have to.” She would like it to be more of a consultation role. Beggs said the thought was that the police have their own training that they do, and you can choose whether to attend. We don’t expect the Commissioners to create their own training. Conklin said she would love to have a language change that would make that more clear.

Conklin also requested that a change be made so that any Commissioner can give the report to the Public Safety Committee (PSC).

Richter said he would like to see the language changed so that the Ombudsman could be removed by the vote of a super majority, or a 100% vote. Beggs said he would convey that to Council.

Beggs said that even though we may occasionally have differences on things, he welcomes it, and doesn't take it personally. This has been a great process, and every draft is better. He said can't imagine there's a Council member who's more supportive of the work that OPO and the OPOC do. He wants the ordinance to be as strong and as effective as possible. Conklin thanked Beggs, saying she totally appreciates the work he's put in from day one, as citizen support of OPOC and OPO, as our attorney, and now as a City Council Member. [Beggs then left the meeting.]

Approve Agenda

Conklin asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Smith moved to approve the agenda. Richter seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Conklin announced at 5:03pm that a short break would be taken. She called the meeting back to order at 5:10pm.

Public Forum

Liz Moore said she appreciated the flexibility given to her in the speaking order, and is appreciating the community commitment that is visible in the room, all across the dais. She appreciates OPOC's support and advocacy for community oversight of police for quite a number of years. It's a long road that we've been on. Reflecting before the campaign for prop 1, and during it, and talking with voters and hundreds of members of the Peace and Justice Action League (PJAL), she feels it's accurate to say there's broad community support for 2 key pieces which are reflected in this ordinance. One is independent investigations and a credible, real path where a community member has an option to request an independent investigation and the OPO has a way to be able to do that, and secondly, and just absolutely critically, substantive public and independent closing reports. She's heard them speak to that many times, and appreciates their advocacy. She thinks it's made a big difference in folks understanding what we need in order to get to where we want to be, which is a place where the police department is trusted by the community, and community members are seen as people to be protected and served equally and well across the board. It takes opening the curtains to really get to that place.

We agree with points that have been made about other desirable outcomes, but recognize the reality of mandatory subject-to -bargaining. We're willing to compromise on things that require bargaining in order to get to things that are laid out in the city charter. That's a ranking of priority that we've achieved some clarity on through many years of processing and learning more about labor law than many of us thought we would ever probably need to learn. She appreciates the trudging through of many drafts, and really appreciates Beggs' patience on this. She's said this to him in person but it bears repeating in a public forum that he's not kidding that his attention span is so long on this, and how critical it is to have someone in leadership who is willing to put in that amazing length of time of attention span. City Council Members have many things to focus on, but she really wants to laud his

long-term focus. That's what it really takes, as you all know, to get the policies in place. Thank you very much.

Conklin asked for more details on substantive closing reports. Moore said she means more than "timely, objective and thorough." Part of a substantive report would be: "here's what I wasn't able to conclude, and here's why." If there is an independent investigation that's not managed by IA, where an officer is choosing not to talk with the Ombudsman, in my view, that's data that should be part of the report. There needs to be more than these 3 criteria to get at the best determination of what we think happened, and here's how we think this could be avoided in the future.

Lin McGinn said she's been following this for quite a while. She came to testimony almost 4 years ago when her son was beaten. She's been following with SPARC for another organization, but right now she is talking for herself because she's very concerned with the negotiations that are going on. She wants to have this encapsulated and move forward instead of being in negotiations with the PD. We probably wouldn't even have the need for this ordinance if it wasn't for the problems in the PD. She came to City Council and talked, and was told "Did you talk to the Ombudsman?" She realized then they had it set up so this Ombudsman is doing their job to find out what exactly happened and whether or not they needed to do more to keep the police under control from beating or harming or killing their citizens. We need to be able to do that, and unless we do that as soon as possible, we aren't getting on the road. This whole haggling over words is putting the thing still in political framework and we're not getting the job done.

She really thinks we need to have a report to the public about how many incidents are happening, and what exactly happens, and this is what the facts are about that. That's what the public needs to know because we need to hold our City Council and our Mayor responsible for things that are happening to our citizens that are not in the scope of law enforcement and the law. Thank you very much. I really appreciate all the work that all of you do. That's how I feel about it as a mother and a citizen of this city.

Colleen Gardner said she is speaking for herself tonight. She is one of those people who have been inundating Council Member Beggs with emails for the past 5 months, and while she doesn't often come to speak with OPOC, she wants them to know that she keeps a very close watch on what this commission does, and she keeps a very close watch on what we are doing with respect to OPO. One of the concerns she has is when she heard Council Member Beggs make the statement that the language in the ordinance isn't specific to the charter but he really doesn't see that it's an issue. That's an issue for her. If we've got the language in the charter, the ordinance should marry to that language. She has a real concern when she starts hearing elected officials, or for that matter, anybody, who says it's "sorta, kinda like", but it's not exactly like that, it gives her pause for concern. She'd like to make it on the record that that language needs to match the charter, with all due respect to Council Member Beggs.

Conklin said the charter is like the Constitution, so when you say you want the ordinance to match the charter, you're saying that the ordinance shouldn't expand upon the charter. But we have laws that expand on the Constitution all the time. It can't be inconsistent with the charter, and Beggs recognized that. The reason we have ordinances is to fill out the spaces in the charter.

Gardner said that's your interpretation. I still am not comfortable that it doesn't marry. With respect to the timeliness, let the OPO do the job, get it done, then move it on to where it needs to move on. She tends to agree with Richter's first comment. She doesn't want to repeat it and start a heated debate. She just wants to say that there are those of us who feel very strongly about what happens in our city. She's probably one of the most passionate people around when it comes to citizens. She truly appreciates what Council Member Beggs has done for this ordinance and how conscientious he's been about listening to the public. He never fails to respond to her email. What that tells her is he truly believes he's going to come up with the best result. She also believes that and she wants to believe that we are going to come up with the best ordinance that those of us who supported Prop 1 wanted to begin with. She thanked the Commission for having this open forum.

Allen McDowell said he wanted to talk about the memo that was generated by Christine Cavanaugh after he sent in his complaint. He felt during Chief Dobrow's time there was little to no accountability in HR for the city and within Spokane Police Department (SPD). He used an unconventional, satirical, tactic against the department to bring firearms handling into question. He said SPD fired back with a whole new medical report. He was concerned that a Facebook post showing an SPD trainee handling a firearm off duty was offensive. He feels the first thing in firearms training should be how to be safe with firearms and not be offensive to the public.

Conklin said the time for filing any complaint about a specific officer has passed. If he can formulate a concern about training practices, he can talk with the Ombudsman about that. Logue said OPO looked at this case, and the officer in the photo was not employed as an SPD officer when the photo was taken.

Tim Connor thanked Beggs and Logue. One of the things he's lamented was the perception that this has turned into a Beggs and Logue difference over a really important piece of legislation. He got into this as an investigative reporter. He did his first reporting on the PD in 1981. This issue has been important to him because he lives and raises children here. In the interest of full disclosure, he was a client at the Center for Justice (CFJ) when he was doing the article on River Park Square. It was after that, that Beggs hired him to be the Communications Director at CFJ, and he took another job there later.

He directed a comment to Richter, saying he was frankly appalled at the idea that there's somehow no legitimacy, or some question about the legitimacy, that this is about independence, and independent investigations. He gathers from the inference of Richter's remarks against Conklin that his perception is that she's somehow joined at the hip with SPARC. This movement came about through a series of very discrete open steps where the public and the City Council were really wrestling with how to give the Ombudsman independence. It was out of frustration that when the Mayor and Council were not willing to do that that we got Prop 1. He doesn't agree with the history that Richter has implied. After having had many stem-winding arguments with Conklin about this, he finds the idea that she's a de facto representative of SPARC bizarre and offensive.

Richter said he didn't say anything about that. He said he doesn't feel like it's his position to speak for the entire community and he doesn't like it when individual Commissioners are implying that they're speaking for the entire community. We are always going to disagree about this.

Conklin said to Connor that it's one thing to address a misperception, but just as in City Council where we don't call Council Members on the carpet, she thinks it's good not to call specific Commissioners on the carpet.

Connor said the conflicts Logue is wrestling with, like wanting to stay involved in the IA process, were really baked into the cake with the first tentative agreement that the Guild reached with the Mayor, which City Council passed because they had no real alternative at the time. The ticket to getting an Ombudsman was being willing to accept that the Ombudsman was going to be involved with an activity that is mandatory subject-to-bargaining. In exchange for that, the Ombudsman was not going to be able to do independent investigations and was not going to be able to file candid closing reports. It stymied progress on this issue for years. He personally, and SPARC collectively, really do favor the Ombudsman continuing to be involved in IA investigations and having a higher certification role. There's also no question that we see that as a mandatory subject-to-bargaining. To have the idea that we can simply roll over the ordinance and add in independent investigations and closing reports, within the city's managerial discretion is illusory. The Guild has every right to say this is something we gave in exchange for the Ombudsman's silence and lack of independence. That could be part of the horse trading that Beggs talked about.

He knows it has been a struggle and he hears your concern about it. He hopes and trusts that you all can support the Council as it moves forward to try to fulfill the promise of Prop 1 for independent investigations, and to negotiate in good faith, to retain the Ombudsman's role in asking questions in IA and in this new certification role. He doesn't think the public ethic of being an Ombudsman or a reporter are all that different. We're simply required to make a good faith effort to do the best that we can to ascertain the truth. In the case in 1981, he asked for officer interviews and was denied across the board. So what did he do? He did the best he could. He gathered police reports. The public expects him to make reasonable steps to get the best evidence he can. At the end of the day as a reporter, he has to say what he thinks, based on the facts, and he's got to tell the reader what he didn't get, and then he's done. He doesn't get to tell the reader to believe him more as an objective reporter than the officer, because the officer didn't show up. He will have done his job as a reporter, just in the way the Ombudsman will have done his. If we come to that step, you will have done your job as an honest broker of the public's business in the role of the Ombudsman. Thank you.

Logue asked Conklin if he could ask 1 question of Connor. He said there's not a definition of good faith effort in the ordinance; it's very legal and very specific. He said a good faith effort is easily doable, and asked Connor to speak to that. Connor said it's much to Logue's credit that he's already earned the confidence of the people across the spectrum. People trust him. He thinks ultimately that's what it's about. He's hard pressed to believe that the public and OPOC wouldn't go along with his ethics as long as it involved doing his best job, being honest and transparent about the constraints, and honest and transparent about how he reaches his conclusions. He's sorry the language process hasn't satisfied Logue, and he's sorry for the tenderness of the trust that is there. He would have hoped it would have been stronger, but that's life.

Conklin said that Mary Ann Murphy signed up, but she believes that Murphy has left.

Report from OPO:

Conklin recognized that Logue will be giving April's report, and April just ended on Sunday, so we appreciate that you haven't had a lot of time to make this a perfect document.

Logue said the more important document is the 2016 OPO Annual Report. While it still has some formatting issues, we're ready to publish. We've put significant effort in this; it's 33 pages long. He's shared his initial executive summary with SPD and IA and they've discussed it so there are no surprises. The majority of his concerns were in the backlog. Conklin established a deadline of next Monday for any feedback from OPOC to Logue on the report.

Logue said OPO did 15 community events in April. He spent 3 days at SCC helping their faculty selection committee. He has volunteered to be the facilitator for the Community Assembly for a year. OPO reviewed and certified 10 cases, and declined to certify 1 case from the 2015 backlog. OPO have completed the review of backlog cases, and also did a mediation request and held the event. This mediation didn't go as smoothly as he would have hoped. The officer participated in good faith and OPO wrote a letter to SPD that the investigation is complete.

OPO went over 20 other reports (5 uses of force, 4 pursuits, and 11 collision reports). Logue attended CIT training. He asked Chief Meidl, along with Director MacConnell, for permission to have Omana attend the Deadly Force Review Board (DFRB) in his absence; the Chief agreed. He had a follow up DFRB meeting this morning at the police academy, and he will be doing an independent investigation related to this specific case.

OPO has received some of the promised funds for Huseman's position for remainder of this year and for Omana's re-classification. \$10,000 was received for OPO training.

Setting priorities for OPO hours

A discussion occurred about the fact that community outreach is increasing and staff is working beyond 80 hours in the pay period. Logue asked the Commissioners about their expectations. He requested consideration for closing the office every Friday in order to try to minimize the impact of the extra hours that are spent every pay period. It doesn't mean OPO isn't working; it allows them to be at other places if needed. Complaints can be filed on-line.

He said OPO is not staffed appropriately in order to conduct the expectations of the ordinance. He asked for help from the Commissioners with community outreach. The Commissioners indicated they were willing to step up to help with community events.

Richter agreed OPO is understaffed. Conklin said we'll support the request for more staff; document the need and we'll support it.

Omana said Friday's are slow, and it's more of a scheduling thing. A person still has access to oversight.

Richter made a motion to allow OPO to close on Fridays. Smith seconded. Further discussion occurred.

Richter said anyone who has concerns about OPO hours can direct their concerns to OPOC.

Conklin wants it to be clear that Logue has the authority to schedule the office staff in the way that makes the most sense for getting the job done and taking care of their mental and emotional health. One way to do that is to close the office on Fridays, whether or not there is anybody working in there will be up to Logue. Conklin called for a vote. She said she will be voting for it not because she thinks closing the office on Fridays is a good idea, but because she thinks it is really important to make sure that employees don't burn out, and to be clear to both City Council and the administration that there's only so many hours in a week and there's only so much work that can get done in those hours.

The motion passed unanimously.

Conklin said she expected OPO to communicate this to the public: it's not that we think the office shouldn't be open on Friday – it's that we don't have the staff to cover on that day.

Summer Meeting Schedule

A brief discussion occurred. Richter made a motion to cancel the July 4th, 2017 regular scheduled meeting and postponed the regular August meeting until August 8th. Smith seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

NACOLE Conference Update

Conklin hopes that people applied for the scholarships. She said we still have not heard from the board member who will be working with us on the workshops.

A discussion took place about Commissioner Terms. Richter said he is moving out of District 1 so there is zero chance he will be re-appointed, and he would like his replacement to have an opportunity to get to NACOLE right away. Conklin suggested that he notify Council and Richter said he really thinks the start date should be moved back, or pushed forward.

OPOC and OPO annual reports

Conklin said we've already dealt with the OPO report. For the OPOC report, Huseman's done a really good job of laying out the factual history. She will meet with Huseman in the next few weeks to flesh out some of the story that needs to go with them.

Audio Recordings for OPOC Website

Huseman said we have had a request from a citizen to post audio recordings on the OPOC website when meetings occur off-site and are not recorded by City Cable 5. A discussion occurred. Richter provided Huseman with a lead for audio files that are posted on the city's website.

5th Commissioner Update

Huseman briefed the Commissioners that the Mayor will be conducting an interview this week of an applicant for the 5th Commissioner vacancy. She will keep them in the loop.

Reports of Commissioners on Community Meetings Attended

Conklin requested that we make it a point, on or before our meetings each month, to email Omana and/or Huseman with the list of meetings we've done, and at this point in the agenda, any report out is something more than "I was at the meeting." A brief discussion took place. Omana asked the Commissioners to get their activities to her and Huseman this week. Conklin encouraged everyone to do this by the 5th of every month. She asked Huseman to provide a reminder at the beginning of each month.

Approve Minutes from 1/24, 2/28, 4/4 Meetings

Smith made a motion to approve the special meeting minutes from 1/24/17 with the deletion of a comment of what Conklin said about Tuesday nights. The motion passed with 2 yes votes and one abstention.

Smith moved to approve the 2/28/17 special meeting minutes with the correction of typo on page 4. Righter seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Smith moved to approve the regular meeting minutes of 4/4/17, with striking out "8pm" under employee performance reviews, and modifying "7:46pm" to "7:56pm" in that same paragraph. Richter seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Conklin adjourned the meeting at 7:19pm.