



Public Safety Committee

Special Committee Meeting

411 Main Street
Catskill, N.Y. 12414
<http://greengovernment.com/>

~ Minutes ~

Wednesday, March 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Board Room

Public Safety Members: Chairperson Hobart; Legislators Martinez, Bloomer, Handel, Gardner and Thorington

Public comments: Pursuant to Greene County Legislature Rules of Order, Rule 14. Privilege of the Floor: Typically a person may speak no more than 3 minutes on a subject matter. However, pending the number of people who attend this meeting, consideration may be given for extended times.

Call to Order

Attendee Name	Organization	Title	Status	Arrived
Thomas Hobart	Greene County	Chairperson	Remote	
Charles A. Martinez	Greene County	Legislator / Budget Officer	Present	
Edward Bloomer	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Patricia Handel	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Larry Gardner	Greene County	Legislator	Remote	
James Thorington	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Patrick Linger	Greene County	Chairman	Present	
William B. Lawrence	Greene County	Majority Leader/Legislator	Remote	
Harry A. Lennon	Greene County	Minority Leader/Legislator	Present	
Michael Bulich	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Linda H. Overbaugh	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Jack Keller	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Matthew Luvera	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Gregory Davis	Greene County	Legislator	Present	
Shaun S. Groden	Greene County	County Administrator	Present	
Warren Hart	Greene County	Dir Ec Dvlpmt, T & Planning/Deputy Co. Admin.	Present	
Pete Kusminsky	Greene County	Sheriff	Present	
MaryJo Jaeger	Greene County	Deputy Budget Officer	Present	
Teri Weiss	Greene County	Sr. Research Aide	Present	
Rev. Richard Turpin	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Committee	Remote	

Katie Oldakowski	PRRC member	member Police Reform and Reinvention Committee member	Present	
Gary Slutzky	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Committee member	Remote	
Angelo Scaturro	Greene County	Public Defender, Police R&R Committee	Remote	
Joseph Stanzone	Greene County	District Attorney, Police R&R Committee member	Remote	
Jeff Friedman	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Committee member	Remote	
Rabbi Zoe B. Zak	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Committee member	Remote	
Kai Hillmann	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Committee member	Remote	
Linda Dunn	Greene County	Stenographer	Present	
Michael Ryan	Mountain Eagle newspaper reporter	Mountain Eagle newspaper reporter	Remote	
Chris Keff	public	audience member	Present	
Monica Kenny-Keff	public	speaker	Present	
Elide Bell	public	speaker	Present	
Stephen Nash-Webber	public	speaker	Present	
Dr. Ronel Cook	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Comm	Absent	
Pastor Richard Snowden	PRRC member	Police Reform and Reinvention Committee member	Absent	

Agenda Item: Review of draft Report, Greene County Police Reform and Reinvention Committee, with PRRC members invited to ZOOM and Legislators invited to be present in person.

Chairman Linger stated: “Alright, folks on Zoom can you hear us okay in here?” Several said yes. Chairman Linger then stated: “Okay, we’re going to get rolling and we’re just waiting on the Public Safety Chair. He’s having a little difficulty getting in (to Zoom), but we’ll get started. (Chairperson Hobart did eventually Zoom into the meeting.) Just so you guys are aware, we are live through our YouTube channel as well as in person here in the County Office Building with some of our Committee members and Board members on Zoom. So, I would like to welcome everyone to this Special Public Safety Committee meeting

for March 10th, 2021 and the purpose of this meeting is going to be to review the draft Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative Report. It's an open meeting and it's also live streamed to our Greene County YouTube channel. The Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative Committee has been invited to join the Greene County Legislature to answer any questions the Legislature may have regarding the recommendations, and most of them are doing so by Zoom. We do have Katie O. (Oldakowski) that's here with us. The draft report was made available to the public on Tuesday, March 2nd, where it was loaded on the county website. Per the Governor's Executive Order, the Legislature is required to take public comment on the draft Plan and either adopt or ratify the draft. Adoption of the Plan by resolution of this Legislature at its regularly scheduled meeting on March 17th along with the Plan Certification form is required to be submitted to the New York State Division of Budget on or before April 1st, 2021. And before the Legislature begins its deliberations here, I would like to take a moment just to recognize the PRRC (Police Reform and Reinvention Committee) and thank them for the incredible work they've done on behalf of the Greene County Legislature. They spent many hours working with the Greene County Sheriff, the County Administrator and the County staff to produce a comprehensive, well-documented, draft Report. This was a big lift. It's not an easy task, given the State's time limitations and the COVID restraints. The Greene County Legislature would also like to recognize this Committee represented a diverse range of experiences and perspectives and the common commitment to working with the Greene County Sheriff's Office to address challenges and supports its strengths, including institutions and organizations supporting the education, business, religion, as well as not-for-profit agencies. So, thank you for your time, your commitment and your hard work. I think the report really shows how much went into this. In conversations that I had with the Sheriff and the County Administrator, I would like to share how impressed they were with the Committee's work, quickly coming up to speed on the operations of the Sheriff and their daily interactions with service providers in our county was an important and necessary task. Evaluating what was successfully working in our community and staying focused on Greene County, not other communities, was necessary before any recommendations for improvement could be made. There were hundreds of documents reviewed and presentations provided on how law enforcement operates within Greene County and their interaction with the County's mental health and substance abuse

agencies. This plan was created with extensive opportunity for community involvement and received the full attention and support of the Greene County Sheriff and its staff. Committee met a total of ten (10) times from September of 2020 through February of 2021. Three public forums were held in multiple locations to obtain the public's vital input. In addition, the county created a special website landing page for this project, where the public provided comments through an on-line portal throughout the process. All comments were provided to the PRRC, as part of their task. The Greene County Legislature has also been provided with the public comments as well as detailed minutes that were taken of every meeting. I don't know if we have Tom on yet. Not quite. So, we'll go ahead and get started with the Special Public Safety Committee meeting. It's 6:07 and Tom's not on yet, but we can open this up to the Board. I know this report was sent out to us last week, so everybody would have a chance to take a look at it, look through the recommendations that were being made by this Committee and then of course the Committee is here if we have any questions for them. So, if anybody has anything they'd like to raise, this would be the time. Or if you have any questions?" (There was no immediate reply). Chairman Linger continued: "The thought here is we have the draft in front of us. Next week we'll do a Resolution on what's going to be accepted, so we can accept the draft as it's written. We can modify what's in the draft, we can add or remove things from the draft, to make a final report that will be done by Resolution and then sent to the State." Legislator Luvera asked: "Mr. Chairman, when is the timeline? When does it have to be submitted to the State?" Chairman Linger replied: "It has to be on or before April 1st." Legislator Luvera replied: "Okay." Legislator Lennon stated: "Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to reaffirm what you've said. The work of the Committee, the amount of work and the meetings that the County Administrator organized and the work of the Committee, I'd just like to say, 'thank you very much'. It was quite an undertaking. The Report is very long and detailed, so thank you." Chairman Linger stated: "Yeah, I would concur. I've seen several reports now that have come out of other municipalities, whether they were counties or villages or towns within the State, this is a professional job that was done by volunteers. I think it wound up probably a lot more time and effort that they wound up volunteering for then what maybe they signed up for, but we did have one member that had to be changed out somewhere in the middle, but other than that, everybody stuck with it and stuck to the task. And I thought the report was

very well done, very well thought out.” Legislator Luvera stated: “I agree and thank you Warren and his staff too for putting the final pieces together. It really looks professional.” Chairman Linger stated: “Does anyone have any questions from the Board on any of the 25 recommendations that were there, anything that looked out of sort? I think the only thing that’s going to take a little more consideration going forward because it’s a pretty large budget item, is going to be the body cameras. I don’t disagree with the notion of having them, but it’s going to be a significant expense and I don’t think we can guarantee today that it’s going to happen in a week or something like that. That’s going to be, that’s going to take a little bit of time I think to get through that procurement process and a policy process for it.” Legislator Handel asked: “There are no Grants out there for something like that?” Chairman Linger replied: “Well, we can look at that and see if there are. We are looking at not only the camera themselves, but the software system that will handle that data and then we’re going to have somebody that’s going to be able to download it and maneuver that data on a daily basis. Get what the District Attorney’s office may need for discovery and those sorts of things. So, it’s definitely got some budget implications there. I think the rest of them were fairly small, as far as the budget end of things go. They’re more policies, some of which we already had in place. Others are new.” Legislator Davis stated: “My understanding is that the body cams that are recommended, the BWC, that’s the ultimate. That’s the best money can buy. There are other systems that are not going to be the Cadillac systems, but that would be a lot cheaper.” Mr. Groden stated: “I think the vendor selection process is probably wide open.” Legislator Davis stated: “My understanding is that the body cams that are recommended, the BWC, that’s the ultimate. That’s the best money can buy. There are other systems that are not going to be the Cadillac systems, but that would be a lot cheaper.” Mr. Groden stated: “I think the vendor selection process is probably wide open.” Legislator Davis replied: “Yeah, but I mean there’s different systems.” Mr. Groden stated: “I might defer to the Sheriff, who may know more about this than I do.” Sheriff Kusminsky stated: “Yeah there are multiple vendors. There are several options. The one that was listed in there consists of five (5) car cameras and a body camera and whenever the officer gets out of the car, it’s automatically on. There’s no chance of him or her, not turning it on and off. And it also captures the rear seat and window in the back of the car. So, if something happens there, you’ll get that as well. So that would be one of the more expensive options,

definitely.” Legislator Bulich asked: “Sheriff, some of the trainings that you have your Department do, are these nationally certified trainings or state certified?” Sheriff Kusminsky replied: “State certified, some are national, but most are State.” Mr. Groden then asked the Sheriff to please speak up. Sheriff Kusminsky replied: “Oh, I’m sorry. Most of them are State certified, some are national certified.” Legislator Bulich stated: “Okay. So, the trainings, if they’re State certified, national certified, they are, you would assume, broaching on some of the areas of concern on Police Reform?” Sheriff Kusminsky replied: “Absolutely.” Legislator Bulich replied: “Okay.” Chairman Linger stated: “Let me go through and just kind of give a brief overview on each one of these recommendations, okay? And that way if there’s any losing touch with it, it was over a week ago when we first got this so and it took some time to get through it. You’ve got, obviously, your preamble there, as far as what the Committee was tasked with. Again, I went through that 132-page document that came from the State on the guidance for this. It looked pretty overwhelming at face value. They did a great job here. In getting to the Committee’s findings and recommendations, I will say, before this draft Report was sent to the Board, it was drafted ahead of time, and given back to the Committee to make sure that the Committee had a general consensus on what was being put forward. So, they were able to agree or dissent as far as whether things were going to go forward to the Board, and this is what came from the majority on that Committee. So, the first Recommendation here, ‘The Committee concluded that the Greene County Sheriff’s Office is well staffed and trained, with an appropriate budget and equipment required to best serve our communities. Moving forward, the Committee recommends the GCSO continue to bring requests for additional programs and funding before the Public Safety Committee of the Greene County Legislature for review and action.’ So, pretty simple Recommendation there. I don’t know that this Board would have any issue with any of that. (There was no reply). Under ‘Recruiting and Supporting Excellent Personnel’, there are two Recommendations: ‘Recruiting efforts should be expanded to include other venues, such as job fairs, school outreach programs, social media announcements, community gathering places and minority neighborhoods or places popular with people of color’ and ‘in conjunction with recruiting and job postings, the Greene County Sheriff’s Office should also provide guidance and support to prospective applicants, especially persons of color and women who may wish to serve.’ Everybody’s good with those two? I don’t think

there's an issue there. On 'Training and Education', the Committee recommended that 'the Greene County Sheriff's Office continue the successful completion of their recurring, continuous training, enabling it to meet or exceed the standards established by the Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Council - especially in the areas of Anti-Bias, De-Escalations, Harassment and Use of Force training', all of which they currently do, all of which are a part of the recent accreditation the Sheriff's Office received by that council as well. The 5th Recommendation: 'The Committee recommends that the Greene County Sheriff's Office continue to emphasize that policing is a partnership with the community, requiring a foundation of positive, trust-based relationships with all segments of the population. The Committee concluded that the Greene County Sheriff's Office provides its officers with training programs that allow it to both perform its mission and accomplish its goal of keeping the community safe while treating its citizens with dignity, honor and respect.' I think we would expect nothing less. Number 6: 'The Committee recommended that the Greene County Sheriff's Office consider communicating and coordinating its training programs and opportunities with the seven local municipal police departments.' We did include them in our Committee hearing they were invited to attend. I believe all of the police departments did attend and were able to speak with the Committee and that's kind of based off of the theory that you want cohesive policies across the county, regardless of who winds up responding to a call. 'While the Committee understands that local participation cannot be mandated, it believes there is value in uniform and consistent training for all law enforcement agencies operating within the county, especially since the 'Closest Car' response policy results in local, county or state agencies to be first on the scene of a reported incident.' Number 7, and this is one that I would whole-heartedly agree with. It was definitely a concern that I saw in the couple of public meetings that I went to, as a public member: 'The Committee recommends that the Troopers serving Greene County be held to the same high standards as the Greene County Sheriff's Office, and that the Governor mandate that New York State Police conduct the same Reform and Reinvention exercise as required of the local agencies.' They respond to about forty per cent of the calls in this county and I know I heard more than one handful of complaints or concerns that came from the public during this Committee's deliberation processes in the public sector. So, I don't think anybody would have a disagreement there?" Legislator Lennon then asked: "Question. So,

you're saying that the New York State Police respond to forty per cent of the calls..." Sheriff Kusminsky stated: "Roughly." Legislator Lennon continued: "...in the county. Now the Sheriff responds to how many, what's the percentage of the Sheriff's office?" Sheriff Kusminsky replied: "About forty." Legislator Lennon stated: "Forty, and the towns and the villages are twenty?" Sheriff Kusminsky replied: "Roughly." Legislator Lennon stated: "Roughly?" Legislator Lennon replied: "Yeah, I'd have to agree with you on that." Chairman Linger stated: "There were people who came and laid some concerns out. They had valid concerns, but their concerns were geared toward the New York State Police and this Committee and this Legislature can't do anything to change their policies or even enact that change going forward for them. It would have to come from the State side and that was the recommendation the Committee had, was that the State Police go through this same type of operation, that we just did. 'Supporting Officer Mental Health and Well-being'. Recommendation Number 8 was the Committee recommended "that the Greene County Sheriff's Office continue to utilize all available support resources to support the mental health and well-being of its officers, as well as, with implementation of the 'Helping Every Responder Overcome Resilience program'. That's the "HERO" program. This program is not currently complete and does not exist within the Greene County Sheriff's Office, but training will begin in May or June of this year. So again, that's an initiative that the Sheriff's office had begun to undertake when this directive came down. There's going to be a continuation going forward to make sure that our officers are fit for duty mentally. In 'Employing Smart and Effective Policing Standards and Strategies', Committee recommended 'that the Greene County Sheriff's Office prioritize procuring new RMS software that will collect and record data to include how often arrests come from 'observed violations' versus responses to a 'service call' and provide a clear breakdown of arrests by ethnicity and gender.' Pete, if I remember correctly, or anybody on the Committee, if I remember right, the discussions around that was, a lot of that information is not dictated off of the State reports?" Sheriff Kusminsky replied: "There was a lot of confusion with the Incident Based reporting and Uniform Crime Reporting, versus what's collected in our Records Management system. The current one is obsolete and not supported by DCJS anymore, so those fields are in there but they're not searchable to us and there's no support for it and frankly every police agency in the State is looking for a new RMS system right now, so we will, the plan is, and the

recommendation was whatever we purchase is able to collect and search that same data that they're looking for." Chairman Linger continued: "Alright, Number 10, the Committee 'also recommends that New York State provide funding for updated local RMS platforms as this will advance the Governor's goals to reduce racial disparity.' In the 'Community Engagement' side, Committee recommended 'the Greene County Sheriff's Office should seek opportunities to enhance their community outreach with presence at events, functions and public housing - demonstrating that the Greene County Sheriff's office is approachable and serves the community in addition to its law enforcement duties.' Number 12, the Committee recommended 'that the Greene County Sheriff's office continue to maintain the School Resources Officer program in as many Greene County Schools as possible. The programs and services provided by the Greene County Sheriff's office to the School Districts are a great success and have overwhelming support of the school administrators, teachers, parents, and frequently, the students themselves.' The Committee also recommended 'that Greene County create a youth program to partner with and enhance the efforts of local youth groups and clubhouses, religious organizations and town and village art and recreation programs. While events and activities would be organized by specific local groups, they could be sponsored and supported by Greene County through small grants and transportation resources and coordinated under a 'Healthy Communities' message from the Greene County Sheriff's Office, and other not-for-profits such as the Greene County Health Consortium." A little bit more there than just the Greene County Sheriff's Office, but a recommendation here, nonetheless. In 'Transitioning Arrested and Incarcerated Individuals Back into Communities', a couple of recommendations: they recommended 'that the Greene County Justice System continue to expand the Drug Court program as an alternative to incarceration, and further explore the possible creation of a Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) Program for Greene County.' I believe the Sheriff was also, had begun to look into this when COVID hit, before the Executive Order but that is a recommendation here as well. Number 15, the Committee recommended 'that the Sheriff appoint a local faith leader as Chaplin for the Greene County Jail and with Rev. Richard Turpin of the 2nd Missionary Baptist Church in Catskill be advanced for consideration.' Hearing no complaints from the Reverend, (laughter). In 'Responding to Mental Health events', the Committee recommended 'that the Greene County Sheriff's Office continue its

current policies as they are in accordance with best practices and serve our communities well.’ The Committee also recommended ‘that the Greene County Sheriff’s Office continue to work in consort with the Mobile Crisis Intervention Team (MCAT) on all mental health events and continue on-going training in de-escalation practices and techniques.’ ‘The Committee recognizes that MCAT is not dedicated only to Greene County. This occasionally causes delays in moving from one crisis to another due to the geography of calls, which is often frustrating for both law enforcement and emergency services. MCAT’s hours of operation are only 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., leaving ten hours with no in-person crisis coverage available (Greene County Mental Health offers a ‘warm-line’ for emergency Mental Health calls). To ensure that mental hygiene, domestic violence, trauma or abuse related calls are followed up by appropriate service providers, the Committee recommends examining funding opportunities to support having a dedicated team to provide responses specific to Greene County.’ Number 18, the Committee also recommends ‘that the Greene County Sheriff’s Office should report all relevant incidents to the Overdose Detection Mapping Application Program (ODMAP) to ensure that “spike alerts” are issued and all appropriate agencies can respond in a timely manner, providing supports and education to Greene County reducing overdose fatalities.’ That’s something that’s come a long way in the last year or so, as far as the timeliness. We’ve always been behind the eight-ball and that system seems to be much more responsive almost up to the minute, so, well worth it there. In ‘Fostering Community-Oriented Leadership, Culture and Accountability’, ‘the Committee recommends that there be a continuation of open and honest discussions between the community and the Greene County Sheriff’s Office.’ ‘Committee also recommends that the community organizations need to take responsibility for positive interactions with police agencies by partnering with the Greene County Sheriff’s office moving forward with structured community programs that include the Sheriff.’ Again that’s, the way I read that, it’s basically a continuation of what we just went through and just to continue that on an on-going basis to improve the system. In ‘Tracking and Reviewing Use of Force and Identifying Misconduct’, ‘The Committee recommends that persons seeking access to any Greene County Sheriff’s Office discipline reports file a FOIL request with the Greene County Attorney FOIL Officer by following the directions that are on the county website under the Freedom of Information request.” Mr. Hart then stated to Chairman

Linger that Recommendation Number 21 got skipped over and Chairman Linger replied: "I see that." Chairman Linger then read out loud Number 21: "The Committee recommends that the Greene County Sheriff's Office continue to use its current practices regarding incidents involving 'Use of Force.' I know that was a pretty significant discussion as well, not only for the Sheriff's office but with all the other towns that were, towns and villages I should say, with the police departments. Kind of all went through their policies and what they already have in place seems to be working. On the 'Citizen Oversight and Other External Accountability, the Committee recommends that Greene County publicize all methods available, including contacting the Sheriff; contacting their Greene County Legislator; contacting the New York State Attorney General; and Using the Greene County Sheriff's office mobile app.' Again, this is for any complaints that may be brought forward to the Sheriff's Office. 'The Committee also recommends the creation of a volunteer 'Community Advocate Committee' (CAC) to facilitate any citizen complaints regarding the Greene County Sheriff's Office. This three-person Committee will include either the Chair of the Greene County Legislature or its Public Safety Committee and two citizens (one from a faith-based organization, and the other leading community outreach.) This Committee will include one or more persons of color. The CAC will receive complaints anonymously through a form on the Greene County website, vet each submission for legitimacy, and bring it to the Greene County Sheriff's Office directly for investigation and resolution. This process will minimize any perceived fear of retaliation that may exist with some citizens.' In 'Data Technology and Transparency, the Committee recommends that the County Administrator bring this request before the Public Safety Committee for referral to the full body of the Greene County Legislature for action to provide the Greene County Sheriff's Office and the community with an accurate, unbiased audiovisual record of enforcement related law enforcement interactions.' That's in relation to the cameras. The whole language is there, in the 'findings.' And as far as the draft Report goes, those are the 25 recommendations. As I said, there were some dissenting opinions there, even from the Committee themselves. That keeps the discussion honest. I know we had, at this point, does anybody from the Legislature have any questions on any of this? A lot of these things, it will take some time to get the policies developed, like the Community Advocate Committee (CAC), and those sort of things, will take a little bit of time. The body camera is obviously a

large budget ticket item and having to go out to that bid process will take a little bit of time, but I don't think any of us disagree with the recommendation of looking into those possibilities. Before I open it up to the floor, anybody from the Board?" Legislator Luvera stated: "Again, I think it was well thought out, planned and I appreciate the work of the Committee. I also appreciate that we included faith-based leaders on the Committee as well. That's been important to me and I think without God in this whole situation, there is not a place for us to go. And I appreciate their input on this Committee and I would further continue to say what you're saying Chairman, you know, defer to the Sheriff regarding the body cameras and whatever we need to do to support him, I would be definitely in full support of that." Legislator Lennon stated: "Also I think it's important to point out the Sheriff that we have he's a community person, who is out in the community daily. He goes to organizations, he talks, makes speeches, which is an important part of the Sheriff's Department and where he's brought this department with accreditation. I think that's very, very important to talk about also. So, he is always reachable. He'll talk about issues and that's very important." Chairman Linger stated: "Yes, absolutely. The Sheriff, the Undersheriff, Captain Quinn, Lieutenant Overbaugh, they are all out in the community. They're very approachable. They're always willing to talk or listen." Legislator Lennon added: "And that's important." Chairman Linger replied: "It's very important. I think probably the members on this Committee probably learned a lot about the criminal justice system and how it operates in Greene County. That was by necessity, to come up with this. And you did a great job at it." Chairman Linger then referred to the list of speakers from the public who registered by calling in. Chairman Linger then stated: "Alright, if we're good with the Board then I will open this up to public comments. We do have the Police Reform Plan member correspondence from the Committee members. We also have the questions that were submitted to the Greene County website, and that was from the inception in September, all the way through until last week here or this week. And we had an e-mail from Emma Christina Arcos as well as the e-mail from Hillary Kolos. I'm not sure if that went in through the website or not, but I know we got it in an e-mail." He then called the first name from the list of speakers. Chairman Linger stated: "Elide Bell, are you here? If you would, come on up here to the front. And you'll probably have to yell." Mr. Groden noted that the microphone is not on. Ms. Bell stated: "I'll do my best. So, first I appreciate you considering my comments. My name is Elide

and I'm a full-time resident of Jewett. To begin, a quick quote from Patrick Linger, is that you?" Chairman Linger replied: "Yes." Ms. Bell continued: 'The time limitations and COVID restraints were complicated further by the fact that approximately forty per cent of all law enforcement calls within Greene County are responded to by the New York State Police who are not required to be involved in this effort.' This quote demonstrates a few things that I'll be talking about. The pressure of time limitation was self-imposed due to a very late start. Safe community outreach and tools like video conferencing were not properly utilized for participation and deflection citing that state police workload has anything to do with complicating the process of facilitating a conversation with the community or collecting feedback that is relative to our community. There are two other comment deflections we are met with in discussing police reform. Why were you not involved earlier? We were. Why didn't you communicate back with us? I've been here for X amount of decades and this isn't an issue that is not a problem in a rural area. This is a major sticking point because it's not true. A negative experience in dealing with the police does exist here, with both residents and visitors. This was made clear in the Hunter survey for example despite not having formal complaints. No survey was done for Greene County. Just because this hasn't been your experience or the experience of others that look like you or that are in your bubble, does not make others' experiences right here in our county invisible or less than. And quite frankly the concerns of those disproportionately impacted who you should be listening to, you aren't because you didn't talk to anyone. And public meetings, safe and welcoming meetings to ensure safe settings for participation by reluctant community members was not something that was reckoned with, despite our calls. And not just worry about retaliation from police or not getting the same service, but retaliation within the community itself, which was apparent from the Back the Blue parade in response to the Black Lives Matter parade in Tannersville, and the Ashland Town Meeting regarding Thin Blue Line flags that resulted in violent and racist quotes on social media in our community. The Governor's workbook states: 'The Police Reform and Reinvention Collaborative was designed to enable all members of the community to participate in reimagining the role of law enforcement. Your process will not be successful if it simply restates the current functions, strategies and operations of the police department without deep and probing consideration of the perspective of those who seek reform. Further, the Chief Executive must certify that the community was

engaged in this process.’ I am going to speak to how this process failed and the community has not been engaged. That is why my request is that the draft currently submitted to this Legislature should not be accepted and we must do this again in a way that is accessible, equitable and transparent. If you choose to move forward with this, despite what I’m saying, I am requesting that a public meeting be set within the next week to discuss amendments and recommendations that should be included in this draft, such as: additional de-escalation training; bias training by a community approved source that’s in-person and not a computer-prompted program; the standard public yearly release of complaints and disciplinary actions of Greene County Police officers, including standard practices of evaluating moral character, on and off duty, as well as on social media; the furnishing of a business card at every interaction that states the officer’s badge number, department and where to submit complaints to a neutral civilian review board; the adoption of Campaign Zero’s Use of Force policy. The beginning of the Plan should also be amended to clearly state the known deficiencies of this process and for the county to formally adopt to do this exercise over for delivery prior to the next budget allocation. I, along with the community advocacy and education group “Anti-Racist Catskills” would like to volunteer to help Greene County facilitate and network this properly, for a valid, shared plan for 2022 that more accurately represents those that seek reform, highlighting and elevating the feedback from residents and visitors with emphasis on folks that are black, indigenous, people of color, indigent, women, low-income and incarcerated individuals that have not been brought into the Greene County discussion. Let me preface the rest of this by saying while this may not have been the Committee’s desire or intent, I don’t think this was malicious, it doesn’t change the factual outcome or result and if there were skills or know-how missing from the Committee to facilitate this process, especially during COVID, they chose not to seek out help, support or expertise from big things, like getting real community involvement to little things, like how to hold and run a video camera without getting Zoom-locked. 1. The draft was only made available last week and I’m still not clear what the plan was to incorporate the limited community feedback prior to presenting it to this Legislature. For example, I for one clearly stated to a committee member that the FOIL process for complaint, discipline records, is not an acceptable solution. I have tried and failed multiple times to do this, and I’m told I’m not asking correctly, there’s not adequate staffing, my request is too

cumbersome. I wanted to have a formal record for the past five years of complaints and discipline for Greene County patrol officers. There are seventy folks that fit this, which is not many and if there are no complaints, then this should hardly take a long time. But we should all be asking, why was this not already requested by the Committee and available to the Police Reform Committee or for the accreditation process? Doesn't this already exist? How is a difficult process like this transparent or acceptable? I've proposed potential solutions, but they aren't in this draft. 2. The community was not engaged in this process or properly notified. The process was not transparent and the sentiment expressed by Reform Committee members is that: They were only doing this because they were being made to. 2. That this topic isn't of concern here, that this is an urban problem, not a rural problem. It was clearly expressed also that certain things were being included in this draft report specifically in the appendices to quell the expressed discontent and complaint and to prove that a good job was done. These things don't look or feel great in proving this was a genuine process or available in minutes for you to read. An example of that third point, including website analytics, trying to illustrate that lots of people went on the website, but it actually only furthers to prove my point: in a county of nearly fifty thousand people, only twelve devices accessed these pages. This does not indicate good performance. Page views is not a viable method in this analysis. One person can view the page a hundred times and if the same person views the page from two different devices, they will show as two visitors. So, two unique visitors on each of those pages was made. And at least one new visitor is someone staffed by the county and how many Committee members looked at these pages? But I digress. 3. The process was started very late. There was not adequate, advance notification and generally poor and non-existent outreach. The Executive Order for the development of a Police Reform Plan was given on June 12th, yet the work did not begin. The workbook with 125 pages of detailed guidance was issued on August 8th, yet the work did not begin. In fact, the first public meeting was not held until the middle of October. There were only three public meetings, relatively close together, all with hardly any notification and difficult to find info and by and large, not designed for safe public discussion and discourse was how the meetings were held. One with all the police forces of local jurisdictions present, one with many coordinating agencies that work with the police and instances of attendees including uniformed officers not wearing masks. The meetings also were all held

on this side of the county. The Committee didn't consider 'who is my audience and where would they be able to best see the information I supplied?' A single Facebook post or buried links on a website with half information will not have reach in Greene County. More successful advertising is done with free and simple signage for garage sales and chicken barbeques than for this important issue. This also highlights why any ideas in the draft that don't include details of a robust outreach plan should be amended to have one for each point. The meeting we are having right now is another example of deficiency. A video conference is not being held for the public and I'm highly uncomfortable with having to be present for this while the Committee can Zoom safe at home. And information about this meeting was not adequately supplied on a website that's not user-friendly. There was missing information, not complete information in each section where this information was stated. And including on the 'event' page for tonight, Police Reform is not included in the title of this meeting which confused people, it was called a Public Safety meeting. The limited purpose participants from the public meetings also all still had the expectations that for there to be additional public discussions with the Committee as things developed, but that never happened. Our correspondences, calls, comments, e-mails, went without communication for months until we took it upon ourselves to aggressively try and get our voices heard, including escalating this to Michelle Hinchey's office, which is ultimately what prompted phone calls to us in just the past two weeks. For this Committee, who did you engage? How did you engage them? Where is the documentation? Was the budget analyzed? No. How is spending on cameras being done without considering this budget and shouldn't the community be involved in that discussion? The budget is not included in the review in this draft. There are needs of the community that may be better met if funding was budgeted in correct areas. Having a doctor in Greene County; more affordable housing; public transportation; mentorship, education and training programs. These things absolutely would have been debated and discussed if folks were brought to the table. In conclusion, the deadline means nothing if this process was not carried out correctly and the Plan does not reflect a shared vision. This exercise was not about the county or Committee taking it solely upon themselves deciding if the police aren't doing a good job as is or trying to check the boxes for bare minimum participation to have something to submit as to not jeopardize funding. Certifying that the community was engaged in this process and draft, with the spirit intended in the Governor's

order, would not be truthful or ethical. In a county of nearly 53 residents and millions of visitors, our residents were not brought to this table. My town board wasn't even given the heads-up and the most important feedback and ideas to highlight and raise up were missing. You should ask yourself why. Thank you." Chairman Linger thanked her and then he stated: "Alright, the next one I have on the list is Stephen Nash-Webber." Committee member Katie Oldakowski asked if the microphone could be turned on, so that the Committee members (who were zooming) could hear better. She was advised that it doesn't work, and Mr. Nash-Webber said he will speak up and he stated: "I do want to reiterate the points that were made by Elide. Those were extremely well-founded, and we have spent as a group a great deal of time looking at this process being carried out across the county and even some of the communities further abroad that are still impacted that we interact with as a community. Where the critiques that she and I have brought forth before and again today are completely valid, I would like to spend my time looking at the recommendations that are made here and some modifications that are appropriate to make this more effective under its scheme. In terms of Recommendation #23, many communities have committed to all officers carrying and distributing at all interactions, cards that contain their name, their badge number and that platform for feedback, right? We're talking about having a CAC, being able to receive that feedback. I would like to make sure that every individual who interacts with the Greene County Sheriff's office know explicitly about that platform. We need, where we have seen issues with this Committee's ability to gather feedback from the community, there's no better way of getting good data and feedback from the community on all police interactions than that scheme. So, I would please ask that we modify or specify that there is a standard operating procedure of issuing those cards at all interactions. I'd also like to bring mention to the letter at the end of the draft Report from Mr. Kai Hillmann. He brings up the question of culture. Several police forces or committees have looked at this and it is, in my opinion, imperative that we have a police force that we could trust as having the highest moral code and while there is great evidence that that does exist to a degree, there is also some evidence that there are failings in that regard and this can limit our ability to make sure that we have a truly diverse work force, but also that we have a workforce free of damaging bias. So, I would ask that that be addressed. That the social media and organizational affiliations of the members of the Greene County Sheriff's Office be scrutinized to make sure that

they are upholding at all times, our shared community values and the value of every member of the community. On Recommendation #2, I would suggest that we look at a targeted mentorship program, where we make sure that any disadvantaged populations who show any interest in becoming members of the Greene County Sheriff's office or any law enforcement office, be, as a standard protocol, paired up with members of the service to help them get through the process of applying for that work, through the Civil Service exam, etc. Targeted mentorship. I would like to reiterate Elide's point regarding money. We saw, though we've requested, no handling in this report as to the budget of the Sheriff's Office, the staffing levels at this office and how they are appropriate for our community. It is, as a result, completely unclear, that we have the correct number of members serving in the Sheriff's Office and that is not evaluated against the staffing levels of the many other agencies that are in the county, including the State Police, towns, etc. So, we have very little ability to evaluate, given that, that we are at correct staffing levels and that we are not over-policed or under-policed. I feel like this is a substantial deficit in the work. We also ask for an explanation for how we are different as a Sheriff's Office from the national standard of law enforcement. As it stands right now, this national standard of law enforcement produces an alarmingly high number of fatal outcomes. We have not addressed in this report how that exists as a lower risk for us than elsewhere in any quantitative or qualitative aspect and that needs to be addressed as it poses a substantial risk to all community members not just the individual who may suffer, specifically from the social trust and economic process of our community. Related to that, we ask that we look at what framework or accountability exists for excessive force and excessive violence on the part of our police officers. It is clear in the national scheme that when incidents occur, a failure to have a robust program of accountability causes greater unrest and distrust among the community. We must make sure that in our programs we have a clear plan on how to address incidents that are contrary to the public trust. I'd like to highlight or ask that the Board look at a specific procurement plan for the RMS system. I guess it's a question more than anything else. Chairman Linger, can you tell me whether or not, or when you would expect an upgraded RMS system to be procured, what's the timeline for that, given this committee's work?" Chairman Linger replied: "I can't give you a timeline right now. We will not only look into grant funding to do that but also partner with the rest of the State who are looking to do the same thing. I couldn't

give you an answer on it right now. It will take, I mean we do have procurement procedures, we can't just go out and then Shaun's says, 'I can't write a P.O. tomorrow'." Mr. Nash-Webber stated: "Understood. I guess my point was, I want to make sure it's a priority and that we can imagine that we have a commitment out of this report and/or resolution that's coming in to, for example, within a year, have that procurement completed?" Chairman Linger replied: "I would, I guess that would depend on the manufacturing of these types of things, I don't know how long it takes to get them, but I would think some decision could be made by this Board to advance the purpose of that type of thing. I don't have any..." Mr. Nash-Webber replied: "Okay. In our survey of law enforcement agencies, we have looked at the investment in I.T. has been an issue. And this appears to be another one that really does impact the performance of the unit." Chairman Linger stated: "I can assure you it will be a priority. If it's in this report as a recommendation, that gets adopted probably next week, they will be priorities." Mr. Nash-Webber thanked Chairman Linger and then stated: "I would also like to tack onto Mr. Hillmann's note on page 20 regarding Recommendation #20 in this bold framing, I strongly suggest that we alter the framing of that Recommendation to suggest that the Sheriff welcomes the opportunity to participate with community organizations, rather than a demand on the Committee's part that we take responsibility to cause interactions. I would definitely like to wrap up by saying that I really do appreciate the amount of work that was done. This is really a lot of work and I don't want to detract from that with our critiques. Our critiques are valid, but I do want to commend them for getting as far as they got and make a further recommendation that this become a standing order of business that continues, that the CAC not only that you grow from the three members that are recommended to something more robust, that they are funded and given resources to continue to follow-up on the performance of the Sheriff's office and pursue these analyses that we have missed in this cycle. We acknowledge that time is limited. We are human. We get as far as we can get, but we are highlighting here a substantial amount of remaining work to be done and we ask that you make this a permanent program. Again, thank you all for your time and I really do appreciate everything you've done. The Sheriff in particular, has been really stellar with a lot of the moves that have been made so far. We have seen reforms already occurring, we just would like to see the remaining parts taken care of. Thank you."

Chairman Linger thanked Mr. Nash-Webber and then stated: "The third one

I have on the list is Monica Kenny-Keff.” Ms. Kenny-Keff then stated: “My problem isn’t necessarily being too quiet, it’s being too loud, so let me know. I am an attorney. I’m used to being very loud.” Chairman Linger stated: “This room is difficult for the people on Zoom to hear from, so that’s why...” Ms. Kenny-Keff replied: “I’ll keep it up, as best I can. Just in response to these two community members that have just spoken, I would like to give a little bit of the flip side to that. Many of the objections that we just heard were about items that could not be dealt with in what the limited scope of this Committee was. There were many items that could not be accessible to these Committee members. The budget was not something that the Sheriff’s Department or this Committee had any control over. The Greene County budget is dealt with in this body. There are recommendations for further expenditures. However, those expenditures this Legislative body has to answer to the taxpayers of Greene County for. It’s not as if money is on trees as the saying goes, that we can just pick it off to get the body cams or the car cameras. With respect to the publishing of the public hearings and the request for community involvement, there were three in-person public hearings. I attended all of them. They were not all in the same place. You can’t unfortunately force people to come. You can’t force people to be engaged. There were availabilities over the website to send in comments from the public. It was well-published. That was how I knew about where to go, how to get involved and how to listen. The Governor put out this workbook, as Elide indicated, on August 8th and Greene County had their organizational meeting on September 30th. They had to find the volunteers. The volunteers of this Committee who should be praised to the fullest extent, they had to find them prior to the organizational meeting. They were at the organizational meeting. Minutes of every meeting, as you can tell, she’s here today and she was taking down every word as fast as people were talking, she didn’t miss a beat. Those minutes can be read, then can be re-read then commented on through the website, through an e-mail, through an anonymous letter to this Board. And again, you can’t force people to engage if they don’t want to. This was part of the discussion in one of the minutes. It was with respect to getting more people to apply to the Sheriff’s Department. You can’t go grab people off of the street and force them to apply. The information is available. The Sheriff and the Committee all spoke about re-engaging the community, trying to get and actively recruiting but at the same time, we’re in a pandemic. We’re in a hiring freeze. You can only do so much. You still can’t put

pen to paper for these applicants. And I believe that the community does have a responsibility. They have a responsibility to the Sheriff's Department just as much as the Sheriff's Department has a responsibility to the community. The community has a responsibility to listen as well as speak to the Sheriff. The Sheriff's Department has a responsibility to listen and also speak. We're not trained Sheriff's officers. We're not trained police officers. There are certain things that I am never going to know about being a police officer or a deputy. That's why I have to be able to listen. There are certain things that a deputy or a Sheriff may never know about being pulled over or having an interaction with police, that's why they need to be able to listen. The community and the Sheriff's department has a responsibility to each other to learn from each other and to listen to each other and change when change is necessary. But again, if it's not broke, don't fix it. In all of the public hearings that I went to, almost every person started with 'I've never had a problem with the Sheriff' or 'I've never had a problem with a deputy, but here are my concerns.' We are Greene County. We are limited to listening to the Greene County community members. We're limited to recommendations with respect to the Greene County Sheriff's Department, in this particular instance. I sat on the Committee for the Town of Cairo Police Department. We were limited to listening to issues with respect to the Cairo Police Department and we made some changes. And there are many excellent changes that are set forth: the accreditation is amazing. It's something that I know that the Sheriff started as soon as he took office. The Town of Cairo Department actually, with permission I believe, adopted the Greene County Sheriff's Choke Hold Policy, as one of their policies, so there is progress being made. You can't fix everything overnight, but I have to say, and I said it at the first public hearing, I think we're extremely lucky here in Greene County. We have a wonderful Greene County Sheriff's Department that is open to the community, that is open to anything that will help the community, not just policing the community. So, the community has to be ready to help as well. In this draft report, the biggest thing is to me, that they're keeping the line of communication open, so no, I don't believe that we are done here. I don't believe the Sheriff thinks that we're done here. I think this is a continuing conversation, it's just that the Governor's office required this and requires this report to be on their desk by April 1st, or funding, not just the police departments and Sheriff's Department, but for Towns and Counties in other areas, is shut off. So, this isn't simply 'we're going through the motions'. This is

since before September, these Committee members have been doing their best to listen and to engage. We're not here about national policing. We're not here about the standard narrative that we are hearing. We're here specifically for the Greene County Sheriff's office. I commend the Committee on the massive amount of work that they did, the huge amount of volunteerism in how many meetings they went to and Rev. Turpin, I second the motion, for you as a Chaplin. He was very engaged during all of the meetings and I think that's a great motion. So, I will second that. I'm at many events throughout the county and I can tell you, since this new Sheriff has taken over, you see him at almost every single one of them and if you don't see him there, it's because you got there after he did, as well as many of the deputies, the Captains, the Undersheriff. They are very involved in this community and I think Greene County as a whole, absolutely the luckiest county around with our Sheriff's Department. Thank you."

Chairman Linger thanked Ms. Kenny-Keff and then he stated: "That's all I have for people who called in ahead of time to speak tonight." Chairman Linger then confirmed with his staff that Legislator Hobart is on the Zoom call now. Chairman Linger then stated: "So, that's who we have to speak. I don't know if anybody has anything additional that we need to go over? Is there anything you want to see changed? Any of the Committee members that may want to, have anything they need to say or respond? I don't mean to put anybody on the spot, that's not my intent at all." Mr. Friedman then stated: "Pat, it's Jeff Friedman." Chairman Linger replied: "Hey Jeff." Mr. Friedman continued: "Hey, how are you. I just wanted to follow-up on something that, I don't remember which speaker was saying about not reaching into the community and hearing from people, Kai, Katie, myself, did have a meeting with folks from the black community to try to get some feedback from them. It was a very difficult process to make happen. You know, there is a lot of I guess you'd call it reticent that community to speak, even in an environment that didn't include government officials or police officers. We purposely tried not to do that. We did invite some other members of the Committee, who were not involved with either a government office or police officers, but they were, they just weren't able to make that meeting. I did say we got a lot of good feedback from the group that was there and also numerous ones of us on the Committee were contacted by members of the public directly and we did engage them. I never heard from the folks who talked tonight, but some of their concerns, many of their concerns, we did hear it and I do only, I

would agree with them and echo on one subject, I think this should be an on-going process. We certainly need to continue to be proactive to make sure that we never have a problem, and I would also say though that I would ask them to look over the report again, the first two speakers, some of the things that they said that we didn't do, we actually did do and are mentioned in the report and I believe the minutes of our meeting are public record, is that true Shaun? Go over our meeting minutes, we did cover a lot of ground that was said that we didn't. And I'm not trying to defend the committee's actions here, but some of the things need to be clarified so, I don't want to take up too much more time other than to say I support some of the things that Kai has been mentioning through those meetings and in his e-mails of late and I think it's important that we have an on-going process here, but you know, these recommendations are a start. It was a very compressed time line, but it was compressed by the Governor's office and so if we're going to make quantitative and qualitative progress, it takes time and it's not going to be done in a six month period, so I thank the Legislature for the consideration of this and the other members of the Committee and certainly I'm happy to continue listening to other members of the community and seeing what we can do to keep moving forward, so." Chairman Linger thanked Mr. Friedman. Katie Oldakowski then stated: "I would just also add that a lot of the recommendations that came out of that Committee, or out of that meeting, were already in the draft Report. So, it wasn't like we weren't trying to address certain things. We did hear everyone that had talked to us and did include things that were brought up, they were already either in it or they were added after, so." Chairman Linger recognized Elide Bell again. Ms. Bell stated: "Hi. I would just like to address a point that seems to keep coming up is that to remind us to read the report again, or the minutes or watch the YouTube videos, which I have multiple times. I can actually cite what people said in those meetings and I believe Rev. Turpin can speak to that. We've read everything." At this point, Rev. Turpin stated over Zoom to Mr. Groden that they cannot hear Ms. Bell. Mr. Groden and Chairman Linger asked Ms. Bell to step back up to the podium, which she did. Ms. Bell continued: "So I would just like to address the point that it seems to be brought up a lot again why didn't we read the minutes, or we need to read the draft again or there's a lot of information, and I can assure you, I have read the minutes. I have read the report. I can cite what people said in the minutes and I said I believe Rev. Turpin can attest to that with the conversations that I had with him. Responses that I have had and things that I was

told do not convey transparency. If those meetings took place with the community and there's testimonial or feedback, where is it? I was told I'm not allowed to see anything. Why can't we see that feedback? What was the feedback that was collected and how was it incorporated into the report? That's part of the transparency process. What I'm saying doesn't mean, again, that anyone didn't work hard or didn't try or that there wasn't some progress made, but the fact is is that this wasn't held correctly. Posting it on a website when nobody knows to look there, a lot of people don't know to look there, is not adequate notification. These are things that we have a problem with that we've been suggesting to fix for a long time and we don't get responses. So, I have an e-mail thread that I have saved without appropriate response going back to the beginning of February, addressing a lot of these things. So, I would like to invite you to call me directly and I'm happy to discuss these points in detail, but I understand you do have a time limitation and it's kind of last minute, so again, here is another open invitation for the Committee and the Legislative members to reach out to me directly and speak with me on the phone, to meet and speak with our group and members of our group. That we think that will be helpful for this process, to make sure that there's certain recommendations in this draft that are also included, that are not currently included. So, I appreciate your listening again. Thank you."

Chairman Linger stated: "The Committee was pretty much given the ability to do what they thought they needed to do to accomplish the task that they were given. Having a meeting within a community I think was part of a plan that wouldn't necessarily be a meeting of the Police Reform Committee, but as Katie said the ideas that were taken from those separate meetings were brought back to the full Committee. A lot of people don't want to go on the record as having met with anyone. They don't want their name out there. As another speaker said it's sometimes, you can't bring them or tell them that if you say something, it's going to go public, and they don't want that. The Committee did what they needed to do to get through what they had to get to." Legislator Handel stated: "I have a question. The Governor has to have this on his desk by April, but does that mean that this is the end-all and be-all of police reform in Greene County? Does that mean that we can't make any changes even after it's on his desk?" Chairman Linger replied: "Not at all." Legislator Handel continued: "I mean, we can still be a continuation, something that we can keep doing?" Chairman Linger replied: "It is and it's actually one of the recommendations that's there is to keep this

dialogue open.” Legislator Handel stated: “So, in the essence of time and the Governor threatening like he likes to do to everybody, cutting us off, this can be put on his desk, but that doesn’t mean that this, that there’s not going to be any more changes for the county, this is it and it’s written in stone and that’s the end of it? So, we can keep coming back to other things, but in the essence of time, we need to get something on the Governor’s desk.” Chairman Linger stated: “Correct and that’s also part of what that Community Advocate Committee is for. People who don’t want to go to the Sheriff and say ‘hey, why don’t you look at this?’ They can come to that Committee. They can bring their idea to that Committee and then the Committee goes to the Sheriff or to the Legislature, whether it’s policy for us or policy for him. It’s kind of a, you know that’s a touchy subject with the way this was rolled out. The Sheriff, as opposed to a police chief, the Sheriff is an elected, constitutionally elected position, so he has his own responsibilities, whereas an appointed or a hired police chief may not. He has a different responsibility and a different role, so that was kind of the plan of bringing everyone else together. The Sheriff really has a little bit different responsibility than everybody else does here. So, it was a little more difficult process to go through some of these. Some of these will be policy decisions that the Legislature has control over. Other things are going to be policy decisions that we don’t control. The Sheriff’s office controls, or further up the chain actually controls. But I think that what came out of this was a real good start and does specify continuation of this process and an avenue for people who maybe aren’t comfortable discussing it, for getting those ideas forward from here on out. Would you agree Sheriff?” Sheriff Kusminsky replied: “Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.” Chairman Linger then asked: “Anybody else from the Committee?” Rev. Turpin then stated: “I wanted to, just for reminder’s sake, this Committee was obligated to have two meetings, because all the counties they had to have two meetings in the public eye. This Committee, our Committee had three meetings, so we had one above what was asked of us to do. And the second thing is, we have to honor how people felt during this COVID-19. There are men and women who are home, haven’t seen their grandchildren, barely seen their children if they’re grown, could not travel, felt very afraid to even go to the store and to really try to get someone to come out during a COVID-19 pandemic, I thought we had good numbers considering the time for which the Governor called this Legislature to get this program moving, we had a bigger fight on our hands, and it’s called COVID-19.

We had many people at those meetings. The largest group that I sat with in a year has been those meetings that we've had. I have not been in a meeting with more people than the meetings that we had at the high school. And I think that was great for this COVID pandemic that we're living in. We can't look past that and say 'okay, everybody should have come out'. Maybe more people would have come out, if it wasn't for the alarm of a pandemic. I've never lived in a pandemic before, never, this is my first time (laughter). Excuse me if I'm not up to par on it, but I respect as a Pastor of our community as well as to our church members, I respect anyone's feelings on this pandemic. If folks wanted to stay home, I honored that. If they wanted to wear two masks, I honored that. If they wanted to wear a shield and gloves, I honored that and if they wanted to stay home and actually say I would not risk catching COVID-19 virus to come out in a board meeting, I honored that and I applaud the Committee and those who came out who said 'I'll do it for my community'. Thank you."

Chairman Linger thanked Rev. Turpin. Rabbi Zak then stated: "I'd love to say something. This is Rabbi Zoe B. Zak. So I wanted to say when I was asked to be on this Committee, I had not met our Sheriff and I really received quite an education for which I want to thank all the organizers and all the people that came to present to us and the Sheriff, the Undersheriff, the Captain and deputies that came, the police captains, people from the Mental Health organizations that came, people really gave a lot of time and effort and care to this and I was pretty sure that no matter what we came up with, of course there would be more. There's always more. There's always more to learn. There's always more space to grow. There's always deeper connections to be made. There's always greater support to give. But I would say what I learned, if I could say the one thing that I really learned being on this Committee was that our Sheriff and our Sheriff's Department is quite open-minded and open to not only interacting with the community that they already do but interacting more and meeting more people. They're willing to go anywhere. That was really made clear, so I think the best thing about this Committee is that it created relationships and understanding and a learning for myself and I suspect for some other people on the Committee to understand better what our Sheriff and everyone in the Sheriff's department actually does. And it gives me a lot of faith in the possibilities going forward. For all of the other ways there are to connect, and so I just want to say to the people that are worried is this the end or did we address everything, I don't think we could've addressed everything. We tried to

and I don't say this in a defensive way, we tried to address what we understood the Governor had asked us, knowing of course any one person's job there's so many, there's so many other aspects that one could discuss. So, I really want to say that I honor everybody that's gotten up to speak and that you're taking the time to bring these questions and I think we have a Sheriff and a department that are really here to address whatever is brought to them, in a kind and compassionate and open-minded way and for that I feel very grateful."

Chairman Linger thanked Rabbi Zak and he then stated: "And I will say, all the people that were selected on this Committee are members who are actively involved within their communities and just because this Committee's actions are finished, they're still out there every day in their communities. They are going to take concerns as they hear them and I will guarantee that Shaun will get a phone call, if they have a concern. I don't see them not making those concerns known, given what they've just gone through and so I think that's still going to come from their communities and that's why, quite frankly why they were selected from the various groups that they were, because they are all over the county and they are a very diverse group. Anyone else from the Committee? Haven't heard our District Attorney or our Public Defender, but they were both part of this as well, that's the other side of the Criminal Justice system that we have here and I think they were able to provide some pretty good insight as to how things actually work, not just looking at them as words on paper, but how they actually work within our system and I think they were a good addition to that committee as well." Mr. Stanzone stated: "I'll just say a couple of words. I just want to express that the people on this Committee I've come to know, and I believe that they are people of the highest ethical standards so when I heard the first speakers express her opinion, she had some criticism and that's great. Criticism breeds progress. I think we all listened, we respect what's being said, but I think that at the end of her statement she indicated something to the effect that the plan would be unethical and that concerns me to make a statement like that. We've all worked very hard. We've listened, taken in a lot of input, put together this plan and then we present it for further input. The term 'unethical' is not a term to be tossed around lightly and I just think that was inappropriate." Mr. Scaturro then stated: "I would like to say that this Committee did put a lot of time and effort into this and I welcome the comments of the people who did speak, and you know it's easy to, I find, to poke holes and to tear something apart rather than putting something whole together, especially from

scratch and that's what we tried to do. It may not be perfect, we say it's a work in progress, but I think we've had a cross-section of the community speak and Mr. Nash-Webber was at several of our meetings. You try to get every avenue out there to get people to speak up, whether they, we had some writings come to us directly, there's some e-mails, so we tried to open it up and was it enough? We did the best we could do, so I'd like to think that we really did put our whole heart into this. It was a Committee decision. Some of the Committee members may not agree with some of the things that we did, but we did try to do what we think is best. We were trying to be transparent about it all and as we said that's why we left it open so it's hopefully a work in progress. That's all we're trying to do, is make it something that will make our community a better and safer place, although it's a pretty safe place to live now. So, that's all. I thank everyone for their help in getting us to this point, because it was quite a bit of work."

Chairman Linger then stated: "Alright, for the Board members then, Warren and Shaun when would you need any potential amendments to what was drafted here, to draft a resolution for next week?" Mr. Groden replied: "To keep with your existing legislative cycle, you have two meetings next week. Monday and Wednesday, if you wanted more time, then our Legislative cycle then would just have to be extended another week into March in order for us then to complete a final document and then to get it the Governor's desk by the requirement of April 1st. Tonight's Wednesday, so Agendas go out Friday typically, so if you can't move for that schedule, then we would then call for a special meeting into the following week. I would remind you that you already have a special meeting on the 31st, so in that window..." Chairman Linger stated: "I think we can move within that schedule, even if there were amendments that are made here, even with the concerns that were brought tonight, those are things that will be looked at as we go forward from this, but if somebody had an amendment they wanted to make as far as the final draft that goes to the Governor's office, when do you need it by, Friday?" Mr. Groden replied: "Or from the floor Monday night." Chairman Linger replied: "Okay. Mr. Groden explained: "Because then we would take that from Monday night's committee meeting and then Wednesday night is our full Board meeting." Chairman Linger stated: "So other than, if somebody has a drastic concern that you feel we need to extend the timeline on, please call me or e-mail. We can move it out by a week or so, but if there's any other little, smaller amendments that you want to see made changes to bring them up and bring the

Resolution next week. Anything else we need?" Mr. Groden replied: "I would just, I would like to extend my thanks to the Committee. I must admit they were very, very committed. I don't think anybody hardly missed a meeting. They were there every night. They asked a lot of questions; they had a lot of debate and I think it was an honest effort. Look it, 25 recommendations that came from this Committee. We, as staff, are watching a lot of other counties. A lot of other counties aren't even coming close to this effort. I've seen one-page reports and meetings that didn't begin until December or January, so this, once we got the Committee rolling, got them past that organizational session, and then they wanted to go into closed committee meetings to then try to debate everything. They worked their butts off. I absolutely respect their effort and I think as a product, this product is a wonderful, 25 recommendations, I mean, come on. That's big, that's very big. As Rev. Turpin said I think two weeks ago, he didn't just want a report, he wanted a report that he could be proud of. Reverend, I don't mean to put words in your mouth, but that's your quote. And I think you should be proud of this report." Chairman Linger then asked: "Anything else from any of the Board members?" There was no reply. Chairman Linger then stated: "I have a motion to close from Legislator Lennon, seconded by Legislator Bloomer and we're closed. Thank you very much." This meeting ended at 7:32 p.m.

Adjournment.

Motion to adjourn was made by Legislator Lennon and seconded by Legislator Bloomer. Chairman Linger thanked everyone and this meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

