A. Roll Call

Chair Currie called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and roll was called. It was noted that a quorum was present.

B. Approve Minutes from June 11, 2018

Motion made by Ms. Ortman, seconded by Sergeant Atkinson, to approve the meeting minutes of June 11, 2018. The minutes were approved.

C. General Information

1. Chair Currie read Form 8B Memorandum of Voting Conflict For Local Public Officer into the Record, which was submitted by Lynette Falzone.
“I, Lynette Falzone, hereby disclose that on June 11, 2018, a measure came before my agency which inured to the special gain or loss of my relative Vincent Falzone, brother,” and the disclosure was signed on 6/11/18.

That disclosure was in reference to the matter heard by the court.

2. Questions from Last Meeting

Chair Currie asked for an update on the body cams.

Major London reported that Major Dietrich will appear before the board next month to finalize questions regarding procurement of body cams. Evaluation should be completed by August 13th.

Major London reported that the Citizen’s Police Forum is tentatively scheduled to occur on October 11th through- November 8th.

Chair Currie confirmed that the new members of the Board should review the August 2017 version of the ordinance. The link on the Citizens Review Board page was not up-to-date.

Chair Currie requested that the Board not take a break over the summer. The Board agreed.

Ms. Cole sent an email to the Board members regarding City-provided email accounts. Mr. Weissman stated that use of a City-provided email account is not mandatory. The reason the City is providing email accounts is because any communication a Board member has with the City is public record. The emails have to be saved in accordance with State retention laws. If a public records request was made for emails, the Board members would have to produce emails sent from personal email accounts. Board members potentially could be compelled by the court to submit to forensic analysis of the Board member’s personal email accounts and computers.

D. Review the following Internal Affairs Investigation

1. Complainant Chief Rick Maglione
   (IA Case 18-0296)

   Allegation
   1) Conduct prejudicial disruptive to the good order of the department
   2) Speech involving themselves or other Department personnel reflecting behavior
Officer: Carl Hannold  
Disposition: 1) Not Sustained  
2) Not Sustained

Motion made by Carol Ortman, seconded by James Teague, to discuss IA Case 18-029, count 1, Conduct prejudicial, disruptive to the good order of the police department against Officer Carl Hannold.

Motion to concur with allegation 1 of IA Case 18-029 made by Carol Ortman, seconded by James Teague.

Screenshots of Officer Hannold’s social media had been provided anonymously to the police department by multiple people. The Board discussed social media policy 129.1, which reserves the right to monitor social media.

Major London stated that Internal Affairs has not been proactively monitoring any social media accounts.

Chair Currie asked when Internal Affairs starts monitoring social media, and suggested that this Officer should be monitored because he already had issues with social media use.

Chair Currie reviewed the screenshots provided anonymously, and questioned the results of the investigation.

Chair Currie assumed by review of the social media posts that Jason Holding and Robert Winston had been affiliated with the police department. Chair Currie inquired whether Internal Affairs questioned Jason Holding and Robert Winston about the allegations in the posts.

Sergeant Malushi responded that he was the lead investigator on the case, and discussed how the posts related to the investigation. Sergeant Malushi further responded that Jason Holding and Robert Winston were no longer employed by the police department at the time the posts were created.

Major London pointed out that the posts by Jason Holding and Robert Winston were based on their personal assumptions of what Officer Hannold was referring to in his post. It was noted that Officer Hannold did not respond to either of these individuals posts.

Captain Falzone stated that the posts lacked proper context.
In a voice vote, the **motion** to concur passed (4-1), with Chair Currie opposed.

**Motion** made by Captain Falzone, seconded by Sergeant Atkinson to review IA Case 18-029, count 2, charging Officer Hannold with speech involving themselves or other department personnel reflecting behavior that would reasonably be considered reckless and irresponsible.

Chair Currie opined that the social media posts reflected behavior that was reasonably considered reckless and irresponsible because it triggered more than one officer to hand over the screenshots.

**Motion** to concur with allegation 2 of IA Case 18-029 made by Carol Ortman, seconded by James Teague.

In a voice vote, the **motion** to concur passed (4-2), with Chair Currie and James Teague opposed.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by M. Denman, Prototype, Inc.]

**Attachments:**
Screenshots of social media posts.