

City of Annapolis

*160 Duke Of Gloucester Street
Annapolis, MD 21401*



Standing Committee Minutes

Wednesday, June 14, 2017

5:00 PM

Mayor John T. Chambers, Jr.
City Council Chambers

Public Safety Committee

1. Call To Order

Chairperson Alderwoman Finlayson called the meeting to order at 5:12 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

4. General Discussion

[ID-221-17](#)

Public Safety Working Group Presentation

Acting Chief Baker was present and answered questions from the committee and updated the committee on what currently being done to resolve issues related to the committees recommendations. He also spoke on the creation of an advisory board, complains, discrimination, internal Affairs and the Professional standards Officer.

Rick Truitt representing the Annapolis Police Department spoke on the presentation at the work group, the union leadership, management and the City.

Committee Member Eric Lipsetts made the following statement "22 questions sent to the city from the PublicSafety Ad Hoc Committee were not answered.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY AD HOC COMMITTEE REGARDING THE CAUCUS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN LEADERS RESOLUTION VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE IN CHIEF MICHAEL J. PRISTOOP

I. The Resolution, the Committee's Formation and Executive Summary.

In October 2016, the Annapolis Public Safety Committee formed an Ad Hoc Committee (Committee) to review allegations contained in a document entitled "The Caucus of African-American Leaders Resolution Vote of no Confidence in Chief Michael J. Pristoop" (Caucus Resolution). The Caucus Resolution recites a number of circumstances and incidences related to City police officers, both current and former, that allegedly illustrate systemic racial discrimination regarding employment and discipline within Annapolis Police Department (the "APD").

The mission statement for this Committee was to address concerns about inequitable treatment within the APD, as outlined in the Caucus Resolution. The specific objectives of the Committee included: (1) to review the complaints and determine the validity of each; (2) if appropriate, to recommend follow-up action; (3) to report findings to the Public Safety Committee and then to all members of the City Council; and (4) recommend a process to be used to address future complaints. The Committee consists of Chair and Alderman Fred Paone, Dr. Carletta Allen, Dr. Craig Coates, William Reichhardt, and Eric Lipsetts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In undertaking its charge from the Public Safety Committee, the Committee collected a significant number of documents, including the APD's responses to concerns and recommendations expressed by the Caucus (and the American Civil Liberties Union) in 2015, prior EEOC findings, court decisions, and APD general orders. It also heard from numerous witnesses, including Caucus Convenor Carl Snowden, Alderman Kenneth Kirby, and Assistant City Attorney Gary Elson. The Committee's fact-finding inquiry was

limited by the termination of Chief Pristoop and by our inability to review personnel files. The evidence the Committee reviewed does not support a finding of systemic racial discrimination at the APD under the leadership of Chief Michael Pristoop. The evidence the Committee was able to collect does suggest that there might be a perception of racial discrimination at the APD by some members of the community. Accordingly, to address this perception, the Committee recommends the following actions be taken:

1. That the APD routinely provide quarterly information not only as to crimes and arrests but also the preventive measures it is taking to reduce crime. These reports should be made not only to the City Council and the Capital Gazette, but also to community organizations and interested groups. The APD should routinely solicit community organizations and interested groups for their suggestions as to how to better improve the interactions between police officers and the community. The APD should consider implementing all reasonable suggestions in an effort to reduce crime and improve community relations.
2. That the APD and State's Attorney's Office communicate within a reasonable period of time, but no later than 60 days from the acceptance of this report, to establish a program wherein the APD is routinely informed of developments in the law affecting policing.
3. That the Public Safety Committee ("PSC") determine what needs to be done to protect our officers, and report back to the Council within 60 days of this report as to its findings. All measures identified by the PSC that can be taken without a significant fiscal impact should be immediately implemented, and those which require fiscal resources should be applied for without delay.
4. That the Chief of APD appoint a member of the public as a nonvoting member of each hearing board established pursuant to the Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights ("LEOBOR"), as provided for by Md. Public Safety Code Ann. § 3-107(c).
5. That independent attorneys be recruited to advise trial boards as to evidentiary matters, not to take part in deliberations, and that these attorneys be solicited to so advise trial boards on a pro bono basis.
6. That a complaint review board be established consistent with the LEOBR, to supplement the internal APD review process. This complaint review board should be authorized to issue reports and findings in coordination with the APD's internal process and the LEOBR.

II. The Committee's Investigation.

The Committee conducted meetings between October 2016 and March 2017. Committee members were able review documents and consider the testimony of witnesses, which included Alderman Kenneth Kirby, Mr. Gary Elson in his capacity as a City Attorney, and Mr. Carl Snowden, the Convener of the Caucus. The Committee also reviewed the APD's Response to the Caucus authored by then-Police Chief Michael J. Pristoop, in which the APD reported that it had implemented 16 of 18 recommendations made by the Caucus and the American Civil Liberties Union. The Committee also reviewed the opinion of Judge John McKenna in the case *Bailey v. Kintop et al.*, Case No. 0702-0013630-2011, in which the Court found an officer liable for altering an arrest warrant.

On or about January 23, 2017, the Committee sent a list of 22 questions to the City and asked that it produce a person knowledgeable about those matters to appear before the Committee; it was anticipated that Chief Pristoop would provide the information requested. On or about February 9, 2017, however, Chief Pristoop's employment was terminated. The City has yet not provided someone to provide information regarding those 22 questions. With Chief Pristoop's termination – his tenure being the ultimate subject of the Caucus's resolution – and notwithstanding it has yet to hear from the City

as to the matters inquired about, the Committee has determined it is in a position to conclude its investigation. Below, the Committee summarizes the information it did receive.

A. Prior Adjudications

The Committee determined that it would be inappropriate to consider matters currently under litigation, such as the allegations contained in the Caucus Resolution concerning Officer Jason Thomas, who brought an action against the City of Annapolis alleging racial discrimination within the APD. However, past disposition reports and prior court rulings were provided to the Committee concerning investigations by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) of complaints brought by other police officers in the 2012-13 time period. Those complaints were filed by officers Carl Bouie, Shelley White (now deceased), Floyd Carson, Jr., and James C. Spearman, Jr. An analysis of those complaints are set forth below:

- *Officer Carl Bouie:* Officer Bouie alleged that he did not receive a promotion despite his eligibility due to his race Officer Bouie also alleged that he was the victim of retaliation within the APD. Based on the information provided by the parties in this case, the EEOC concluded there was no causal connection between the failure to promote Officer Bouie in March 2009 and the discipline that he suffered in August 2010.
- *Detective Shelley White:* Detective White alleged that he was “discriminated against because of his race (black) and sex (male) when” he was “subjected to unequal terms and conditions of employment (hours, scheduling and assignments) and retaliated against for engaging in a protected activity with respect to a hostile work environment.” Based upon its investigation, on January 31, 2013 the EEOC concluded there was little likelihood of establishing a violation of civil rights laws in the circumstances presented by his charge .
- *Officer Floyd Carson Jr.:* Officer Carson filed a complaint with the EEOC alleging discrimination in violation of the Civil Rights Act. The Committee was only able to obtain a copy of the Dismissal and Notice of Rights letter issued to Officer Carson by EEOC on January 31, 2013, in which the EEOC said “based upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes a violation of the statutes.”
- *Sergeant James C. Spearman, Jr.:* Apparently Sergeant Spearman filed his discrimination complaint with the EEOC and later contacted the US Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division for a written confirmation of the dismissal of the EEOC complaint and verification of his right to proceed to a lawsuit against the APD. Because the Committee was only given the July 30, 2013 letter from the Justice Department to Sergeant Spearman, we did not have the substance of the discrimination complaint. Officers White, Bouie, Spearman and Carson, collectively, brought suit in Federal District Court alleging numerous civil rights violations by the APD. In their lawsuit, the officers’ allegations included: disparate treatment in hiring, discipline and work assignments, as well as hostile work environment, and retaliation within the APD. The Court, however, ruled in favor of the City, noting “[g]enerally, all (of the plaintiffs) suffer from the same fatal defect - the lack of admissible evidence that establishes plaintiffs’ prima facie cases or genuinely disputes the City’s proffered nondiscriminatory rationales for its actions.”

A. Carl Snowden

Mr. Snowden testified regarding the allegations referenced in the Caucus Resolution . Generally, Mr. Snowden testified regarding the lack of meaningful communication between the APD and some members of the community; for instance, he said he was unaware that the APD had implemented 16 of 18 recommendations the Caucus and the American Civil Liberties Union had made a year before.

B. Alderman Kenneth Kirby

Alderman Kenneth Kirby testified as to an incident raised in the Caucus Resolution, wherein Alderman Kirby believed that he was treated disrespectfully by a member of the APD in the lobby of the Annapolis police station on Taylor Ave. Alderman Kirby said "hello" to this officer, and the officer ignored the salutation. The gravamen of this allegation is that Chief Pristoop failed to impose discipline on this officer for racial reasons, knowing that the officer was seeking employment elsewhere.

Alderman Kirby said that he reported the incident to City Manager Thomas Andrews that day, and that he assumed Mr. Andrews would speak to Chief Pristoop about it. The Committee was unable to determine if City Manager Andrews contemporaneously spoke with Chief Pristoop about what had occurred.

A few weeks later, Alderman Kirby spoke to Chief Pristoop directly about the incident. It was not until six weeks later, and after the officer involved had left the APD, that Chief Pristoop tried to arrange for a meeting between Alderman Kirby and the officer involved, which meeting the officer declined.

C. Gary Elson

Assistant City Attorney Gary Elson testified as to the internal procedures for investigating complaints and the internal APD procedures for disciplining officers. Most notably, Mr. Elson testified that investigations of citizen complaints are referred to the APD's Internal Affairs unit. The investigation of such complaints is to be completed within 30 days. The Chief of Police makes the final determination as to whether discipline is to be imposed, and if so, the nature of the discipline. Mr. Elson also reported that under the current procedure the complainant receives only notice of whether his or her complaint has been sustained or rejected. If sustained, the citizen complainant does not receive any information as to whether the discipline was administered or the nature of any corrective action.

III. The Committee's Findings.

A. The Prior Adjudications

The Committee did not receive the details of the underlying EEOC complaints, responses, nor the details of the EEOC's investigations; it is the Committee's understanding that such documents are confidential. Nor did the Committee review the underlying documents upon which the federal court relied. As a threshold matter, discovery (the exchange of information between the parties) is not publicly available. The federal court noted that the Plaintiffs had failed to dispute the City's proffered "non-discriminatory rationales" for the actions it took, an implicit recognition that actions were indeed taken which were adverse to the parties, for which the City had asserted a non-discriminatory reason.

In five instances, allegations of racial discrimination within the APD were made, and all were rejected. Some weight needs to be given to these administrative and court rulings because these complaints were investigated by the EEOC and considered by a court. However, without making a full independent inquiry about the allegations made by these four officers, the Committee cannot make its own judgment regarding these allegations.

B. The Shelly White Allegation

The Caucus raised questions as to why the APD did not provide an honor guard for Detective Shelley White's funeral. At the time of his death, Officer White was still named as a Plaintiff in a pending law suit against the City of Annapolis and he was no longer employed by the APD. It is the Committee's understanding, based on inquiry, that that Chief Pristoop did not contact Detective White's family until the day of the funeral and that no previous request was made by the family for an honor guard or attendance at the

funeral by the Police Chief. In order to avoid this situation in the future and as a direct result of this incident, the City has since adopted a procedure which describes the circumstances when an honor guard will be provided.

C. *The Alderman Kirby Allegation*

The Caucus raised questions about the manner in which Alderman Kirby was ignored by a then-corporal on the APD, and why no discipline was imposed. The Committee found that, other than discussing this matter with Alderman Kirby, no action was taken by Chief Pristoop until months later, and after this Committee had been formed. Regardless of what might be said about the Chief's handling of this incident, the APD has subsequently issued a general order specifying how elected officials are to be addressed and responded to by police officers.

D. *The 18 Recommendations*

The Caucus questioned why recommendations made by it and the American Civil Liberties Union had not been implemented. The Committee found that 16 of the 18 recommendations had either been adopted, or were in the process of being implemented (such as the recommendation that officers wear body cameras, funds for which have been requested, and a pilot program is underway). It is the Committee's understanding this information was presented to the City Council, and publicly available at the time the Caucus passed its Resolution of "No Confidence," but the Caucus seems to have been unaware of it (and thus the Committee's recommendation for better communications).

E. *The Disparate Treatment Allegations*

The Caucus claimed there has been disparate treatment within the APD, and as to that matter the Caucus provided examples of where African-American officers were disciplined for making false statements, but non-African-American officers were not disciplined for similar violations. As noted earlier, the Committee made inquiry of the City as to the specific circumstances behind these claims, but the Committee was not able to obtain answers as Chief Pristoop never appeared before the Committee.

IV. *The Committee's Analysis and Recommendations.*

As was said previously in this Report, the Committee was continuously handicapped by its inability to review personnel files due to privacy considerations. Additionally, we would like to have heard from the Chief. However, having said that, based on the evidence provided to and collected by the Committee, including those who testified, the Committee did not find evidence of systemic racial discrimination within the APD.

What the Committee can state, is that there is a perception by some in the community that there is systemic racial discrimination at the APD. An example of evidence of perception overtaking reality is in the Caucus' complaint regarding the APD's supposed inaction on its 18 recommendations; in fact, the APD implemented, or is in the process of implementing, 16 of those recommendations, facts as to which the Caucus was apparently unaware.

While the APD has a policy of non-discrimination, the Committee also finds there are some systemic perception problems that need to be addressed between the APD and some of the citizens of Annapolis it has sworn to protect. The first of these problems involves communication: (1) there is a lack of meaningful and clear response from the APD when a citizen files a complaint, and (2) between the APD and some citizen groups in Annapolis. This latter problem is evidenced, for instance, by the Caucus being unaware of the APD's implementation of most of its recommendations.

As to the first of these findings, it is the Committee's understanding that when a citizen makes a complaint, that complaint is referred to the APD's Internal Affairs Division. An

investigation is made, and is to be completed within 30 days. Findings are ultimately reported to the Chief of Police, who determines if the complaint is sustained and, if so, what discipline is to be imposed. The complainant, however, receives notice only as to whether his or her complaint was sustained or the officer was exonerated, the limitation on the information provided apparently dictated by the need to preserve personnel information.

Thus, the citizen who complains receives virtually no information as to the findings, nor the disposition. Given such a process, and the fact that it is completely managed by the APD, it is understandable that some members of the community, as reflected in the Caucus Resolution, have little confidence that the APD polices its own.

The Committee believes there must be better communications between the APD and the community it serves. Periodic reporting to the City Council appears to be inadequate. Better and more transparent communications reinforce the bond between the APD and the citizens of Annapolis; such a bond based on mutual trust is critical to the APD's mission and ability to carry out its law enforcement functions. The Committee is fully aware that bonds between citizens and the police have become frayed recently, evidenced by recent well-publicized events involving encounters between citizens, as well as horrific attacks upon police officers. To this extent, the Committee recommends as follows:

1. That the APD routinely provide quarterly information not only as to crimes and arrests but also the preventive measures it is taking to reduce crime. These reports should be made not only to the City Council, police social media and the Capital Gazette, but also to community organizations and interested groups. The APD should routinely solicit community organizations and interested groups for their suggestions as to how to better improve the interactions between police officers and the community. The APD should consider implementing all reasonable suggestions in an effort to reduce crime and improve community relations

The Committee was informed that there is no formal or systematic communications between the APD and the City Attorney's office, and/or the Anne Arundel County State's Attorney's office, regarding new developments in the law that affect law enforcement by police officers.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends:

2. That the APD and State's Attorney's Office communicate within a reasonable period of time, but no later than 60 days from the acceptance of this report, to establish a program wherein the APD is routinely informed of developments in the law affecting policing.

Although not explicitly within its purview, the Committee also expresses its concern regarding officers' safety. Police work, by its very nature, is dangerous. Notwithstanding that danger, the City is under an obligation to take all reasonable measures within its ability to protect its officers from acts of violence directed towards them. Accordingly, the Committee recommends:

3. (A) That the Public Safety Committee determine what needs to be done to protect our officers to the best of our ability;
(B) That the Public Safety Committee report back to the Council within 60 days;
(C) All measures that can be taken without a significant fiscal impact be immediately implemented; and

(D) Those which require fiscal resources be applied for without delay.

As to resolving complaint procedures between the APD and the community, the Committee takes note of officer protections established by the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights ("LEOBOR"), § 3-107 et seq. Recent legislation allows for a layperson to sit in on trial boards established by the LEOBOR, although that layperson must go through a vigorous training program, and cannot vote on the outcome. Still, the Committee believes that all citizen participation involving officers accused of misconduct in the context of community/police interactions should be encouraged. Accordingly, the Committee recommends:

4. That a layperson person be identified to sit in on trial boards, as authorized by P.S. § 3-107(c).

The Committee is also cognizant that trial boards are semi-judicial proceedings, wherein witnesses are sworn and evidence taken. To ensure fairness and integrity of the process, the Committee believes that a trial board, when constituted, would be well served by having an independent attorney advise it as to evidentiary matters and provide legal advice as necessary. The Committee has also been informed that trial boards in the APD are relatively infrequent, such that a trial board having such advice could be served by an attorney on a pro bono basis. Accordingly, the Committee further recommends:

5. That attorneys be allowed to advise trial boards as to evidentiary matters, not to take part in deliberations, and that these attorneys be solicited to so advise trial boards on a pro bono basis.

The Committee also believes, however, that having a layperson sit in on a trial board, and not having a vote, is insufficient to assure the community that there is a neutral body monitoring police interactions with the citizens of Annapolis. Accordingly, in addition to having a layperson sit in on trial boards, the Committee recommends:

6. That a complaint review board be established, to supplement the internal APD review process. This complaint review board should be authorized to issue reports and findings, so that the public knows what happened and is assured that the complainant was given a fair hearing.

The Committee notes that the APD is in favor of establishing such a board.

The Committee further suggests that this review board consist of one representative of each ward, a mayoral appointment, and a representative of the APD. Administratively, the Committee contemplates that complaints would be heard by a panel of three members, one of whom will be a representative of the APD, in this way, the time-burden on the members would be limited. The specific procedures, scope of complaint review, and reporting mechanisms should be developed by members of the review board subject to review of the Office of Law and approval of the City Council. The actions of this complaint review board must be consistent with the provisions of the LEOBR.

CONCLUSION

In the course of the Committee's work, communication and perception problems were identified. Based on the evidence reviewed, the Committee did not find evidence of systemic racial discrimination within the APD. The Committee has recommended

specific steps to address better communication with all segments of the community; transparency in the processing of citizen complaints to the APD and efforts to protect the safety of police officers and citizens. The Committee's recommendations as to how those problems could be addressed are outlined above.

To the extent that the City implements any or all of the recommendations of this Committee, it is imperative that future collaborative work be done that involves the APD and members representing the diverse segments of our community.

Chairman of the Public Safety Ad Hoc Committee Alderman Paone presented the report on behalf of the committee and introduced the committee members present:

**Dr. Craig Coates,
Eric Lipsetts
William "Bill" Reichhardt**

Chair Paone spoke on the Shelly White Allegation, not having an Honor Guard at Mr. Whites Memorial Service, allegation from Alderman Kirby -with no acting taken by the Chief until months after the incident, recommendation from the ACLU that were not given the the Caucus, the implementation of body cameras, information not being shared with the Caucus, allegations of police department's treatment of African American Officers, former Chief Pristoop and the need for legal cancel.

Chair Paone also present the following recommendations:

The committee did not find racial discrimination in the Annapolis Police Department, problems to be address by the police department related to complaints, Citizen complaints, citizens were no notified of actions taken related to their complaints,

- 1. Provide quarterly report and be provide to citizens.**
- 2. Police and states Attorneys Office communicate regarding updated to the laws.**
- 3. Public Safety Committee reports to the City Council within 60 days after an issue has been reported.**
- 4. Law Enforcements Bill of Right - Trial Boards has a lay person is required to go thru training. City Council nominate a citizen to sit on the Trial Board.**
- 5. Attorney be allowed to advise trial Boards**
- 6. Complain Review Board be established- one rep per ward**

Alderman Kirby was present and made the following statement: "Perception can be Reality"

2. Business before Committee

a. Approval of Minutes

[PSC051517](#) Approval of Minutes for the Regular Meeting

Attachments: [PSC051517.pdf](#)

Alderman Paone moved to approve the Regular meeting Minutes of May 15, 2017. Seconded. and CARRIED on voice vote.

Aye: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

b. Appointments and reappointments to Committees

[AP-18-17](#) Confirmation of Scott Baker, Chief of Police

Attachments: [AP-18-17 Scott Baker Confirmation Memo.doc](#)
[AP-18-17 Scott Baker Resume.pdf](#)

Alderman Paone moved to recommend favorably Ap-18-17 Confirmation of Scott Baker, Chief of Police. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Aye: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

3. Legislation before Committee

[O-13-17](#) Parking Enforcement and Rulemaking Responsibilities - For the purpose of updating parking enforcement and rulemaking responsibilities in Chapters 2.36, 12.08 and 12.32 in the Code of the City of Annapolis; and matters generally relating to updating parking enforcement and rulemaking responsibilities.

Attachments: [O-13-17 Parking Enforcement and Rulemaking Responsibilities.docx](#)
[O-13-17 Staff Report.docx](#)
[O-13-17 Transportation Board Findings.pdf](#)

Transportation Director Gordon gave a brief presentation on ordinance and answered questions from the committee.

City Manager Andrews was present and answered questions from the committee.

Alderman Kirby spoke on the City's Towing Company and safety issues for the Parking Enforcement Office without the police being on the seen.

Alderwoman Pindell Charles moved to postpone O-13-17 Parking Enforcement and Rulemaking Responsibilities - For the purpose of updating parking enforcement and rulemaking responsibilities in Chapters 2.36, 12.08 and 12.32 in the Code of the City of Annapolis; and matters generally relating to updating parking enforcement and rulemaking responsibilities until the July Meeting. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Aye: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

[O-27-17](#) Special Parking Permits for Transport and Contractors - For the purpose of establishing parking shuttle eligibility for special parking permits; limiting special parking permits within the Historic District; and clarifying conditions for issuing special parking permits.

Attachments: [O-27-17 Special Parking Permits for Transport and Contractors.docx](#)
[O-27-17 Staff Report.docx](#)

Transportation Director Gordon was present and spoke in favor of the legislation.

Alderman Budge gave a brief presentation on the legislation and answered

questions from council.

Alderman Paone moved to recommend favorably O-27-17 Special Parking Permits for Transport and Contractors - For the purpose of establishing parking shuttle eligibility for special parking permits; limiting special parking permits within the Historic District; and clarifying conditions for issuing special parking permits. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Aye: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

O-28-17

Removing City Employee Parking from Hillman Garage - For the purpose of improving parking availability in the downtown commercial area by relocating most City employee parking from Hillman Garage to satellite parking facilities; and providing transportation to and from said satellite parking facilities.

Attachments: [O-28-17 City Employee Parking at Hillman Garage.docx](#)
[O-28-17 Staff Report.docx](#)
[O-28-17 Employee Petition.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 Transportation Board Findings.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 CityEmployeeParkingQA.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 Hillman Garage - Frequency Full.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 Parking Study Draft - Hillman Occupancy.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 City Employee Comments 6,12,17.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 Public Hearing Comments 6,12,17.pdf](#)
[O-28-17 EmployeeConcerns 6,12,17.pdf](#)

Alderman Budge was present and answered questions from the committee.

Alderman Paone moved to recommend unfavorably O-28-17 Removing City Employee Parking from Hillman Garage - For the purpose of improving parking availability in the downtown commercial area by relocating most City employee parking from Hillman Garage to satellite parking facilities; and providing transportation to and from said satellite parking facilities. Seconded. DEFEATED on voice vote.

Nay: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

O-29-17

Double Parking - For the purpose of authorizing double parking for the expeditious loading and unloading of commercial vehicles.

Attachments: [O-29-17 Double Parking.docx](#)
[O-29-17 Staff Report.docx](#)
[O-29-17 Transportation Board Findings.pdf](#)

Alderman Budge gave a brief presentation and answered questions from the committee.

Alderman Paone moved to recommend favorably. Seconded. CARRIED on voice vote.

Aye: 3 - Alderman Paone, Alderwoman Finlayson and Alderwoman Pindell Charles

5. Adjournment

Upon motion duly made, seconded and adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

**Regina C. Watkins-Eldridge, MMC
City Clerk**