

**MINUTES
NORTH CAROLINA SENTENCING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING**

March 6, 2015

The North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Commission met on Friday, March 6, 2015, at the North Carolina Judicial Center in Raleigh, North Carolina.

Members Present: Chairman W. Erwin Spainhour, Art Beeler, Honorable Charlie Brown, Paul Butler, Robert Campbell, Honorable Warren Daniel, Honorable Richard Elmore, Honorable Robert Ervin, David Guice, Ilona Kusa, Robert Montgomery, Luther Moore, Honorable Fred Morrison, and Honorable Thomas Thompson.

Guests: Anne Precythe (Community Corrections, Department of Public Safety), Keenon James (North Carolina Sheriffs' Association), Yolanda Woodhouse (Administrative Office of the Courts), Jamie Markham (UNC School of Government), and Ryan Niland (NC Office of Administrative Hearings).

Staff: Susan Katzenelson, Ginny Hevener, John Madler, Michelle Hall, Tamara Flinchum, Sara Perdue, Mark Bodkin, Rebecca Murdock, Jennifer Wesoloski, and Shelley Kirk.

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Spainhour called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Members, staff, and visitors introduced themselves. Chairman Spainhour reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Thomas Thompson moved to adopt the minutes from the December 4, 2014, meeting; the motion was seconded and carried.

STRUCTURED SENTENCING STATISTICAL REPORT FY 2014

Chairman Spainhour recognized Jennifer Wesoloski, staff, to present court statistics for Fiscal Year 2013/14 (*see* handout). Ms. Wesoloski noted that the information presented was included in the annual Structured Sentencing Statistical Report for Felonies and Misdemeanors and in the Felony and Misdemeanor Quick Facts documents. Trend data included in the presentation was based on the current and previously published Statistical Reports.

Ms. Wesoloski noted that a sentencing episode, by definition, is the sentence imposed for the most serious conviction for a given day of court. In FY 2013/14, there were 28,130 felony convictions (excluding drug trafficking and violent habitual felon convictions) and 119,960 misdemeanor convictions (excluding DWI convictions, cases disposed by magistrates, Class 2 and 3 criminal traffic offenses, and local ordinance offenses) under Structured Sentencing. Felony convictions have decreased by less than 1% in the last fiscal year and misdemeanor convictions have decreased by 8% in the last fiscal year. Ms. Wesoloski noted the five-year trends: felony convictions have decreased nearly 7% and misdemeanor convictions by 22%. She then presented felony and misdemeanor information on the number of convictions by offense

class and crime type, prior criminal record, punishments imposed for the current fiscal year including active-, intermediate-, and community punishments, and ten-year trends. She also presented information on several special issues, including habitual felon convictions, drug trafficking convictions, and life and death sentences.

Ms. Wesoloski concluded that the data reflect Structured Sentencing at work in the North Carolina court system, and noted that there was a great deal of stability in many of the statistics presented. However, there were shifts in punishment types for felony and misdemeanor convictions, particularly changes in non-active punishments for felony convictions and active and community punishments for misdemeanor convictions. The shifts in non-active punishments for felony convictions over the past few years were most likely a result of changes to community and intermediate punishments under the JRA, while shifts in active and community punishments for misdemeanor convictions were most likely attributed to the common practice of sentencing misdemeanants to credit for time served.

Several questions were raised regarding the shifts in non-active punishments for felony convictions, particularly the increase in community punishments and the decrease in intermediate punishments since the implementation of the JRA. Judge Ervin asked how staff determines if offenders are sentenced to a community or intermediate punishment. Ginny Hevener responded that the clerks enter the punishment type from the judgment form into ACIS. Chairman Spainhour replied that he did not announce whether the punishment was community or intermediate at sentencing and that he thought there was little distinction between the two types of punishment following the passage of the JRA.

Judge Brown asked if quick dips were an intermediate sanction if an offender falls into a cell where only a community punishment is authorized, supervised probation is given, and the delegation of authority is not limited. John Madler responded that a quick dip is available as a condition of a community punishment and an intermediate punishment.

Judge Ervin asked what offenses are included in the “other” crime type. Ms. Hevener responded that those offenses included habitual felon convictions and offenses that did not fit into the person, property, and drug offense crime types. Judge Ervin then asked if habitual felon convictions were assigned a crime type based on the underlying felony offense. Ms. Hevener replied that while habitual breaking and entering would be classified as a property offense, and the underlying offense for habitual felons could be any of the crime types, habitual felon convictions as such are classified as “other.” With habitual felon convictions, often receiving mitigated sentences, comprising a significant portion of the “other” category, this crime category also has the highest percentage of mitigated sentences. Prior to the JRA, a large percentage of Class C sentences were falling into the mitigated range, driven by habitual felon convictions. Post-JRA, a large percentage of Class D sentences are also falling in the mitigated range, since habitual felons are now sentenced four classes higher than the underlying offense, rather than a Class C for all habitual felon convictions.

Ms. Katzenelson pointed out that the new habitual felon law under the JRA seems to be working as intended. An increased flexibility in charging habitual felons has resulted in more use by prosecutors. Ms. Hevener followed up by providing the Commission with information

regarding the percentage of habitual felon sentences and non-habitual felon sentences falling in the mitigated range; a larger percentage of habitual felons were sentenced in the mitigated range (62% and 60% respectively) than non-habitual felons sentenced in the mitigated range (38% and 23% respectively) for Class C and Class E convictions.

Mr. Beeler asked if staff had data on shifts in drug culture (*i.e.*, an increased use of heroin and a decreased use of cocaine, particularly crack-cocaine) and the effects these shifts may have on drug trafficking convictions. Ms. Hevener responded that it is difficult to use the AOC data to track such shifts because only some drugs have a specific AOC offense code. Offense codes for the general drug schedule (*e.g.*, Schedule II) and free text fields can also be used.

Mr. Campbell asked whether data are available on offenses initially charged as capital offenses that subsequently result in conviction of a lesser offense. Ms. Hevener replied that the Sentencing Commission only tracks information on convictions in its statistical reports. She noted that this information would be available only if it is captured on an AOC form and entered into AOC's automated database. Judge Ervin added that he read a report by Indigent Defense Services (IDS) that provided that information. Ms. Katzenelson responded that she could contact IDS to obtain that information and provide it to the Commission.

Judge Ervin asked why they have been seeing decreases in felony and misdemeanor convictions over the past ten years. Ms. Hevener responded that these decreases are associated with a decrease in the crime rate since 2008 and shifts in demographics, including growth in the aging population and a decrease in the growth of the most crime producing age group. Ms. Katzenelson added that crime has decreased tremendously nationwide, and a shift in demographics is a likely explanation.

Mr. Campbell asked about shifts in the number of charges and convictions and if there were graphs to show these changes. Judge Brown responded that conviction rates have remained stable. Ms. Hevener added that the Forecasting Technical Advisory Group (FTAG) looks at criminal justice trends and population trends to determine what affects crime rates. Administrative Office of the Court (AOC) data that were reviewed during the FTAG meeting showed an increase in felony filings over the past year and a decrease in misdemeanor filings. Judge Ervin asked if the decrease in misdemeanors across the board was attributed to legislative changes several years ago that eliminated many lower level misdemeanors. Ms. Hevener replied that those legislative changes that reclassified many lower level misdemeanors into infractions were mentioned in the Statistical Report.

Mr. Campbell asked for clarification on the definition of a sentencing episode; he asked if a DWI or a misdemeanor possession of marijuana would be selected as the most serious conviction on a given day of court. Ms. Hevener responded that the Sentencing Commission does not track data on DWI convictions, so the misdemeanor possession of marijuana would be selected as the sentencing episode. Judge Ervin asked if DWIs were tracked for the prison population. Ms. Hevener replied affirmatively, but added they are a dwindling population, given the shift of all DWI offenders to local jails, effective January 1, 2015.

CURRENT POPULATION PROJECTIONS – FY 2015 TO FY 2024

Chairman Spainhour recognized Ginny Hevener, staff, to present the Current Population Projections for Fiscal Year 2015 to Fiscal Year 2024 (*see* handout). The projections were prepared in conjunction with the Department of Public Safety's Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice (DACJJ), and are produced on an annual basis as part of the Commission's original mandate to develop a projection tool for accurate long-term planning of correctional resources.

Ms. Hevener described the data from the AOC and from the Department of Public Safety (DPS) that are used to project the prison population. The projections are based on the most recent empirical data available – FY 2014 – and were prepared using the simulation model that was developed in collaboration with SAS Institute.

Ms. Hevener noted that FY 2014 represents the second full fiscal year of data since the implementation of the JRA. Ms. Hevener cautioned that data from the early stages of implementation are not necessarily representative of future practices. The annual update of the projections will adjust the projections accordingly as practices evolve.

The prison population is projected to increase from 37,236 to 38,983 across the ten-year projection period – an increase of 5%. The current projections represent a decrease compared to last year's projections, primarily due to the recent legislative change to the commitment location for misdemeanants with sentences greater than 180 days and for those sentenced for impaired driving.

Comparing the projected prison population with the capacity estimates provided by the Adult and Juvenile Facilities Section of the DACJJ, the projected prison population will be below Expanded Operating Capacity for all but the last year of the projection. Ms. Hevener noted that the capacity estimates, as well as the prison projections, include the newly opened Confinement in Response to Violation (CRV) Centers.

Ms. Hevener described demographic trends, criminal justice trends, and policy changes that factor into the decline of the prison population prior to the passage of the JRA. With the implementation of the JRA, the population declined further – primarily as a result of the shift of most misdemeanants from prison to local jails through the establishment of the Statewide Misdemeanant Confinement Program (SMCP) and the legal change that places limits on revocations and confinement for technical violations of probation. Ms. Hevener noted that the prison population has remained around FY 2006 levels for the past two years.

Ms. Hevener summarized the assumptions that were used to develop the projections. The assumptions reflect criminal justice practices from FY 2014. The projections take into account projected growth in felony convictions for the ten-year projection period, changes under the JRA, and, when possible, changes from the past legislative session.

Mr. Butler asked about prison population increases in other states. Ms. Hevener replied that the prison population is increasing in some states and decreasing in others, with the

percentage increase/decrease driven by the size of the population. Ms. Katzenelson stated that the federal prisons are in trouble because mandatory minimum sentences are so long. Mr. Beeler commented that the prison population is up 1.2 percent nationwide.

Ms. Kusa asked if there had been any attempt to look at the other states that have implemented JRA and how North Carolina compares. Commissioner Guice commented that North Carolina did very well in a three year study by the Council of State Governments that evaluates North Carolina and other states with JRA. He remarked that the results for the states vary depending on focus and in terms of how many tools from the JRA toolbox are used.

Mr. Beeler asked Mr. James if the Sheriffs' Association projects the jail population, to which he replied no.

Mr. Beeler commented that he would like to congratulate Commissioner Guice, Director Solomon, and all the DPS staff for those budget numbers in the Governor's budget – particularly the pay increase for correction officers and the proposed funding for transitional housing for mental health offenders.

Mr. Moore noted that the handout is showing a standard operating capacity of 38,749 throughout. He asked whether it can be assumed that all prison construction or closings are completed or nearly completed. Ms. Hevener deferred to Commissioner Guice. Commissioner Guice stated that the department has completed the closings it committed to. Mr. Moore then asked if there were any plans in the legislature for prison construction. Commissioner Guice noted that Senator Daniel was a better person to respond to that question. Senator Daniel stated that there currently are no plans for prison construction.

JUSTICE REINVESTMENT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT SUBCOMMITTEE – STATUS REPORT

Chairman Spainhour recognized Judge Brown to provide an update on the Justice Reinvestment Implementation Report Subcommittee. Judge Brown reviewed the concept of Justice Reinvestment and reminded Commissioners about the Commission's mandate to evaluate the implementation of the JRA on an annual basis. The Subcommittee had been meeting to study various JRA issues and gather information for the 2015 report.

Judge Brown reviewed the previous JRA Implementation Evaluation Reports, submitted in 2012, 2013, and 2014. The 2012 Report dealt primarily with preparation for the implementation of the JRA. It detailed the major efforts agencies took to plan for the implementation of the legislation. The 2013 Report detailed the staggered early implementation of the JRA and included information on agency refinements to policies and procedures. Also included were early observations about the JRA, including its initial impact on the prison population. The third JRA Implementation Evaluation Report was submitted in 2014. That report described emerging practices in the field based on staff interviews with practitioners across the state. It also contain the first full calendar year of data from cases processed under the JRA. Judge Brown pointed out that one of the Subcommittee's major concerns noted in the 2014

report was an effective way to monitor reinvestment under the JRA; the Subcommittee still has that concern.

Next, Judge Brown described recent Subcommittee activities. The Subcommittee met in October to study JRA-related issues. The Conference of District Attorneys had requested the Commission study ASR and CRV credit towards consecutive sentences. The Commissioner of DACJJ had requested the Commission study terminal CRVs. The Commission had referred all three issues to the Subcommittee for study. At the October meeting, the Subcommittee made three recommendations: (1) Eliminate ASR; (2) Change the application of CRV credit towards consecutive sentences so that the credit for CRVs that are served concurrently is equal to one CRV period rather than multiplied by the number of CRVs; and (3) Eliminate CRVs for misdemeanor offenders and create a substitute path to probation revocation using quick dips. The Commission heard those recommendations at its December meeting and decided to refer the issue of ASR back to the Subcommittee for further study. The Commission adopted the other two recommendations from the Subcommittee. Judge Brown reported that those recommendations had been included in legislation introduced in the General Assembly. Judge Brown continued, providing detailed information the Subcommittee heard from the criminal justice agencies at its meeting in February.

Judge Brown asked Keenon James, NC Sheriffs' Association, about DWI offenders getting substance abuse services and what treatment is available for them. Mr. James replied that those offenders are eligible for treatment at either Black Mountain or DART Cherry. Judge Brown asked who would have data on why offenders are in the treatment programs (*i.e.*, for a condition of probation versus confined as an active sentence). Ms. Precythe responded that DPS would have that information. Judge Brown asked what the minimum length of stay is for a DWI conviction where a court recommends DART. Mr. James responded that for DWI convictions, offenders would have to get at least a 90-day sentence to be eligible.

Mr. Markham clarified that there are two different ways offenders can be sent to DART Cherry or Black Mountain, either as a condition of probation or as a condition of post-release supervision (or parole). DWI offenders in the SMCP are serving active sentences; the only way they can get to DART or Black Mountain is through being paroled. Their sentence length will not affect their eligibility.

Mr. Campbell asked if the only treatment the SMCP offenders get for substance abuse is either through DART Cherry, Black Mountain, or whatever the NCSA puts together. Discussion ensued regarding available substance abuse treatment in local confinement facilities. Commissioner Guice stated that in reality, inmates cannot be forced to participate in substance abuse treatment programs. Inmates that do participate, do so because they think they are getting something in return (*e.g.*, time off their sentence, driver's license reinstatement, etc.). He noted that there is a lot of misinformation about DWI offenders not getting treatment now that they are housed in county jails; when DPS housed DWI offenders in State prisons, it always had an issue getting them to participate in treatment. He added that DPS has been working with the counties, trying to establish ways they will have treatment options at the local level. He reiterated that inmates cannot be forced to participate. Discussion ensued about the potential to regionalize substance abuse treatment for misdemeanor offenders.

Mr. Butler cited the current workload of the PRSP Commission. There are approximately 7,000 post-release supervisees under supervision; he indicated the population could reach 10,000. The Commission sees 60 to 100 cases on a daily basis, each needing a decision. He remarked that the Commission could not handle the current workload if it had not been supported with the appropriate level of staffing.

Judge Brown described the anticipated contents of the 2015 report, which will include legislative changes made to the JRA during the 2014 Legislative Session, a summary of agency implementation efforts from CY 2014, and updated and expanded data on changes to sentencing, probation and PRS under JRA. He concluded, stating that the 2016 report will provide the first look at long term outcomes under the JRA, with an examination of recidivism for probationers.

RESEARCH AND POLICY STUDY GROUP – STATUS REPORT

Chairman Spainhour recognized Susan Katzenelson, staff, to report for Chairperson Davis on the status of the Research and Policy Study Group. The Research and Policy Study Group held its second meeting on January 23, 2015 at the NC Judicial Center in Raleigh.

Following greetings and introductions, the meeting opened with a short summary of the Study Group's November 14, 2014 meeting, the various topics discussed, and the decision to focus on three major criminal justice issues – juveniles and youth 16-21; 'tipping points' and recidivism prevention; and mental health services. In view of the topics identified at the November meeting, and a renewed interest statewide in the mental health challenges presented by criminal justice clients, Chairwoman Davis selected "Mental Health" as the first issue to be addressed by the Study Group.

In line with Ms. Davis' directive, the substantive presentations were planned to provide an overview of current mental health services in North Carolina's Criminal Justice System. The first presentation, by Rebecca Murdock (staff), discussed early opportunities for community intervention, primarily from arrest to pre-trial. She described contacts, responses and services available in the community-, in local jails and detention facilities-, and within the court system.

Next, Anne Precythe (Director of DACJJ's Community Corrections), described the mental health issues facing probationers and post-release supervisees in the community, and the assessment and services available to address their needs. She highlighted a Governor's Crime Commission grant to develop statewide training curriculum for all officers about mental illness-, and more in-depth training for Specialty Mental Health Probation Officers. As part of the grant, the UNC-CH School of Social Work is also conducting a pilot study in Wake and Sampson Counties to evaluate the impact of the new Specialty Mental Health Probation on reducing probation violations.

Services provided in the community by the DHHS were described by Flo Stein (Deputy Director, Division of Mental Health) and Sonya Brown (Chief, Justice Systems Innovations Section). Finally, an overview of mental health services in the DACJJ's Division of Prisons was provided by Terri Catlett (Deputy Director of Health Services) and Kenneth Lassiter (Deputy Director of Operations).

In a comment for the next undertaking of the Research & Policy Study Group, Commissioner Beeler recommended to study three specific tipping points in preventing recidivism: transitional housing, inter-silo communication at DPS, and efficient ways to facilitate conversation between agencies. Sheriff Clemmons framed the topic as a challenge to get together two groups – those who ‘have’ and those who ‘need’ – for solutions, with communication being the key.

Following a lengthy and thorough discussion of the issues, Commissioners identified multiple potential mental health topics for further study. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. with a number of Commissioners volunteering to work with staff to narrow the mental health topics into a more workable list.

Volunteer members of the Research & Policy Study Group met for a follow-up on February 13, 2015. At that meeting, the members approved a list of five mental health topics for further discussions.

The next meeting of the Study Group was scheduled for April 17, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND REVIEW

Chairman Spainhour recognized John Madler, staff, to provide an update on the legislative session. Mr. Madler stated that this is the first session of the 2015-16 biennium, referred to as the “Long Session.” The General Assembly convened on January 14 to organize, adjourned, and then reconvened on January 28 begin conducting business. To date, members have filed 171 bills in the House and 198 bills in the Senate. He discussed the filing deadlines and crossover dates for each house.

Mr. Madler stated that Sentencing Commission members have filed two bills this Session based on Commission recommendations, Senate Bill 183, Eliminate CRVs for Misdemeanants, and Senate Bill 185, Clarify Credit for Time Served (*see* handouts). Mr. Moore asked if there was any opposition to either of the bills; Mr. Madler stated that he was not aware of any opposition.

Mr. Madler then highlighted the relevant provisions from the Governor’s budget proposal. For the Judicial Department, the Governor’s budget proposed sixteen million dollars over two years - six million dollars the first year and ten million dollars the following year. This money would be appropriated for the basic functions of the court, such as costs associated with jurors, witnesses, and interpreters, as well as equipment maintenance, hardware and software. Mr. Madler noted that Chief Justice Martin had been asking for thirty million dollars.

Regarding the Department of Justice, Mr. Madler commented that there were several proposals that would provide additional funding to improve crime lab operations and reduce criminal case backlogs, such as funding start-up costs for the Western regional lab, establish six new lab technician positions, and increasing funding for outsourcing toxicology cases.

Mr. Madler reviewed a number of provisions that affected the Division of Adult

Correction and Juvenile Justice in the Department of Public Safety. The Governor's budget proposed beginning the reclassification of positions for nearly 10,000 correctional officers who work in prisons; increasing mental health facilities and services for inmates; adding positions in order to open the remaining 72 inpatient residential mental health beds at Central Prison Health Care Facility; and funding the growth in the population of offenders who are subject to electronic monitoring.

Mr. Madler concluded with the Governor's budget proposal by pointing out that there were funds recommended for expanding the Treatment Alternative for Safer Communities (TASC) program in the Department of Health and Human Services; TASC provides care management services to people with substance abuse or mental illness who are involved in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Madler then reviewed several bills of interest to the Commission: Senate Bill (SB) 32 – Grand Jury Investigation, House Bill (HB) 115 – Prosecutor Consent to Waive Jury Trial, HB 167 – Aggravating Factor/Violent Act Before a Minor, SB164 – Assist Inmate Reentry/Waived Fees, and SB198 – Persons under 18 in Confinement Facilities.

Turning to the legislative review, Mr. Madler explained the process the Commission follows and reviewed the Commission's policies and offense classification criteria. Mr. Butler asked if staff tracks Commission recommendations made to the General Assembly. Mr. Madler affirmed that the results of the recommendations are tracked and are reported to the Commission each year at its September meeting. Mr. Butler then asked for the percentage of provisions that finished consistent with the Commission's recommendations. Mr. Madler stated that it varies by session but that it is, on average, a majority of the provisions. Ms. Katzenelson stated that there is a lot of interaction behind the scenes – the legislators are aware of the Commission and they do contact staff to get information. She offered to put together the information from the previous reports and provide it to the Commission. Commissioner Guice commented that if the General Assembly had listened to the Commission's recommendations in the past, the Justice Reinvestment Act might not have been needed; the Commission had made many of those recommendations.

Sara Perdue, staff, presented the bills for review (*see* handout).

HB 32 – Amend Habitual DWI [Ed. 2]. Ms. Perdue reviewed the proposal to reduce the number of prior convictions required for habitual DWI from three to two. She reminded the members that they had seen a similar proposal in 2013 and that DWI offenses are not classified under Structured Sentencing.

HB 39/SB 75 – Labor/Up Amusement Device Penalties [Ed. 1].

(G.S. 95-111.13 – causing serious injury) Judge Ervin moved to find the proposed Class E felony provision consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class E felony. Judge Elmore seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 95-111.13 – causing death) Judge Ervin moved to find the proposed Class E

felony provision consistent with the Homicide Offense Classification Criteria for a Class E felony and that it would also be consistent with the Homicide Offense Classification Criteria for a Class F felony. Luther Moore seconded the motion and the motion carried.

HB113 – Protect Our Students Act [Ed. 1].

(G.S. 14-27.7(b)) Judge Ervin moved to find the proposed reclassification of the offense from a Class A1 misdemeanor to a Class I felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class I felony but that it would be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class H felony. Art Beeler seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-202.4(a)) Judge Ervin moved to find the proposed reclassification of the offense from a Class I felony to a Class H felony consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class H felony. Luther Moore seconded the motion and the motion carried.

(G.S. 14-202.4(b)) Judge Ervin moved to find the proposed reclassification of the offense from a Class A1 misdemeanor to a Class I felony inconsistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class I felony but that it would be consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class H felony. Art Beeler seconded the motion and the motion carried.

SB83 – Criminal Law/Filing False Document [Ed. 2]. Judge Ervin moved to find the proposed Class I felony provision consistent with the Offense Classification Criteria for a Class I felony. Judge Elmore seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Chairman Spainhour noted that, as the Session continues, there will be more bills for the Commission to review. In December, the Commission authorized the Chairman to appoint a Legislative Review Subcommittee to meet between Commission meetings if necessary. Chairman Spainhour informed the members that there would be a Subcommittee and that it would meet on April 24th. He read the list of members but stated that any Commission member is welcome to attend.

Senator Daniel stated that he was the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary II Committee, where many of these bills will be considered and that the members of the Committee are not all defense attorneys and aware of the nuances associated with some of these topics. He encouraged Commission members to send their comments to him and Senator McKissick and they will share them with their colleagues.

Chairman Spainhour informed the members that the next full Commission meeting is scheduled for June 5, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Katzenelson
Executive Director