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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PROCEEDINGS } \\
& \text { (4:08 o'clock p.m.) } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. } \\
& \text { We're calling the meeting to order. Roll call. } \\
& \text { Rob Perkins? } \\
& \text { MR. PERKINS: Present. } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Man-E? } \\
& \text { MAN-E: That's an initial. } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That's } \\
& \text { what I was looking for, okay, and I can't find } \\
& \text { it. That's why } I \text { was delaying calling roll call. } \\
& \text { Okay, Citizen Man-E. } \\
& \text { MAN-E: Present. } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: } \\
& \text { Councilwoman Hallam? } \\
& \text { MS. HALLAM: Present. } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: CEO } \\
& \text { Innamorato? } \\
& \text { MS. INNAMORATO: Present. } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: } \\
& \text { Controller Cor -- oh, my God. } \\
& \text { MR. O'CONNOR: I'm here. } \\
& \text { JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: } \\
& \text { Conners. } \\
& \text { MR. O'CONNOR: O'Connor. }
\end{aligned}
$$ JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Judge Kelly Bigley. Kidding.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Present.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Before we start, I'm going to call to everybody's attention the fact that $I$ just discovered the Sunshine Act requires that all of our meetings be published in a newspaper of general circulation, and it's my understanding in speaking with the Controller's Office that our meetings have never been published in a newspaper of general circulation.

They are posted on the court website. They are posted on the Controller's website. The agenda is posted, so all those things are done in accordance with the law, but the newspaper has been lacking for several years now, as far as I'm able to ascertain. So that would include this meeting tonight.

We're not taking any action at this meeting tonight, so $I$ propose that we stay and continue our work session because it's been noticed in the way that this meeting has been noticed for several years. I think that going forward, we should advertise all of our meetings in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

I will also say we're not taking any official action tonight, and the remedy for a violation of the Sunshine Act is any action that you took would be void, so we're not going to run that risk tonight because we're not voting on any items. It's just a discussion.

Does anybody disagree with
proceeding? Please speak now or forever hold your peace.
(No response.)

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Moving right along. And $I$ will coordinate with the Controller's Office as to how exactly we're going to go about publishing since it's never been done. I'm not sure who's responsible for it. It costs money, but we'll figure it out.

Okay.

MS. HALLAM: Judge Evashavik, can I just suggest one thing while you guys are working on that? While the Post-Gazette is on strike, maybe we could consider the Tribune Review as our paper of general circulation.

MS. INNAMORATO: It has to be printed.

MS. HALLAM: It has to be printed?

MS. INNAMORATO: It's the state law.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah, we could do the Courier.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah, there's a lot of -- there's a lot of consternation that has happened around it, but -- because some municipalities don't -- some counties and municipalities actually no longer have a paper that is printed. So it needs to -- the state law needs to change.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. To get with the times.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:

Exactly.

MS. HALLAM: So can we just try to explore something that's not the Post-Gazette while they're on strike?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah. The Pittsburgh Courier, is that the name?

MS. INNAMORATO: Yes.

MS. HALLAM: Yes.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We can publish there because that is a paper of general circulation.

MS. HALLAM: Okay. I think that's awesome.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Great. Okay.

First up on the agenda is the By-laws and Rules. To the new members, you received my chicken scratch in the -- over the e-mail, okay?

I'm just going to go through if any -- unless anybody minds. What happened is we were trying to get a subcommittee meeting together to go over these Board rules, and we just couldn't get it together, so one day, Councilwoman Hallam and Judge Bigley and I met, and we went over these.

And I took notes, and rather than having them typed, $I$ just basically tried to make them legible and sent them out to everybody. I can't say that $I$ agree with all of them, okay, and I will voice my disagreement as we go along with certain parts of them. But just does everybody have it in front of you? Does anybody have my scratched-up version?

MS. INNAMORATO: I do not.

MS. HALLAM: I have it in my e-mail.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. I'll share.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So basically, what this is is the typed-up version of the scratched-up version. So I took out the sections you scratched out. You can compare it side-by-side.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: It's
okay. I believe you. But let me just -- okay, what I did is the first section is the Board. It sets forth the Board -- the members of the Board. And then the next one is the Board powers and duties, which we all agreed, this is in the statute. Why do we need to repeat it all in our Rules? We're bound by it. That's the law. It doesn't need to be a part of our Board rules. So we just took it out.

Same thing with the section entitled Warden. That's in the statute. We don't need to repeat it.

Board meetings and the public. We took out B. We didn't think that, you know, if you missed a meeting, you should have to give two days prior written notice of your anticipated absence.

C we changed from two days to 48
hours and said that any special meetings or executive sessions will be held in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

Then let's see, D, a quorum is established. That's the law.

We added E. Board meetings may proceed without a quorum. However, Board action requires a quorum as set forth in $D$ above. $D$ is typed. You can read it.

Okay. Then $F$ says, unless permitted by Title 61 or other applicable law, no Board member may appear or participate in any meeting by proxy or substitute representative.

Okay. There's a lawsuit going on right now, FYI to everybody. It is my understanding -- and it's about Ken -- here's the bottom line. The Jail Oversight Board statute says that only the County Council President and the President Judge may send a designee to these meetings. It says the County Executive, the County Controller, and the Sheriff. It doesn't provide for them to send a designee. So in the past, certain of those offices have sent designees. There's a lawsuit pending. It's my understanding that there's preliminary objections scheduled this Friday, and they'll be resolved this Friday, hopefully. Well, they probably won't be resolved, who knows.

But the Sheriff points to a statute that pertains -- I don't have these sections, and I'm not sure exactly where they are in the law, but the Controller, the Sheriff, and the county Executive all point to various sections of the law that say that, for instance, the Sheriff, my Chief Deputy has authority to do anything that I can do. Therefore, my Chief Deputy should be able to attend this meeting on my behalf.

The County Executive points to some provision in the Home Rule Charter that allows for sending designees.

I don't know how the court is going to rule, but however the court rules, we're bound by that. So to me, that's the end of it. We can't make a rule that's contrary to the law, so that's why I'm suggesting that we just say or other applicable law. But that's the background.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. I will say one thing about saying and other applicable law. I think that we start off these by-laws by saying we're following Title 61. And I know that - - I think it's Title 1 of the PA Code where it talks about, like, the Rules of Statutory Construction and that the specific always prevails over the general.

And so we have a specific statute that governs this Board, and so that prevails over anything else general about the Controller duties, Sheriff duties, or Executive's duties.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: And I know that's your position, but that will be decided by the Court.

Is that not in front of the Court right now?

MS. HALLAM: That is in front of the Court. But $I$ just want to make sure that we don't write bylaws that then the court tries to use in lieu of --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh.

MS. HALLAM: I would like to keep it just we say that this Board was created in compliance with Title 61, and we stick to Title 61 and let the Court rule.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. All right.

MS. INNAMORATO: So does that mean -- for the sake of clarification, does that mean removing no Board member may appear or participate in any meeting by proxy or substitute representatives?

MS. HALLAM: No, it says keep that. Unless permitted by Title 61, no Board member may appear, participate in any meeting by proxy or substitute representative.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I propose saying unless permitted by Title 61 or other applicable law, meaning if the Court says the County Executive, per the Home Rule Charter, can send a designee, that's another applicable law.

So everybody can decide on that. I think it should say other applicable law. Bethany wants it to say Title 61.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I don't think this would necessarily be -- I don't think we can exclude the phrase other applicable law.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Do you --

MS. HALLAM: I just don't think you can have other applicable laws when this is the superseding -- you know, anything else is preempted by Title 61. I think the County Administrative Code cannot supersede it.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I think you'd be -and it's not necessarily -- I think you're right, but it's not to the exclusion of all other laws. So I don't think --

MS. HALLAM: Okay. So Title 61 or other applicable law.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Or other applicable law.

MS. HALLAM: Cool. Gotcha.
JUDGE BIGLEY: But otherwise, I think you're right. I don't think it would necessarily be -- I don't think I would exclude the phrase other applicable law. I think it would control the Title 61 meetings.

I don't know, Rob, you're a lawyer. Chime in.

MS. HALLAM: Yinz are all lawyers.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't
think it matters. I think the Court of Common Pleas will probably decide.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah, others will decide and then the Court will decide. Soon, we think, too.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah. I mean, I think we're going to be bound by whatever the Court decision is no matter what we write in here. But $I$ would not want to -- I would like to include other applicable law because otherwise if the Court rules in favor of the three officers, our Board rules will be contrary to the Court ruling.

MS. HALLAM: That's fair. I think that's very fair.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. HALLAM: So actually, though, that little phrase would go after 1721-28, unless permitted by 61 PA --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Or other.

MS. HALLAM: -- or other applicable laws.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yes.
MS. HALLAM: Okay. So that doesn't go at the end.

MR. O'CONNOR: Can we just remove it until the court rules and then change it? We can always amend the Board bylaws. Why not take it out until the Court rules and then come back?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well,
what -- take out the whole --

MR. O'CONNOR: I'm just saying delete $E$ at this moment. We're going to get a ruling in a couple months. We can put it back in, or whatever the ruling is goes directly into this.

MS. HALLAM: I know when we talked at our meeting, what we talked about is how -- is specifically about like subcommittee meetings and other committee meetings too, and that's why we thought that we should say this kind of broadly until then instead of saying nothing because we kind of wanted to put our guidelines in place while we were waiting for -- it to play out.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I -- I vote that we leave in other applicable law and leave it in because that way --

MS. HALLAM: You don't vote, though.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I know.

Well, not today, but how we were going to propose this for a vote.

MS. HALLAM: Cool.
MS. INNAMORATO: Just a point.
And, you know, I do have to say that we did vote as a Board that we were creating a subcommittee on bylaws, and myself and --

MR. O'CONNOR: Weren't invited.
MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah. We weren't included in this discussion.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Just so you know, you were included on the e-mails inviting you to the discussion.

MS. INNAMORATO: I know, but I -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I
mean --
MS. INNAMORATO: I'm very scheduled.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I know you are, but this wasn't done secretly. Both of you were included.

MS. INNAMORATO: I know it wasn't done secretly, but it wasn't --

MR. O'CONNOR: But we couldn't attend, or else there was a quorum.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yes. And I think what we -- what we see is that, right, we have our teams that are here. They're at every meeting. They help us do the work because we have many obligations outside of just this, as everyone else does. But, you know, I don't want to create something that prohibits a member of my team who is knowledgeable in doing work from being able to participate in a dialog when $I$ am not available. And that way the Executive's office can be present and, you know, not necessarily giving that individual decision-making power but, you know, by writing this are -- is then -- I -- are we excluding members of my team from being able to come to a subcommittee meeting --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Not - by adding other applicable law, we're saying that if the court says they can, then they can.

MR. O'CONNOR: Then why not wait
until the court says either way?
JUDGE BIGLEY: Are you talking - -
she's just talking about the Jail Oversight Board meeting. She's talking about subcommittee.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Subcommittee meetings.

MR. O'CONNOR: That's also.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Maybe we can
amend -- can we talk about that? Is that --
MS. HALLAM: Sure. That's what this meeting is for.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah. MS. HALLAM: I would also like to say, if that is on the table, remember that that also means that $I$ can send somebody, or Man-E can send someone, or Rob can send someone.

If that is the argument to take it out, remember that that opens it up to any of us sending anyone that we want on our behalf as well -- that it would then not be unique to whatever the Court rules on those three specific offices.

So I just want to remind folks of that because $I$ feel like you may be cool with like a member of your staff going, but if $I$ send someone on my behalf to represent me, you might not be cool with that.

MS. INNAMORATO: Well, I think it
has to do with -- a differen- -- like differentiates between like you're already a
designee of the President of Council.
MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MS. INNAMORATO: Correct?
MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MS. INNAMORATO: And then we are ex-officio members, so we are here by the nature of our position that we're elected to. And then we have community members who are appointed, right?

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MS. INNAMORATO: So I think we're talking about specifically ex-officio, where you are already a designee of the President. So you couldn't necessarily sub-designee, correct?

MS. HALLAM: But I could because I'm not a representative of the President. I am a member of this Board because he designated me to be the member of this Board. I'm not necessarily here as his proxy. I am here as a member of the Board because I was like duly authorized to be there, so therefore, I am an equal member, as is anyone else, as are the community members.

MS. INNAMORATO: I'm not saying that. I'm not talking about anyone's -- like everyone is equal.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MS. INNAMORATO: It's just a matter of you are here by the nature of the appointment of the President of Council. And, you know, our community members are here because we chose to appoint them, and Council chose to approve their appointments.

MS. HALLAM: Sure.
MS. INNAMORATO: And then there are people like myself, the judges, the sheriff, the controller, who are here because of the nature of the position that we hold. And that is, I think different when you're talking about a designee than you're talking about someone who is appointed by another government entity.

MS. HALLAM: Then by definition, you are arguing that we are inequal members of the Board.

MS. INNAMORATO: No.
MS. HALLAM: If you are saying that you have a different --

MS. INNAMORATO: That's not what we're arguing.

MS. HALLAM: -- place here.

MS. INNAMORATO: Everyone has a -everyone has a vote. We're just saying that if you're -- you know, this is common on many other boards. You know, $I$ can send a representative.

And at times, right, like it varies on the bylaws whether that person can act as a voting member, or they are just there in place to review and report back. So they're -- I think that's just a nuance that we should discuss and consider.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. I also think, again, we are really unique on this Board, as different than other boards, that we have a controlling state statute that authorizes who gets designees, who doesn't, and that they are all equal member of the Board.

And I'm not talking about voting power as much as just equal presence, equal weight, equal authority, and equal vote. I think that's -- if we are saying we are all equal members, then that would apply to every single member of the Board and not just the judges and the county row offices.

JUDGE BIGLEY: We all know
(inaudible), right?

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh. Agreed.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Of all three
(inaudible), right?
MS. HALLAM: Right.
JUDGE BIGLEY: So I think we're all agreeing that we're all equal.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

JUDGE BIGLEY: But $I$ think we also recognize that we all have different roles in some ways on this Board, right? Like we're all bringing something unique to it, correct? And we're all bringing like kind of a different perspective.

And there is, I think -- I
recognize that there are times I don't I think there's going to be a time $I$ can send -- in other words, $I$ don't have someone on my staff that's going to bring anything different to the Board, but $I$ recognize that the County Executive, there might be someone on her staff, in other words, that might bring something to a subcommittee meeting that has some knowledge that maybe she doesn't have or experience or something -- or maybe even, maybe Corey, at some point -- I don't know about the Sheriff -- but maybe somebody or
other on this Board might.
The good thing about us writing these is that if we chart our own path, in other words, within the law, we can write our own rules that let us --

MS. HALLAM: Agreed.
JUDGE BIGLEY: -- write our path.
MS. HALLAM: Which it says right here.

JUDGE BIGLEY: So I'm thinking that maybe we can say that with only within some limits people can designee for certain purposes, a subcommittee or whatever, designees for certain purposes, something that we know is for a specific reason and it's not something that's problematic. Do you know what I'm saying?

MS. HALLAM: I would, but I
would --

JUDGE BIGLEY: You know it's useful.

MS. HALLAM: I would just point to how problematic that exact thing you're referencing was in the past.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Right.
MS. HALLAM: That was like one of
the number one issues.
JUDGE BIGLEY: (Inaudible.) I think we can define it in a way that it's not going to be a repeat of anything or that we know it's going to bring something of value to as opposed to anything that (inaudible.)

MAN-E: I want to comment a little
bit. I want to start off by saying I think we should leave it in, but $I$ also agree with your amendments under applicable law. That makes sense to me.

Of course, I'm not a student of the law. I don't know, and the perspective that $I$ bring to the Board is not just as a community member but as an impacted person. And I want us to all remember who it is we're talking about, who it is we're supposed to be representing, you know what I'm saying?

And I'm not trying to be shady. I'm not trying to -- you know what I'm saying, you know, throw shade in anybody's direction, but if you're talking about, you know, subverting or passing off your duties to somebody else, you know what I'm saying, your duty should be to the people who are in the $A C J$ and in these programs, you know what $I$ mean?

So, you know, from my perspective, I think we should want to be here, and we should want to give these people the best representation that we can, you know what $I$ mean? And of course, I'm not against, you know, other people's input. Maybe somebody is more passionate and more knowledgeable about a particular subject, and I understand that, but if the State statute says we are supposed to be here except, you know what I'm saying, I know president -- or President Judge and President of the County Council, and I think we should follow that, you know what I'm saying? And not only that, $I$ think we should want to.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: By the way, Barb Griffin is also present.

MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you, and I apologize for being late. This language would not prohibit a member of the Board from sending a person with knowledge about a topic to a meeting to provide information or to gather information, right? It's just saying you can't -- that person cannot be there to take an official action, to vote or count for a quorum, or things like that?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, that's not what it says. So we would need to change it because it actually says --

MS. HALLAM: Appear or participate.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Appear or participate. So if we want to limit it to voting, we can change it. It's with the pleasure of the Board.

MS. HALLAM: I don't want to limit it to voting just because the lawsuit is about appearance and participation. So they can sit in the public, like anybody else can.

And again, like there are staff members from those representatives here in the audience right now, but they're sitting out there where staff go. This is for the Board members. That's for staff.

MS. GRIFFIN: Right.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, do we want to take a straw vote --

MR. O'CONNOR: No, we're not voting. You said we're not taking a vote.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, no.
I understand, Mr. O'Connor. I mean about the final language, because $I$ think everybody
anticipates that we're going to be voting next week. We don't have to do that. We can table it, but somebody needs to prepare the document to be voted on, so I need to know the consensus of the Board, Mr. Connors.

MS. GRIFFIN: Can we post it -- do we want to put it on the next meeting on the agenda?

MS. HALLAM: What was that?
MS. GRIFFIN: Do we want to put it on the agenda for the next meeting?

MS. HALLAM: I think the purpose of this meeting was to discuss things to be on March's agenda, right? That's what I think unless anybody else thinks different.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: But if we can't reach a consensus, it doesn't have to be on the agenda.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. Yeah.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That's what we're trying to ascertain, what everybody's pleasure is.

Mr. Perkins.

MR. PERKINS: I had a question for how the subcommittees would do their work. Would
this language exclude -- I was thinking if we had a health committee and we wanted to invite a physician to be a part of our working group and contribute to the subcommittee, is this -- would this language prohibit that? That they couldn't participate or --

MS. HALLAM: In my opinion, no. For example, on County Council, we have the members of the committee, which again, can't be a quorum of the committee, but we have the members of the committee and then we have invited guests.

So sometimes we invite the County Manager. Sometimes we invite an expert on the topic we're talking about. Sometimes we invite a committee member to opine on it. So those are the invited guests. They're not members of the body and they are not taking any votes. They're not participating as members of the Board. They are there as we invited them to participate.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I think that we need to carve out under the committee section of this.

MS. HALLAM: I think so. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: It's
not carved out --

MS. HALLAM: That's a good idea. When we get to that.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: -- so it would need to be amended to provide for that.

MS. HALLAM: Okay.
MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah.

MS. HALLAM: So when get to 4 .

MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah. I was going to say with the subcommittee that we don't want -- this isn't testifiers and people would come in and out. This would be people who we would agree to appoint to a subcommittee that would maintain that position until that subcommittee wasn't -- dissolved.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: There are not members of the JOB.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yes.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah. I think that's a good idea.

MS. HALLAM: That's good, too, because then we could have more people without hitting a quorum, you know?

MS. INNAMORATO: Yes. Yeah, they can meet, and then they can do -- they can serve as working groups.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah. Does everybody like that idea?
(No response.)

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yes.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yes.

MS. HALLAM: I think so. So these are -- who picks who those people are?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, we'll get to that. I don't think --

MS. HALLAM: All right. Yeah. Let's move on.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: -- it's still -- well.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, I mean, move on to the thing we were talking about.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh, okay.

MS. HALLAM: Move back.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Okay. I don't know what the consensus is, so how about I just say --

MS. HALLAM: I will go down and say, in my opinion, I think we should keep it as is or other applicable law, the controlling statute that we know is the controlling statute
of the Board, and then pending the outcome of the Court case or other applicable law, which is literally what the Court's deciding.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.

MS. HALLAM: That's in my opinion.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Man-E,
what's your vote?

MAN-E: Yeah, I agree with that, and the applicable law.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:

Mr. Perkins?

MR. PERKINS: Let me just make sure I understand.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: This is not an official vote. This is just to say how we should amend these. And you could change your mind when we vote on it.

MR. O'CONNOR: Well, there's
pending litigation. We can't be voting on pending litigation. If we -- if we place a straw vote right now and there's a litigation that's happening next week, that could determine the outcome of the litigation.

MS. HALLAM: And then it would undo that piece.

MR. O'CONNOR: That's why this should just be on hold and go from there.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. It's not going to determine the outcome of the litigation, and the proposed amendment is not contrary to anything that the court would do. That's what you're not following.

The way that this is written, no matter what way the court comes down, our rules are in compliance with the future Court ruling.

Does anybody have a question about that?

MS. GRIFFIN: No, I would just add as a new Board member who is in the process of absorbing and taking in --

MS. HALLAM: It's a lot.
MS. GRIFFIN: -- a lot of new information, it would be my preference to not have it on the March agenda and give us more time to consider it. But that's my view.

MS. HALLAM: That's fair.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I mean, and the POs are Friday, I might add. So I mean, it might be that it would get on the April agenda. That could very well be. So it could be
tabled until April.
MS. GRIFFIN: Okay.
MS. HALLAM: Don't table. Hold. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Hold.

MS. HALLAM: Table, you need
two-thirds. To hold, you just simply move it to the next one.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. So I'll go this way this time.

Ms. Griffin, you'd like to hold this until the Court decision; is that correct?

MS. GRIFFIN: Not necessarily to the Court decision, but beyond the March meeting.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: You need more time to digest all this.

MS. GRIFFIN: That's my sense for now.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Judge Bigley?

JUDGE BIGLEY: I'm fine, but I think we should still continue to go through and --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: With
holding off on voting next week?
JUDGE BIGLEY: Yeah. The next
meeting is March. I'd say we just run through.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Mr.

O'Connor?

MR. O'CONNOR: I'm not giving comment.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.

County Executive Innamorato, would you like it to be on the agenda in March or would you like to defer it?

MS. INNAMORATO: I think we
should -- I think we should hold.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.

MS. INNAMORATO: And I do think, pending the outcome of the case.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. INNAMORATO: Because
then we're --

MS. HALLAM: The bylaws until the case is resolved?

JUDGE BIGLEY: No.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, at least not in March.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
I think we should also hold.

MS. HALLAM: I'm ready to move forward with or other applicable law.

MAN-E: I'd like it not to be on March's agenda.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Mr.

Perkins?

MR. PERKINS: I'd like to hold too.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. So I think we're going to hold off. This is not going to be on the March agenda. I think we have a consensus on that, but let's still go through it.

MS. HALLAM: Okay.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Hopefully, maybe $F$ will be resolved for us by the Court.

MS. HALLAM: E.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Sorry.
Well, no. E is Board meetings may proceed without a quorum. However, Board action requires a quorum as set forth in $D$ above. You probably couldn't read my handwriting.

MS. HALLAM: Oh. The last -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Then the next thing is the Robert's Rules of Order apply.

Public participation. Obviously, our monthly meetings are open to the public. The agenda has to be published at least 24 hours in advance. Public comment will take place at every meeting. Members of the public may address the Board for up to three minutes.

I don't know what everybody thinks about this provision that was in -- that was proposed. The Board, after majority vote, may limit the total testimony period of a public meeting to the last 30 minutes. If anybody is opposed to that, I guess --

JUDGE BIGLEY: We left it in because we said if we don't want it, we don't have to vote on it.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. I'm never going to vote to limit public comment, but if a majority of the Board is, why --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. I'm just calling everybody's attention to it.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. That's how I think.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. And then last, public comments shall be limited to matters within the Board's jurisdiction.

Anybody want to comment on anything else in that section?
(No response.)

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No.
Okay. Board organization --
MAN-E: Hold on. My fault. My
fault. Real quick. You say the Board, after majority vote, may limit the total testimony period to a public meeting to last 30 minutes. Can you explain that a little bit more, please?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I guess that just means that we could -- let's say we had some urgent issue, and we needed a lot of time to discuss it. This is hypothetical. I didn't draft this, by the way, so I'm not sure the person who drafted it, what their intent was, but I would presume that if we didn't have a lot of time on some particular evening, we could say after majority vote public comment shall not exceed a total of 30 minutes, which would be ten people at three minutes each.

important, that's why everybody came out to
speak. I don't think we should limit speaking
power, especially when this is like your only
opportunity to address the Board, you know what I
mean? Yeah.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
What's everybody's pleasure? I could go either
way.
Ms. Griffin?
MR. O'CONNOR: Take it out.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Take it
out?

MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah, unless you
could provide some sort of advanced notice. So if we know there was an agenda that at least the public could be alerted that testimony is limited, but you know, so they don't come and waste time, but --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Take it out. I think the consensus is take it out. Okay. That's out. Does anybody disagree? MR. PERKINS: Nope. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Good.

Okay. Board organization. And officer -- sorry. Okay. So this proposal is that we elect a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson and a Secretary. Each officer is elected to a two-year term. The Chairperson runs -- sorry, the Vice Chairperson runs the meeting in the Chairperson's absence. The Secretary is the secretary. If there's a vacancy in any of the above positions, the Board shall elect a new Officer to fill the unexpired term as set forth in Number 2 above.

MS. HALLAM: I just wanted to add on that thing. There was one thing from our meeting that was not in there that $I$ put in this one. It was within 30 days of the vacancy, like, to actually give us a timeline, if you remember to have to --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I mean, in my notes, obviously, $I$ missed it. MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So it says is -- what $I$ had is the Board shall, in the event of a vacancy in any of the officer positions, the Board shall elect a new officer to fill the expired term within 30 days of the vacancy occurring.

So basically, no matter when it happens in the month, we're going to have another meeting and so we will get to do it at that next meeting.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. I'm going to say even though I would appear to have a vested interest in this as the President Judge, I want to say for the record to everybody here, it's my understanding that the President Judge has been the Chairperson of this meeting since this Board's inception. The Court provides a lot of information and prepares for this meeting. I kind of feel that, you know, you have -- the Court is a neutral unbiased arbiter, okay, in the general sense of how there's three branches of government, and the branches of government are all represented on this Board also. And I just -- I feel like it gives the Board stability to have the Judge as the Chairperson.

Trust me, the extra work is not something I relish. I'm just put -- I'm putting it out there. That's my opinion and I will live by the vote of the Board, okay? Just so everybody knows. I just think it gives the Board some stability.

MS. HALLAM: I'll go first. I'll
just say I think the two-year terms, because I know they were initially proposed as one-year terms, and we talked about -- we changed them to two so that we could have the stability.

I think, like, when you look to
Robert's Rules, so if we were to take this out and default to Robert's Rules, we would still have this because this is what the standard practice is is to elect a chair and a vice chair.

I will say from a personal
perspective, it's not always about who the President Judge is, because I agree with you on a lot of that, but remember you are one of the two members who get to designate someone. And I have lived through a Board where the person who thought they were the Chair, despite us not really having one, really, you know, put a bad taste in a lot of people's mouths and there was nothing any of us could do about it.

So at least this gives us every two years, if we think the person isn't doing a good job, then we can vote in a new person.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I understand your reasoning.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So I have very personal reasons against it.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I thought we also did -- $I$ could be wrong, but I thought we also named the person who was --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear. Can you use the microphone?

JUDGE BIGLEY: I thought we also did it --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: You're still not talking --

JUDGE BIGLEY: I thought that we also had discussed the fact that the person who would be the elected members could only be the people who were designated in the statute. We had discussed this.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: You mean --

JUDGE BIGLEY: In other words, not one of the -- I thought we --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Are you proposing that it be limited to the County Executive or the President Judge or the Sheriff or the Controller?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Yes. I thought that's what we had --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Or the President of County Council. I don't know.

MS. HALLAM: Again, I think we're
trying to make these positions on the Jail Oversight Board not equal again. And remember, we are all very --

JUDGE BIGLEY: No, it's not talking about equality. It's talking about consistent with what it was. Because remember, it's changing. This has always been this way since this was the prison before -- before it was the Jail Oversight. So now, we're completely upending it.

And I think when we were talking about it, we talked about the difference in the appointments between the change from a county Executive, the delay when the County Executive changes, to appointments to people from the community, the approval process for those people.

In other words --
MS. HALLAM: No community members, is what you're saying?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Yes, because when
the County Executive gets elected, that County Executive appoints community members, and there's a delay between those community members coming in and getting approved by County Council.

MS. HALLAM: I thought that's why we did two years.

JUDGE BIGLEY: And so we talked about those being the people specifically in the statute that are delineated, the County Exec, one of those specific people because that would cause a delay on the three community members that aren't part of the Board until sometime later.

MS. HALLAM: Well, I thought
what -- the way that was resolved was that when we would vote, then they wouldn't be -- because we have to do it every January. Those community members wouldn't be on the Board yet.

So if that's the concern, I don't think that really will ever come up because they just wouldn't be here to be appointed if they weren't on there by January.

Because if you look at Number 2, it says their term would be from January to December, which would mean we would vote for them in the January meeting.

JUDGE BIGLEY: No, I think -- I just --

MR. O'CONNOR: Are you saying like if they overflow, or are you saying you're just limiting the Chairperson to one of the elected --

JUDGE BIGLEY: To one of the elected.

MR. O'CONNOR: -- and not a resident member?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Right.
MR. O'CONNOR: That's what you're saying?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Right. It was because of those concerns. I thought that's something we spoke of.

MS. HALLAM: No. I mean, I don't think that we ever talked about that. But if that does satisfy your concern, there will never be a time where that will be an issue because we have the provision that if a vacancy happens in 30 days, like, for example, somebody's term expires, they -- the way that it works in Allegheny County is when your term expires, you're only off the Board when a replacement is appointed. So there is never an overlap.

Like even with when -- for example, County Executive Innamorato put the three new community members on, the previous community members were still members of this Board even into the beginning of her term. They just chose not to participate anymore. They were still the members of this Board because that's in the County Code that the appointment lasts not at the expiration of the term but when a replacement is appointed.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Oh, I understand.
I'm just saying that's why I had said --
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. INNAMORATO: I don't know if that considers resignations though, so if folks resigned at the end of the last Executive's term.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

MS. INNAMORATO: Right. Like they could have still been acting Board members on an expired term, right, but there could be --

MS. HALLAM: Official resignation. MS. INNAMORATO: -- resignations.

We still are delayed by going through the process that we're beholding to to submit our nominees to County Council because County Council only meets twice a month, right? So we do have a delay in that.

So there is an -- like, I don't want to say that that would never happen because I do see circumstances in which that could happen where we don't have everyone appointed like we saw this year.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. I very much hear what you're saying, but doesn't Number 5 take care of that? Let's say Rob is the Chair of the Board. He resigns. We then within 30 days, the remaining members of the Board have to approve his replacement.

MS. INNAMORATO: I'm thinking more of the scenario where in January, if the folks who are appointed to the Board voted to create the -- voted on the leadership, the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson, the Secretary, it would have excluded all of the community members.

MS. HALLAM: Correct.
MS. INNAMORATO: Yes. So if we were following this --

MS. HALLAM: You're just saying that --

MS. INNAMORATO: If this was in
place, then we would have had the vote in January by the way that these bylaws are written.

MS. HALLAM: Okay. I'm sorry. I misunderstood Judge Bigley to have been talking about, like, actually, that position becoming vacant.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well they're talking about two different things.

MS. HALLAM: I think they too are talking about two different things, yeah.

JUDGE BIGLEY: But that's something I think we need to work through that section. Since we're not going to look at it until next month, maybe we can address it.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. I don't think we should exclude the community members from Board organization.

MR. O'CONNOR: Just to clarify. So
first of all, $I$ think, Bethany, you'll second this. We're finally doing this, which is a good thing --

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.
MR. O'CONNOR: -- because these were drafted a year ago.

MS. HALLAM: Well, if we are. We'll see.

MR. O'CONNOR: Well, yeah. But so the Secretary, $I$ know that that's typically my office. Do we want to keep that because we do all the records? We post. We do everything like that. I mean, with the call-in -- you know, the court recorder. We have to get somebody to video these meetings, and we pay for that out of our office, so --

MS. HALLAM: And provide the notice now.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. So I just wondered, the Secretary, do you want to designate that because $I$ think that was in the --

MS. HALLAM: I would compromise.
MR. O'CONNOR: -- statute anyways, but -- I mean, I'm not going to give my staff extra work if we're not -- not that we want to do more work, but if somebody else is the Secretary, that will alleviate a lot of stress for my office.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, I agree with Mr. O'Connor.

MS. HALLAM: I agree with him.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I mean,
he's the -- nobody else could really do that except the County Executive, the President Judge. I mean --

MS. HALLAM: We could do that.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: -- I am perfectly happy to permanently designate the County Controller.

MR. O'CONNOR: I don't know if my staff is.

MS. HALLAM: I think you could -- I think it's also --

MR. O'CONNOR: But that's the -it's been -- we know the system at this point. And look, 20 years from now, it could be somebody different.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: It would be difficult.

MR. O'CONNOR: But that's what I would say.

MS. HALLAM: I would also say, with keeping the Secretary, Controller, I think that eliminates any concern about electing a Chair and Vice Chairperson because then that is the consistency. The -- making sure the notices always go out, that we always have a clerk. We
already always have minutes. We always have, you know, everything. That's the consistency is whoever is in the Controller's Office consistently has to, you know, regardless of elections every two years.

So I'd be cool with that. The Controller is the Secretary but then keep the rest. The Controller's Office or the Controller, how do you want to say it, shall serve as the Secretary, and the Secretary shall act --

MR. O'CONNOR: I mean, we could write up -- I'm sorry. We could write something up and send it. I don't -- we don't need to do it right this second.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So you're saying in front of Number 4, the Controller is the Secretary.

MR. O'CONNOR: Just $I$ know that's a duty that we've been doing, so...

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah. I think it would be very hard to transition that duty from office to office, and there would be a lot of mistakes -- problems made.

MR. O'CONNOR: I mean no disrespect to a resident, but that's a lot of work for a
resident -- a citizen member.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, no, no. I agree with you. I agree with you. JUDGE BIGLEY: I don't think anyone wants it.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Let's just do this. Okay. So I am suggesting that the President Judge remain the Chairperson. I will certainly not be offended by anybody who votes against that, but let's take -- get a consensus, not votes.

MS. HALLAM: Okay.
I will say that $I$ would be honored to vote for you as Chairperson when the vote happens, but $I$ absolutely think that we should elect a person, even if it is you.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That's okay. Okay.

MS. HALLAM: I think it should stay an election.

MAN-E: Yeah. I agree very much.
However you want to do it.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Mr.

Perkins?
MR. PERKINS: I agree with that.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: County Executive Innamorato?

MS. INNAMORATO: I feel agnostic on this one at the present moment. I do agree with Corey's need to be the Secretary because it does make sense because we do have, like, we come with staff and, you know, you have to --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah, yeah.

MS. INNAMORATO: -- be in compliance constantly.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: All
right. So you're not sure?

MS. INNAMORATO: I'm unsure.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Mr.

O'Connor?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. I mean, I could go either way. Can we figure out --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: You can be unsure --

MR. O'CONNOR: How is it written
here?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: --
right now. It's okay. I'm just trying to see like --

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. I mean, I understand Judge's point, but I also understand Bethany's point on how to do this and have -- I don't mind a constant conversation about it because it renews people's position on the Board. It keeps the sitting judge at this point, you know, doing their job, which we didn't see for months before. So $I$ could go either way. I'm fine.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: All
right. Well I won't -- then I won't hold you to anything.

Judge Bigley?
JUDGE BIGLEY: I'm fine with the President Judge remaining.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Ms.
Griffin?

MS. GRIFFIN: I would be inclined to let other members of the Board potentially be elected as President. And I would note that the terms, the two-year term, would create an unevenness in the sense that the public members are appointed for a three-year term. I don't know if that can be renewed. It probably can, but there may be a situation where, you know,
someone ends their term on the Board in the middle of their term, two-year term in a position.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well,
that goes to Judge Bigley --
MS. HALLAM: So keep it like this.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: --
which we didn't really get a consensus on.
Okay. But I'm -- there's four people who are saying we do not want the PJ to always be the Chair. There's two who are saying the PJ should be the Chair, and there's two who are abstaining. So we don't really have a consensus on that.

So I don't know. I don't know how to resolve these things.

MR. O'CONNOR: We have time to figure this out.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I know.

I know. I know. But guess what --

MS. HALLAM: No abstentions without a valid reason. That is in Robert's Rules.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We never have any, like, work sessions, which I'm also going to propose that we start having.

MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, yeah. I think the subcommittees, that's probably the biggest conversation we need to have tonight -- one of them.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: All right.

MR. O'CONNOR: But setting those up and having them meet and report back to the Board monthly would be helpful.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. All right. Well, then, that's up in the air, okay, the Chairperson. But $I$ think there's a consensus that the secretary is always going to be the Controller; is that correct?

MS. HALLAM: No, I'm going to push back on that now. I don't actually agree with it.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:
(Laughter.)
MS. HALLAM: What? I'm serious.
If $I$ abstain from saying what the Secretary has -- should do.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Well, everything is up in the air. Let's go on to committees.

MS. HALLAM: What? It is such a simple question. That's funny.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. The committee -- let's see. The Chair shall appoint the committee members. We took out - - I mean, subject to final approval by the Board, what's everybody want to do? I don't really care.

MS. HALLAM: I will start by saying especially if -- if we are going -- like, I know that when we talk about these committees the Chairperson does have a lot of authority here when it comes to committees. I'm only comfortable with that language if it is an elected Chairperson.

Again, we could have someone be running these meetings for years and years and years and doing so poorly when you're no longer President Judge.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, it's okay. We can leave in there subject to final approval. It could be a vote.

MS. INNAMORATO: I don't have the state statute in front of me that governs all of this, but you know, knowing that it's the

Executive's authority to appoint the community members, is there any restriction or outline on the appointment of some committee members to the JOB?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No.
MS. INNAMORATO: That's not
outlined in the state at all?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No.

No.

MS. HALLAM: No, not at all. It doesn't even reference it.

MS. INNAMORATO: Okay.
MS. HALLAM: But I have it up if you want to just like peruse it.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
so do we want to say we want to vote?
MR. PERKINS: I have a question.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MR. PERKINS: Why was it decided
that the Chairperson would have the power to -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't know.

MR. PERKINS: -- appoint every
committee and then appoint all the members?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't know.

MS. HALLAM: I mean, I can say from past practice it always was kind of just like, hey, who wants to be on this committee? Like, I could unilaterally say, hey, we're creating this committee and then it would be like, hey, who wants to be on it? And it was so random. There was no structure whatsoever.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I think basically probably anyone who volunteered would be allowed to be on the committee. I don't think it was ever really an issue.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: But maybe it will be down the line, so why don't we leave, you know, subject to final approval by the Board. That way, the Chairperson doesn't dictate.

MS. HALLAM: So can you say -- what is that? Is that the last sentence in --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: (a).

MS. HALLAM: -- $1(b)$.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Sorry.
1(a). The Chairman of the Board shall, from the Board members, appoint the committee member subject to final approval by the Board.

MS. HALLAM: The majority of the Board?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:
Majority of the Board.
MS. INNAMORATO: May I also offer a suggestion. So in the State House, and it sounds silly, but it's -- there's a committee on committees, right? So we would have a subcommittee that we could define whether it's -you know, maybe it's the permanent members, three of the permanent members who would bring a slate to the Board for approval for the subcommittees. So final approv- -- that way it's a little more democratic. There's more voices from folks who are on the Jail Oversight Board. They can make a slate of recommendations for each subcommittee, and then it goes in front of the Board for approval.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I'm fine with that.

MS. HALLAM: I know on County
Council we do the President picks who's on the committees. That's why I thought we modeled it after this -- after like what the County does,
but...
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:
Listen --
MS. HALLAM: I think we took out --
isn't that something that we took out, a nominating committee?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yes. We took out a nominating committee.

MS. HALLAM: Which is, I think, what the County Executive is maybe referencing.

MS. GRIFFIN: I just wondered if someone would address why the standing committees were taken out and what was the reasoning behind that?

MS. HALLAM: What are the standing committees? You mean, like 4?

MS. GRIFFIN: Why we're not having standing committees.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:
Because --

MS. GRIFFIN: I'm not necessarily saying we have to. I'm just curious as to --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I'll tell you. Okay, Number A was inspections and investigations. It said a Board -- the Board
shall have a standing committee to perform semiannual inspections.

In my opinion, the statute says every Board member must go to the jail at least twice a year. So I thought that that was contrary to the law.

B, a standing committee to evaluate and administer these rules. I just thought that was unnecessary. And anybody can feel free to disagree with me. And when I say "I," I mean Judge Bigley and Councilwoman Hallam and I.

Nominations. It says the Board shall establish a standing committee to nominate the Chairperson, Vice Chair, Secretary, as well as the citizen members, okay? The citizen members appointments are two the County Executive by the statute and so this is contrary to law. We can't take away the County Executive's power.

Additional committees. The Board may establish additional committees as it deems necessary. I think that's self-explanatory and redundant, and of course we can.

So those are the reasons. If you guys want to add to that because you were with me when we discussed those, feel free to.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Yeah, the one tried to take away the County Executive's right to -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right. JUDGE BIGLEY: -- select the three Board members.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right.

JUDGE BIGLEY: That's in direct contravention to the statute.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Correct.

MS. GRIFFIN: Right. I understand that this draft may have come from, you know, some other places that don't really make sense for us, but $I$ don't know, I might want to consider a little bit more whether there are other standing committees that we might want to have but haven't thought it through yet. But I'll think about it and let you know if $I$ come up with anything.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Sure.

MS. HALLAM: I can talk to you
about like the committees we have had historically because there have been some in, like -- $I$ don't know, you guys can all correct me if I'm missing any. So we -- and again, it was a super informal -- it was just like in a meeting. Hey, we're going to have this committee and we're going to start meeting, was how it had always happened. And anybody could come to the meetings that you wanted to, but there were the certain members who volunteer at the jump to like be the voting members of the committee.

We had an Incarcerated Individual's Welfare Fund Committee, which was kind of like how should we spend this money that we generate from commissary profits and now also phone profits.

We had a Suicide Prevention Subcommittee, which was -- you know, originally, that was one of the main recommendations in a review of the jail was you got to get your suicide rate down. I think that that's something that we've actually maybe done well at over the years, but it wasn't because of the suicide Prevention Subcommittee.

The next thing was -- do you remember? Do you guys remember?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The library.
MS. HALLAM: The Library
Subcommittee is the newest one that was created. I'm missing one.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Who's on these committees? Are they defunct?

MS. HALLAM: I mean, I was on all of them. It was just kind of who wanted to do -Exit Interview Subcommittee.

MS. GRIFFIN: So I like -- if we could have ad hoc --

MS. HALLAM: They were so random.

MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah. There
certainly should be something in there like the additional committees. You can create ad hoc committees, but $I$ would just want to consider and think about a little bit more, like, whether there are ongoing issues -- ever issues that we need to make sure we have a committee that's looking at this all the time. So I'm going to think more on that.

MR. O'CONNOR: So do you think -could it be helpful to redline and like get -what was the prior one that was sent out and what was deleted?

MS. HALLAM: That's what she e-mailed.

MR. O'CONNOR: I know, but this is just some stuff is crossed out and scribbled.

MS. HALLAM: So that's what I typed up.

MR. O'CONNOR: It's not like redlined. I know, but it doesn't have what was in there and what was deleted. Do we have any of that, like a redlined version?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, the only thing you have is what $I$ sent out. And guess what? I don't know how to redline.

MR. O'CONNOR: Okay.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't.

MR. O'CONNOR: So maybe we can do something like that so it's easier to follow.

Like you're saying the Nomination Committee was deleted, but then -- and, Bethany, I like that you did this, but it doesn't say anything about that.

MS. HALLAM: Well, we deleted it, so I just didn't --

MR. O'CONNOR: I know. But if it's still with something sent out --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: It's hard to follow.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, it's hard to follow what you deleted and what you didn't. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: You have to follow my chicken scratch.

MR. O'CONNOR: I know. Sorry, Judge.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That's okay. I get it.

MR. O'CONNOR: Not bad.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Well, the line
through it is the biggest indication that it was struck out because there was a line through it.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
But it seems to me that you -- the previous Board has established some standing committees. Is that accurate?

MS. HALLAM: Yes.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Or were they not seeing --

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. There were at least four. They exist.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
So we do have standing committees?
MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. I mean, I can
read the committees.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Can you read them again?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, Bylaws, Exit Interviews, IIWF, and Books are the four that I have.

MS. INNAMORATO: Incarcerated -MR. O'CONNOR: I do have a note about Suicide Prevention, but I don't know that we ever did a committee on that.

MS. HALLAM: I think it -- well, we did before you were on the Board.

MR. O'CONNOR: Right. So those --
MS. HALLAM: So yeah. That was a year before.

MR. O'CONNOR: -- are the four that I -- or five that $I$ have. But the only ones -- I have IIWF, myself, Councilwoman, and the Sheriff. Exit Interviews, myself, Councilwoman.

Bylaws, myself, the County Executive, Judge Bigley, and Councilwoman Hallam.

And on Book, we just have a sidebar on that, that there's four members, but the jail administration needed to be at those meetings to
have that conversation.
So that's the records that we have on those committees.

MS. HALLAM: And Suicide
Prevention, $I$ can tell you for a fact, I'm the only one left that was on it.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. So that's --
MS. HALLAM: It was Barb Parees when she was Deputy County Manager; Terri Klein when she was a community member.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. I don't even have that. I just have it blank.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Does everybody want to keep those committees? Does everybody feel there's a need to keep all of these committees? And it's no --

MR. O'CONNOR: I think we just have to put people on them and make them meet.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah.

MR. O'CONNOR: That's the biggest thing there.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I was going to say if everybody thinks we should keep these committees, then everybody think about what committee you want to be on.

MS. HALLAM: All of them.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: And we can get them going again. I think that would be really helpful.

MS. INNAMORATO: The other thing on the agenda --

MS. HALLAM: I will say that one of the things that's in this provision that $I$ think is important and is one of the main reasons why the subcommittees were way less structured than they could have been was because there was never a real Chairperson of each committee, and the few that had kind of like anointed Chairpersons didn't want to be it. And so therefore the meetings just didn't happen. And that's really where the substance of what we do on this Board should be happening, and it didn't.

So I will add that, why I support the -- that we need a Chairperson of every subcommittee regardless of who that is.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
I agree with that.

MS. GRIFFIN: Judge, I have one
more thing $I$ wanted to add. And $I$ hate that $I^{\prime} m$ stepping out here as a new member but I'm just going to go for it.

I would like the Board to perhaps consider adding to the bylaws -- I know our duties and responsibilities are set out by statute, but a statement of -- a Mission Statement or a Statement of Principle, guiding principles or a statement of, you know, things that guide our decision-making in this process, the things that are -- that we value the incarcerated individuals, the community, our staff, and kind of have a statement of purpose of guiding principle.

So I -- I haven't -- I've got a lot on my plate, so I'm going to maybe perhaps draft something up and propose it that sounds like this Board would be interested in.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Everybody okay with that?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. Just make sure it doesn't conflict with what the statute says we're supposed to be doing.

MS. GRIFFIN: Absolutely.
MS. HALLAM: Okay. And then it
will be open for discussion.
MS. GRIFFIN: Yep.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Next is the Liaison job description.

MS. HALLAM: Can we do that one last because that's the messiest one and these other two $I$ think are we can hammer out.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Fine. Incarcerated Work Assignments.

MS. HALLAM: Okay. Did everybody get the e-mail that $I$ sent with the materials? They were the same materials that $I$ provided to County Council when we allocated the funding for this. If you see the packet that has like the County of Allegheny piece of paper on the front of it, that is showing -- because $I$ know when $I$ was talking to some folks in preparation for this meeting -- I want to remind everybody that when we talk about worker pay and uniforms, both of those things were funded by the county and are in the 2024 budget.

So what this first sheet is is saying when the operating budget was enacted, which was the December 12, 2023, and the actual operating budget that we approved is attached behind it. And if you turn to the fourth -fifth to last page and you see Jail, you'll see
that they literally have dedicated line items in the jail's budget, which is what Controller O'Connor had asked me to do when we had been discussing this previously. I gave a lot of pushback saying, no, let's approve it first, and then I'll get the money. But instead -- it worked. Council gave the money, so we have \$1 million for Incarcerated Worker Pay.

I will say based off of my proposal, there is zero chance we can spend that this year because we're already so far into the month, so we will actually way under-spend that.

And then Incarcerated Individual Uniform was given $\$ 500,000$. And based off of quotes which will be in the preview of the County Executive since they do contracts, they'll pick like who provides the uniforms. We will just be dictating colors, but the actual cost has already been taken care of.

So I want to make sure when we're having any deliberations about worker pay, we're not talking about the money because that has been handled. So that's what this packet is.

The things $I$ sent in your e-mail were, One, the jail's current policy about how we pay, our Inmate Labor is what it's called, so the incarcerated workers who are in the jail right now. The jail has a policy around it. It does not include paying them right now.

Also, in that e-mail, you will see that $I$ cited the provision that we are uniquely, in the whole, entire country, the only county that when we pay our county workers, we have to follow a really strict pay schedule to do it. It is up to us how much we want to pay them, but for incarcerated folks who have dependents, 75 percent of any wages that they make in the jail have to go to their dependents. They only get 25 percent of it.

For folks who are incarcerated workers who do not have dependents, they don't get any of the money while they're actually in jail. It's more of a savings account and a ramp up to help them once they're released. They get one-third of the total wages that they made at release; one-third three months later; and one-third three more months later.

That's another thing that $I$ want to make sure we're not getting into the weeds about. We cannot change that. I wish we could. If I
was a state legislator, $I$ would be pushing to change that because it's only a county of the second class in Pennsylvania of which we are the only one.

So let's not dispute -- let's not debate how much this costs. It's already allocated and let's not debate how and when we're going to pay them because we truly unfortunately cannot do anything about that.

I also attached the document that shows the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections and how they pay their workers. I again want to point out that folks who are incarcerated at the State and Federal level who are doing very similar jobs, if not the same jobs as the people in the Allegheny County Jail, do get paid for their labor. They are overwhelmingly on an hourly rate. There are some SCIs in Pennsylvania that pay a per-day rate, which is where $I$ got the idea after some concerns were raised about how to keep track of their time, punch in and punch out. We've been working on this for, you know, almost two years now, so $I$ can promise you that any question you have about this, $I$ have already researched, have the information on, and am happy to share it. But $I$ just wanted to start out this discussion with that.

The proposal that was funded, like how $I$ got the calculation for the million dollars was $\$ 10$ a day. So regardless of what job they work, if they're doing laundry, if they're working on the pod, if they're working in the kitchen, if they're serving food, if they're doing basic maintenance, whatever job they're doing, no matter how many hours they work a day, if they work a day, they get $\$ 10$ for the day.

I've been in discussion with the Treasurer's Office to figure out if escrow is the best way to kind of handle it since we will be holding onto their wages until they're released. The Controller's Office will be really integral in the conversation about the disbursements to dependents, but -- so basically, what $I$ would like to do is I would like to pick a date that we think this can be implemented by. June lst is the one I'm throwing out there. Mind you, this is about a year later than $I$ would have liked to do this, but June lst, I feel like gives us March, April and May to figure out those logistics of actual program implementation. But I would really like to vote on this at the March meeting. So any questions anyone has -- again, I do not want to reinvent the wheel. I literally want to copy the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections process and just do \$10 a day.

So I would take any questions from anybody about it?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Do you have one County Exec?

MS. INNAMORATO: I do. So as we're going through this of how to like -- so the money is allocated. That's not the issue. Where we're running into challenges is in actually defining how the process is going to work because we have standards. When you call someone an employee, you get access to pension. We have a minimum wage of $\$ 18$ an hour, you know, healthcare, fair labor standards, everything that applies to a "employee." So, you know, we'd be interested in exploring kind of a program that would provide compensation that would give credit to commissary accounts.

MS. HALLAM: We legally cannot do that.

MS. INNAMORATO: That's where we believe that we can do that and it actually makes it easier to do -- and then you get -- have someone who -- you know, they're allowed to take out their commissary after, you know, they exit the facility, which would then bypass the different -- you know, having to work with, $W-2 s$, 1099s, all the other things involved with having someone as an employee and work through that $H R$ process.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. I very much understand that. That is definitely one of the things that we will have to figure out because they will have to be $W$-2'd. They will. That's why I had that conversation with the IRS to make sure there weren't any benefit implications once they were released and get this money in the lump sum.

But I will say that in the e-mail
that I sent -- so I said I sent the JOB the controlling statute, but $I$ also sent the one that's called Inmate Labor. It's specifically Subchapter A about county correctional institutions. So it doesn't talk about employees. It's basically -- it just says labor. So if they are doing labor, whether you call it a
program or you call it a job, they have to be paid according to this. That's the only problem there is they are doing labor, right? They're preparing food. They are doing laundry. They're cleaning the jail. They're doing the maintenance. They're painting the jail. Some are dock workers. Some are, you know, hall workers, but they're doing labor. And so I do not believe that there is a way around that. It doesn't talk about employees. It just calls -- it says Inmate Labor in County Correctional Institutions and it says the authorities in charge shall fix the wages. So that's us and we're saying 10 bucks a day. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't mean to throw a monkey wrench into this, but what's our job? Our job is to ensure the health and safekeeping of the inmates, right? Work -work is included in that because it's under Title 37 , and it says that written local policy must require that inmates who participate in a work program receive compensation. That's the PA Code. The jail does have a policy about compensation. You passed it out. MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:
Allegheny County Bureau of Corrections compensation right now is, believe it or not, they get a second meal and contact visits.

But here's my question. Do we as the Jail Oversight Board have the ability to direct the compensation? Is that our function as the Jail Oversight Board or is it the County Executive or County Council's function? I don't know that it's our function, that we have the authority and the power to do this.

I'm not saying we don't. I'm saying $I$ really don't know.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So the -- I mean, for example, the policy that you're reading from?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yes.
MS. HALLAM: A functioning Board would have, you know, wrote that policy. That is what we are supposed to do. It specifically says in the statute we're supposed to set the policies.

So we could literally change this policy to say that their compensation is $\$ 10$ per day.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: But we are to set policies regarding health and safety of inmates. Like how does this pertain to health --

MS. HALLAM: I don't believe that that's actually what the statute says, that our policies are just to be the health and safety. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, that's what we are, oversight. We -- our powers and duties include the operation and maintenance of the prison and alternative housing facilities and the oversight of the health and safekeeping of inmates.

MS. HALLAM: I agree with that, but

I think you skipped over the really operative word here is the Board administrative powers and duties shall include the "operation" and maintenance of the prison. So everything having to do with the operation of the jail is absolutely within our preview. And this is how the jail is operating is with unpaid incarcerated labor.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.

I would like to -- I don't know -- I'm not disagreeing with you.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, no. I know you're just pointing out something. That's the point of this meeting.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I'm saying I don't know. Like it makes me a little nervous. Do we have the power to do this? Is it our function? Maybe it's your function as county Council.

MS. HALLAM: Our function was to fund it, and we did that.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:

Maybe - -
MS. HALLAM: So we did what we were told to do.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.

I don't know. I don't know.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So I think operations is the key word there is -- we should be writing all these policies.

Again, that is my goal for this Board when it is now functioning. We have subcommittees. We're writing the policies. We're setting the standards. We're doing all the things that we are to do.

And I would argue that the
safekeeping of the incarcerated individuals is
absolutely affected by them being valued for
their labor and being set up to succeed when they
leave, which is -- is unfortunate as it is, how
we have to pay them. I would love to put the
money on their books and allow them to get extra
phone calls home, allow them to buy extra food
from commissary, but we can't.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Why do
you say we can't?
MS. HALLAM: Because the thing that
I sent here --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Which
would be --
MS. HALLAM: -- under this is,
Title 61, Part 3, Inmate Confinement. Chapter 31
is Inmate Labor. This was one of the e-mails
that $I$ think -- yes.
So now go down to Inmate Accounts.
So this is about county correctional
institutions. Inmate Accounts. Three-fourths of
the amount credited to each inmate, or the entire
amount if (d), Inmate Accounts under 3104.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Thank
you.

MS. HALLAM: $3104(d)$.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. HALLAM: Yeah, Inmate Accounts. So it says -- okay, three-fourths of the amount credited to each incarcerated person or the entire amount if the person so elects, shall constitute a fund for the relief of any person or persons dependent upon the incarcerated individual and shall be paid to such persons establishing dependency to the satisfaction of the authorities at such time and they may prescribe.

So that's the first part.
Three-fourths of anything you make if you have a dependent, or all of it, if you choose, but at least three-fourths has to go to your dependent.

In the case of an incarcerated person has no person dependent on him, the incarcerated person's wages shall be deposited for his benefit and shall be paid to him as follows: One-third at the time of his discharge; one-third three months later; one-third six months later. So like basically, the three-month ramp-up. We cannot supercede that. That's state law.

MR. O'CONNOR: I think that's a conversation. I mean, obviously, when it's an internal -- sorry. I know you have to go.

MS. INNAMORATO: I think we want to find a way where we can compensate people for their labor who's currently residing in the ACJ at the rate of $\$ 10$ a day. We want to do it that is in legal compliance but also doesn't hold us to -- you know, we also can't be in violation of our Human Resources laws and things around worker's comp and pension and healthcare and everything.

So, you know, I think where it makes sense is having us, you know, outline the program, here's what this would look like and have the JoB review it.

MS. HALLAM: So but you agree that this is the Jail Oversight Board's preview to approve such a program? Because I think that is unquestionable and $I$ can't tell if you're trying to say you think the Executive can do it without the Board.

MS. INNAMORATO: I think that -yeah, I think that might be more of a legal question.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well,
that's -- and that's --
MS. HALLAM: Which you're in luck because $I$ also legislated that this Board is now required to have a Solicitor. So we should also do that too.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I agree.

MS. HALLAM: Because I'm getting really frustrated sitting up here.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I'm tired of researching all this stuff.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. This is getting really -- yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: He knows.

MS. HALLAM: He doesn't want anything to do with it, and $I$ don't blame him.

MR. CRUM: Oh, I've been looking up plenty for you. I have to raise my hand to get in line.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Would you like to raise your hand?

MR. CRUM: I'd like to ask a question.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Do you guys mind? Mr. Crum is my -- what's your title?

MR. CRUM: Consigliere.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. HALLAM: But also a constituent and a resident of Allegheny County and, therefore, in this public meeting, you may address the Board.

MR. CRUM: Question for you, perhaps. Setting aside whatever the powers and duties of the judicial -- sorry, the Jail Oversight Board and the plain meaning of what oversight is, but when we talk about the duties and powers under Section 1724, I'm sure there can be a reasonable debate about what the parameters and limits of what those duties and powers are.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.
MR. CRUM: But that's a discussion for a more general conversation. Let's cut to the quick on what is this funding that is being presented by the legislative branch of local government through the executive branch of local government, that now has these assets.

The question becomes what responsibility or power does this Jail Oversight Board have in distributing that? Therein lies
the question, because once you determine that question is going to determine how far the parameters of this Board's power are.

MS. HALLAM: Yes.
MR. CRUM: They could be hypothetically unlimited, and you could have meetings until the cows come home. The question is, have you far exceeded the parameters of oversight based on statutes in 1724.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.
MR. CRUM: So when we take a look at the proposal that came out regarding the funding, if you look specifically at the statute at 61-PS-1304.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MR. CRUM: That you yourself brought to the attention of the Board, and you looked at subsection (b), could you read for me what the title of the subsection (b) says for the record?

MS. HALLAM: Are we looking at Title 61 that governs the Board's duties or are we looking at the one about the pay?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: 3104.
MS. HALLAM: 3104. I thought you
said 1304. I'm sorry. Yes.
MR. CRUM: Maybe I misspoke.
MS. HALLAM: Inmate Labor in County
Correctional Institutions.
MR. CRUM: Correct.
MS. HALLAM: Authority to County Commissioners, which we are a Home Rule, so we do not have County Commissioners. We have a County Executive and a County Council.

MR. CRUM: Okay. Subsection (b)
indicates authority to County Commissioners. It says the County Commissioners or Chief Administrator.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MR. CRUM: Of the county
correctional institution shall. We understand --
MS. HALLAM: Yes.
MR. CRUM: Let me finish.
MS. HALLAM: I don't dispute.
MR. CRUM: Shall is not negotiable.
MS. HALLAM: Correct.
MR. CRUM: So that one -- and I'm
trying to understand, but it says county correctional institution, what or who is the county correctional institution.

MS. HALLAM: So if I can answer that. I would actually say that's irrelevant because if you look at the 1, 2, 3 that it's saying they shall do, none of that has anything to do with what we're talking about. It's determining the amount, kind, and character of machinery to be erected; arrange for the purchases and installation of machinery; and provide for the sales of articles and material produced. So that specific subsection is about in other jails and prisons they actually make stuff. You know, you see in movies, license plates and stuff like that. That is what is up to the County Commissioners or Chief Administrator to the county correctional institution.

MR. CRUM: So if $I$ understand that argument, it is that services which the inmates are providing is not incorporated in subsection (b) •

MS. HALLAM: Correct.
MR. CRUM: Or you don't apply it.
MS. HALLAM: Correct. It says
nothing about services. It's specifically about machinery for the industries, and it's about what
to do with the stuff the incarcerated individuals make as a product of their labor, but not services.

MR. CRUM: You distinguish
subsection (b) from subsection (c) and distinguish it from subsection (d) and distinguish it from subsection (e) or do you read them in totality?

MS. HALLAM: I distinguish them as the separate subsections that they are but understanding that it all pertains to the totality of 3104 , which is Inmate Labor in County Correctional Institutions.
So everything else -- I mean, I
also agree. I'm reading just the literal interpretation of what it says here, and $I$ think that (b) also specifically aligned with -- if you look at (a) in the general rule, the subsections of that are also all about manufacturing and production and not about what we're doing in the Allegheny County Jail.

> The funding says the County

Commissioners. We did that. The inmate
accounts, that's what we're talking about now. But yeah, I really do think that -- it is very
specific about (b) for the industries and machinery and is not talking at all about services provided.

MR. CRUM: I understand that position. I guess my question is that if all of those subsections under 3104 are not applicable, but you are carving out subsection (b) as not being in any way relevant to (a), (b), (c), or specifically (d).

MS. HALLAM: No, I'm not saying that. Like, for example, (d) would be relevant to (c), (b) and (a). I think they're all relevant to each other.

MR. CRUM: So the institution that has the accountability for the administration of (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) only applies to (a) -I'm sorry, is applied to only (b) -- I'm sorry, would only apply to inmate accounts -- would not apply to inmate accounts?

In other words, we can agree that the plain language says that county correctional institutions shall and you're carving that out. You're saying we don't pay attention to that. So let's move onto Inmate Account subsection (d).

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

MR. CRUM: If it says there the authorities in charge of the county correctional institutions shall fix the wage, the question is who is that county correctional institution?

MS. HALLAM: We're the authorities in charge of it. We set the operations, the maintenance, the safekeeping, the policies. We, as this Board, do everything as pertains to --

MR. CRUM: Is not the case of -this Board is oversight.

MS. HALLAM: I mean, that is the title of this Board, the Jail Oversight Board, but when you read the duties under the Jail Oversight Board statute, it's much more than just oversight.

MR. CRUM: So the Jail Oversight Board is functioning as a legislative body?

MS. HALLAM: No, it's functioning under the statute Title 61 that gives us our very specific -- which $I$ agree with you are quite broad authorities as pertains to the jail.

It's the same reason we confirm the warden, the same reason that we, you know, dictate what happens with the Incarcerated Individual's Welfare Fund, the same ways that we have unilateral access to the jail at any time we want for inspection.

Yeah, I don't actually think anything in here is contradictory. I would say to your point specifically about $3104(b)$, if, you know, this Board would determine that we want to institute a program like you mentioned for labor where they make something, where they're making, you know, license plates as their labor in the jail, I absolutely believe it would be up to the County Commissioners to say under the authority of the County Commissioners to determine the amount, kind, and character of the machinery to be erected to do that and the industries to be carried on in the county correctional
institution. I think it would be up to them to arrange for the purchase and the installation of the machinery at the expense of the County, and $I$ believe it would be up to them to provide for the sale of articles and material produced.

I do absolutely think that because this statute specifically gives that specific authority.

MR. CRUM: But when we look at subsection (e) Special Administrative Fund.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

MR. CRUM: The authorities in charge of a county correctional institution may establish a fund for the purpose of carrying out this section.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

MR. CRUM: And may provide for the purchase of machinery and materials and payment of wages from such fund.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MR. CRUM: My question is the funding that you obtained through the legislative body of the county --

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MR. CRUM: -- that's going through the executive branch of the County --

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
MR. CRUM: -- is that a special administrative fund that the legislative body on which you sit created for purposes of the funding of the $\$ 10$ a day?

MS. HALLAM: No, because it's in the jail's general budget. It is not a special administrative fund. It's money that was allocated to the jail's general budget.

MR. CRUM: So is it the case that you are asserting that the Jail Oversight Board's responsibilities, powers, and duties are to be the conduit for any funding or any legislative acts or executive acts that are passed? They have to come through the Jail Oversight Board for a vote for them to be enacted?

MS. HALLAM: Anything that has to do with the operation of the jail, period, has to come in front of this Board, yes.

MR. CRUM: So --

MS. HALLAM: For example, I believe that County Council could give $\$ 10$ million, and the Jail Oversight Board could do nothing with it because it is inevitably up to us.

MR. CRUM: So are you taking the position on behalf of -- well, as your responsibilities entail you, that the Solicitor would be in a position at the current state of funding at $\$ 1,500$ a month to be able to defend the position that you are striving that the Jail Oversight Board has pretty unlimited power when it comes to the execution of the Legislative Branch's determination on County Council, the Executive branch's decisions on County Council, and/or the Judiciary's functions in determining whether that which is passed through the Jail Oversight Board was legally appropriate?

Do you believe that the County and/or you have or can get the funding to pay for a Solicitor to defend that position to have section -- I'm sorry, Title 61, Section 1724 grants this Board unlimited power to do that of anything that pertains to the operation and maintenance of the Allegheny County Jail?

MS. HALLAM: I would actually even go further than that and say that it is irrelevant what the Legislative Branch and the Executive Branch wants as pertains to the Jail Oversight Board.

I maintain, as I did throughout this entire conversation about incarcerated worker pay going back years, that we didn't even need County Council to allocate the funding. If this Board voted to implement paying $\$ 10$ a day to incarcerated workers, the County would be required to fund that.

Similarly, to a -- not similarly. It's not the same. But like for example when a contract is entered into, a Collective Bargaining

Agreement, the County is then required to fund that Collective Bargaining Agreement because that is the controlling law about the pay for that subsection of workers. I believe that this is the exact same, that if the Jail Oversight Board, you know, leave out Controller O'Connor's argument from months past, County Council has to fund it first. I do not believe that was necessary. I maintained that at the time as well.

So I would say that it --
regardless of what the Legislative Branch does, regardless of what the Executive Branch does, I would fully expect our Solicitor to go to Court to litigate the broad powers that this Board is granted until Title 61.

MR. CRUM: I'm sure you're familiar with the cost of solicitors and --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Well, we're going to move on.

MS. HALLAM: We're going to have to get a cheap one. I do know that.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We're going to move on.

MS. HALLAM: I took a compromise to pass that legislation.

MR. CRUM: I'm sorry for --
MS. HALLAM: No, I appreciate the pushback for sure. I want to make sure that all these questions are answered. Unfortunately, this is something $I$ think about in my sleep, so I very much have thought that out.

MR. CRUM: Thank you.
MS. HALLAM: Thank you, though, very much.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. I think the bottom line is that County Executive Innamorato wants to review this proposal with the Law Department and get back to us. Is that accurate?

MS. INNAMORATO: Yes.
MS. HALLAM: I mean, I will just say that $I$ will agree collegiately to not put this on the agenda for the March meeting so that your office can have time to do that, but $I$ do also feel like this has been delayed so much further past where we initially planned to implement it. So regardless, $I$ will have this on the agenda for April is the one thing I will say. So that gives us a little over a month.

MS. INNAMORATO: Sorry. And we are responsible for administering such functions, so we need to make sure it's in compliance --

MS. HALLAM: No, I get that.

MS. INNAMORATO: And that it's all figured out.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.

MS. INNAMORATO: On the executive and administrative side.

MS. HALLAM: Sure.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Sure.

Next is uniforms.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, this is the easiest thing to talk about. So glad we're on this one.

Again, this is operations, maintenance, safekeeping of incarcerated individuals. Checks all the boxes we've been talking about now. This one is the most simple out of all of them. We have over-funded this initiative. The quotes that $I$ got were closer to $\$ 250, \$ 300,000$.

Again, I do believe that the actual
purchasing power and contractual power for getting these uniforms is solely in the hands of
the Executive's Office, but again, this Board can say these are the color uniforms that need to be worn in the jail.

We are simply implementing the Department of Corrections current policy. They switched to more neutral colors. I, in that e-mail shared the rationale behind that. We, in previous meetings, have had public commenters who had came here and talked. They were -- there's some study of color. I forget what it's called, but who have come and said, like, is kind of like angry, bad, aggression. And that there has been a shift, not just in Pennsylvania, but across the country, to kind of try to neutralize not just the uniforms in jails and prisons, but even the colors of the walls in jails and prisons.

So this one is very simple. The money is already allocated. Something that folks may not know who are new on this Board is that there are many different colors that are worn within a jail. If you're on DHU, you know, like segregation, you wear certain uniforms. If you are a child in the Allegheny County Jail, you wear a different color uniform. If you are a hall worker, if you are a kitchen worker, if you are a dock worker, if you are a pod worker, all of those things have set color uniforms. They are all pretty neutral-ish colors. You know, there's like gray. Other than DHU, which I think we would probably get pushback if I tried to change that because they are uniquely stripes -so this is only proposing to change the main uniforms for the jail and the children's uniforms because currently, the children are wearing that color and now it's going to be everyone.

So my official proposal is can we -- to change the reds in the jail to tan and to change the children's uniform to yellow, to neutral kind of not off-putting colors?

And again, the money is already
allocated. The data and evidence is there. And again, we are following down the line of what the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections has already implemented in their facilities.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Any
questions?
MS. HALLAM: Does anyone want to
push back on that one?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well,
I'll push back on the colors.

MS. HALLAM: Of course, Judge. Go ahead. Go ahead.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: One of the reasons that the jail uniforms are red is so that if there's an escape, they're easily identifiable. I feel like that the jail garb looks like scrubs.

MS. HALLAM: Sure. Yeah.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: So then maybe if it's -- maybe if it's tan, that's not easily enough identifiable. That's my only --

MS. HALLAM: What color do you propose?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, I don't know because $I$ didn't read your whole color spectrum.

MS. HALLAM: It was like this much. You did that on purpose.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I know. I just -- I feel like it just needs to be something other than tan because tan is -- it's so nondescript and blends in.

MS. HALLAM: But in -- they do that all the DOCs, which, you know, I'm sure they have more escapes than we have at the ACJ.

I would, you know, be open to like doing a flip-flop, like yellow for everyone and tan for the kids, which is what the kids are now. So that would be my only pushback against the tan isn't recognizable enough because there are already people wearing that color in the jail.

So that would be my only pushback. If it's a big concern, I am not set on tan for them and yellow for the kids. I would flip-flop them.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. HALLAM: But I don't want like the red. That is the one color that is like aggression, raises your blood pressure.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I read that. I mean, or it could be stripes because stripes is easily identifiable.

MS. HALLAM: There's already stripes in DHU. They specifically want them to be stripes.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No other stripes.

MS. HALLAM: But right now, again, the kids are tan. So there's already tan and it has been acceptable as easily enough identifiable for the children housed in the jail.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. What's anybody else think?

MS. GRIFFIN: Is it like a bright, bright yellow, or is it a mild yellow?

MS. HALLAM: It can be any yellow you want to pass this and get something done in this way.

MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah. I do like the idea of having the tan for the children. It seems like a more calm color. Yellow can be a little bit loud so. And maybe that fits more for adults to have that -- more identifiable in the case of escape.

So, you know, I don't know. I didn't read the study either. I don't know if incarcerated individuals or youth have had any input on what color they would want, but $I$ do like the idea of flipping those colors.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. So --

MS. INNAMORATO: Is there any say on the -- on blue, green?

MS. HALLAM: Those colors are already used by the different workers in the
jail. So like gray, green, orange, stripes. What's another color, somebody who goes into the jail? What other color do we see people in? Yeah, stripes. All those colors are for different -- again, there are other people who wear different colors than the regular colors. And most of the colors are used up. And so when we're -- if the goal is to be like less offensive, that's why it was tan and yellow. Again -- but yeah, $I$ am open to other colors, but beware that many colors are already used. So if it's up to me, I would really like everyone to be tan and the kids to be yellow. If it will get you to vote for it when you normally wouldn't, if $I$ flip-flop it, I am open to that. But again, I want to make sure it's not like a scream-at-you yellow because that's the whole point of this is to kind of soften --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Calm. MS. HALLAM: -- the jail. Calm the jail. Yeah, and it's been shown to reduce acts of violence, reduce aggression, blood pressure. So there's a lot of studies from people a lot smarter than me on this topic.

And so yeah, if you want to flip-flop? Otherwise, I'm going to propose it as tan for everyone, yellow as the kids, and ask that in March, we vote on at least something.

Does anyone --
MS. GRIFFIN: I don't feel that super strongly about it. You know, I would prefer a softer yellow -- a softer yellow --

MS. HALLAM: Like an Easter yellow kind of yellow? Is that what you're thinking?

MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah, just -- and plus young people -- I imagine they care about -even incarcerated what color they're wearing. I don't know what -- you know, what would make them feel better wearing -- I don't know. Maybe that's in the study somewhere. I'll take a look at it. Are we voting on this today?

MS. HALLAM: We're not voting on anything today, but it will be on the March agenda, so if anyone is not for it now, tell me and this is where I'd like to kind of workshop it prior to.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Did anybody ask the jail what colors they'd like?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So the jail is
who gave us the breakdown of all the different colors that are used. Whenever we started having conversations with the jail, it got really messy because we were also trying to do the staff at the jail's uniform change at the same time as this. Lots of things happened in that, so I backed away from that and are specifically focusing on these uniforms.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
Well, I like yellow for adults and tan for children.

MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah.
MR. PERKINS: Sounds good to me.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. MAN-E: Yeah, I personally like it the other way around, but $I$ don't care that much. So long as it's not red.

MS. HALLAM: Can we pick a yellow? Can we all agree on the yellow?

MS. INNAMORATO: Can $I$ just say, can we consult with the jail and then get a quote for the different colors that exist, and that way, we can understand kind of the cost associated with it and really get a rundown and have all of the information that we need in front
of us of like here are the different populations and where we have different colors?

MS. HALLAM: If that is a concern, I do have that list that $I$ can share with you. But again, $I$ cannot get quotes because that is solely up to the County Executive.

MS. INNAMORATO: Exactly. So I would like to go and take the --

MS. HALLAM: But I -- the money doesn't matter.

MS. INNAMORATO: I would like to go through that process of getting the quotes.

MS. HALLAM: But the money is
already there. We know that we have more than enough money there. That is not the issue here. We're specifically just saying what are the colors? We want to do this. Not to exceed the amount that has been allocated in the budget. We can put that in our Motion.

Do you like yellow for everyone and tan for the kids or vice-versa?

Judge, you like yellow for everyone and tan for the kids?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I do.
MS. HALLAM: And you like it the
other way, but you don't care?
MAN-E: Yeah, I like tan for everyone.

MS. HALLAM: Okay. Rob?
MR. PERKINS: I don't have a strong opinion, but no red.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. Anyone else?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Judge
Bigley?
JUDGE BIGLEY: I'm good.
MS. HALLAM: Do you care one way or another, tan for everyone, yellow for kids? You said you liked it the other way, right?

JUDGE BIGLEY: I like yellow for everyone and tan for the kids.

MS. GRIFFIN: That was my choice too. Yellow for everyone, tan for the kids.

MS. HALLAM: Okay. I am going to put a Motion on March's agenda, yellow for everyone, tan for kids. Is there any way we can make it like a not ridiculous yellow? Does anybody have suggestions on language to make it like a, what do you want to say, soft yellow? I don't know how you guys want to say that.

MR. PERKINS: Yellow.


the staffing. That's the medical issue that -- I believe that the Controller and Beth -Councilwoman Hallam had a meeting with the medical staff --

MS. HALLAM: Oh, yeah.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: - people and you all were recommending that we have a Medical Staff subcommittee?

MS. HALLAM: Love that. I will -you know, that's the one thing I will commend the County Executive for like really bringing a diverse group of community members to here, but there is so many needs on this Board for like different areas of expertise, and $I$ think that she did a really great job like picking a wide array of people to be here.

But if she got five appointees, I'm sure she would have probably put somebody with medical experience here.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I'm in favor. I think everybody -- is everybody in favor of that?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. So what would it look like? Would it be like members, this whole Board, or would it be like the whole
committee is a medical group of people? Like
would it be -- would it be a hybrid of us and
them, or would it be just them? What do you guys
think?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I
thought it would be a couple of Board members on
the subcommittee and then some medical
professionals. Is that --
JUDGE BIGLEY: Yep.
MS. GRIFFIN: Yes.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That's
just reading what was disseminated.
MS. HALLAM: I like that a lot.
Who would pick those medical professionals? We
would vote on them as a Board, like kind of take
applications?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Where
are we going to -- yeah, I guess.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Why don't you have
just the people on this subcommittee that are
part of the Board decide? That way, you don't
have to involve us.
It's so hard for us -- can we agree
to even exchange e-mails and get them answered.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I know.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, the story of my life, yeah.

JUDGE BIGLEY: So if it's holding up the process and we trust the people that are on the subcommittee, let the people that are on the Medical Subcommittee decide who the medical people are that are on, right?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I can live with that. What does everybody think?

JUDGE BIGLEY: So the County

Executive and the people on the Medical Subcommittee can decide who the people are there -- the community people that are going to participate. I think that way, that will cut out the middleman.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Does everybody like that?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. The one thing I will ask is, you know, just to streamline the process. Like, I'm just having like kind of trauma from flashbacks because when we got the liaison is like we really did need somebody who like filtered requests. So I would only ask that there be like someone -- I don't know, the

Controller's Office isn't here, so I don't want to really like speak for them even though most of the office is actually here, but I don't know if that's something they'd be willing to do or...

I just want somewhere, someone who is responsible for, like, hey, these 50 people would like to be considered by the subcommittee to be on it.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: A chairman.

MS. HALLAM: A Chair of the -JUDGE BIGLEY: A Chair of the subcommittee?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Who could do that.

MS. INNAMORATO: I mean, this is why, like $I$ think with the liaison, like, maybe should be the person who is doing the administrative work for this body because it's too -- it doesn't work when it's just e-mail chain --

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.
MS. INNAMORATO: -- between all of us, right?

MS. HALLAM: Agreed.

MS. INNAMORATO: There should be - it should be filtered through a central person who then can make sure that information is disseminated in a timely manner, that things get scheduled.

MS. HALLAM: I don't dispute that at all.

MS. INNAMORATO: So could we -- is that something that we can look at with the job description and add that administrative function to it?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. For now, are you guys cool with just assigning it to her to be like, hey, maybe we can put a call out, like who wants to be on this --

MS. INNAMORATO: Well, I will say that we have a list as a starting point for folks who would be considered for a community because of the community process that we went through to gather resumes and for all of the Boards, Authorities and Commissions for the county. MS. HALLAM: Yeah, that's a really great start. And $I$ think all of those people should be sent to the liaison, but I'm just asking about the public call as well for other
people who maybe weren't included in that group to be able to still be considered for this committee.

MS. INNAMORATO: Maybe we can use the Allegheny For All as a depository for it. It's still active and we receive -- we receive resumes for both jobs and Boards, Authorities and Commissions every day.

MS. HALLAM: Okay. So maybe we can do that and then have an e-mail, or you can e-mail Karen and just have her collecting them, and we put a deadline on it or something. Like, hey, you've got to apply by -- what do you think is a fair date?

MS. INNAMORATO: When would we want the committee to be active?

MS. HALLAM: ASAP.
MS. INNAMORATO: So we'd want to make the appointments in April?

MS. HALLAM: Well, it doesn't have to be done at the regular meeting if it's the Chairperson of the Board -- of the subcommittee who is choosing them.

MS. INNAMORATO: But it has to be a report thing of some committee members need to be approved by the Board.

MS. HALLAM: Didn't we change -- we don't have any bylaws. That's not really true. We could just make a committee and agree.

MS. INNAMORATO: That's true, but that was a concern that was brought up by everyone.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Do they have like the air conditioning on ten in here?

MS. HALLAM: I've been sweating all day. I'm not complaining about this at all.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. So we're saying that -- you're proposing that the liaison be the one that collects the applications and filters them?

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Am I
hearing that accurately?
MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah. I mean, that could be the point of first review.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
MS. INNAMORATO: If we want that to be. I'm saying that -- I think more broadly I want the liaison to function as -- have an administrative function for this Board --

MS. HALLAM: Same.

MS. INNAMORATO: -- and be able to -- you know, that's the person we go to if we need to reach the rest of the members and coordinate and make sure materials are distributed.

So if this is an administrative function of the Board that, you know, we're using that individual to manage this, we'd then not add additional work or have the work live under one person's office.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. I gotcha. All right. Well, I think everybody agrees with that?

MS. HALLAM: What, the liaison is collecting --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yes. But the liaison is not really going to filter the applications, just collect.

MS. HALLAM: Right. Just collect.

MS. INNAMORATO: Yep.

MS. HALLAM: Just because, just
like some background, that has been like a thing that we're trying to smooth out is like the liaison shares all the information that they have
with all members of the Board.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I think that's been correct.

MS. HALLAM: No, you did. I just wanted to make sure the County Executive --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I will - -

MS. HALLAM: -- knew that. I wasn't arguing.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: How about then -- oh, no, no. I know you weren't. How about if at the next meeting we appoint -- we create a subcommittee.

MS. HALLAM: March?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: The

March meeting. And I don't know, do we want three Jail Oversight Board members? I know we're not going to pick now, and then we'll say we're going to -- why don't we designate how many non-Jail Board people will be on the subcommittee?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Uh-huh.

MS. HALLAM: What's the name?

Medical?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Medical Staffing?

MS. HALLAM: Jail Healthcare?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
Jail Healthcare Subcommittee.

MS. INNAMORATO: Healthcare Advisory subcommittee was the name we were using.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Healthcare Advisory Subcommittee.

Okay. So, I don't know. We could decide this at the meeting, how many people you want. I don't know. If it's too big, it becomes ineffective because you can never get anybody together to go accomplish anything.

MS. HALLAM: Correct.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't know. What's everybody think?

MS. HALLAM: I think there should be four JOB members max so that they -- every time the Healthcare Advisory Board meets it doesn't have to be Sunshine'd and, therefore, you only have -- you never have a quorum of the Board.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Do you want four other people? Do you want three?

MS. HALLAM: I think you want an
even amount, so either three or five. Is that too big?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh, three or -- well, you said an even number.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, sorry. I think you want an uneven amount.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh, un. MS. HALLAM: In case there's ever like a vote that the Advisory Board is taking. I really don't know. I never created an Advisory Board.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, we're not really giving them the ability to vote. MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah, we're not -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We're just presenting to the whole Board recommendations.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I would do three, then give you guys if you need to expand with as many community members as you want.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Yeah, I like that. How about we start with three community members, but the subcommittee has the ability to expand in its discretion.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Like to as many
community members as you need --

MS. HALLAM: To do your job.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Yes. So if you want to add ten medical people, however many you want to do to get the job done, you know, however.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. So we're going to establish a Healthcare Advisory Subcommittee. There's going to be four JoB members on it. We're going to authorize three community members but it's going to be within the subcommittees discretion to expand on the number of community members. The Jail Liaison is going to be the repository and collector of applications for the public -- the community members spots.

MS. HALLAM: Cool.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right?

Okay. We're all good?
JUDGE BIGLEY: That will be decided
on by the -- by the --
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: By the subcommittee.

JUDGE BIGLEY: By the subcommittee Board members. They'll decide who the people are.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. We're good? All right. So then we have the liaison job description which --

JUDGE BIGLEY: Oh, my God.
MS. HALLAM: This is a lot.
JUDGE BIGLEY: This can go on --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, can $I$ just say preliminarily, that $I$ think it should really be cut down.

MS. HALLAM: Well, for the sake of her own understanding, it's a lot.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: It's so detailed and complicated. And first of all, is the jail liaison an employee or a subcontractor? I don't know.

MS. HALLAM: An employee of -- so, okay. This was something that was -- when we created the position was very highly contentious, and $I$ actually think that if we're going to be talking about it, maybe we should talk about changing this.

But currently the Jail Oversight Board liaison is an employee whose salary and benefits have their own line item under the Sheriff. So it was because at the time he was
the only member of the Board who volunteered to house the position in his department.

I actually think something we should consider is maybe going outside of any of us and maybe seeing if the Treasurer's Office would house them just so that they're more supervised. Just so that it's somebody who is outside of the members of the Board, because I worry, and this was something that was proposed whenever we first were discussing creating this position, that because this person is housed under the Sheriff, who is but one member of the Board, that it appears as if she reports to him when it was made very clear she reports to all of us equally.

So that's just a proposition that we don't need to maybe figure out right now, but it's something --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: But the Sheriff doesn't pay her salary; is that correct?

MS. HALLAM: The Sheriff does pay her salary.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: But the Sheriff is reimbursed, right?

MS. HALLAM: No. The Sheriff -- it is a line item in the Sheriff's budget.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh.
MS. HALLAM: Jail Oversight Board -- actually, you might be able to see it in that thing I printed out. It might actually be -- if you take the packet that $I$ gave you and look at the Sheriff, I actually think $I$ saw it in there. Hold on. Is it alphabetical? No.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That's okay. I believe you.

MS. HALLAM: Well, I just want to show you it so that we know -- Court of Common Pleas, Controller, County Council. Yeah, do you see Sheriff? $\$ 123,250$, Jail Oversight Board liaison personnel and fringes. It's a line item in the Sheriff's Department budget.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. MS. HALLAM: So it is not reimbursable. It is not a contracted position, but right now she is working under no job description or MOU. She's just kind of doing what we ask.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Can $I$ say something?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Sure. igure out something other than parking somebody somewhere. There has to be a better solution than -- you know, if we have somebody who falls under us, then putting them somewhere -- do you know -- I think there -- we have to put our heads together and figure something out rather than parking an employee under some faux department somewhere and saying you put them in your department and act like they work for you.

So that's the only thing $I$ was saying. I find that to be a problem, and I think that was the problem initially that $I$ had when $I$ said, well, who does she work for and the Sheriff said, well, she's in my office. And I said, well, does she work for you? And he goes, well, no. I go, what do you mean? This whole thing -so then what do I say to the Treasurer when $I$ say does she work for you and they'd say, well, no, but she's in our office.

You know, if an individual works
for the Jail Oversight Board, the individual works for the Jail Oversight Board. So the question is if we're going to have -- whether it's a Solicitor or a liaison. We have to be prepared that those individuals work for the Board.

So I think we need to figure that out rather than put them under somebody else's line item.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.
JUDGE BIGLEY: And then pretend that they -- do you know what I'm saying?

MS. HALLAM: I agree with you very much.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah, but they're paid by the Sheriffs.

MS. HALLAM: The only problem is -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: She's paid by the -- I think it's a problem that she's paid by the Sheriff myself.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. And that was -again, we had to create it somewhere administratively. So don't look for like just this part of the conversation. Don't look at it as like her actual functions of her job duty, but administratively, that position needed to be housed somewhere, like in the HR organizational structure or whatever you want to call it. We needed somewhere to house it.

Originally, we thought the Courts was the most appropriate place, and Judge Clark did not want it there. We --

JUDGE BIGLEY: Then you do agree that somebody then needs to figure out --

MS. HALLAM: Well, the solution is --

JUDGE BIGLEY: -- that's not okay for somebody to say, well, you have this, but somebody else needs to pretend and then house somebody.

MS. HALLAM: I agree. And the solution is the Jail Oversight Board needs to have a budgetary allocation in the budget. That's really the solution, to pay for both the liaison and the solicitor and whatever else.

I mean, paying to record the meetings. That shouldn't fall on the Controller's office. Paying for, you know, somebody to type up the transcripts. That shouldn't be within them. We should have a department that is the Jail Oversight Board and we do not.

And that is the reason that it has to be placed somewhere. It's just
administratively. But you're right. It does give the perception of some sort of impropriety or some sort of unequal distribution of authority to the Sheriff's Office or wherever she's housed.

That was the only reason that in my discussions with the Treasurer's Office about these escrow accounts for the worker pay, we had brought up is it a possibility that we could house this person there because it's somebody who is not on the Jail Oversight Board.

So just -- again, not something set in stone. Just like an option to throw out there. Something to think about, because I think any one of our offices -- you put her under County Council, you're going to say, I have more authority. You put her under the Courts, it's going to be you guys. You put her in the Exec's office -- no matter where --

JUDGE BIGLEY: That concerned me.
I said, you know, tomorrow --
MS. HALLAM: Yeah.
JUDGE BIGLEY: -- like say tomorrow she says, well, I need FMLA, who do $I$ call?

MS. HALLAM: The Sheriff's HR people.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right.
MS. HALLAM: But she doesn't -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: And that's --

MS. HALLAM: I agree with you. That's wrong.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That shouldn't be.

JUDGE BIGLEY: But according to them, she doesn't. She doesn't work for them. She works for Jail Oversight. So this is the confusion that it creates. And $I$ felt bad, not just for us, but for her. You're right. It did create, $I$ think, to some degree, a perception of who did she work for.

MS. HALLAM: Right.
JUDGE BIGLEY: That wasn't fair to the Board or to her.

MS. HALLAM: Or to the Sheriff.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Yes. And so I
think --
MS. HALLAM: Originally, he was just going to use funding in his salary's allocation to pay her, and $I$ was like, no, I'm going to put a line item there, so you don't have
to take from other positions for her. That was the whole reason for the own line item because he was just going to take that $\$ 123,000$ out of his own budget, and I didn't think that was fair.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: So he didn't take it out of his budget?

MS. HALLAM: He did not. We
allocated that funding specifically and separately.

JUDGE BIGLEY: So then somebody
needs to change our structure so that we can put it under ours and then there can be -- it can be clear that, you know, these positions, whether it be a solicitor or a liaison, that they report to the Board, that the fall under the Board, you know, and then there's no doubt.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah, I agree.
I think that is also something for maybe the County Executive's Office to look into. I can ask the Council Office as well since we, you know, approved the budget presentation, but I don't know the answer to that off by heart, like how you would create -- well, County Council has the authority under the Charter to create any department that it deems necessary, or eliminate
any department that it deems necessary.
I don't know if creating a
budgetary section for the Jail Oversight Board is the same as creating a department, but if anybody of a legal mind would like to opine.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I don't know. We don't need a lot. We just need enough for those two. That's all.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. And again, maybe some other things.

JUDGE BIGLEY: No, that's all.
MS. HALLAM: Wait a minute. You don't want like JOB swag and stuff like that? Judge Bigley walking around in JOB swag.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Yeah. I don't know about that.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Well, in any event, $I$ think we really need to pare down this -- my opinion, pare this thing down.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I think by law.
MS. INNAMORATO: Well, I think we have, like, right, this is a MOU, so it has more details and then like the rules and responsibilities are kind of outlined in the job description.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yeah.
MS. INNAMORATO: So, I mean, it sounds like there's a lot of -- a lot of unknowns still of where, you know, ultimately, this person lives.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Can $I$ say something else? On Page 5, it says the liaison shall be independent of both the Board and the Jail, and I'm like she works --

MR. PERKINS: Yeah. Should be loyal to us, not to the --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right.
MR. PERKINS: -- to the jail.
JUDGE BIGLEY: She wouldn't be independent of us.

MR. PERKINS: Yeah.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: And also, like, she has to comply with all these professional and ethical codes such as -- like, I mean, my God, there's like five of them in there. She has to take reasonable measures to ensure that we, members of the Board, comply with the law.

MR. PERKINS: Yeah.

MS. HALLAM: She can't do the stuff that's in there.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Of course, she can't.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I do think we all agree that she needs to -- the one thing I think we need -- that at least $I$ think, is there needs to be one -- there needs to be a central way for her to get complaints, that we need to know how they're being addressed. They need to be sent back to us as a group, right, because that was one of the issues is, I guess the perception that those weren't coming as a group.

But I think also is our understanding of how these complaints are getting to her. In other words, what are the different avenues that the liaison can get these complaints.

And also, what number are they coming in at? So, in other words, $I$ know there was talk about the inmates being able to get the complaints to her on their tablets. Apparently, the jail is saying that there's no way for her to be able to do that.

MS. HALLAM: The jail lies.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I know. Well --
MS. HALLAM: The jail lies. So right now, they're saying that if they want to submit requests to the liaison, like the incarcerated people, they have to fill out this piece of paper and it's just like administratively ridiculous.

There's a way that they could put a request on the tablet, but the jail is telling them that they can't.

MS. INNAMORATO: I do know, so we tried to get the survey on the tablets, and we ran into errors, but they dropped off paper surveys. So we have more than 450 responses from residents from the ACJ. So it might -- there might be a limitation of the technology because we tried to work through it for a month to get the survey on and we just ended up with paper and pencils.

MS. HALLAM: But I thought that the -- I thought that the problem with that was that was too much, like the survey was too much? This is literally like one tiny piece of paper.

MS. INNAMORATO: It had to do with
access to the internet and using -- using a form
that was web-based.
MS. HALLAM: Google form.
MS. INNAMORATO: Yeah. So that would be -- if you had something maybe embedded on the tablets, but then $I$ don't know how you get it to a centralized location if it's not connected to the web. So that was where that -that's went -- that's my very high-level knowledge of what happened, so we defaulted to paper surveys and made them available.

And like I said, we do have 400 -and-some responses so far. So it's working. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I thought the jail's explanation made sense. I don't remember what it was about why they could not allow it --

MS. HALLAM: They were saying it had something to do with -- to make it like -- I thought -- I thought that what their issue was that they couldn't collect that information via the tablets without them also having access to it and we didn't want them to have access to it because it's like a secret complaint to the Board kind of thing. That's what $I$ thought their hang-up was. I may be wrong.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I thought they said the programmer -- the programmer -- the program wouldn't allow for it in some capacity.

MS. HALLAM: That's what the County Exec was saying her problem was.

But what I would say is, I mean, someone in the jail can send me an e-mail right now. Why can't they e-mail the liaison?

JUDGE BIGLEY: I thought --
MS. HALLAM: Yeah, you can send me a text or an e-mail.

JUDGE BIGLEY: -- there's always some way we can account that every complaint is being addressed.

MS. HALLAM: Right.
JUDGE BIGLEY: That's what we want, right?

MS. HALLAM: Yes.
JUDGE BIGLEY: It's that we know that -- or, you know, an issue was raised and now we know that it's been addressed, where up until now, none of us had any clue.

MS. INNAMORATO: So they can e-mail you?

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

MS. INNAMORATO: From the tablet?

MS. HALLAM: Yeah, like GTL messaging.

MS. INNAMORATO: Well, then they could just message --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, then they could message her.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. Just like they filed grievances via their tablets, they send messages to their counselors via their tablets. They can also send external messages to like any of us.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Can't we have an e-mail for the Board --

MS. HALLAM: We don't.

JUDGE BIGLEY: For the public -no, for the Public Comment, can't we have a central e-mail just for --

MS. HALLAM: Yep.
JUDGE BIGLEY: -- the liaison, not her personal, but --

MS. HALLAM: And put her on
everybody's approved visitor --
JUDGE BIGLEY: -- like issues at
whatever, and it would be all -- anything they want investigated, that would directly go into a box that we would also know the number -- in other words, and a notice would also get sent to Karen.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. JUDGE BIGLEY: You know what I'm saying?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: That is a separate issue from the MOU. That's how does she conduct her job.

MAN-E: Yeah, that's what $I$ was going to say. That's actually my question. Do we know how the process works currently?

MS. HALLAM: A piece of paper. We have a copy of a piece of paper.

MAN-E: All right. Like after she gets the complaint?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, we don't get it.

MS. HALLAM: We don't ever see the complaint.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We don't ever see it.

MS. HALLAM: We see her when she
writes a report.
JUDGE BIGLEY: That's why we're trying to create a process that's more electronic, but the jail was saying there was no way to do it.

MAN-E: So do we know if she writes a report of every complaint?

MS. HALLAM: We do not know that.
MAN-E: I gotcha.
JUDGE BIGLEY: Other than if we get -- other than if we get a copy, we don't know.
MAN-E: Only reason I'm asking is because quite a few people I've spoken to in the jail have submitted a lot of complaints and have zero follow-up, you know what I mean? So I am curious about like how the process works, how we can make that process better, and also like hold her accountable if she's not doing what she's supposed to be doing.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: And we all agree with that.

MS. HALLAM: I agree 100 percent.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: And she complained to me at one point about not getting
messages -- like she wants to be able to get the messages on the tablet because she feels that they're not getting to her. Like they're getting lost.

MS. HALLAM: As mail does. As interoffice mail does get lost in the jail. It's lost in the sauce.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No. It would be nice if they could do it electronically and we could all get a copy of it.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. But aside from that, that's the mechanics of how she does her job. The topic that we're on today is the MOU. Somebody needs to take a stab at this.

MS. HALLAM: Now, if you say -JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Who wants to take a stab at writing this? MS. HALLAM: I'd be willing to work with a couple folks. I don't want to -- I don't think $I$ should do it by myself, and then I'll just be like, you're all attacking me, anything that you don't like about what I do. So I'm not going to do that, but $I$ will be willing to, like,
spearhead a, like, Google.doc where we do like suggestions. Do you know how to do that, how you can, like, not actually change it, but you can just say $I$ suggest this change?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, but you can teach me.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah. It's pretty
easy. I can teach you how to do it.
I would be willing to spearhead either a small group or the full group of that because $I$ think that this document is way too long, first of all, but also for us to go through the nitty-gritty of --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right.
I don't even want to go through this.
MS. INNAMORATO: It's an employment agreement, yeah. It's like pretty -- it needs to be kind of pretty detailed. I don't think this long, but it's a lot to go through in a working session like this.

MS. HALLAM: Well, I would also point out that she's had the job for some time. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Right. JUDGE BIGLEY: I don't know how much of this you can stick her with.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: A year later --

JUDGE BIGLEY: Also, a lot of this has to do with the selection -- two pages of it has to do with the selection process, so it's kind of moot.

MS. HALLAM: Well, in case we ever get a new one.

MS. INNAMORATO: Well, in the job description, too, it does say that the JOB can assign different tasks to the liaison if given in writing within the month.

JUDGE BIGLEY: But $I$ think the biggest thing that cries out is a system. There has to be a system, and I'm not aware that there's any like system at all. And I find it hard to believe that there can't be a system.

MS. HALLAM: Uh-huh.

JUDGE BIGLEY: And like I said, even if it entails once a -- even if she gets something in writing, she should be entering it into the database, right? And if it's not given to her in writing, if it's sent by e-mail, that could go into whatever database --

MS. HALLAM: Sorry. We're listening to you, Judge Bigley, I swear, out of this ear.

JUDGE BIGLEY: So I say that we create immediately an e-mail that inmates can e-mail all issues to her.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. But that's a separate issue.

MS. HALLAM: Well, no, I think -- I do agree that it is relevant to this because it will be in their job description responsible for answering e-mail and written forms, but $I$ will say --

JUDGE BIGLEY: Complaints.
MS. HALLAM: They can't just e-mail anyone like you, and $I$ can e-mail anyone. It's like they need to be on your, like, approved phone list to message them.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. We need the jail here to tell us the capabilities.

JUDGE BIGLEY: They can't do it on the tablet?

MS. HALLAM: They do it on the tablet, but it is not like they have the Gmail app on the tablet and just send out an e-mail to everybody they want. It's like an approval. JUDGE BIGLEY: Well, then why can't --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We need the jail here to answer your questions, not to be rude. But we can't answer these questions.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Well then it should be a requirement that once the liaison gets anything, even if it is in writing, that that be entered into something.

MS. HALLAM: I agree.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. JUDGE BIGLEY: So we'll do it two ways, okay? Once we get a system -- immediately that once she gets one, it be entered. Until we can work out a system with the jail where they create a system that it can be entered by the inmates, for now she can enter it in so that we can see how things are addressed and what the resolution was. That's what we want to do.

MS. INNAMORATO: So what $I$ can do is I can go to the Acting Warden. I can ask him to create a process or for the liaison and we can see what is possible and where, you know, headaches are. We can also bring in the

Department of Information Technology, who is responsible for this stuff, to see what is possible. But it seems like that's something reasonable that we could handle administratively.

JUDGE BIGLEY: And we can see -- a lot of the complaints would be coming from family members who do have access to e-mail.

MS. HALLAM: That's a good point. That's a good point. I do agree with that. So maybe they're for two separate purposes. Because I know probably half of the complaints that $I$ get are from people outside of the jail on behalf of a loved one.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Like when the people call me on a three-way, right --

MS. HALLAM: Oh, I've never seen anybody do that. That is a violation of jail policy. I've never seen that.

JUDGE BIGLEY: You know, I --
people get around it, so I'm saying family members will get the complaint on behalf of the resident. So in the meantime, what the liaison can do is enter it into a database that we all have access to too, so we can see what the complaint was, what the resolution was.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. And then in the meantime, Bethany has agreed to take a stab at re-writing this. Does anybody want to help her?

MS. GRIFFIN: Yes.

MS. HALLAM: Yes. Barbara.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE:

MR. PERKINS: I'll help.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Bethany, Barb, and Rob are all going to rework this document and submit a proposal to us. Wonderful.

Thank you.

MS. INNAMORATO: I would ask that once you guys get the document to a place that you like, if you would give it to us so that we can run it through our Human Resources and make sure it's in compliance.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.
MS. INNAMORATO: Okay. Thank you. JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. I think that's it.

MS. HALLAM: Great guys. Just so you know, this is the first-ever full Board work


JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: --
okay, about here are, you know, good practices, et cetera, okay?

MS. HALLAM: But again, if we're saying that the Jail Oversight Board doesn't have the authority to do anything about that, why would we waste our time?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We're not saying that. We're talking about it. We're talking about it.

Okay.
MS. HALLAM: I'm down. I would love to be there.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: So can I -- he told me to pick three dates and give him three dates, and he will make one of them work, okay?

JUDGE BIGLEY: Fine.
MS. HALLAM: Four o'clock.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Any time we want. So everybody --

MS. HALLAM: Okay. Next week, I'm on spring break from school. So my evenings are freer. The following week, I just need to be done by 6:00 every night.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Well, I'd like to be home like, you know --

MS. HALLAM: Daytime or evening?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I think for our purposes, for everybody to be here it needs to be at like 4:00. Doesn't everybody in this room have a job in the daytime?

MS. HALLAM: Yes. Many. Many jobs.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: So, I mean, unless it's really far out and you can take the day off --

MS. HALLAM: I can always do it on
my lunch break, just -- I don't want my schedule --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: It's going to take a couple hours.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, then I cannot do my lunch break.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. So can people make it here by 3:00?

JUDGE BIGLEY: I can.

MS. GRIFFIN: Yes.

MAN-E: I can.

MS. HALLAM: Not always, but, yeah.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Well let's pick a couple days when you can make it here at 3:00. I don't want to make it next week. It's too soon for him.

MS. InNAMORATO: Monday the lith is my soonest day.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay. Let's give him Monday, March lith.

MS. HALLAM: I can't ever do Mondays.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Why not?

MS. HALLAM: Because $I$ have early class on Mondays.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: I don't care. How about March 12th? I'm just going to throw dates.

MS. HALLAM: I would -- I could do March 12th at 3:00. But Sara's schedule is maybe who we should start with.

JUDGE BIGLEY: That's my son's birthday. Sorry.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: We'll
start with Sara. You give us a day.
MS. INNAMORATO: I can be here at

4:00 on the 13th.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
March 13.
MS. HALLAM: I can do 4:00 on the 13th. I just have class at 6:00, so if it's going to be two hours, $I$ can do that.

MS. GRIFFIN: I'm not available on the 13th.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: You're not?

MS. GRIFFIN: No. Sorry, I'm traveling that day and also the 14 th. But the following week, the week of March 18th, I'm pretty much wide open.

MS. HALLAM: The 15 th ?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: No, we're not coming on Friday at 4:00. I lay down the law on that.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Bethany, when you're old, Friday at 4:00, you're getting ready for bed.

MS. HALLAM: Oh, I wish I had that luxury, Judge Bigley.

JUDGE BIGLEY: Isn't that true?
Let's look the week of the 18 th.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I'm usually falling asleep.

MS. HALLAM: We're sometimes falling asleep there, too.

JUDGE BIGLEY: We're so pathetic.
MS. HALLAM: It's not pathetic.
JUDGE BIGLEY: I used to go out like on Friday nights, Bethany.

MS. HALLAM: Yeah.

JUDGE BIGLEY: When $I$ was young.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay,
March 20 -- okay. We're not going to be able to get everybody --

MS. HALLAM: March 20th - -

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: March 20th at 3:30 will be one date. Just give me one more and I'll tell him to pick it.

JUDGE BIGLEY: I'll make it work.
MS. HALLAM: What is this again, John Wetzel?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Yes, but I'm going to give him a second date. He wanted three. I've already narrowed it down to two.

MS. HALLAM: Wait, Judge Bigley
left. Can we get her back?
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: She'll be here.

MS. HALLAM: John Wetzel, 3:30.
MS. INNAMORATO: And then the next one available is the 28 th.

MS. HALLAM: I have no school, so I can do --

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Can you do 3:00 on 3/28?

MS. INNAMORATO: As of now, yeah.
MS. HALLAM: Okay, Thursday the 28th.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay, you guys.

MS. HALLAM: At 3:30.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Okay.
I'm going to give John Wetzel a choice, March 20th at 3:30 or March 28th at 3:00. Okay
everybody? So block it out, and I'll get back to you as soon as $I$ can.

MS. HALLAM: Got it. Thank you.
JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Is that it?

MS. HALLAM: Are we going to schedule another one of these meetings?

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh, yeah. I think we need to have regular work sessions. I'm sorry, but like look how we got things accomplished.

MS. HALLAM: I agree. I just think that if those are the dates that we're looking at, that is way too far away to wait for another work session.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: These are John Wetzel dates.

MS. HALLAM: I know, but those were also just our next available dates as a full Board.

JUDGE EVASHAVIK DILUCENTE: Oh.
MS. HALLAM: So my concern is, you know, do we take the one that we don't use and make it our working session? You know, if one is

John Wetzel, is the other one our working session? Can we do that?
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| 142:17, 142:21, | key [1] - 83:18 | 14:9, 15:21, 17:18, | Library [1] - 65:24 | love [4]-84:5, 86:1, |
| 142:25, 143:6, 143:7, 143:9, 143:19, | kidding [1] - 4:2 <br> kids [13] - 106:3, | $23: 4,24: 10,24: 13,$ | license [2] - 92:12, | 115:9, 153:13 |
| 143:23, 144:2, | 106:9, 106:24, | $130$ | lies [3] | loved [1] - 150: |
| 144:10, 144:21, | 108:13, 109:3, | 85:25, 100:3, 136:21, | 138:25, 139:2 | luck [1] - 88:2 |
| 144:24, 145:8, | 111:21, 111:23, | 137:24, 156:18 | lieu [1] - 11:21 | lump [1] - 79:16 |
| 145:12, 145:18, | 112:12, 112:15, | Law [1] - 101:14 | life [1] - 117:2 | lunch [2]-154:14, |
| 146:5, 146:14, $146: 23,146: 24$ | 112:17, 112:20, $114: 21$ | laws [6]-7:8, 11:3, | light [1] - 114:6 | 154:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:23, 146:24, } \\ & \text { 147:1, 147:3, 147:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:21 } \\ & \text { kind }[28]-15: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 3,13: 9,14: 22, \\ & 87: 9 \end{aligned}$ | limit [7] - 26:6, 26:9, | luxury [1] - 156:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:19, 148:3, 148:6, } \\ & \text { 148:13, 148:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:18, 22:12, 41:13, } \\ & 60: 3,65: 9,66: 5 \end{aligned}$ | lawsuit [3] - 9:18, $10: 3,26: 10$ | $38: 22,39: 2$ <br> limitation [2] - | M |
| 149:7. 149:12 | 78:20. 92:6. 96:13. | lawyer [1] - 13:21 | 139:16 |  |
| 149:13, 150:5, | 103:11, 103:14 | lawyers [1]-13:23 | limited [3] - 37:3, | machinery [7] - 92:7, $92: 8,92: 25,94: 2,$ |
| 150:14, 150:19, | 104:14, 108:18, | leadership | limiting [1] - 46:5 | $96: 13,96: 18,97: 8$ |
| 151:2, 151:8, 151:10, | 109:10, 109:21, | 48:17 | limits [1] - 89:15 | mail [27]-7:10, 8:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:22, 152:3, 152:9, } \\ & \text { 152:15, 152:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:23, 116:15, } \\ & 117: 21.129: 21 \end{aligned}$ | least [9] - 34:25, | line [14]-9:21, | $73: 9,74: 24,75: 5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 152: 15,152: 17 \\ & 152: 20,152: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 117:21, 129:21, 136:25, 140:24, | 36:7, 39:15, 42:22, | $60: 15,68: 11,68: 13$ | $79: 18,84: 17,103: 7$ |
| $153: 1,153: 8,153: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 25,140: 24, \\ & 146: 18,147: 6,152: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 63:4, 68:22, 85:16, $109: 4,138 \cdot 7$ | 74:1, 88:20, 101:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:20, 120:10, } \\ & 120: 11.141: 8.141:! \end{aligned}$ |
| 153:18, 153:20, | kitchen [2] - 77:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:4, 138:7 } \\ & \text { leave [8] - 15:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:17, 127:24, } \\ & \text { 129:1, 129:15, 131:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 141:12, 141:24, |
| 154:1, 154:4, 154:10, | 103:25 | $15: 22,24: 9,58: 21$ | $134: 25,135: 2$ | $142: 15,142: 19$ |
| 154:16, 154:20, <br> 154:22, 155:1, 155:7 | Klein [1] - 70:9 | $60: 16,84: 4,86: 19$ | list [3] - 111:4, | 145:5, 145:6, 147:23, |
| 155:11, 155:15, | knowing [1] - 58:25 | 100:6 | 119:17, 148:17 | 148:4, 148:5, 148:11, 148:14, 148:15, |
| 155:23, 156:2, 156:9, | 22:22, 25:21, 140:9 | left [4]-36:17, <br> $38 \cdot 23,70 \cdot 6,158 \cdot 6$ | listen [2]-62:3, | $148: 25,150: 7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 156: 16,156: 19 \\ & 156: 24,157: 6 \end{aligned}$ | knowledgeable [2] - | $\begin{array}{\|} \text { 38:23, 70:6, 158:6 } \\ \text { legal [4] - 86:5, 87:7, } \end{array}$ | listening [1] - 148:1 | mailed [1] - 66:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 156: 24,157: 6 \\ & \text { 157:10, 157:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $17: 8,25: 8$ | $87: 23,136: 5$ | literal [1] - 93:15 | mails [2] - 16:12, |
| 157:15, 157:16, | knows [3] - 10:7, $41: 25,88: 15$ | legally [2] - 78:23, | literally [6] - 31:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:24 } \\ & \text { main }[3]-65: 15 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 157:20, 157:23, | 41.25, 88.15 | 99:3 | 74:1, 78:3, 81:23, | $71: 9,104: 7$ |
| 158:1, 158:7, 158:14, 158:19, 158:22 | L | legible [1] - 7:20 | 113:9, 139:23 | maintain [2] - 29:13, |
| 159:3, 159:7, 159:15, |  | legislation [1] - | litigation [5] - 31:19, | 99:16 |
| 159:20, 160:1, 160:7, | labor [12] - 76:17, | 101:1 | 31:20, 31:21, 31:23, | maintained [1] - 100:9 |
| 160:12 | 78:18, 79:24, 79:25, | legislative [5] - | $32: 5$ | maintenance [7] - |
| Judge's [1] - 55:2 | 80:3, 80:8, 82:22, | 89:20, 95:17, 97:12, $97: 19,98: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { live }[4]-41: 23, \\ & \text { 117:10, 122:10, 160:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $77: 9,80: 6,82: 10$ |
| judges [2]-20:11, | 84:3, 87:5, 93:2, 96:7, $96: 9$ | Legislative [3] - | lived [1] - 42:17 | 82:18, 95:7, 99:10, |
| 21:22 | Labor [6]-75:1, | $98: 23,99: 13,100: 12$ | lives [1] - 137:6 | 102:17 |
| judicial [1] - 89:10 <br> Judiciary's [1] - 99:1 | 79:21, 80:11, 84:17, | legislator [1] - 76:1 | local [3] - 80:20, | majority [7] - 36:13, |







| ```136:3 Section [2] - 89:13, 99:7 sections [3] - 8:8, 10:9, 10:12 see [23]-9:8, 17:2, 48:5, 50:1, 54:24, 55:8, 58:4, 73:12, 73:25, 75:5, 92:12, 108:3, 129:4, 129:14, 143:21, 143:24, 143:25, 149:19, 149:24, 150:2, 150:5, 150:24 seeing[2] - 68:20, 128:5 segregation [1] - 103:22 select [1] - 64:4 selection [2]-147:4, 147:5 self [1] - 63:21 self-explanatory [1] -63:21 semiannual [1] - 63:2 send [15]-9:23, 10:1, 12:17, 18:10, 18:11, 18:20, 21:4, 22:16, 52:13, 141:8, 141:11, 142:10, 142:12, 148:25 sending [3] - 10:19, 18:14, 25:20 sense [9]-24:11, 33:16, 41:15, 54:6, 55:22, 58:1, 64:13, 87:13, 140:14 sent [15] - 7:20, 10:2, 66:21, 67:9, 67:23, 73:9, 74:24, 79:19, 79:20, 84:12, 119:24, 138:10, 143:4, 147:23 sentence [1]-60:20 separate [4] - 93:10, 143:10, 148:7, 150:10 separately [1] - 135:9 serious [1] - 57:20 serve [2]-29:24, 52:9 services [4] - 92:18, 92:24, 93:3, 94:3 serving[1] - 77:8 SESSION [1] - 1:8 session [8] - 4:22, 146:20, 152:1, 159:14, 159:23, 159:25, 160:9, 160:16 sessions [3] - 9:6,``` | ```56:24, 159:9 set[11]-9:12, 35:24, 40:10, 72:4, 81:21, 82:2, 84:3, 95:6, 104:2, 106:8, 133:11 sets [1] - 8:14 setting[3]-57:7, 83:23,89:9 several[2]-4:17, 4:24 shade [1] - 24:21 shades [1] - 113:13 shady [1] - 24:19 shall [23] - 37:3, 37:23, 40:9, 40:21, 40:23, 52:9, 52:10, 58:4, 60:24, 63:1, 63:13, 80:13, 82:17, 85:6, 85:9, 85:19, 85:20, 91:16, 91:20, 92:4, 94:22, 95:3, 137:8 share [3]-8:5, 77:1, 111:4 shared [1] - 103:7 shares [1] - 122:25 sheet [1] - 73:20 Sheriff [18] - 9:25, 10:8, 10:11, 10:13, 11:12, 43:24, 69:18, 127:25, 128:12, 128:20, 128:21, 128:24, 128:25, 129:7, 129:14, 130:14, 131:16, 134:19 sheriff [1] - 20:11 Sheriff's [4] - 129:1, 129:16, 133:4, 133:24 Sheriffs [1] - 131:12 shift [1] - 103:13 shirt [1] - 113:19 show [1] - 129:12 showing [1] - 73:14 shown [1] - 108:22 shows [1] - 76:11 side [3] - 8:10, 102:9 side-by-side [1] - 8:10 sidebar [1] - 69:23 silly [1] - 61:8 similar [1] - 76:15 similarly [2] - 99:23 simple [2] - 102:19, 103:17 simply [2] - 33:6, 103:4 single [1] - 21:21 sit [2] - 26:11, 97:20 sitting [3] - 26:15,``` | ```55:6, 88:9 situation [1] - 55:25 six [1] - 85:22 skipped [1] - 82:15 slate [2]-61:12, 61:17 sleep [1] - 101:6 small [1] - 146:10 smarter [1] - 108:25 smooth [2] - 122:24, 152:13 so.. [1] - 52:19 soft [3]-112:23, 113:21, 114:9 soften [1] - 108:19 softer [2] - 109:8 solely [2] - 102:25, 111:6 Solicitor [5] - 88:4, 98:18, 99:6, 100:14, 130:25 solicitor [2] - 132:16, 135:14 solicitors [1] - 100:18 solution [4] - 130:3, 132:6, 132:13, 132:15 someone [16] - 18:11, 18:21, 20:15, 22:17, 22:20, 42:16, 56:1, 58:16, 62:12, 78:15, 79:3, 79:8, 117:25, 118:5, 141:8 sometime [1] - 45:12 sometimes [4] - 28:12, 28:13, 28:14, 157:8 somewhere [9] - 109:16, 118:5, 130:3, 130:5, 130:9, 131:18, 131:23, 131:25, 132:25 son's [1] - 155:21 Soon [1] - 14:3 soon [2] - 155:4, 159:1 soonest [1] - 155:6 sorry [21] - 35:21, 40:2, 40:5, 49:3, 52:12, 60:23, 68:5, 87:2, 89:10, 91:1, 94:17, 99:7, 101:2, 102:1, 125:5, 147:25, 152:4, 155:22, 156:11, 159:9 sort [3]-39:14, 133:2, 133:3 sounds [4]-61:7, 72:15, 110:13, 137:4 speaking [2] - 4:9,``` |  | ```21:14, 25:9, 30:25, 43:16, 45:9, 50:16, 58:24, 63:3, 63:17, 64:8, 72:5, 72:20, 79:20, 81:21, 82:6, 90:13, 95:14, 95:19, 96:22 statutes [1] - 90:9 Statutory [1] - 11:6 stay[2] - 4:21, 53:19 steeler [2]-113:3, 113:4 stepping [1] - 71:25 stick [2]-11:25, 146:25 still [13]-30:13, 33:21, 35:14, 42:9, 43:12, 47:4, 47:6, 47:19, 47:23, 67:23, 120:2, 120:6, 137:5 stone [1] - 133:12 story [1] - 117:1 straw [2]-26:20, 31:20 streamline [1] - 117:20 Street [1] - 1:21 stress [1] - 50:20 strict [1] - 75:9 strike [2]-5:21, 6:20 stripes [8] - 104:6, 106:16, 106:17, 106:19, 106:20, 106:22, 108:1, 108:4 striving [1] - 98:21 strong [1] - 112:5 strongly [1] - 109:7 struck [1] - 68:13 structure [3]-60:8, 131:24, 135:11 structured [1] - 71:10 student [1] - 24:12 studies [1] - 108:24 study [3] - 103:10, 107:16, 109:16 stuff [9]-67:1, 88:11, 92:12, 92:13, 93:1, 136:13, 138:1, 150:2, 152:13 sub [1] - 19:14 sub-designee [1] - 19:14 Subchapter [1] - 79:22 subcommittee [27] - 7:13, 15:14, 16:6, 17:16, 17:24, 18:1, 22:21, 23:13, 28:4, 29:9, 29:12, 29:14,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unless }[8]-7: 12, \\ & 9: 14,12: 10,12: 14, \\ & 14: 17,27: 15,39: 13, \\ & \text { 154:11 } \\ & \text { unlimited }[3]-90: 6, \end{aligned}$ | violence [1] - 108:23 | 103:24, 108:6 |  | Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | visitor [1] - 142:24 | wearing [4] - 104:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:21 } \\ & \text { worn [2] - 103:3, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | visits [1] - 81:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:6, 109:13, 109:15 } \\ & \text { web [2]-140:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { worn [2]-103:3, } \\ & \text { 103:20 } \end{aligned}$ | zero [2] - 74:10, |
|  | voices [1] - 61:15 | 140:7 | worry [1] - 128:9 | $144: 16$ |
| 98:22, 99:8 | void [1] - 5:5 | web-based [1] - | wrench [1] - 80:16 |  |
| unnecessary [1] - | volunteer [1] - 65:6 | 140:1 | write [6]-11:20, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:9 } \\ & \text { unpaid }[1]-82: 21 \\ & \text { unquestionable }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | volunteered [2] - | website [2]-4:14, | 14:8, 23:4, 23:7, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 10,128: 1 \\ & \text { vote }[36]-15: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:15 } \\ & \text { weeds [1] - } 75: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 52:12 } \\ & \text { writes [2] - 144:1, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:19 } \\ & \text { unsure [2] - 54:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 15:23, 16:2, 16:5, | week [9]-27:2, | 144:6 |  |
|  | 21:2, 21:19, 25:25, | 31:22, 34:2, 153:22, | writing [11] - 17:13, |  |
| 54:20 | 26:20, 26:22, 31:7, | 153:24, 155:4, | 23:2, 83:19, 83:22, |  |
|  | 31:15, 31:17, 31:21, | 156:13, 156:25 | 114:2, 145:19, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 7,8: 8,18: 13,36: 10, \\ & 38: 24,45: 19,52: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 36:13, 36:19, 36:21, | weight [1]-21:19 | 147:12, 147:21, |  |
|  | 37:12, 37:23, 38:7, | Welfare [2]-65:9, | 147:23, 149:9, 151:4 |  |
| 52:13, 57:7, 57:11, | 38:11, 41:24, 42:24, | 95:25 | written [6]-9:2, |  |
| $57: 24,59: 13,64: 18$, $67: 3,72: 15,75: 10$ | 45:15, 45:24, 49:1, | Wetzell [9]-152:5, | 32:8, 49:2, 54:21, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 67: 3,72: 15,75: 10 \\ & 75: 19,84: 3,85: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 14,58: 22,59: 16, \\ & 78: 1,98: 7,108: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:6, 152:11, } \\ & \text { 157:25, 158:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:20, 148:11 } \\ & \text { wrote [1] - 81:19 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 86:9, 88:9, 88:18, | 109:4, 116:15, 125:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 157: 25,158: 9 \\ & \text { 158:23, 159:16, } \end{aligned}$ | Wrote [1]-81:19 |  |
| 92:13, 96:10, 96:16, | 125:13 | 159:24, 160:9 | Y |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:19, 98:15, 108:7, } \\ & \text { 108:12, 111:6, 117:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 48:16, 48:17, 99:20 | 60:8 | year [13] - 40:5, 42:3, |  |
| 121:6, 132:20, 133:8, | votes [3]-28:17, $53: 10,53: 11$ | wheel [1] - 78:3 | 42:4, 48:7, 49:24, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 139: 18,140: 25 \\ & 141: 22,144: 16 \end{aligned}$ | voting [12]-5:6, | 75:7, 105:15, 108:18, | 55:21, 55:23, 56:2, |  |
| upending [1] - 44:15 urgent [1]-37:17 | 21:7, 21:17, 26:7, | $115: 25,125: 16$ | $63: 5,69: 15,74: 11$ |  |
|  | 26:10, 26:22, 27:1, | 130:17, 135:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 22,147: 1 \\ & \text { years [12] - 4:17, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| useful [1] - 23:20 | 109:17, 109:18 | $156: 14$ | 4:24, 42:23, 45:6, |  |
| V |  | william [1] - 2:15 | 51:14, 52:5, 58:17, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { vacancy [5] - 40:8, } \\ & 40: 15,40: 22,40: 24 \\ & 46: 20 \end{aligned}$ | W | willing [4] - 118:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 18,65: 19,76: 23 \\ & 99: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | W-2'd [1]-79:13 | wish [2] - 75:25, | yellow [42] - 104:13, 106.2, 106:9, 107:5, |  |
|  | W-2s [2] - 79:6, | 156:22 | 107:6, 107:11, 108:9, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:20 } \\ & \text { vacant }[1]-49: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 86:20 | wondered [2] - | 108:14, 108:17, |  |
| valid [1]-56:22 | wage [2]-78:17, | 50:13, 62:11 <br> wonderful [1] - | 109:3, 109:8, 109:9, |  |
| value [2]-24:5, 72:9 | 95:3 | $151: 13$ | 109:10, 110:10, |  |
| valued [1] - 84:2 | wages [6]-75:12, | word [2] - 82:16, | 110:18, 110:19, |  |
| various [1] - 10:12 | 75:20, 77:15, 80:13, | 83:18 | 111:20, 111:22, |  |
|  | 85:19, 97:9 | words [9] - 22:17, | 112:12, 112:14, |  |
| versa [1] - 111:21 | wait [4]-17:20, | 22:20, 23:4, 43:20, | 112:17, 112:19, |  |
| version [4] - 7:25, | 136:12, 158:5, 159:13 | 44:22, 94:20, 138:16 | 112:21, 112:23, |  |
| 8:7, 8:8, 67:7 |  | 138:20, 143:4 | 112:25, 113:1, 113:2, |  |
| vested [2] - 38:19, | walking [1] - 136:14 | worker [8]-73:17, | 113:3, 113:4, 113:10, |  |
| 41:7 | walls [1] - 103:16 | 74:21, 99:18, 103:25, | 113:13, 113:16, |  |
| via [4]-140:20, | wants [9]-12:21, | 104:1, 133:7 | 113:18, 114:1, 114:3, |  |
| 142:10, 142:11, 161:7 Vice [5] - $40 \cdot 3,40: 6$ | 53:5, 60:4, 60:7, | Worker [1] - 74:8 | 114:5, 114:9, 114:10 |  |
| Vice [5] - 40:3, 40:6, $48: 18,51 \cdot 23,63: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 14,101: 13 \\ & 119: 15,145: 1,145: 19 \end{aligned}$ | worker's [1] - 87:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:20 } \\ & \text { yesterday [1] - 38:23 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $48: 18,51: 23,63: 14$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 119:15, 145:1, 145:19 } \\ \text { Warden [2]-8:22, } \end{gathered}$ | workers [9]-75:2, 75:8, 75:16, 76:12 | $\operatorname{yinz}_{[1]}-13: 23$ |  |
| 111:21 | 149:22 | $75: 8,75: 16,76: 12$, $80: 7,80 \cdot 8,99.21$, | young [2] - 109:12, |  |
| vice-versa [1] - | warden [1] - 95:23 | 80:7, 80:8, 99:21, $100: 4,107: 25$ | 157:15 |  |
| 111:21 | waste [2]-39:18, | WORKING [1] - 1:8 | yourself [1] - 90:16 |  |
|  | 153:7 | works [7] - 46:22, | youth [1] - 107:17 |  |
| view [1] - 32:20 | ways [3]-22:10, | 130:21, 130:23, |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { violation }[3]-5: 4, \\ & 87: 8,150: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $95: 25,149: 14$ | 134:11, 137:10, |  |  |
|  | wear [3]-103:22, | $143: 14,144: 17$ |  |  |

County of Allegheny Office of the Controller
Allegheny County Courthouse 436 Grant Street | Suite 104 Pittsburgh, PA 15219-2498
Phone (412) 350-4660 | Fax (412) 350-3006

The minutes of Tuesday, February 27, 2024's Jail Oversight Board meeting are provided by the County of Allegheny Office of the Controller Corey O'Connor.

Sincerely,


Corey O'Connor
Allegheny County Controller

