

School Ethics Commission Meeting Public Session Minutes

November 24, 2020

Chairperson Robert Bender called the meeting of the School Ethics Commission (Commission) to order at 9:34 a.m.

Notice of the meeting was provided to the State House Press Corps and the Secretary of State and filed as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

I. Roll Call

Roll Call	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Present	X			X	X	X		4
Absent		X	X				X	3

Also in attendance were Kathryn Whalen, Director, Offices of School Ethics and Compliance, staff member Jeannine Pizzigoni, and Deputy Attorneys General (DAsG) David Kalisky and Jaclyn Frey. Everyone in attendance at the meeting participated via telephone due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

II. First Public Comment

At the start of the meeting, Director Whalen explained to the public (who also accessed the meeting by telephone due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic) how the meeting would be conducted. More specifically, it was explained that the public would be afforded the opportunity to provide public comment regarding his/her case; the Commission would then adjourn to executive session (on a different conference line); the Commission would return to public at approximately 12:00 p.m.; at that time, members of the public would be afforded another opportunity to provide public comment in connection with his/her case; and then the Commission would vote on matters pertinent to its business.

9:36 a.m. Christopher Pringle, noted his attendance, but did not offer any public statement/comment.

9:37 a.m. Laura Siclari, counsel for Complainant in the matter docketed as C41-20, noted her attendance, but did not offer any public statement/comment.

9:38 a.m. Robin Grodner, friend of Complainant in the matter docketed as C41-20, noted her attendance, but did not offer any public statement/comment.

9:39 a.m. Julio “Angel” Quiles, the named Complainant in the matter docketed as C26-20, noted his attendance and then read the following statement:

Good morning, I am the complainant of the docket C26-20 that is on your agenda. Before I make my public comment, I would ask to please provide copies to all the commissioners residing over this matter, I also wanted to point out that I have not received a copy of the second response from Respondents Mr. Barckett and Mr. Garnto on counts 1 & 3 of the complaint on the Ethics' Commissions letter dated September 29th, 2020.

With that said, I've noticed on the agenda that you will make a motion to review the docket in Executive Session. I would like to thank the Board of Ethics commission for not dismissing this case and for moving forward. I understand why the commission has decided to move forward with the complaint as it pertains to respondents Everett Garnto and Anthony Barckett for counts 1 & 3. The evidence is overwhelming, as it includes two video endorsements of my opponents during the 2020 Garfield School Board Race (without disclaimers) and one School Board Meeting revealing that Mr. Garnto was the campaign manager for my opponents. They purposely showed favoritism of their candidates, providing an unwarranted privilege or advantage towards my opponents during the Garfield 2020 School Board Election Race. With that consideration, I thank and appreciate the Board of Ethics Commission for moving forward.

However, due of the gravity of this complaint I am also asking the Ethics Commission to reconsider count two of the complaint that accuses all respondents of the School Board Code of Ethics violation. I would like to emphasize there is enough evidence that Mr. Nucifora, Mr. Mazzola and Mr. Focarino knowingly committed the violation. The evidence is the omission of the sixth Board Member (Richard Derrig) in the mailed propaganda that included the five respondents and their titles endorsing "New Beginning Brighter Future" without a disclaimer. Additionally, there is the video where Mr. Garnto endorsed the three candidates as BOE president and endorsed on behalf of the other four respondents. In that video, Mr. Garnto admitted to a meeting with Vice President Charles Nucifora, Board Member Jack Mazzola, Board Member Anthony Barckett, Board Member Allan Focarino to evaluate my opponents' candidacy for the Board of Education. That meeting resulted in their endorsements for my three opponents, which is depicted by the mailed propaganda from "New Beginning Brighter Future" as well as Mr. Garnto endorsing them on behalf of the members of the School Board that participated in that meeting. So not only does that prove that they were knowingly aware of the endorsement, that meeting was also a violation of the New Jersey Sunshine Law, as it included six out of the nine board members in a private meeting that was not made public. In that video Mr. Derrig was not named as a participant of that meeting nor was he named as an endorser in the mailed propaganda. This would imply Mr. Derrig was not aware of the propaganda at all or he may have refused to endorse them. Conversely, that would mean that Mr. Nucifora, Mr. Mazzola and Mr. Focarino had to have been made aware or else they would have been absent just as Mr. Derrig was. Therefore there is enough evidence to escalate the complaint in its entirety, regardless of what their attorney has claimed.

With that, I again thank the commission for considering my complaint, but I ask the commission to please consider escalating the entire complaint. The respondents cannot state that their endorsements were made as private citizens, as they clearly admitted their endorsements on video in their official capacity. As I stated, one of the videos even has the former Garfield BOE President admitting to meeting with the other board members in

their official capacity in order to endorse “New Beginning Brighter Future”. I believe if any portion of the case is dismissed, this then creates a precedent for all New Jersey municipalities on what is allowed ethically in School Board Elections or in any matter that may involve mailed or video propaganda. The precedent would contradict the spirit of the Advisory Opinion that I presented at the start of my complaint. More importantly, the precedent would contradict the spirit of the School Board Code of Ethics and will allow an environment in where Board Members will be shrewder in using their official capacity to influence matters outside of providing the students with a thorough and efficient education.

Thank you for allowing me to comment and thank you for considering my complaint. Mr. Quiles also provide the following links related to his Complaint:

Board Meeting from May 21st with Everett Garnto revealing that he was my opponents’ campaign manager (scroll to 19:20):

https://gboeorg.sharepoint.com/:v/s/GBOEBOARDMEETING/ERqP8u9LGP1LltQc0d_pwjwBWvqs16J_7qSiAVPDAsW-qA?e=b4zkEU.

New Beginning Brighter Future campaign video featuring Mr. Everett Garnto endorsing the three candidates without a disclaimer on behalf of himself and the four other respondents, and mentions of a meeting he had with candidates and board members (scroll to 2:20):

<https://www.facebook.com/887347591349917/videos/532989414018299/>.

New Beginning Brighter Future campaign video featuring Mr. Anthony Barckett endorsing the three candidates as a Board Member without a disclaimer (scroll to 12:25, and then 19:52):

<https://www.facebook.com/887347591349917/videos/3016404221743531/>.

9:45 a.m. Regina Giacomini, the named Complainant in the matter docketed as C44-40, noted her attendance and then stated, she would like to reiterate the point that this is not a frivolous complaint, and as a mother of a special needs child (Ms. Giacomini gets emotional and apologizes) and as an aunt of a child who has a chromosome disorder, who was not expected to live to 20, the fact that a Board member, a sitting Board member could be so callous is absolutely horrifying to me. And the response that he sent you in which he tore apart my character with absolutely no proof of anything that he wrote, makes me realize that no matter what happens with this Complaint, as soon as he’s finished, this Board member is going to rip me apart on Facebook, because that’s his M.O. And it’s not right that he’s allowed to write things like that about a member of the public when everything that I write has to come with proof within the last six months. And that’s it. That’s just my opinion on what’s happened. I am sorry for getting upset. I just want you to understand that it wasn’t frivolous. I have no ill intent toward this man. I’ve had children in the district for many years. I have five children in district and one in college and I’m terrified of what he’ll do to them. And I thought it was the appropriate thing to comment to this ethics violation and that’s it and I’m sorry if I got too emotional. Thank you.

9:48 a.m. Sonya Still, the named Complainant in the matter docketed as C49-20, and former Board Chair for the Ethical Community Charter School, noted her attendance, and made

the following statement: I too submitted a Complaint against a Board member. I too want to argue that this Complaint is not frivolous and does need to be reviewed on its merits. My Complaint also goes to the ethical operation of the school board, protecting the confidentiality of students, faculty, family members, as well as Board members who permit the school board to operate. As does this body as a body in confidence in its deliberative action and process, to make the best decisions in providing and taking care of the best interest of the students without fear of the deliberative process being exposed and disclosed in a prejudicial manner to one or another Board members. In order for the Board to reach the best conclusions that it can it needs to be able to have a deliberative process that is confidential, and reach a conclusion and move forward as an individual body. To me that would be like the arm trying to argue against the leg. If it cannot make a decision and move forward. With one Board member who doesn't win a particular argument being able to go to the public and attack itself, is basically what it is doing. So, I would ask you to seriously consider the gravity of the Complaint. I did not make it frivolously and it's important. It's nine years of work on my part that I took very seriously. That the Board needs to be able to function as a Board and I think this particular member has difficulty not winning and I think there may be others on this line who would like to comment as well. Thank you very much for considering this matter and reviewing this matter.

9:54 a.m. Peter Went, a supporter of Complainant in the matter docketed as C49-20, noted his attendance, and read a letter that he submitted as the former vice chairperson of The Ethical Community Charter School (TECCS), and along with three former TECCS trustees Gordon N. Gemma, Esquire, Robin Grodner and Veronica Park. The letter reads:

Dear New Jersey School Ethics Commission Members:

Kindly accept this submission in support of Ms. Sonya "Terry" Still's complaint filed on August 20, 2020 ("Complainant") against Mr. Dan Ackman ("Respondent"), C49-20 ("Complaint"). As more thoroughly set forth below, we suggest to you that there is substantial evidence to support the Complaint. Thus, we respectfully request that you reject the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss and that you sustain the ethics charges set forth in the Complaint.

At the time of filing, Ms. Still was the chair of the board of trustees of The Ethical Community Charter School in Jersey City ("TECCS") where the Respondent is one of the trustees. We, all former trustees of TECCS, strongly support Ms. Still's decision to file the Complaint because at the core of this matter are not only ethical standards, but also the delicate mechanics of governance that builds on a commitment to honor the school's bylaws, deliberate fairly, honestly, and respectfully with fellow trustees, and to uphold the laws, regulations, and policies governing the operation of a Charter School. A well-functioning board builds on the recognition that ethics and ethical standards enshrined in the New Jersey School Ethics Act, N.J.S.A. 18A:12-21, et seq are pivotal standards that all elected board members individually have sworn to uphold and have to collectively adhere to ensuring that the responsibility entrusted to them is carried out with the greatest levels of integrity. Effectively, board members rely on the expectation that sensitive and confidential discussions remain confidential and are not being disseminated or shared with members of the press, public or the school community.

Ms. Still's filing identifies several situations where the Respondent not only violated the TECCS's bylaws regarding confidentiality, but also failed to uphold and enforce the laws, state rules and regulations on ethical conduct. He did not confine his actions to policymaking. Rather,

he chose to ignore the deliberative process and undermine the delicate governance mechanism of the board by making public comments to the press and school community that were divisive and disparaging to Ms. Still and other members of the board. The Respondent's behavior stooped to ridicule, disrespect, lack of courtesy and decorum, and embraced an unprofessional and unethical approach as series of emails exchanged clearly demonstrate. Respondent ignored and publicly rejected the advice of the board's attorney and he recklessly and publicly accused the board of illegal conduct, which undermined the board's integrity with the staff and the local school community.

The Respondent knowingly chose to disregard the board's bylaws, which clearly provide that only the Chair is authorized to speak on behalf of the board. Although he lacked authority to speak publicly for the board, he nonetheless made very damaging, misleading, and disparaging remarks to the public and to the press without the consent of the board. His public statements to the press violated the confidentiality attributed to personnel matters as required by the school's bylaws and by the laws of this state. The school's bylaws require each individual trustee to "maintain full confidentiality regarding matters discussed in closed session or in private conversations with the Principal or other trustees". The Respondent "thumbed his nose" at the bylaws and his fellow board members, and he purposely and knowingly violated the confidentiality and trust because he did not agree with the board's decisions. Rather than accepting and respecting the board's decisions, he chose to publicly declare those decisions as illegal and disparage the board members and the board attorney.

Ms. Still's Complaint was precipitated by series of actions that the Respondent undertook starting June 30, 2020. On that day the employment contract of TECCS's founding principal, Ms. Marta Bergamini, expired and was not renewed. Her contract then was terminated to automatically trigger a 60-day severance period. The decision not to renew the principal's contract was vetted with the board attorney.

As the decision of not renewing the contract was discussed among board members, the Respondent became increasingly agitated accusing certain board members, including Ms. Still, with nefarious intent, conspiracy to disenfranchise employees, actions against the interest of the students and parents, and acting illegally, criminally, negligently, unlawfully, and unethically. Notwithstanding Ms. Still's, other board members and the board attorney's best efforts to explain to the Respondent the considerations behind the non-renewal, the Respondent refused to hear the facts and circumstances and failed to accept the veracity of the information provided to him. He started to exhibit an increasingly virulent pattern of disruptive and disorderly conduct in discussions and interactions with fellow board members in meetings, on the phone, in emails and in the board's public meetings.

Starting July 2, 2020, the Respondent actively engaged in a public disclosure of confidential board matters, including personnel information, issued statements publicly that were unauthorized and defamatory public statements, contrary to his ethical and fiduciary obligations as a trustee. In doing so, he violated the School Ethics Act as well as TECCS policies and bylaws. He chose to couch his activities under the protective umbrella of First Amendment Rights, attributing an almost mythical power of free speech to his statements, failing to recognize that confidentiality standards of a board member eclipse First Amendment Rights.

But the Respondent not only violated repeatedly confidentiality standards: he belittled trustees who he disagreed with, he questioned the professional competency of consultants, and

questioned the legal advice produced by counsel, both the school's own and other counsel involved in the post-termination negotiation process with Ms. Bergamini's counsel. Moreover, the Respondent chose to fuel racial and gender-based animus not only during exchanges and conversations among board members, but also during public meetings.

There are several reasons why the Complaint should be upheld. At the core of the Complaint are the mechanics for effective board governance and the smooth functioning of a board that is entrusted with the management of public funds, carries the burden of fiduciary responsibility, acts as an employer and makes policy supporting the educational process. All such mechanics build on the expectations of confidentiality and School Ethics standards enshrined in New Jersey School Ethics Act, N.J.S.A. 18A:12-21, et seq.

These standards set high levels of ethical behavior, fiduciary responsibilities, and confidentiality from a school board member. The Respondent has intentionally and deliberately chosen not to obey to these standards, followed his own unfair, biased, and objectively erroneous and inaccurate understanding of the bylaws, the law and the standards and policies governing the operation of Charter School. In fact, the Respondent admits that he has knowingly broken policy and ethics standards. Specifically, his view that the First Amendment takes away the privilege of confidentiality is obviously inaccurate. In fact, it is a legally false and misleading statement.

The Respondent failed to refrain from making public statements and he disparaged his fellow board members. He knowingly and deliberately chose not to hold confidential matters confidential, and he was well aware that publicly disclosing such matters would needlessly cause division between the board and the school community, disparage Ms. Still and other board members, damage the reputation of TECCS, and interfere with the board's ability to serve its students. Remarkably, the Respondent did all of this after he made the decision to disenroll all his own children from TECCS and enroll them in another school due to a personal conflict.

The Respondent has consistently proven himself to be unable or incapable of conducting himself as a productive member of the board as required by the board's bylaws and the New Jersey School Ethics Act.

Based upon the foregoing, we respectfully request that the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss be denied, and that Ms. Still's Complaint be sustained. The Respondent placed his own personal interests and above those of the board, the school and the students, and he must be removed as a trustee of TECCS.

Sincerely,

Gordon N. Gemma, Esq, former trustee of TECCS, Robyn Grodner, former trustee of TECCS, Veronica Park, former trustee of TECCS and Peter Went, Ph.D., former vice chair of TECCS

9:58 a.m. David Scott, a friend of the Complainant in the matter docketed as C26-20, noted his attendance, but did not offer any other public comments.

10:00 a.m. A motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to add the matter docketed as C32-19 to the agenda under "Other Business."

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

III. Executive Session

At **10:03 a.m.**, the following **Resolution** was read:

Whereas, the Open Public Meetings Act (*N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 et seq.*) authorizes the Commission, a public body, to meet in Executive Session under certain circumstances; and

Whereas, the Open Public Meetings Act requires that the Commission adopt a Resolution at a public meeting to go into Executive Session; and

Now therefore be it resolved that, consistent with the provisions of *N.J.A.C. 10:4-12(b)*, the Commission will adjourn to executive session to discuss matters which, by statute, are regarded as confidential and also to discuss matters possibly involving litigation, specifically: C45-18; C26-20; C28-20; C34-20; C35-20; C41-20; C44-20; C48-20; C49-20; C53-20; C59-18; C09-20; C36-20; C39-20; C40-20; C42-20; C43-20; D02-20; D03-20; C45-20; C66-20; and C32-19; and

Now therefore be it further resolved that the Commission will return to open session to conduct business at the conclusion of Executive Session.

Motion was made by Mark Finkelstein, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adjourn to Executive Session to discuss the matters set forth in the foregoing Resolution.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

IV. Return to Public/Second Public Comment

At **12:03 p.m.**, a motion was made by Jude A. Tanella, and seconded by Dennis Roberts, to return to public session for the purpose of receiving public comment/testimony.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

12:04 p.m. Jerry Tamborino, a friend/employer of the named Complainant in the matter docketed as C34-20, noted his attendance and asked whether the Commission was going to address each matter on the agenda and then the public would be able to comment or would the public be able to comment before the matters were addressed? Chairperson Bender explained the process and then Mr. Tamborino made the following statement:

I just want to point out that I'm Ms. Chermont's employer and I've been involved with this matter, as far as the problem with her ex-husband whereby she's filing a complaint against Mr. Way because he was basically being biased in a situation where there is a custodial court matter regarding the minor child. I can say that I've been involved with that matter for over a year and I was shocked to see such a letter from a principal of the high school after an email that was sent to him asking that he participate and be involved in helping the father out. He then sends an email to his secretary; I need a letter to that effect, to basically hurt one of the parents who's the mother here, Ms. Chermont for the benefit of the father in a custody matter.

To me that's a violation of the Act. Clearly, in a response to the motion to dismiss she points that out. It doesn't matter if it's a family member or not. It's for any others that might get an unwarranted privilege because of the conduct of the official, which happened here and I just want to point out and make a comment as a member of the public that I think the motion should be denied. Ms. Chermont should have her opportunity to show not only that he violated the ethics rule, twice, but she has proof that should be viewed and the motion should be denied, so she has the opportunity to show not only that he did that, he wrote the letter to the court. Basically, because he knew it was going to the court because the email from the father said to him, my attorney needs it by such and such a date. So he knew there was a deadline. He knew the court was going to be reviewing it and he knew that it was going to help the father and not just help the father, but hurt the mother. That's the first part.

The second prong is that in there he makes allegations that she was not responsive, which are completely false. So she should at least have the opportunity to present that evidence to show not only did he favor one of the parents, but it was based on false allegations as well. That's a big part of this and she has all of that proof. That she was more responsive than the father ever was through the entire life of the child. Through all the schooling he ever did. She was the primary care taker and then suddenly a letter comes out from the principal that she's not responsive and the father lost his job because of this. I mean, he just goes out on a limb here to really, to help the father and really hurt the mother. So as a member of the public I would just say that the motion be denied and she should have her opportunity to present the evidence and have a full hearing on it. Mr. Tamborino thanked the Commission for allowing him to speak.

12:07 p.m. Dan Ackman, the named Respondent in the matter docketed as C49-20, noted his attendance, and stated that he just “wanted to update the record.” On September 30, 2020, the Complainant, Sonya Still ran for re-election to the Board and she was “voted out.” She was not re-elected as was her deputy vice chair, Peter Went. Mr. Ackman thanked the Commission.

12:08 p.m. Robin Grodner, a friend of Complainant in the matter docketed as C49-20 and a trustee for the Ethical Community Charter School, again noted her attendance, and noted that she has received communication from a concerned member of the TECCS community who is actually very fearful to speak out for the fear of intimidation from Mr. Ackman. The fear is about an incident that occurred during the TECCS meeting on November 18, 2020. During the meeting, there was a discussion concerning whether to keep the schools open or to close them. According to Ms. Grodner, Mr. Ackman posted the information that was discussed in the confidential meeting on Facebook. This member is concerned because any time Mr. Ackman disagrees with the conversations that occur at the meetings, he goes on social media to state his opinion and reveals confidential information, which is a violation of school ethics law.

At this time, Mr. Ackman interjects and would like to respond to Ms. Grodner’s statement. Director Whalen then ceases the conversation to explain to the public how the public comment session of the Commission’s meeting operates. The Commission may only review matters that are on the agenda. Director Whalen explains that this is not an opportunity for the public to come on-line and levy allegations against each other. The Commission may only hear matters that are currently pending before the Commission and reviews the allegations that are on file. Director Whalen informs Ms. Grodner that if she has another issue that she would like the Commission to hear that she may file a complaint with the Commission noting the allegations that she was discussing. Director Whalen further noted this is not the forum for the Commission to hear allegations that are not on the agenda, and/or currently pending before the Commission.

12:11 p.m. Veronica Parks, a friend of Complainant in the matter docketed as C49-20 and a trustee for TECCS, noted her attendance and stated that C49-20 is a “critical case” and should be upheld.

12:11 p.m. Julio “Angel” Quiles, the named Complainant in the matter docketed as C26-20, again noted his attendance, but did not offer any further public statement/comment.

12:11 p.m. Peter Went, friend and supporter of Complainant in the matter docketed as C49-20, again noted his attendance, but did not offer any further public statement/comment.

12:11 p.m. Vivianne Chermont, Complainant in the matter docketed as C34-20, noted her attendance, but did not offer any public statement/comment.

12:12 p.m. David Scott, a friend of Complainant in the matter docketed as C26-20, noted his attendance, but did not offer any public statement/comment.

12:12 p.m. Regina Giacomini, Complainant in the matter docketed as C44-20, again noted her attendance, but did not offer any further public statement/comment.

V. Complaints to Review

C45-18 Motion was made by Jude A. Tanella, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to table the matter, and to draft correspondence as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C26-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C28-20 Motion was made by Jude A. Tanella, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C34-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C35-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to table the matter, and to draft correspondence as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C41-20 Motion was made by Mark Finkelstein, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C44-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C48-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C49-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to table the matter, and to draft correspondence as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C53-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to draft a decision as discussed.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

VI. Decision to Adopt as Written

C59-18 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C09-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C36-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C39-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C40-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C42-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

C43-20 Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

VII. Orders to Show Cause

D02-20 Motion was made by Jude A. Tanella, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

D03-20 Motion was made by Jude A. Tanella, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to adopt the decision as written.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

VIII. Administrative Dismissals

C45-20 This matter was on the agenda for informational purposes only.

C66-20 This matter was on the agenda for informational purposes only.

IX. Other Business

C32-19 This matter was added to the agenda for informational purposes only.

X. Minutes

Motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Jude A. Tanella, to adopt the amended minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting (public and executive) conducted on October 27, 2020.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

XI. Adjournment

At 12:22 p.m., a motion was made by Dennis Roberts, and seconded by Mark Finkelstein, to adjourn.

Vote

Vote	Robert Bender	Michael Carucci	Michael Collins	Mark Finkelstein	Dennis Roberts	Jude A. Tanella	Richard Tomko	Total
Yes	X			X	X	X		4
No								0
Abstention								0

Submitted by:

Jeannine Pizzigoni

Approved by:

Kathryn A. Whalen, Director