

City of Miami

*City Hall
3500 Pan American Drive
Miami, FL 33133
www.miamigov.com*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 14, 2009

10:00 AM

Commission Chambers

Civil Service Board

*Miguel M. de la O, Chairperson
William J. Scarola, Chief Examiner
Jessica Angel-Capo, Board Member
Mariano Cruz, Board Member
Michael T. Dames, Board Member*

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 10:19 a.m. The roll call for Board Members at the commencement of the meeting was as follows:

Present: Chief Examiner Scarola, Member Dames, Member Angel-Capo and Member Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

Member Scarola informed all present that Chairman de la O will not be present and that he will chair today's meeting.

A. APPROVING THE MINUTES OF:

Regular Meeting of June 30, 2009.

The Board entered a motion to APPROVE the minutes of the regular meeting of June 30, 2009 which resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Cruz, seconded by Member Dames, to APPROVE. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

B. PERSONNEL MATTERS**C. MILITARY LEAVES OF ABSENCE****D. DISCIPLINARY MATTERS**

D.1 Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Tika Jones, Police Officer, of her 40-hour suspension, effective July 12, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED

D.2 Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Juan Herrera, Police Officer, of his 40-hour suspension, effective June 30, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED

D.3 Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Stanley Winfrey, Police Officer, of his 20-hour suspension, effective July 11, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED

D.4 Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Deborah Hudson, Typist Clerk III, of her 8-hour suspension, effective July 13, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED

- D.5** Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Jose Gonzalez, Police Officer, of his 120-hour suspension, effective June 29, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED

- D.6** Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Guillermo Sanchez, Police Officer, of his 120-hour suspension, effective June 28, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED

- D.7** Copy of a letter from Chief John F. Timoney, Director, Department of Police, notifying Vincent Jackson, Jr., Police Officer, of his 40-hour suspension, effective July 13, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

NOTIFIED**E. GENERAL ITEMS****F. REPORTS**

Pending Hearings as of July 14, 2009. (NOTIFICATION)

G. REQUESTS FOR HEARINGS

- G.1** Copy of a Request for a Grievance Hearing from Teri Guttman Valdes, Attorney, on behalf of Ajit S. Chhabra, Budget Analyst, pursuant to Civil Service Rule 16.2 - Complaint by Employee, concerning an alleged violation of Civil Service Rule 17.1 - Practices, Penalties. (DISCUSSION)
Deferred from the meeting of June 2, 2009.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes asked what would happen if at the end of considering this matter, the Board's vote (on whether to grant or deny her client's request) resulted in a tie vote.

Acting Chairman Scarola responded that the matter would be carried over to the next meeting [and reheard by the full Board].

Upon hearing the Acting Chairman's response, Attorney Guttman-Valdes proceeded with her presentation. She went on to say that her client, Mr. Chhabra is employed as a Budget Analyst and that he had applied for three specific positions (Principal Staff Analyst, Senior Finance Accounting Analyst, and Administrative Assistant II) as set forth in her request for a hearing. She went on to say that despite Mr. Chhabra's extensive and abundant qualifications and years of service, he was not selected to be interviewed for any of the three positions. Attorney Guttman-Valdes further stated that based upon a review of the interview results [for Administrative Assistant II] and the employee that was selected, Mr. Chhabra requested a grievance hearing because they believe that his non-selection was based upon his race and gender thereby subjecting him to discrimination.

Acting Chairman Scarola asked for the department's position on Mr. Chhabra's request for a hearing.

Diana Vizcaino, Assistant City Attorney (ACA), responded that in accordance with Civil Service Rule 17.1, Attorney Guttman-Valdes failed to identify who discriminated against Mr. Chhabra. She went on to say that in opposing counsel's request, there were allegations that Mr. Chhabra was discriminated against because of his nationality, which is Asian. ACA Vizcaino further stated that as far as the Administrative Assistant II position for which Mr. Chhabra applied in April 2008, there were 43 who applied, 29 deemed eligible, of which 4 were Asian. She went on to say that of the 29 eligible applicants, 8 were selected to be interviewed, one of which was Asian. She stated that Mr. Chhabra made the same complaint when he applied for the Finance Accounting position in July 2008 and for this particular recruitment, there were 25 eligible applicants, 4 of which were Asian and that one Asian applicant was selected for interview. ACA Vizcaino went on to say that Mr. Chhabra has been making [discrimination] complaints since 1997 and that he has filed numerous complaints with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and most recently in February 2009, he made the same exact allegation that he is making before the Board today and the EEOC in its investigation found that there was no cause. She further stated that Mr. Chhabra did not establish a prima facie case of discrimination; therefore she would ask the Board to deny the employee's request for a hearing based upon the following: (1) The allegations are unfounded and (2) the Board had not heard who Mr. Chhabra claimed to be the person that discriminated against him because of his nationality.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that Mr. Chhabra's claim of discrimination that they are proceeding under is based upon race (Asian) and sex (male), but not nationality as stated by opposing counsel. She went on to say that in order to state a prima facie case, which is the threshold they need to meet in order for the Board to grant her client's request for a hearing and an opportunity to put on evidence, her client needs to show that there was a vacant position, he applied, was qualified, and not selected for an interview. She stated that all three positions were advertised, her client applied and was deemed eligible, and he was not selected to be interviewed; however, applicants that were either female or non-Asian were selected to be interviewed, which is the basis for their case. Attorney Guttman-Valdes went on to say that she felt what she presented was sufficient to set forth a prima facie case for an allegation of discrimination, which is the basis needed for the Board to grant her client's request for a hearing.

Acting Chairman Scarola asked the department's attorney if she wished to respond to the employee's position on this matter.

ACA Vizcaino responded in the affirmative and stated that since the allegation was changing from solely race to now include gender, she would submit that of the 29 eligible applicants for the Administrative Assistant II position, that 7 on the register were males and that more than half of the eight selected to be interviewed were males; and the numbers were similar for the Senior Finance Accounting Analyst position. She went on to say that she did have a copy of the Administrative Assistant II interview results for the Board's perusal. ACA Vizcaino further stated that the Board has conducted hearings pursuant to Rule 16.2 concerning a violation of Rule 17.1, but opposing counsel has not stated the grounds necessary in order to be granted a hearing under Rule 17. She stated that the key question is who discriminated against Mr. Chhabra and the Board has not heard that answer.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that the charge of discrimination was made against the City of Miami.

ACA Vizcaino responded that the City does not select candidates to be interviewed. She went on to say that she was sure the Board was familiar with the City's interview process because it has been discussed on many occasions. ACA Vizcaino further stated that Mr. Chhabra applied for the position of Administrative Assistant II, he was deemed eligible, his name was placed on an eligible register, [the names were certified to the hiring department], and from the [certification] list, applicants were selected by the department director to be interviewed. She stated that the question is whether the allegation of discrimination is against Department Director Diana Gomez who held interviews for the Senior Finance Accounting Analyst position and against Department Director David Rosemond who held interviews for the Administrative Assistant II position because if that is so, she has a right to be made aware and put on notice.

Acting Chairman Scarola asked if Board Members had questions.

Member Angel-Capo asked when did the interviews for Administrative Assistant II take place.

ACA Vizcaino responded that the Administrative Assistant II interviews took place in April 2008 and for the position in the Finance Department they took place in July 2008. She reiterated that in February 2009, Mr. Chhabra filed a complaint with the Federal EEOC and they conducted a full investigation as to the same allegations that he made today and determined there to be a No Cause finding.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that the EEOC's finding was not binding on the Board and that it was not a full-blown investigation that they did, but something internal. She went on to say that there is no deposition, but upon receipt of a charge from the City concerning an employee's complaint [of discrimination], the EEOC investigates and 99% of the time they check the box indicating a No Cause finding.

ACA Vizcaino stated that she strongly disagreed with opposing counsel's interpretation of investigations handled by the EEOC because she worked for the EEOC. She went on to say that the investigations conducted by the EEOC are federal investigations for which they take sworn statements from witnesses and there are numerous requests for discovery.

Member Angel-Capo asked if Mr. Chhabra is complaining that he was not interviewed.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that her client was not selected to be interviewed even though he was eligible and believed that he was more qualified than those individuals who were selected for interview, which is the point of their request for a hearing.

ACA Vizcaino stated that Mr. Chhabra is claiming that he was discriminated against because he is Asian and a male which caused him not be interviewed in 2008 for the Administrative Assistant II and Senior Finance Accounting Analyst positions. She went on to say that it was the department's position that Mr. Chhabra's allegations were unfounded. ACA Vizcaino further stated that Mr. Chhabra's non-selection for interviews had nothing to do with either his gender or race because there were four other Asians for both positions that were deemed eligible and in each case, one Asian was selected for interview.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that opposing counsel forgot about the third position of Principal Staff Analyst that was also under discussion.

Member Angel-Capo asked if an Asian was selected for all three interviews.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded in the negative. She went on to say that an Asian was not interviewed for the Principal Staff Analyst position.

ACA Vizcaino stated that opposing counsel did make a public records request for the third position of Principal Staff Analyst, but she did not have that data. She went on to say that if the Board wished to have data as to how many applicants were eligible and Asian, she could provide this information at the Board's next setting.

Member Angel-Capo asked Attorney Guttman-Valdes if she knew whether an Asian was interviewed for the Administrative Assistant II position.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that she did not know. She went on to say that she does her own research as opposed to relying on representations from her client so she only knows who the department ultimately selected to fill the position.

Member Angel-Capo stated that Mr. Chhabra was not complaining about the selection that was made [to fill the position] but about being interviewed.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that her client was complaining about both because an applicant cannot be selected to fill a vacant position if not selected for an interview.

Member Angel-Capo stated that it was critical to know if an Asian candidate was interviewed.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that her client's complaint is that in the most recent interview process, seven females and one male were interviewed. She went on to say that it is her understanding that she is not to pull all sorts of documents to prove her case at this time, but to see if she could allege a prima facie case initially [and if her client's request is granted for a hearing], it would be at that time that she would get into the documentary evidence.

Member Angel-Capo asked for the number of males and females that were interviewed for the other two positions [Senior Finance Accounting Analyst, Principal Staff Analyst].

ACA Vizcaino responded that she could provide the Board with a copy of the certification list, eligibility register, and the list of candidates selected for interview, one of which was Asian. She went on to say that Rule 17 is very specific as to what the remedy is and that Rule 17.1 allows for a penalty imposed by the Board which is preventing an employee from holding a classified position. ACA Vizcaino further stated that if there are allegations being made as to discrimination on the basis of race and gender, the Board needs to know who in particular is being accused of discrimination.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that information [about the person accused of discrimination] will be revealed through the evidentiary hearing. She went on to say that unfortunately they do not have discovery as far as depositions in order to ask a question or serve an interrogatory to find out who were selected for the interviews and ultimately filled the positions, which is the whole point of the evidentiary hearing.

Member Cruz stated that according to a letter he was looking at, it mentioned Mr. Chhabra's excellent qualifications, but nothing was produced to prove his qualifications [for the job.] He went on to say that the only name he saw that he recognized was David Rosemond and that he has known Mr. Rosemond for over 20 years, that he is a very fair person, and he does not discriminate against others. Member Cruz further stated that when he talks good about a person that is because that person is good so he does not think Mr. Rosemond is one who discriminates against anybody. He stated that

he has to be shown evidence of discrimination [which he has not seen in this case.]

Acting Chairman Scarola asked Member Cruz if he had a question he wished to pose to either attorney.

Member Cruz asked what evidence was there to prove there was an act of discrimination and how was it that Mr. Chhabra felt he was discriminated against.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that her client feels that he was discriminated against because he was not selected for the interview. She went on to say that the Board has the department's representation as to who made the selection to fill positions, but this information is not clear from the Administrative Policy Manual (APM).

ACA Vizcaino referred the Board to APM 3-92 (Interview Process) and stated that this policy has been discussed before the Board in the past. She went on to say that the policy does talk about the department director having sole discretion of making the selection of candidates to be interviewed.

Member Angel-Capo asked which department held interviews for the Principal Staff Analyst position.

ACA Vizcaino responded that she did not know because she did not have that data but perhaps opposing counsel had data on this position.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that she did not know, but she could check with her client.

ACA Vizcaino stated that when Mr. Chhabra filed his complaint with the EEOC, the Principal Staff Analyst position was not made a part of his complaint so this would be something new before the Board.

After conferring with her client, Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that the Principal Staff Analyst position in question was housed in the departments of General Services Administration (GSA) and Parks.

Member Angel-Capo asked Attorney Guttman-Valdes if there were 3 or 4 positions that her client was claiming he did not get an interview for.

ACA Vizcaino responded that according to the employee's complaint, there are 3 positions that are alleged.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that she did not have the job announcement so she could not say for sure which department housed the Principal Staff Analyst position.

Member Angel-Capo responded that she needed to know which department housed the Principal Staff Analyst position.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that she did not have the register announcement.

Member Dames asked for Mr. Chhabra's date of hire.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that Mr. Chhabra was hired in April 1983 as a Management Analyst for over 10 years, Principal Staff Analyst (1995-96), Administrative Assistant III for a couple of months and then he returned to Management Analyst. She went on to say that he currently holds the position of Budget Analyst and has held this position since June 2002.

Member Dames asked how many times had Mr. Chhabra applied for other positions.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded he would apply whenever (higher-level) positions were open that he would qualify for.

Member Dames asked how many positions did Mr. Chhabra apply for and of the positions he applied for, how many interviews was he selected for.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded that he applied for 7 positions and of the 7 positions he was selected for two interviews.

Member Dames stated that with regards to the Senior Finance Accounting Analyst position, he would like to know how the department director chose the individuals for this interview.

Acting Chairman Scarola stated that he wanted to make sure he was clear on two points concerning Mr. Chhabra's complaint. He asked if Mr. Chhabra was deemed eligible for the three positions and if he is complaining that from the pool of eligible applicants, he was not selected to move to the interview process.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes responded in the affirmative. She went on to say that the discrimination complaint is based on his race and gender and that they want to be able to let the Board see on paper that when her client's experience is compared to those candidates that were selected for an interview that he was the more qualified individual.

Member Cruz asked if the procedure used to deem individuals eligible was based on a score or application requirements.

ACA Vizcaino responded that according to the information she had, Mr. Chhabra was deemed eligible for two of the positions so the question raised by Member Cruz was not the issue at hand. She went on to say that the allegation is that Mr. Chhabra was not selected for an interview because of his sex and because he is Asian.

Member Cruz asked what procedure is followed to select a person for an interview.

Acting Chairman Scarola explained to Member Cruz that the interview process is not like a (promotional) exam given for either police or fire sworn personnel, for which they would be selected based upon score. He went on to say that the candidates are deemed either eligible or ineligible for a position and the department director somehow selects those he/she wishes to interview (from the eligible applicants).

ACA Vizcaino responded that it is the department director's discretion to choose from the certification list those applicants that will be interviewed and that the City's Interview Policy, APM 3-92 speaks of that person as being the department director.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes asked opposing counsel if she could direct her to where the APM states that the department director has the responsibility of selecting persons for interview.

In response to Attorney Guttman-Valdes' question, ACA Vizcaino referred opposing counsel to paragraphs III and IV of the Interview Policy.

Attorney Guttman-Valdes stated that she has read the policy many times and the one thing she could not find was the number of persons a director is allowed to interview based upon the number of vacancies. She went on to say that the policy also does not

specify who picks the candidates and the procedure used for selecting candidates so that is why she cannot tell the Board who her client's complaint is against and also the reason they have asked for a hearing.

ACA Vizcaino stated that she appreciates opposing counsel's curiosity on who selects candidates for interviews, but that is not the allegation that she is making before the Board today. She went on to say that Mr. Chhabra and his counsel are making very serious allegations of discrimination based upon race and gender.

Following discussion, the Board entered a motion to DENY Mr. Chhabra's request for a grievance hearing pursuant to Rule 16.2. which resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Angel-Capo, seconded by Member Cruz, that this matter be APPROVED. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

No: Dames

Absent: Chairperson de la O

H. TODAY'S HEARINGS

- H.1** Hearing of appeal on behalf of Rodrigo Jimenez, Telecommunications Technician, concerning his demotion.
Hearing previously scheduled for May 12, 2009; however continued pending settlement. Hearing scheduled for today, pursuant to Civil Service Board Manual of Procedures. Settlement 30 days past due the 30 days requirement.
SETTLED : THE HEARING WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE BOARD'S DOCKET AND THE CASE CLOSED.
- H.2** Hearing of appeal on behalf of Orlando Borges, Police Officer, relative to his 20-hour suspension, effective June 7, 2006.
The Executive Secretary stated that she received a request from the employee's attorney to continue this hearing. She went on to say that the hearing has been continued a total of 5 times of which 3 continuances were granted at the request of the employee and 2 continuances were charged to the Board.
Attorney Rind stated that the reason for the continuance is two-fold. She went on to say that Attorney Cohen, who is handling this case is out of town and Officer Borges could not be available.
Member Angel-Capo stated that this is the fourth continuance that the employee is requesting so he needs to make an effort to be available for his hearing.
Attorney Rind stated that originally the continuance request was not due to Officer Borges' unavailability but it was due to a conflict with scheduling. She went on to say that this happens sometimes because the hearings are not coordinated with the attorneys' calendars when they are scheduled.
ACA Vizcaino stated that she had no objection to the continuance request.
Following discussion, the Board entered a motion to CONTINUE Officer Borges' hearing and charge the continuance to the employee, which resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Angel-Capo, seconded by Member Cruz, that this matter be CONTINUED. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

H.3

Hearing of appeal on behalf of Juan Herrera, Police Officer, relative to his 40-hour suspension, effective November 29, 2008.

ACA Vizcaino asked that this hearing be continued and charged to the department. She went on to say that Officer Herrera has three pending cases filed with the Board and at this time she was trying to resolve some issues that have not been fruitful so she is requesting a continuance to deal with those issues. ACA Vizcaino further stated that it is her understanding that opposing counsel has no objection.

Acting Chairman Scarola asking for the scheduling history of Officer Herrera's case.

ACA Vizcaino stated that this is the first time the hearing was scheduled and the first continuance requested by the department.

Following discussion, the Board entered a motion to CONTINUE Officer Herrera's hearing and charge the continuance to the department which resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Cruz, seconded by Member Angel-Capo, that this matter be CONTINUED. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

H.4

Hearing of appeal on behalf of Humberto Mijares, Building Inspector III, relative to his 3-day suspension, effective August 27, 2008.

ACA Vizcaino asked that this case be continued on the basis that this is the department's first request and that the department is entitled to have its case heard by a full Board.

Attorney Rind objected to the department's request for a continuance based upon the Board's policy that if a quorum was present, the Board would not grant a continuance (solely on the grounds that there was not a full Board). She went on to say that she has been required to go forward with a four-member panel in two instances so she did not think the department's reason was the proper basis for a continuance given the Board's rule.

Member Angel-Capo asked for the number of continuances granted for this case.

The Executive Secretary responded that one continuance was granted and charged to the Board.

Following discussion, the Board entered a motion to DENY the department's request for a continuance which resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Angel-Capo, seconded by Member Dames, that this matter be APPROVED. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo and Cruz

No: Scarola

Absent: Chairperson de la O

Following the Board's motion to DENY the department's request for a continuance, the Board entered into the scheduled hearing of Humberto Mijares.

Diana Vizcaino, Assistant City Attorney (ACA), represented the department.

Osnat K. Rind, Attorney at Law, represented Humberto Mijares, the Appellant.

ACA Vizcaino waived opening statements and Attorney Rind deferred opening statements.

The Rule of Witnesses was invoked and all witness were sworn in individually.

Witnesses for the department appeared in the following order:

- 1. Maurice Pons, Inspections Chief, City of Miami, Department of Building.*
- 2. Eldys Diaz, Police Officer, City of Miami, Department of Police.*

Questions were posed by Board Member Dames during the testimony of Witness Diaz.

- 3. Hector Lima, Department Director, City of Miami, Department of Building.*

Questions were posed by Board Members Cruz, Dames, and Angel-Capo during the testimony of Witness Lima.

The Department rested its case and Attorney Rind made opening statements. Witnesses were called to testify on behalf of the Appellant in the following order:

- 1. Humberto Mijares, Building Inspector III, City of Miami, Department of Building, testified on his own behalf.*

Questions were posed by Board Member Dames during the testimony of Witness Mijares.

The Appellant rested his case.

Following closing argument by both attorneys, Member Cruz stated that there was case law (Circuit Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, 155 F.2d 18) presented about left turns. He went on to say that many times while waiting to make a left turn, he would refuse when persons gestured that he make the turn; therefore, employees have to be very careful when driving.

Following discussion, the Board entered a motion to find the Appellant NOT GUILTY of Charge #1 - Civil Service Rule 14.2(e) (3) - Has violated or failed to obey any lawful and reasonable official regulation or order...."

Under discussion, Member Cruz stated he has been driving for at least 40 years and he can say there is nothing a driver can do when another driver side-swipes your vehicle.

Member Dames stated that he heard discussion about Mr. Mijares having 11 vehicular accidents and that the Appellant agreed to having these accidents.

Acting Chairman Scarola reminded Member Dames that the Board was only considering the three accidents included in the reprimand.

Member Dames stated that he had no other comments.

Acting Chairman Scarola stated that he found it disturbing that the department used the two accidents for which Mr. Mijares was not at fault as the basis for issuing the reprimand [that is before the Board today.] He went on to say that he heard no testimony from the department to refute the Appellant's story that when he made the left turn, he thought he had the right of way because there was no other vehicle in his path.

Following discussion, the motion on the floor to find the Appellant NOT GUILTY resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Cruz, seconded by Member Angel-Capo, that this matter be APPROVED. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

The Board entered a motion to find the Appellant NOT GUILTY of Charge #2 - Civil Service Rule 14.2(l) - Is careless or negligent of the property of the City of Miami. The motion resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Dames, seconded by Member Angel-Capo, that this matter be APPROVED. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

AJOURNMENT:

The Acting Chairman called for a motion to ADJOURN, which resulted as follows:

Motion by Member Cruz, seconded by Member Angel-Capo, to APPROVE. PASSED by the following vote.

Aye: Dames, Angel-Capo, Scarola and Cruz

Absent: Chairperson de la O

The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m. Breaks were taken at 10:54-11:05 a.m. and 12:47-12:55 p.m.

SIGNATURE:

Miguel M. de la O, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Tishria L. Mindingall, Executive Secretary

