



CPRB PUBLIC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 9, 2026 – 6:00 PM

Albany Community Police Review Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 9, 2026

A. Call to Order

The April 9, 2026, regular monthly meeting of the CPRB was called to order by Member Hamilton at 6:18 pm. The meeting can be viewed in full [here](#).

B. Roll Call

Members Present – Hamilton (presiding member), Person, Morris, Jones, Johnson

C. Approval of Minutes – January 8, 2026

- a. Member Hamilton moved to approve the minutes, Member Morris seconded the motion
 - i. Vote Count
 1. Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron
 2. Against – 0
 3. Abstained – 0

D. Communication from the City of Albany

- a. Presentation by the Office of Audit and Control
 - i. The OAC informed CPRB staff that they were no longer attending the CPRB meeting, no comments were made by OAC.
- b. Report from Program Director Schaaf
 - i. Program Director Schaaf presented the results of the Community Survey, the results can be seen below in Appendix I
 - ii. Program Director Schaaf reported that the CPRB currently had 145 open complaints, 42 of which were pending OPS action, with 123 pending CPRB membership action, and that only 20 of those complaints will have been pending review for less than 120-days.
 - iii. Program Director Schaaf reported that an employment offer was extended and accepted for the Confidential Secretary role and the anticipated start date is April 27, 2026.
 - iv. Program Director Schaaf reported that once the Confidential Secretary is in place, he will begin to coordinate the interviews for the investigative roles.

E. New Business

- a. Discussion of Officer Nominations

Member Morris remarked that based on the recent membership changes she did not believe there were three members interested in being elected officers.

Member Morris moved to table discussion on Officer Nomination until the next meeting of the CPRB, Member Person seconded the motion.

- i. Vote Count
 - 1. Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron
 - 2. Against – 0
 - 3. Abstained – 0

b. Discussion of Selecting Legal Service Providers

Members Hamilton remarked there was a need to select a legal service provider to ensure the CPRB has the needed representation

Program Director Schaaf reported that two proposals were received and that neither firm was in the City of Albany. Additionally, it was reported that one of the firms was in Washington DC and not licensed in the State of New York and the other firm was in the capital area.

Member Jones moved to table discussion of Legal Service providers until as least 6 CPRB members can participate, Member Person seconded the motion.

- i. Vote Count
 - 1. Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron
 - 2. Against – 0
 - 3. Abstained – 0

c. Discussion of Selecting Investigative Service Providers

Member Person inquired with the prior firm responded to the RFP. Program Director Schaaf remarked that they did and that they are one of the to be considered.

Program Director Schaaf reported that three proposals a were received, one of which was from the firm that has historically provided these services to the CPRB.

Members inquired about the status of the agreement from the previous firm and Program Director Schaaf remarked that the firm’s contract expired at the end of 2025 and was not eligible to be renewed. Program Director Schaaf also recommended that if members were to select a firm the previous firm developed the current investigative process that is used.

Member Hamilton remarked that the previous firm would likely have an advantage during the selection process.

Member Jones moved to table discussion of Investigation Service providers until a future date; Member Morris seconded the motion.

- i. Vote Count

1. Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron
2. Against – 0
3. Abstained – 0

F. Review of Complaints

a. Update from Professional Standards

- i.** Cmdr. Rittie introduced himself to the new members, offered to meet with membership in person at OPS offices, and said that he spoke with Program Director Schaaf about coordinating that once more members are seated. Cmdr. Rittie also provided information on how APD is processing complaints while the CPRB has not been meeting. He advised that complaints are still being received by both APD and the CPRB and are still being investigated by OPS. Cmdr. Rittie issued reassurance that complaints are still being investigated by OPS. Cmdr. Rittie reported that APD is in the process of hiring more officers and looks like there will be a large group of new officers attending.

Member Person asked Cmdr. Rittie if Lt. Peterson was the new OPS point of contact for the CPRB and Cmdr. Rittie confirmed.

Member Hamilton expressed that he believed that there was a breakdown in understanding on the powers of the CPRB to discipline officer. Cmdr. Rittie explained that APD discipline is the responsibility of the Chief of Police, and the complaints with sustained allegations are still being processed at APD and accountability is still occurring, even when the CPRB is not meeting or reviewing complaints. Member Hamilton asked if the CPRB failed to complete the review within 120 days that APD is still proceeding with discipline. Cmdr. Rittie confirmed APD is still proceeding with the discipline despite the CPRB not completing review within the 120 days.

b. Complaints for Review

CC2025-072 – Member Morris – Det. Adalian – the full review can be viewed here.

The complainant alleged that on October 10, 2025, APD officers failed to properly document an incident in a report.

Allegation #1 – Call Handling (failure to take a report) – Not Sustained

Member Morris moved to approve the findings, member Person seconded.

Vote Count

- Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron
- Against – 0
- Abstained – 0

CC2025-034 – Member Person – Det. Stiles

The complainant alleged that on June 30, 2025, APD officers improperly knocked on his door, directed profanities at him, improperly used force, and failed to request medical treatment. Additionally, OPS alleged that the officer failed to properly document the use of force.

Allegation #1 – Conduct Standards (banding on door and ringing bell) – exonerated

Allegation #2 – Conduct Standards (profanity) – sustained

Allegation #3 – Call Handling (failure to request medical attention) – sustained

Allegation #4 – Use of Force (push) – sustained

Allegation #5 – Use of Force (failure to complete report) – sustained

The CPRB recommended that the officer receive retraining on the applicable policies and effective communication, and the loss of one leave credit.

Member Person moved to accept the findings, Member Hamilton seconded.

Vote Count

Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron

Against – 0

Abstained – 0

CC2025-054 – Member Morris – Det. Adalian

The complaint alleged that on October 9, 2025, APD officers were disrespectful, unprofessional, and intimidating while interacting with the complainant.

Allegation #1 – Conduct Standards (unprofessional, disrespectful, and intimidating) – Not Sustained

Member Morris moved to approve the findings, Member Person seconded

Vote Count

Affirmative – 4 – Hamilton, Jones, Morris, Peron

Against – 0

Abstained – 1 – Johnson

CC2025-069 – Member Morris – Det. Adalian

The complainant alleged that on November 1, 2025, APD officers improperly used force that caused injury while detaining him.

The Complainant remarked that what happened was what was reported by Member Morris. The complainant added that he did not intend to threaten to strike the officer and that he was intoxicated. The complainant remarked that he was quickly pulled from the vehicle and placed on the ground where he was struck several times. The complainant relayed that he did suffer injury and is still experiencing the effects of it.

Allegation #1 – Use of Force (strike) – exonerated

Allegation #2 – Use of Force (causing injury) – unfounded

Member Morris moved to approve the findings, Member Person seconded.

Vote Count

Affirmative – 4 – Hamilton, Jones, Morris, Peron

Against – 0

Abstained – 1 – Johnson

c. Closures without Review

i. CC2026-003 – withdrawn

ii. F.S. Complaint – Out of Jurisdiction – No referral

iii. R.M. Complaint – Out of Jurisdiction – FOIL request

iv. E.S. Complaint – Out of Jurisdiction – Duplicate

v. M.B. Complaint – Withdrawn

vi. K.I. Complaint – Out of Jurisdiction – Referred to Albany County Sheriff's Office

Member Hamilton moved to approve the closures without review, Member Morris seconded.

Vote Count

Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Peron

Against – 0

Abstained – 0

G. Public Comment

a. At the time public comment was called no commenters were present. However, during the meeting, the commenters below arrived, and members allowed comments at the end of the meeting. Public comments can be found here.

i. Ms. Alexander made remarks about the delays in resolution of her complaint from July of 2024, the lack of communication or response from CPRB membership, and how Program Director Schaaf has assisted her. Ms. Alexander also remarked that she had a concerning interaction with APD “few months” ago but did not file a complaint.

ii. Mr. Morris made remarks about his current complaint status and was not sure if it had been previously filed. Program Director Schaaf informed Mr. Morris that his complaint from September of 2025 was received and the complaint he sought to file earlier this year was a duplicate of the September 2025 complaint. Program Director Schaaf provided Mr. Morris with a business card and requested he contact the CPRB for more details.

H. Adjournment

a. Member Person moved to adjourn the meeting, Member Hamilton seconded.

i. Vote Count

1. Affirmative – 5 – Hamilton, Johnson, Jones, Morris, Person

2. Against – 0

3. Abstentions – 0

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 pm.



Community Survey

COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW BOARD

February 12, 2026

Purpose

The CPRB created and launched a survey seeking community input on two distinct topics. The first topic was how to address the CPRB's complaint review backlog. The second topic was if City of Albany law governing CPRB membership should be changed to allow for former Albany Police Department (APD) employees and immediate family to serve as members of the board.

The survey will inform membership of how the community would like the CPRB to address the complaint backlog and if membership should suggest to the Common Council make changes to City of Albany law governing CPRB membership.

Launch and Response

The survey launched on December 1, 2025, remained open until January 15, 2026, and was open to all City of Albany residents, employees, businesses, visitors, and anyone else who has interactions with Albany Police Department. The survey was posted and distributed on the CPRB's website and social media; the City of Albany's Agenda Center; on flyers posted in City Hall, CPRB Office building, and APD locations open to the public; provided to our community partners, to include the Center for Law and Justice and the Albany Library System; and released to the media.

55 responses were received.

Question One - Background Information

Prior to posing the question, participants were provided with the below background information regarding the CPRB complaint backlog and legal obligations related to the complaint review:

The CPRB is responsible for reviewing Albany Police Department (APD) Office of Professional Standards (OPS) complaint investigations. As required by [§ 42-345\(B\) of City of Albany Law](#) the CPRB's complaint review must be completed within 120-days *after* OPS provides the CPRB a preliminary investigation report. The CPRB's complaint review is not completed until *after* the CPRB votes on the complaint during a public meeting.

If the CPRB fails to complete the required review within 120-days, the CPRB *must* return the complaint to the Chief of Police for APD to make final complaint outcome determinations and impose any applicable discipline. This means that any CPRB complaint review completed *after* 120-days will *not* be considered by APD to determine complaint outcomes and any applicable discipline.

Currently, the CPRB has 68 complaints waiting for CPRB complaint review and vote. 43 of those complaints are already beyond or will pass the 120-day complaint review period before the end of 2025.

So far in 2025, the CPRB has received 80 complaints.

Question One

How the CPRB should handle complaints beyond the 120-day complaint review period? Please rank the below options in order of preference.

- Complaints beyond the 120-day review period should be reviewed by the CPRB when there is an ability to complete the review without impacting the timely review of complaints still in the 120-day complaint review period.
- Complaints beyond the 120-day review period should be reviewed by the CPRB in the same way as in the past which may cause complaints still in the 120-day review period to pass the 120-days before they are reviewed by the CPRB.
- Complaints beyond the 120-day review period will be considered closed without of review by the CPRB, allowing the CPRB to focus on the timely review complaints that are under the 120-day requirement thereby allowing CPRB recommendations to be considered by the Chief of Police.

Question One Results

All 55 participants provided a response to question one.

The top ranked choice was to close complaints beyond the 120-day review period to allow for more timely review of complaints and consideration by the Chief of Police.

The second ranked choice was to review complaints beyond the 120-day review period when the board could complete the work without impacting the timelessness of more recent complaints.

The third ranked choice was to continue reviewing complaints beyond the 120-day review period as the CPRB has done in the past.

Question One Result Breakdown

Complaints beyond the 120-day review period will be considered closed without of review by the CPRB, allowing the CPRB to focus on the timely review of complaints that are under the 120-day requirement thereby allowing CPRB recommendations to be considered by the Chief of Police.

42 top choice

4 second choice

9 third choice

Complaints beyond the 120-day review period should be reviewed by the CPRB when there is an ability to complete the review without impacting the timely review of complaints still in the 120-day complaint review period.

6 top choice

32 second choice

17 third choice

Complaints beyond the 120-day review period should be reviewed by the CPRB in the same way as in the past which may cause complaints still in the 120-day review period to pass the 120-days before they are reviewed by the CPRB.

7 top choice

19 second choice

29 third choice

Question One Participant Comments

14 of the participants who ranked closure of complaints beyond the 120-day review period to allow for more timely review of complaints and consideration by the Chief of Police as their top choice made the following comments:

- Complaints that cannot result in discipline due to timing should be closed.
- The CPRB should ensure members of the board have outside legal representation, it is a lot to ask volunteer board members to expose themselves to legal liability. This will attract new members and free up the backlog.
- How does it help anyone to waste time on things that you can't actually change?
- It makes no sense to spend time on things the law says you can't do. You should be following the law as required.
- The law says close complaints after 120 days. So, they should be closed. If past members weren't getting their work done that is not a current member issue.
- Law seems to say close the complaint after 120. So why is this even a question?
- Stop wasting time and get to work out complaints are old and need to be addressed.
- Don't you think the law clear on what must happen?

Question One Participant Comments (continued)

14 of the participants who ranked closure of complaints beyond the 120-day review period to allow for more timely review of complaints and consideration by the Chief of Police as their top choice made the following comments (continued):

- Don't waste time on things you can't change. Oh, wait that seems to be what the board does. Way to show up for the community.
- Only one real choice, comply with the law.
- Please follow the law. That is why rules exist.
- It is the CPRB's fault. You all need to own this, otherwise you will lose all public trust. Stop blaming City Hall and stop blaming Common Council for the previous lack in leadership. Get outside council via RFP immediately, fill positions AFTER BACKGROUND CHECKS and get this program running properly.
- How about doing some work? The board only talked about cases like 4 times last year. What a joke. No wonder there is an issue.
- Two months without a meeting and you review 4 complaints. No wonder there is a backlog. You can not even review complaints when there is nothing else to do. This board is a joke and should be disbanded. It will save the city almost \$700k that can be used to actually make things better.

Question One Participant Comments (continued)

3 of the participants who ranked complaints beyond the 120-day review period should be reviewed by the CPRB when there is an ability to complete the review without impacting the timely review of complaints still in the 120-day complaint review period as their top choice made the following comments:

- Review the process on handling. Perhaps batch by officer by type or by neighborhood. Establish short and longer more in-depth reviews.
- There's some context I do not have for example if the complexity of cases in the queue cause backlogs or delays. However, if there were a prioritization system based on level or severity this could enable reviews to be done quickly and those with more intensity or more escalated could go beyond the timeline if there were a system dictating that. Feel free to reach out to discuss more of this idea.
- I am beyond frustrated at this backlog specially given the amount of videos I have seen of the Albany Police Department this year.

Question One Participant Comments (continued)

2 of the participants who ranked review of complaints beyond the 120-day review period when the board could complete the work without impacting the timeliness of more recent complaints as their top choice made the below comments:

- CPRB should also consider prioritizing complaints based on the severity of the alleged APD actions that led to the complaint.
- Any other option would allow some complaints to be ignored permanently.

Question Two Background Information

Prior to posing the question, participants were provided with the below background information regarding the CPRB complaint backlog and legal obligations related to the complaint:

City of Albany Law establishes the minimum qualifications to become a member of the CPRB.

Specifically, [§ 42-337\(C\)](#), prohibits any former employee of the Albany Police Department (APD) and their immediate family members from *ever* being a member of the CPRB.

The CPRB acknowledges the inherent conflicts of interest in allowing current APD employees and their immediate family members from being a CPRB member. However, a former APD employee and their immediate family member may assist the CPRB in meeting its goal of creating a complaint review process that is free from bias and informed of actual police practices, as required by [§ 42-332\(E\)](#), by members that are reflective of the community, as required by [§ 42-337](#).

Question Two

Should former employees of the Albany Police Department (APD) and their immediate family members be allowed to be CPRB members? Please select only one.

- No, they should never be allowed to be a CPRB member.
- Yes, they should be allowed to be a CPRB member without limitations.
- Yes, but the law should be changed to allow membership after a period of 10-years.
- Yes, but the law should be changed to allow membership after a period of 10-years and allow for only one CPRB member to be a former APD employee or immediate family member at the same time.

Question Two Results and Breakdown

All 55 participants provided a response to question two.

21 (38.2%) participants chose to allow former APD employees and immediate family to serve as a member after a period of 10-years.

17 (30.9%) participants chose to allow former APD employees and immediate family to serve as member without limitations.

9 (16.4%) participants chose to allow former APD employees and immediate family to serve as a member after a period of 10-years and allow for only one CPRB member to be a former APD employee or immediate family member at any one time.

8 (14.5%) participants chose to never allow former APD employees and immediate family to serve as a member.

Question Two Participant Comments

5 participants who selected; yes, they should be allowed to be a CPRB member without limitations, made the following comments:

- The Council and the Mayor should each be allowed to include one former APD employee or immediate family member (leading to 2 such members among the total of 9) among their appointees. Membership should be allowed after 5 years.
- It is not a community board if you exclude community members without a true conflict of interest. The only limit should be current employees and family just like it is for city employees.
- Let's put cops and robbers on the board. I mean why not at least things will be different but nothing will get done like always.
- Who cares this board is a joke. It needs to be dissolved.
- Funny you can't even hold a meeting correctly. What a joke.

Question Two Participant Comments

5 participants who selected; yes, but the law should be changed to allow membership after a period of 10-years and allow for only one CPRB member to be a former APD employee or immediate family member at the same time made the following comments:

- I like the bottom two options. Despite there being the valuable insight and expertise of a former cop they could be incorporated as a nonvoting member - the risk is too great for bias. I hate to prohibit service altogether, but it seems duplicitous for the initial review to come from OPS and then have a former APD that is functioning like a filter.
- It concerns me as a resident, the police review board members who have resigned this year.
- All members of the community should be allowed to apply for membership.
- The overall purpose of the board is to assess and actually review policy and procedure. While on the job experience can be an invaluable resource in this regard, the foremost priority needs to be the actions of the department's members. Anything that could lead to overly weighted bias in either direction when reviewing should be avoided and limiting board member affiliation is crucial to that end.

Question Two Participant Comments

4 participants who selected; yes, but the law should be changed to allow membership after a period of 10-years, made the following comments:

- I would shorten period to 5 years and would allow family members upon retirement of employee.
- 10 years seems like a lengthy period. Former APD might provide insight to protocols and procedures that could help guide CPRB.
- Officers are members of the community which is required to be represented.
- Immediate family members seems more problematic; they may have personal relationships with current APD members but lack the policing practices and knowledge of former officers.
- Felons on the board should be matched with cops to make sure laws are followed. They can watch each other.

Question Two Participant Comments

1 participant who selected; no, they should never be allowed to be a CPRB member, made the following comment:

- You haven't established that the reason for the backlog is insufficient board members, so this doesn't seem relevant.

Publication of the Survey Results

These results will be published on our website and with the minutes of this meeting.

ALBANY

for all.

Powered by Pride & Potential

Questions