

Windsor Police Service Discipline Hearing
In the Matter of Ontario Regulation 268/10
Made Under the Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990,

And Amendments thereto:

And

In The Matter Of

The Windsor Police Service

And

Constable Kevin LaCoursiere #7556

Charge: Discreditable Conduct
Insubordination
Neglect of Duty

Before:

Superintendent (Retired) M.P.B. Elbers
Ontario Provincial Police Adjudicator

Appearances:

Counsel for the Prosecution: Mr. David Amyot
Windsor Police Service

Counsel for the Defense: Ms. Maria Carroccia
For Constable LaCoursiere

Penalty Decision with Reasons:

The Hearing:

Constable Kevin LaCoursiere pled guilty on June 28, 2019 and was found guilty of One (1) count of Neglect of Duty pursuant to Section 2 (1) (c) (i) of the Code of Conduct contained in the Schedule to Ontario Regulation 268/10 as amended. One Count of Discreditable Conduct and One Count of Insubordination were withdrawn by the Prosecutor, Mr. David Amyot at the Hearing on June 28, 2019.

The charge pertains to the attendance of Constable LaCoursiere and a now retired Windsor Police officer attendance at the residence of the complainant in Windsor, Ontario on February 28, 2016 in regards to a domestic situation that was not properly investigated by the Windsor Police Service.

An agreed statement of facts was submitted to this Hearing by Counsel for the affected parties and marked as Exhibit three (3).

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. The Windsor Police Service ("WPS") has employed Police Constable Kevin LaCoursiere ("PC Lacoursiere") since June 21, 1993.
2. PC LaCoursiere (Badge #7556) currently holds the rank of Senior Constable.
3. On July 26, 2018, J.L. (the "Complainant") filed a public complaint with the Office of the Independent Police Review Director ("OIPRD") against Police Constable Lalonde, who is now retired, ("PC Lalonde") and PC LaCoursiere, regarding an incident that took place at the Complainant's residence on February 28, 2016.
4. The complaint alleged that PC Lalonde and PC LaCoursiere failed to arrest the Complainant's common-law spouse, S.G. ("S.G.") for domestic assault.
5. On February 28, 2016, the Complainant called the WPS to report that the Complainant's then common-law spouse had assaulted the Complainant at their residence, where they lived with their newborn twin babies.

6. PC Lalonde and PC LaCoursiere were dispatched to the residence around approximately 10:26 p.m. to investigate the matter. PC Lalonde took the lead in the investigation.
7. When the officers arrived, the Complainant informed PC Lalonde, while PC LaCoursiere stood by and spoke with S.G., that S.G. had been drinking and had assaulted the Complainant.
8. The Complainant showed scratch marks that were on the Complainant's chest, and claimed that S.G. tore the Complainant's shirt when S.G. assaulted the Complainant. Marked as Exhibit 1 to this Agreed Statement of Facts are the pictures of the Complainant's injuries that were taken on the Complainant's cellphone on the night of February 28, 2016, and which were provided to the OIPRD.
9. The Complainant also provided the OIPRD with an audio recording that was made surreptitiously on the Complainant's cell phone that night. Marked as Exhibit 2 to this Agreed Statement of Facts is the Transcribed Audio Recording, and marked as Exhibit 3 is the original Electronic Audio Recording from February 28, 2016.
10. There were reasonable grounds to support the Complainant's report that S.G. had assaulted the Complainant.
11. The Police Standards Manual (2000), under the heading, "Domestic Violence Occurrences," provides, *inter alia*, the following at paragraph 15:
 - a. *"The procedures should provide that in all domestic violence occurrences an officer is to lay a charge where there are reasonable grounds to do so."*

Marked as Exhibit 4 to this Agreed Statement of Facts is the Police Standards Manual (2000).

12. In addition, the WPS Directive 781-03 titled "Spousal/Partner Violence Response Policy" provides, *inter alia*, the following:

- a. *“Charges shall be laid in all incidents of Spousal or Partner Domestic Violence where there are reasonable grounds to do so.”*

13. In the same WPS Directive under the heading, “Procedures,” Section D (20) requires that officers:

- a. *“Explain to the victim and accused the Provincial and Windsor Police mandatory charge policy in relation to domestic violence. Charges will be laid when there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offence has been committed and only the Crown Attorney can withdraw the charge.”*

Marked as Exhibit 5 to this Agreed Statement of Facts is the WPS Directive 781-03.

14. PC Lalonde and PC LaCoursiere had a positive duty to arrest and charge S.G. with assault on the night of February 28, 2016.

15. However, PC Lalonde and PC LaCoursiere failed to arrest and charge S.G. with assault, and instead arrested S.G. with Breach of the Peace due to S.G.’s belligerent and uncooperative behavior.

16. PC Lalonde retired from the WPS effective April 30, 2017, and is no longer employed as a police officer in Ontario. As a result, the investigation into the subject complaint focused on the allegations of misconduct against PC LaCoursiere.

17. PC LaCoursiere’s conduct on February 28, 2016 breached the WPS Directive 781-03, in that he failed to arrest and charge S.G. with assault, as he was required to do.

18. PC LaCoursiere’s conduct on February 28, 2016 breached section 2(1)(c)(i) of the Ontario Police Services Act of Ontario Code of Conduct, in that PC LaCoursiere, without lawful excuse, neglected to perform a duty.

19. PC LaCoursiere accepts responsibility for his actions and is remorseful for not upholding his duty as a police officer.

20. PC LaCoursiere apologizes to the Complainant and is remorseful for any harm his neglect of duty may have caused the Complainant.

21. The Complainant has been advised of the resolution of this matter, and of the parties' joint submission concerning penalty. The Complainant is supportive of this resolution.

22. Based on these facts, PC LaCoursiere pleads guilty to the count of Neglect of Duty, contrary to section 2(1)(c)(i) of the Code of Conduct of Ontario Regulation 268/10 and section 80(1) of the Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 15. PC LaCoursiere's actions constitute Neglect of Duty in that PC LaCoursiere, without lawful excuse, neglected to perform a duty as a member of the WPS.

FINDINGS:

Mr. David Amyot representing the Windsor Police Service and Ms. Maria Carroccia representing Constable Kevin LaCoursiere #7556 have proposed a joint submission of Eighty (80) Hours forfeiture of pay to be taken from the banked overtime or lieu days or annual leave pursuant to Section 85 (1) (f) of the Police Services Act.

Mr. Amyot submitted eight (8) cases to support their joint penalty disposition.

Mr. Amyot made the following submissions to support his position for the forfeiture of eighty hours pay. He also advised the Tribunal that the Complainant was also in agreement with the joint submission submitted by Counsel.

Mr. Amyot stated:

Employment Info.

- PC LaCoursiere has been a member of the WPS since June 21, 1993

- Currently holds the rank of Senior Constable, 1st Class

- PC LaCoursiere does not have any prior discipline on record and has received several commendations (as set out in his Personal Conduct Sheet)

The Law:

- The principles with respect to disposition are well established in PSA discipline jurisprudence

- They are as follows:

1. Disposition should accord with the purposes of the police discipline process.

These purposes include:

- The employer's interest in maintaining discipline in the police workplace

- The Respondent officer's right to be treated fairly

- Public Interest – ensuring a high standard of conduct and public confidence in police

2. Corrective Dispositions should prevail, where possible. Emphasis on a more remedial philosophy over a punitive philosophy.
3. The presumption that the lowest disposition should be imposed, where possible.
4. Proportionality of the disposition to the offence.
5. Higher standards of conduct apply to police officers.

- Through disciplinary jurisprudence, a number of mitigating and aggravating considerations have emerged that affect disposition.

- These include:

- Public interest.
- Seriousness of misconduct.
- Recognition of the seriousness of the misconduct.
- Handicap or other relevant personal circumstances.
- Provocation.

- Procedural fairness considerations.
 - Employment history.
 - Potential to reform or rehabilitate the police officer.
 - Effect on police officer and police officer's family.
 - Consistency of disposition.
 - Specific and general deterrence.
 - Employer approach to misconduct in question.
 - Damage to the reputation of the police force.
-
- Not all of these factors are relevant to the present case
-
- Many of these factors stem from the seminal decision of Williams and Ontario Provincial Police (1995), 2 O.P.R. 1047 (OCCPS)

Public Interest

- This factor deals with ensuring that the public interest of ensuring a high standard of conduct for police officers, while also ensuring that the public remains confident in police services

- It is our position that the requested penalty of a forfeiture of 80 hours pay satisfies the public interest factor.

- PC LaCoursiere is being held responsible for his actions through the forfeiture of pay as a penalty.
- This represents a loss of salary of approximately \$4,000
- Moreover, the public complainant is in agreement with the proposed penalty, which also serves to satisfy the public interest component

Seriousness of Misconduct

- Seriousness of the misconduct is a fundamental consideration
- In our submission, PC LaCoursiere's conduct represents serious misconduct
- As a police officer, one of PC LaCoursiere's primary duties is to assist victims of crime
- In assisting victims of crime, an officer needs to be sensitive to the position he/she holds as a police officer and the vulnerability of the victim(s) he/she are assisting

- In *Krug*, the Commission reflects this fundamental role by citing Section 1(4) of the PSA and noting the general principles that govern the provision of policing as follows at page 12:

1. Police services shall be provided throughout Ontario in accordance with the following principles...

- 4. The importance of respect for victims of crime and understanding their needs.*

Further section 42(1)(c) of the Act imposes on every police officer the clear legal duty and responsibility for "assisting victims of crime".

- These statements from *Krug* reflect the principle that police officers' conduct in relation to victims of abuse is held to a high standard and police officers have to a duty to be sensitive to victims of abuse
- The present case involved a call for service related to a domestic assault occurring in the home with 2 infant twins present.
- There were visible signs of injury on J.L.

- PC LaCoursiere is veteran Police Officer with, at the time, over 25 years of service

- PC LaCoursiere was aware of his duty, pursuant to both provincial and WPS directives to charge S.G. with domestic assault but failed to do so.

- There is no question that PC LaCoursiere's actions caused discredit to the reputation of the WPS and constituted serious misconduct.

- In considering our joint submission on a forfeiture of pay, you should also consider the effect that PC LaCoursiere's conduct may have had on the victim

Brudlo and Toronto Police, OCCPS, 23 Nov. 2005 at para 15

- In this case, PC LaCoursiere's neglect of duty adversely affected J.L. in regard to an ongoing custody dispute with S.G.

- J.L. has been fully apprised of this disciplinary process and has expressed his consent and agreement to the proposed penalty.

- As such, in consideration the effect PC LaCoursiere's actions had on J.L., it is clear that his actions did have a negative effect on J.L, but he has moved on and is content with the proposed penalty.

Recognition of Seriousness of Misconduct

- Pleading guilty to disciplinary allegations constitutes a recognition of the seriousness of the misconduct, which is a mitigating factor

Carson and Pembroke Police (2001), 3 OPR 1479

- PC LaCoursiere's guilty pleas to the disciplinary charge of Neglect of Duty demonstrates his recognition of the seriousness of his misconduct
- In addition, PC LaCoursiere has apologized for his actions directly to J.L. through this apology to J.L. set out in the Agreed Statement of Facts filed before you today.

- PC LaCoursiere has also cooperated in the resolution of this matter and the preparation of the Agreed Statement of Facts
- His guilty pleas; formal written apology and cooperation in this proceeding demonstrate his recognition of the seriousness of his misconduct and are mitigating factors in consideration of an appropriate penalty

Handicap or Other Relevant Personal Circumstances

- We are not aware of any handicap or other relevant personal circumstances in regard to PC LaCoursiere
- This factor, in our view, is not relevant to this proceeding.

Provocation

- This is not a relevant factor in this matter

Procedural Fairness Considerations

- This is not a relevant factor in this matter

Employment History

- Consideration of an officer's employment history is a standard factor to consider
- It can serve as both a mitigating and aggravating factor
- PC LaCoursiere does not have any prior discipline on record.
- PC LaCoursiere has served with the WPS since 1993 and is a veteran officer with over 26 years of service
- PC LaCoursiere's service record contains several commendations
- His length of service, lack of discipline on record and commendations all serve as mitigating factors

Potential to reform or rehabilitate the police officer.

- An officer's potential to rehabilitate, or put another way the likelihood of recurrence is an important consideration.
- As already indicated, Corrective Dispositions should prevail, where possible. Emphasis on a more remedial philosophy over a punitive philosophy disciplinary penalties

- PSA case law has held that unless the offence is so egregious and unmitigated, the opportunity to reform should be a significant consideration (*Andrews v. Midland Police* – 2003)
- By pleading guilty PC LaCoursiere must be viewed as accepting responsibility for his actions and as such, the WPS acknowledges that the potential to rehabilitate exists and he should be given the opportunity to reform.

Effect on police officer and police officer’s family

- Although the proposed penalty will result in a substantial loss of salary for PC LaCoursiere, it is our submission that the proposed penalty will not create an undue or special hardship on him or his family

Consistency of disposition.

- Consistency in penalty has been a hallmark dispositional factor for many years
- It has been widely recognised as an important penalty consideration (*Schofield and Metropolitan Toronto Police* – 1984)
- Hearing Officer must strive to ensure that the penalty issued is treated in a similar fashion as similar misconduct, while recognizing that no case is exactly the same as another
- We have provided several decisions in our Brief of Authorities that deal with similar facts, primarily involving NEGLECT OF DUTY
- In *Mowers and Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police*, the Ontario Civilian Police Commission considered an officer’s neglect when subject to a police service policy on domestic violence.¹

¹ *Mowers v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Service*, 1999 CanLII 31610 (ON CPC).

- The subject officer in *Mowers* encountered an individual who had previously been charged with domestic assault. One of the conditions of this prior charge was that the individual was forbidden from being within three blocks of his spouse. The individual was in breach of this condition because the officer confronted the individual outside of a residence in which the spouse was living. The police service had a policy which required the officer to conduct a proper investigation in cases of domestic violence. However, the officer failed to investigate the individual's intentions further or make an arrest in relation to the breach of condition.

- The subject officer was subsequently charged with multiple counts of misconduct, including a neglect of duty. The OCPC determined that the misconduct in this case was serious, and that it was fortunate that "serious consequences did not arise as a result of [the subject officer's] neglect."²

- The OCPC considered other mitigating and aggravating factors, and ultimately affirmed a penalty to reduce the rank of the officer by one grade for a period of six (6) months.

- The serious nature of misconduct in cases of domestic violence is a theme which is present in another relevant OCPC decision.

- In *Turgeon v. Ontario Provincial Police and G.C.*, the subject officer appealed the decision that he had neglected his duty as well as the imposed penalty requiring him to forfeit forty (40) hours.³

- The officer had interviewed a woman at the detachment, who reported an incident of domestic violence concerning her husband.

- The officer was charged because he labelled the woman as "cuckoo" and failed to investigate further, as was required by the OPP's Domestic Violence Occurrence Policy.

² Ibid., at para 53.

³ *Turgeon v. Ontario Provincial Police and G.C.*, 2012 ONCPC 11 (CanLII).

- The initial Hearing Officer found that this was a “very serious incident” and concluded that the penalty “must signal to all members that this is clearly an unacceptable response to a domestic violence complaint.”⁴
- The OCPC affirmed this conclusion on appeal as a reasonable finding, and dismissed the appeal.
- Although not directly on point factually, *Mowers* and *Turgeon* decisions provide guidance with respect to an appropriate penalty range for similar cases of neglect of duty (6 month demotion – forfeiture of 40 hours pay)
- PC LaCoursiere has plead guilty to 1 counts of neglect of duty
- The joint submission on penalty is consistent with the *Mowers* and *Turgeon* decisions
- In our submission, PC LaCoursiere’s actions are serious; however they do not rise to the seriousness of the *Mowers* case (which involved other misconduct) wherein a 6 month demotion was seen as the appropriate penalty.
- Rather, PC LaCoursiere’s actions are more similar to the factual scenario in the *Turgeon* case, which is why the parties are jointly submitting that a forfeiture of 80 hours pay is appropriate in these circumstances.
- Consequently, the proposed penalty reflects the seriousness of the misconduct and is consistent with similar neglect of duty cases
- Moreover, the public complainant in this case is supportive of proposed penalty
- In our submission, when you consider the nature of the misconduct in question, the seriousness of it, the circumstances surrounding the misconduct, and all of the

⁴ Ibid., at para 89.

circumstances of this case, the proposed penalty falls well within the range of possible penalties for similar misconduct

Specific and general deterrence.

- Deterrence of the respondent officer and other officers is legitimate objective of police discipline
- It is our submission that the proposed penalty will serve as both a specific deterrence to PC LaCoursiere, but also as a general deterrence to other officers

Damage to the reputation of the police force.

- Although this matter has not been reported on in the media, there is no question that PC LaCoursiere's misconduct has damaged the reputation of the WPS and his fellow officers

Conclusion

- The penalty that is being jointly submitted for endorsement and acceptance is reasonable in the circumstances of this case;
- It is commiserate with the seriousness of the misconduct;

- It properly takes into account the appropriate factors to be considered in assessing penalty;
- And it is consistent with prior Commission decisions regarding penalty for similar misconduct
- Our submission also takes into account the relevant mitigating circumstances (isolated incident; acceptance of responsibility; apology to the complainant; support of the complainant; lengthy unblemished employment record)
- We would jointly ask that you consider our joint submission and endorse the proposed penalty

Ms. Carroccia representing Constable LaCoursiere stated that she was in agreement with the submissions and cases that Mr. Amyot submitted to the Tribunal. She stated that this officer initially had set dates for a Hearing and then decided to plea guilty to the Count of Neglect of Duty to avoid a lengthy Hearing. She stated that LaCoursiere regrets his conduct and how it adversely affected the Complainant. She reminded the Tribunal that two officers were present for this incident and one has now retired. She advised the tribunal that Constable LaCoursiere will do better in the future and he has learned from this incident.

The complainant J.L. also addressed the Tribunal. He stated that this was an unfortunate incident and it was unfortunate that one officer has retired. He stated that he was aware that Constable LaCoursiere has an exemplary service record with the Service. He stated the following in his address to the Tribunal.

“Given his service record it would turn the outcome of this Hearing into an opportunity to educate, promote understanding that men are also victims of domestic violence. Helping to illustrate what can happen when domestic violence charges are not laid. It also points out that the public appreciates the efforts of the police. Regardless of intentions we all make mistakes. It is just a matter of learning, sharing, and moving forward.”

J.L. expressed dismay in the investigation and the nightmare it has caused for his family.

J.L. agrees with Counsel's position on the disposition.

In Williams and the Ontario Provincial Police, the Commission identified three key elements a Hearing Officer must take into account when imposing a penalty. These include: the nature of the seriousness of the misconduct, the ability to reform or rehabilitate the officer, and the damage for the reputation of the police force that would occur if this officer remained on the Force.

In Legal Aspects of Policing at pages 6-93) the author (Paul Ceysens) states the following in relation to guidance in Neglect of Duty counts:

In Ontario, a peace officer commits Neglect of Duty when he or she "without lawful excuse, neglects or omits promptly and diligently to perform a duty as a member of the police force."

The leading judicial decision concerning failure to promptly and diligently discharge duty is P.G. v. Police Complaints Commissioner (1996) 90 O.A.C. 103 (Div. Court). This case considered the provisions of the Ontario scheme as stated above.

In P.G., the Divisional Court ruled that either of two situations is required in order to establish neglect of duty:

1. "there was some element of willfulness" in the police officer's neglect; or
2. "there was a degree of neglect which would make the matter cross the line from a mere performance consideration to a matter of misconduct".

The Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services as it was known at that time has ruled that the employer must establish that the police officer was required to perform a duty, and that he or she failed to perform this duty because of neglect, or did not perform the duty in a prompt and diligent manner. If these two burdens are established, the police officer bears the burden of establishing lawful excuse.

I will not recite the cases in their totality, however I have read and considered the cases that I was provided by Counsel. As learned Counsel have stated, there are no cases found which parallel the case that is before me at present. The cases as provided are for guidance to the disposition penalty that Counsel has sought to be appropriate for the findings of guilt on the Neglect of Duty count rendered on June 28, 2019.

The cases provided by Counsel can be considered as instructive in assisting the Tribunal to reach an appropriate disposition.

I must be guided by the OCCPS decision of Schofield and Metropolitan Police Service.

“Consistency in the disciplinary process is often the benchmark of principles. The penalty must be consistent with the facts, and consistent with similar cases that have been dealt with on earlier occasions.”

Accountability, ethical behaviour and conduct are at a standard much higher than the public we serve. It is generally known and an accepted fact that the law requires a higher standard of conduct with Police Officers in their lives than the ordinary citizen.

Credibility, honesty, integrity are characteristics that are earned. As one elevates him / herself through the ranks of this proud organization; those characteristics are more revered and treasured. It helps to create the professional image and excellence that the Windsor Police officers strive to maintain.

In determining disposition, I must give due consideration for the public interest. It is common knowledge that the public holds Police Officers in a position of high trust. It is therefore extremely important that the Windsor Police Service demonstrate that members will be held to that standard. There is no doubt that the charge of Neglect of Duty has been proven by the guilty plea entered by this officer and the supporting joint submission of the Agreed Statement of Fact.

Constable LaCoursiere has been a member of the Windsor Police Service since 1993. He is noted for his diligent police work that has earned him the respect of his superiors. He is a highly respected member of the Service. Reading these accolades it makes it even more difficult to understand why this officer conducted himself in the way which he did to lead to these charges. Constable LaCoursiere also has numerous letters of tribute, commendations and support in his file. These letters act as mitigating factors in my decision.

Members of the Windsor Police Service are expected to investigate criminal activity in a professional and thorough manner. Reports are expected to be filed forthwith as policy dictates with this Service. In this case, we have a public complainant J.L and his son which were directly affected by Constable LaCoursiere’s actions. The public must be confident that the police will strive to set the example for those in the community. Anything short of this will be seen as a contradiction and serve no other purpose but to undermine the efforts of all serving officers and the explicit goals of the Windsor Police Service.

I feel relatively confident that this experience, pleading guilty at the earliest opportunity that Constable LaCoursiere has learned from his indiscretion and that he is fully prepared to take responsibility for his actions. I believe this also sends a strong message to all police officers that you must consider when investigating domestic issues that you do so in an honourable, thorough and professional manner.

It is commendable that Constable LaCoursiere recognizes and accepts that his actions were irresponsible and unacceptable as a police officer. My only hope now is that Constable LaCoursiere follows through on his promise to the Tribunal to uphold the core values of a police officer and conduct himself accordingly.

Constable LaCoursiere has no prior disciplinary issues on file. He has tributes and letters of support on file as presented by Mr. Amyot in Exhibit #4.

He has pled Guilty to the charge of Neglect of Duty before this Tribunal and I believe he has learned from the process he has endured throughout this investigation by the Professional Standards Unit of the Windsor Police Service and understands the position as submitted by J.L.

You are accountable for your actions and any deviance from those actions, the Windsor Police Service will hold you accountable. This is what the public expects of the management of this Police Service.

Short of dismissal, it is unknown to this Tribunal or to the Windsor Police Service whether this conduct will continue by this officer.

The proposed joint penalty submission submitted by Counsel in this matter suggests to me that the officer can be rehabilitated and once again be useful to this proud organization.

The Windsor Police Service will not tolerate unacceptable behaviour by its members. The rank structure within the Windsor Police Service is the backbone of the organization. It must be respected. The proposed joint submission as submitted I believe sends a message to the organization and its members.

The Windsor Police Service views this misconduct as serious and is cognizant that a penalty must be imposed to protect the interest of the public we serve

Constable LaCoursiere, as a senior member of this organization, you have conducted yourself with a total lack of professionalism, judgment and courtesy, which is expected of all members of the Windsor Police Service.

I commend you for attending your Hearing in Windsor on June 28, 2019 with your Counsel Ms. Carroccia and pleading Guilty to the misconduct charges as quickly as you have done. It was obvious to me that you wished to put this situation behind you. I will take into consideration your forthright manner in assessing the appropriate disposition.

I may have been more inclined to administer a more stringent penalty if it were not for the positive comments and observations relayed to me by Counsel and the supporting documentation that was presented by Counsel.

I have considered the submissions by Counsel, the agreed statement of facts and the joint penalty submission agreed to by Counsel and Constable LaCoursiere.

Disposition:

In light of the seriousness of this allegation and bearing in mind all the evidence placed before me, Constable Kevin LaCoursiere #7556 will forfeit eighty (80) hours of banked overtime, lieu days or annual leave pursuant to Section 85 (1) (f) of the Police Services Act.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M.P.B. Elbers", followed by "Supt. (R)" written in a similar style.

**M.P.B. Elbers, Superintendent
(Retired)**

**July 10, 2019
Date**