



## **Board of Ethics**

---

### **Monroe County, New York**

The Monroe County Board of Ethics is responsible for reviewing claims against Monroe County officers and employees concerning breach of ethics and conflicts of interest.

On April 27, 2024, and April 30, 2024, the Monroe County Board of Ethics received official requests from the Monroe County Legislature to complete an inquiry into the conduct of Monroe County District Attorney Sandra Doorley following an April 22, 2024, traffic stop.

The Monroe County Board of Ethics has completed its inquiry. Attached is the final report. A public release of this report is also available on the Monroe County Office of Public Integrity website.

Please contact Janson D. McNair, Chairperson of the Monroe County Board of Ethics, with any questions at 585-753-3100.

## Monroe County Board of Ethics Report

Pursuant to Section 45-25.B. of the Code of Ethics of the County of Monroe

July 18, 2024

This report is issued pursuant to the provisions of, and in accordance with the powers vested in the Ethics Board of Monroe County (the “**Ethics Board**”) by, (i) Article 18 of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York (the “**GML**”), and, in particular, §808 thereof, and (ii) the Code of Ethics of the County of Monroe (Chapter 45 of the Code of Monroe County (the “**County Code**”), §§45-1 through 45-25 (collectively, the “**County Ethics Code**”), and, in particular, § 45-25.B. thereof. The Ethics Board has on its own initiative conducted a review of the circumstances of a traffic stop in the Town of Webster by Webster Police Officer Cameron Crisafulli (“**Officer Crisafulli**” or the “**Officer**”) in the late afternoon of April 22, 2024 involving Monroe County District Attorney Sandra Doorley (the “**District Attorney**” or “**District Attorney Doorley**”) pursuant to § 45-25.B of the County Ethics Code and, as authorized by that section, pursuant to a written complaint, dated April 30, 2024, submitted to the Ethics Board by thirteen (13) members of the Monroe County Legislature.

### I. Findings of Fact

The Ethics Board hereby makes the findings of fact hereinafter set forth regarding the events that took place on April 22, 2024 and its immediate aftermath. These findings are derived from a review of the following sources:

- (a) Town of Webster Police Department (the “**Police Department**”) video footage taken from the body-worn camera of Officer Crisafulli during the events that occurred in the driveway and garage of the District Attorney’s home, as that footage was set out in an April 27, 2024 article reported by Robert Bell of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle (the “**BWC Footage**”) and the unredacted version of the same furnished to the Monroe County Office of Public Integrity (the “**OPI**” or the “**Office of Public Integrity**”) by the Police Department;
- (b) A transcript of the BWC Footage prepared for the OPI, a copy of which is appended to this report as Exhibit A (the “**OPI Transcript**”);
- (c) Internal memorandum of Town of Webster Police Chief Dennis J. Kohlmeier (“**Chief Kohlmeier**”), dated April 22, 2024 summarizing the substance of the three (3) telephone calls initiated by District Attorney Doorley to him on that date at 5:43 p.m., 5:45 p.m. and 5:52 p.m. (the “**Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum**”);

- (d) Internal memorandum of Town of Webster Police Lieutenant Jeffrey Webster (“**Lieutenant Webster**”), completed between April 22 and April 23, 2024, regarding his conversation with District Attorney Doorley at her home during the April 22<sup>nd</sup> traffic stop (the “**Lieutenant Webster Memorandum**”);
- (e) The April 25, 2024 written statement issued by District Attorney Doorley to News10 NBC (the “**Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement**”);
- (f) The April 29, 2024 video statement and apology issued by the District Attorney as that video statement was set out and made viewable in an article of that same date reported by Gary Craig in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle (the “**Doorley April 29<sup>th</sup> Statement**”);
- (g) The extended video interview conducted by News10NBC investigative reporter Jennifer Lewke on April 30, 2024 with District Attorney Doorley and set out and made viewable on the News10 website, reported April 30 and updated May 1, 2024 (the “**Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview**”);
- (h) The Guest Column by the District Attorney appearing in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, dated May 2, 2024, captioned “I made a colossal mistake” (the “**Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement**”); and
- (i) Report of the Monroe County Office of Public Integrity, dated July 15, 2024, regarding “Ethics complaint against District Attorney” (the “**OPI Report**”).

**A. The April 22, 2024 Traffic Stop.**

On April 22, 2024, at approximately 5:20 p.m., District Attorney Doorley drove home from her office<sup>1</sup> in a black SUV owned or leased by the County of Monroe (the “**County**”) and we believe made available for her use pursuant to the Motor Vehicle Rules and Regulations for County Vehicles, effective February 1, 2017 (the “**County Vehicle Policy**”).<sup>2</sup> While on Phillips Road in the Town of Webster, with a maximum speed limit of 35 miles per hour, District Attorney Doorley was traveling at a speed of 55 miles per hour, 20 miles per hour in excess of the posted speed limit.<sup>3</sup> The District Attorney did not stop her vehicle on Phillips Road in response to the lights and siren from Officer Crisafulli’s vehicle, proceeding instead to her home where she exited the car and engaged Officer Crisafulli who had pulled his vehicle into the driveway of her home.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview.

<sup>2</sup> It is noted that the District Attorney’s vehicle does not bear official Monroe County license plates, a practice which is customary for certain County officials such as the District Attorney and the Monroe County Sheriff.

<sup>3</sup> The speed at which the District Attorney’s vehicle was traveling on Phillips Road that afternoon is established by several of the sources cited above, including the BWC Footage and the Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement.

1. Failure to Stop.

In response to her driving beyond the posted speed limit, Officer Crisafulli pulled his police vehicle immediately behind the District Attorney's car and activated his vehicle's lights and siren in an effort to alert her that she was to pull over to the side of Phillips Road and stop her car.<sup>4</sup> The District Attorney did not do so. Instead, she proceeded to drive her vehicle to her nearby home where she parked her car in the garage and exited her vehicle, at which point Office Crisafulli pulled his vehicle into the driveway of her home to effectuate a legal traffic stop.

The District Attorney has offered a few, somewhat differing explanations as to why she failed to pull her vehicle over on Phillips Road. She initially advised Officer Crisafulli on April 22<sup>nd</sup> that she did not see the lights or hear the siren of his vehicle because she was on the phone.<sup>5</sup> Later, in that same interaction with Officer Crisafulli she states that "I didn't know that you were stopping me. There were lots of other people on the road." When Officer Crisafulli replied that he was right behind her at the time, she responded, "Yeah. There were other people on that road too." She then stated that she "thought [Officer Crisafulli was] going somewhere else because I thought no one would ever pull a black SUV after you ran my plates."<sup>6</sup> In her conversation with another Webster police officer who arrived at her home during the traffic stop, District Attorney Doorley stated that "He [i.e. Officer Crisafulli] turned around. I didn't know it was me. I wasn't sure because there were cars going back and forth. Then I got turning into Fieldcrest and I'm like, I'm just going to drive home, that's what I did."<sup>7</sup>

Nevertheless, on several occasions during the April 22<sup>nd</sup> stop in her driveway and garage District Attorney Doorley indicated that, at some point, she did become aware that Officer Crisafulli was, in fact, attempting to pull her over. At one point in her interaction with the Officer, she told him that "half the time I was on the phone with Dennis [Chief Kohlmeier] telling him why are you pulling me over."<sup>8</sup> She later told another Webster police officer who subsequently arrived at her home during that stop that "I was just trying to pull into my driveway. I was on the phone with Dennis Kohlmeier saying, would you please tell the person who is following me that I'm almost home."<sup>9</sup> She told that same Webster police officer that "I got on the phone with Dennis. I don't know, even before I turned in---when I turned in, I said, you know, it's me that they're stopping, just tell them it's me."<sup>10</sup> Finally, in her discussion that afternoon with Sergeant Johnson of the Police Department, District Attorney Doorley all but conceded that she was aware that Officer Crisafulli was attempting to pull her over on Phillips Road. Sergeant Johnson asked "Why would you not just pull over? You made it a bigger deal than it needed to be. And you knew why

---

<sup>4</sup> OPI Transcript, p.2, lines 12-13; p.5, lines 5-6.

<sup>5</sup> OPI Transcript, p.2, lines 14, 15. We note that the District Attorney indicated that she was using her phone in hands-free mode as required by law. OPI Transcript, pp.2, lines 19, 20; p.6, lines 23, 24.

<sup>6</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 7, lines 13-15. See also OPI Transcript, p. 12, lines 24, 25. Officer Crisafulli advised the District Attorney that he did not run her plates put rather called them out. OPI Transcript, P. 7, lines 16, 17.

<sup>7</sup> OPI Transcript, p.11, lines13-19.

<sup>8</sup> OPI Transcript, p.6, lines 17-19.

<sup>9</sup> OPI Transcript, p.8, lines 22-24.

<sup>10</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 11, lines 20-21.

you were getting stopped, clearly.” The District Attorney responded, “Clearly”.<sup>11</sup> She then went on to say that “I didn’t want to stop on Phillips Road. I was right down the street. I figured I would just stop in my driveway. That’s what I figured. I thought it would be easier. Apparently, I was wrong.”<sup>12</sup>

## 2. Telephone Calls by District Attorney to Chief Kohlmeier.

As noted above, the District Attorney called Chief Kohlmeier on three (3) separate occasions during the incident. It is not entirely clear from the District Attorney’s comments on April 22<sup>nd</sup> whether she placed the first call to Chief Kohlmeier while she was on Phillips Road or only after she turned onto Fieldcrest, but Chief Kohlmeier indicates in the Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum that it took place at 5:43 p.m. and lasted eighteen (18) seconds. When he received that call on his work cell phone, District Attorney Doorley “said something to me along the lines of ‘Tell your officer to stop fucking following me.’ When I asked what she meant, she said one of our officers is following her through her neighborhood. I was confused by what she meant and told her that I would find out what was going on. As I was hanging up the phone, she said something about the officer having there [sic] lights and siren on.”<sup>13</sup>

The second phone call by the District Attorney took place while she was in her garage<sup>14</sup> approximately 2 minutes later at 5:49 p.m. and lasted fifty-nine (59) seconds.<sup>15</sup> District Attorney Doorley asked Chief Kohlmeier to speak with Officer Crisafulli. In their conversation, Officer

---

<sup>11</sup> OPI Transcript, p.14, lines18-21.

<sup>12</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 15, lines 6-10. See also the Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum in which Chief Kohlmeier states that in her third phone call to him on the afternoon of April 22<sup>nd</sup> District Attorney Doorley stated that she did not want to stop on Phillips Road and chose to drive home instead. See also the Lieutenant Webster Memorandum (“The DA said that she chose not to stop on Phillips Road at 5:30, and I reiterated that it is not her choice whether to stop or not and that decision is the reason that three Officers, a Sergeant and Lieutenant had to respond lights and sirens for a vehicle that was refusing to stop”). In her subsequent comments regarding her failure to stop her vehicle when required, District Attorney Doorley indicated that there was no good answer and that it was a mistake not to do so. See Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview and Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement.

In a comment District Attorney Dooley made to Officer Crisafulli on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, she remarked about having to deal that day with three homicides in the City of Rochester. See OPI Transcript, p. 7, lines 6-9, and p.9, lines 14-15. The District Attorney told Lieutenant Webster that afternoon that “she just had a bad day, there were four people shot in the city, and three of them were homicides. She mentioned how terrible it was to have to see a man murdered in his taxi and on top of that a lawyer took their [sic] own life.” See the Lieutenant Webster Memorandum. In subsequent comments addressing her behavior that day, she referred to the three (3) homicides (without mention of them occurring in the City of Rochester), as well as having watched a video of the execution of an innocent taxicab driver and learning of a frightening medical issue involving her husband. See Doorley April 29<sup>th</sup> Statement and Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement.

<sup>13</sup> District Attorney Doorley confirmed the duration of that first call but could not recall exactly what was said in that conversation. See Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview.

<sup>14</sup> See BWC Footage.

<sup>15</sup> Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum.

Crisafulli explained to Chief Kohlmeier that he attempted unsuccessfully to get her to stop her vehicle and that she was not complying with any of his commands.<sup>16</sup>

The third and final phone call by the District Attorney to Chief Kohlmeier occurred about seventeen (17) minutes later at 5:52 p.m. and was one (1) minute in duration.<sup>17</sup> As set out in the Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum, District Attorney Doorley “explained that she was speeding and did not want to stop on Phillips Road and chose to drive to her house. She seemed upset that the officer did not recognize her vehicle. She also said that the officers were waiting for a supervisor to show up. I said that the officer would not know who she was based on the vehicle and that she should have pulled over. As we were on the phone she said that [Webster Police Lieutenant] Jeff Webster was there, that she was going to talk to him and hung up.”<sup>18</sup>

In addition to the three (3) calls placed to Chief Kohlmeier, District Attorney Doorley twice told Officer Crisafulli to call the Chief. The first time occurred at the outset of the interaction between Officer Crisafulli and the District Attorney in the driveway to her home.<sup>19</sup> The second occasion took place just moments later.<sup>20</sup>

### 3. Identity of Office.

On three occasions during the traffic stop at her home, District Attorney Doorley identified herself by her official position.<sup>21</sup> Immediately upon exiting her vehicle in the garage, she told Officer Crisafulli, “[S]orry, I’m the DA. I was going 55 coming home from work.”<sup>22</sup> When Officer Crisafulli later asked “You say you’re a DA?”, District Attorney Doorley responded, “I am the DA....Let me get you my badge. I am the DA of Monroe County.”<sup>23</sup> Subsequently, when asked by Officer Crisafulli why she called him an “asshole”, she replied, “I am the DA of Monroe County.”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> OPI Transcript p.3, lines 13-25, and p.4, lines 1-7. Chief Kohlmeier confirms the substance of the second phone call from the District Attorney in the Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum. He states that she advised him that “an officer was at her house and that she was doing 50 [sic] mph on Phillips Road and that he was trying to stop her. She stated that it was Officer Crisafulli and asked me to talk to him. She then apparently handed him the phone. I was able to hear him give her instructions that she said that she was not going to follow. He then explained to me that he observed her speeding and that he tried to stop her when she continued driving to her house. I could hear him continue to give instructions not to go into her house. I told him to get a supervisor to the scene to assist him. He then hung up the phone.”

<sup>17</sup> Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum.

<sup>18</sup> Chief Kohlmeier’s summary of the third phone call from the District Attorney is consistent with what the BWC Footage reveals took place at this point in the traffic stop. See also OPI Transcript, p. 12, lines 13-25, and p.13, line 1.

<sup>19</sup> OPI Transcript p.2, lines 4-5. “I don’t really care. So you can call Dennis.”

<sup>20</sup> OPI Transcript p.2, lines 9-10. “Yes it is. You can call Dennis Kohlmeier right now.”

<sup>21</sup> The District Attorney also retrieved her badge of office from her vehicle and displayed it to Officer Crisafulli. See OPI Transcript, p. 5, lines 22-23.

<sup>22</sup> OPI Transcript, p.2, lines 1-2.

<sup>23</sup> OPI Transcript, p.5, lines 19-23.

<sup>24</sup> OPI Transcript, p.6, lines 1-4.

In three additional instances, District Attorney Doorley referenced the role that she or her office could or would play in the possible disposition of this matter. When Officer Crisafulli stated that her position as District Attorney did not give her the right to go 55 mph in a 35-mph zone, she replied, "I don't care. I don't really care. You know what, if you give me a traffic ticket, that's fine. I'm the one who prosecutes it, okay, just go ahead and do it. Go ahead."<sup>25</sup> Later, when Officer Crisafulli advised her that when, as in this instance, there is a legal traffic stop he has the right to detain her until the stop is completed, she responded, "[T]hen just write me the fucking ticket. I really don't care....Because I'm the one that's going to prosecute myself. You know what I'll do with the ticket?"<sup>26</sup> Finally, after Officer Crisafulli handed the speeding ticket<sup>27</sup> he issued over to her, District Attorney Doorley said, again, "[T]hat's fine. That's fine. I'll take care of it since I'll be prosecuting myself."<sup>28</sup> The District Attorney has since pled guilty to the speeding ticket and paid the fine and surcharge imposed pursuant to the Vehicle & Traffic Law of the State of New York.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4. Refusal to Cooperate with Officer Crisafulli and Comply with his Directions.

The BWC Footage captures repeated failures and refusals on the part of the District Attorney to comply with the lawful directions and commands of Officer Crisafulli during the traffic stop at her home. It also captures numerous comments in which she disregarded Officer Crisafulli and his efforts to properly effectuate a lawful traffic stop. Her comments and actions resulted in Officer Crisafulli, at the recommendation of Chief Kohlmeier, calling for assistance from a supervisor.

While on the phone with Chief Kohlmeier a second time, District Attorney Doorley expressly refused to comply with a direction by the Officer to stay at the back of her vehicle.<sup>30</sup> Against the express command of Officer Crisafulli, she went inside her home. When later advised by the Officer that she could not just go inside since this was a traffic stop, she replied, "I understand the law better than you. Would you just leave me---would you just leave me alone?"<sup>31</sup> After overhearing Officer Crisafulli calling for the assistance of a supervisor (as recommended by Chief Kohlmeier), she said, "No. Get out of my fucking house."<sup>32</sup> Shortly afterward, District Attorney Doorley stated to the Officer, "I am not dealing with you right now" and then, in response to his request that she step over to a specific location, she responded, "I'm not going to."<sup>33</sup> Later in their interaction Officer Crisafulli asked the District Attorney to "[J]ust come outside over here" to which she responded, "No. I'm not going outside....I'm waiting for you just to leave."<sup>34</sup> Once

---

<sup>25</sup> OPI Transcript, p.6, lines 9-13.

<sup>26</sup> OPI Transcript, p.6, lines 17-25; p. 7, lines1-2.

<sup>27</sup> The ticket was issued for violation of Section 1180(d) of the Vehicle and Traffic Law of the State of New York which provides that no person shall drive in excess of the maximum established speed limits at any time.

<sup>28</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 18, lines 7-9.

<sup>29</sup> Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement; Doorley April 29<sup>th</sup> Statement. See also, OPI Report, Paragraph 25.

<sup>30</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 3, lines 4-6.

<sup>31</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 4, lines 8-12.

<sup>32</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 4, lines 13-16.

<sup>33</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 5, lines 11-15.

<sup>34</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 7, lines 24-25; p. 8, lines 1-4.

again, Officer Crisafulli asked that District Attorney Doorley come and stand at the back of her car to which she replied, "I'm not walking out there. I'm not. I'm not."<sup>35</sup>

When Officer Crisafulli first advised District Attorney Doorley that she was traveling at 55 miles per hour in a 35 miles per hour zone, she responded, "I don't really care."<sup>36</sup> She repeated that statement twice more in response to Officer Crisafulli's comment that she had exceeded the speed limit by 20 miles per hour.<sup>37</sup> When asked by Officer Crisafulli why she was acting so hostilely toward him for simply doing his job, District Attorney Doorley responded, "[Y]ou are being an asshole."<sup>38</sup> On several occasions the District Attorney indicated that she just wanted the Officer to "get...out of here",<sup>39</sup> "just leave me alone",<sup>40</sup> "just go away",<sup>41</sup> and "just leave me— would you just leave me alone"<sup>42</sup>.

#### 5. Possible Additional Violations.

Both Sergeant Johnson and Officer Crisafulli indicated in the course of the events on April 22<sup>nd</sup> at her home that the District Attorney had committed at least one offense that could subject her to arrest. Sergeant Johnson advised District Attorney Doorley that, when she failed to stop on Phillips Road as directed by Officer Crisafulli "you broke another law because of that, right? You should know better. This is not a traffic ticket. That's is [sic] an arrestable offense, Sandra. You know this."<sup>43</sup> Officer Crisafulli likewise indicated in his conversation with Sergeant Johnson and shortly afterwards with Lieutenant Webster that her actions in failing to stop were an "arrestable offense"<sup>44</sup> In none of those instances, however, was the precise nature of the arrestable offense or offenses referenced.<sup>45</sup>

#### B. Post-April 22<sup>nd</sup> Events.

---

<sup>35</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 10, lines 23-24; p. 11, lines 3-6..

<sup>36</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 2, lines 3-4.

<sup>37</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 6, lines 5-10. See also OPT Transcript, p. 6, lines 5-10, and OPI Transcript, p. 7, lines 6-9: "You know what I've been dealing with all day? Three murders in the city. And do you think I really care if I was going twenty miles over the speed limit?"

<sup>38</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 5, lines 24-25; p. 6, line 1.

<sup>39</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 3, lines 19-20.

<sup>40</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 2, line 25; p.3, line 1.

<sup>41</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 3, line 14.

<sup>42</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 4, lines 11-12.

<sup>43</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 14, lines 13-17.

<sup>44</sup> OPI Transcript, p. 16, lines 8-9; p. 17, lines 4-5.

<sup>45</sup> However, in a subsequent interview conducted by interviewers from the New York State Commission on Prosecutorial Conduct and investigators from the OPI, Officer Crisafulli indicated that he meant, at the time, unlawfully fleeing a police officer under the Penal Law of the State of New York (the "**Penal Law**") but then determined that the elements of the crime set out in the applicable section were not met. However, he still felt that that Section 1144(a) of the Vehicle and Traffic Law of the State of New York (the "**Vehicle and Traffic Law**") (Failure to Yield to an Emergency Vehicle) and/or Section 195.05 of the Penal Law (Obstructing Governmental Administration) would apply, but in his discretion chose not to charge either offense. See OPI Report, Paragraph 20. See also OPI Report, paragraph 23 in which Lieutenant Webster said in his interview that he did believe that the elements of Obstructing Governmental Administration under the Penal Law were met but Officer Crisafulli using his discretion chose not to charge District Attorney Doorley with it.



In the days immediately following April 22<sup>nd</sup>, District Attorney Doorley publicly addressed the events that took place at her home on that date. On April 25, 2024, she issued a written statement to the media which reads in its entirety as follows:

On Monday, April 22, 2024, I was driving home following a busy day at work. I admit that I was not paying attention to my speed on Phillips Road in the Town of Webster. Less than half a mile from my neighborhood, I noticed a Webster Police car behind me. Once I realized that the intention of the car was to pull me over, I called the Webster Police Chief to inform him that I was not a threat and that I would speak to the Officer at my house down the street.<sup>46</sup> The Webster Police Officer followed me to my house and issued me a speeding ticket for my speed of 55mph in a 35mph zone. I acknowledged that I was speeding and I accepted the ticket. By 1:00PM the following day, I pled guilty and sent the ticket to the Webster Town Court because I believe in accepting responsibility for my actions and had no intention of using my position to receive a benefit. Nobody, including your District Attorney, is above the rule of law, even traffic laws. Anybody who knows me understands without a doubt that I have dedicated my entire 33 year career to the safety of this community. My work to ensure the safety and respect of law enforcement is well proven time and time again. I stand by my work and stand by my commitment to the public safety of Monroe County.<sup>47</sup>

When asked later about this statement District Attorney Doorley responded that “[T]he first statement went out for the sake of transparency. I wanted to make sure that I was being transparent in what I did. I’ve always been very clear about, you know, what I’ve done in this office. At that point, I was not even thinking about the body worn camera. I just wanted to make sure that it was out there that I got pulled over by the Webster Police and I got a speeding ticket and I had pled guilty to it.”<sup>48</sup>

In her first public statement that followed the issuance of the BWC Footage, District Attorney Doorley acknowledged that, by her actions on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, she had failed the community and the standards to which she holds herself. She repeated her apology to Officer Crisafulli<sup>49</sup> and to members of law enforcement. She acknowledged that what she did was wrong, that there were no excuses for it, that she was fully to blame, and that she took full responsibility for her actions. She acknowledged that she did not treat Officer Crisafulli with the respect that he, and all police

---

<sup>46</sup> In the Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview and the Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement, respectively, the District Attorney referenced the fact that she had the phone numbers of all police chiefs on her phone and that she speaks with them all the time. She reiterated in the Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement what she wrote in the Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement, that she had called Chief Kohlmeier “to tell him that I was not a threat and I’d talk to his officer in my driveway rather than on the roadway. But it was stupid. I wish I hadn’t done it.”

<sup>47</sup> Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement.

<sup>48</sup> Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview.

<sup>49</sup> At the conclusion of the traffic stop on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, District Attorney Doorley apologized to Officer Crisafulli. OPI Transcript, p.18. line 15. District Attorney Doorley also later indicated that she reached out on two occasions to Officer Crisafulli to speak to him to apologize and had left a message in each instance but hoped to be able to do so directly. See Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview. See also OPI Report, Paragraph 20.

officers, deserve. She stated that she was truly sorry and asked for forgiveness by the community. She stated that it was wrong for her to take the stress that she was experiencing from her work and a family health issue out on the officer “that was just doing his job.” She acknowledged that she owed full transparency to the community and would hold herself accountable in four (4) ways: (i) she would willingly pay the fine in connection with the speeding ticket to which she had already pled guilty; (ii) she would refer the entire matter to another district attorney for review<sup>50</sup> and would fully cooperate with that investigation; (iii) she would self-report the matter to the Grievance Committee<sup>51</sup> and would fully cooperate with that investigation; and (iv) she would discipline herself and undertake ethics training.<sup>52</sup> District Attorney Doorley’s acknowledgment of her wrongdoing and her public apology for her conduct on April 22<sup>nd</sup> are also fully reflected and repeated in the Doorley April 29<sup>th</sup> Interview and in the Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement.

## II. Applicable Statutory Provisions

### A. Article 18 of GML.

Matters related to conflicts of interest and ethical conduct on the part of municipal officers and employees are governed in the first instance by Article 18 of the GML. Those officers include “county officers” who are defined as including any officer or employee paid from county funds.<sup>53</sup> Accordingly, District Attorney Doorley and officers and employees of her office paid from County funds would be subject to these provisions of the GML.<sup>54</sup> Article 18 deals with certain state-wide rules applicable to municipal officers and employees, including, for example, (i) whether and under what circumstances a municipal officer or employee can engage in business, or have an interest in a contract, with the municipality for which he/she serves, and (ii) the receipt and/or solicitation of gifts.

GML §806(1) mandates that certain municipalities, including counties, adopt a local code of ethics to supplement the state-wide rules of Article 18 and to provide standards of conduct with respect to matters not covered under the GML. The local ethics codes are required under GML §806(1) to address certain matters, but they may also include other standards relating to the conduct

---

<sup>50</sup> District Attorney Doorley requested that Onondaga County District Attorney William J. Fitzpatrick conduct such a review. However, when New York State Governor Kathy Hochul requested the New York State Commission on Prosecutorial Conduct to investigate this matter, District Attorney Fitzpatrick deferred to the Commission and chose not to proceed with the requested review.

<sup>51</sup> Attorney Grievance Committees are authorized to investigate, review, and prosecute complaints of attorney misconduct. While complaints regarding the conduct of attorneys in Rochester would typically be reviewed by the Grievance Committee for the Seventh Judicial District, we have been advised that this matter has been transferred for consideration to the Grievance Committee for the Eighth Judicial District in Buffalo.

<sup>52</sup> Doorley April 29<sup>th</sup> Statement.

<sup>53</sup> GML §800(5).

<sup>54</sup> The provisions of Section 74 of the Public Officers Law of the State of New York captioned “Code of Ethics” is by its terms not applicable to district attorneys or assistant district attorneys. See 1954 N.Y. Ops. Atty. Gen. 52 (Informal); 1957 N.Y. Ops. Atty. Gen. 100 (Informal).

of officers and employees as deemed advisable.<sup>55</sup> The local ethics code may regulate or proscribe conduct not expressly prohibited under Article 18 but may not authorize conduct prohibited by that Article or prohibit conduct expressly permitted thereby.<sup>56</sup>

GML Article 18 further authorizes counties and other municipalities to establish a board of ethics, the function of which is to provide, in relevant part, advisory opinions to municipal officers and employees with respect to the provisions of Article 18 and the local ethics code.<sup>57</sup> It may also, at the request of the municipality's governing body, provide recommendations with respect to the drafting and adoption of ethics codes and amendments thereto.<sup>58</sup> A municipality, including a county, may, by enactment of a local law, grant its ethics board the authority to receive complaints alleging violations of ethics regulations and standards, to investigate those complaints and, on its own initiative, conduct investigations as to whether any such violations exist. Likewise, the local board may be granted enforcement authority, including the administering of penalties.<sup>59</sup>

### **B. Chapter 45 of the Monroe County Code.**

Pursuant to the previously cited authority granted under GML Article 18, the County adopted Chapter 45 of the County Code (§§45-1 through 45-25) entitled the "Code of Ethics of the County of Monroe", recognizing that "there are rules of ethical conduct for public officers and employees that must be observed if a high degree of moral conduct is to be obtained and if public confidence is to be maintained in our unit of government."<sup>60</sup> The County Ethics Code is expressly intended to be in addition to any prohibitions set forth in GML Article 18 or any other general or special law relating to ethical conduct. (Id.)

Article II of the County Ethics Code (§§45-4 through 45-15), captioned "Standards of Conduct", details various prohibited or otherwise regulated activities and circumstances and defines the standards that county officers and employees are required to satisfy in the discharge of, or otherwise related to, their official duties. Section 45-4 sets out the general standard of conduct applicable to all county officials:

No officer or employee shall...engage in any business or transaction or activity...of any nature which is in conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest.

Other sections under Article II prohibit certain specific conduct or activities. Most relevant for the purposes of this report, however, are the provisions of §45-13, captioned "Course of Conduct". In particular, §45-13.A. provides that:

Every office or employee shall endeavor to pursue *a course of conduct which will not raise suspicion among the public that he is likely to be*

---

<sup>55</sup> GML §806(1)(a).

<sup>56</sup> GML § 806(1)(a); See also 1992 Ops. St. Compt. No. 92-30).

<sup>57</sup> GML §808(1)(3).

<sup>58</sup> GML §808(2).

<sup>59</sup> 1991 N.Y. Op. Atty. Gen. (Inf.) 1135; 91-68, October 25, 1991).

<sup>60</sup> County Ethics Code §45-2).

*engaged in acts that are in violation of his trust. He should not use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others.* He should not by his conduct give reasonable basis for the impression that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties or that he is affected by the kinship, position or influence of any party or person.

[emphasis added]

Finally, Article V of the County Ethics Code establishes the Ethics Board, setting forth its powers and duties which are consistent with those mandated and/or authorized under GML Article 18 and the informal opinion of the New York Attorney General.<sup>61</sup>

### III. Analysis and Conclusions

The Ethics Board's analysis is premised, as it must be in all instances, on the facts presented or made known to it, including by means of any related investigation that it may undertake. As previously noted in this report, in this instance those facts include the statements and information contained in the (i) BWC Footage, (ii) OPI Transcript, (iii) Chief Kohlmeier Memorandum, (iv) Lieutenant Webster Memorandum, (v) April 25 Doorley Written Statement, (vi) April 29 Doorley Video Statement, (vii) Doorley News10 Interview, (viii) Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement, and (ix) OPI Report.

At the outset, we acknowledge and have taken into full consideration in the issuance of this report that District Attorney Doorley has devoted herself to the service and safety of this community for approximately thirty-three years and has, as she herself has noted, worked to "ensure the safety and respect of law enforcement."<sup>62</sup> Her indisputably long career of public service cannot, however, serve to relieve the Ethics Board of its obligations, limited as they may be, to review and evaluate her conduct as a County officer in light of the provisions of the County Ethics Code when, as in this instance, properly called upon to do so.<sup>63</sup> Such a review is both appropriate and, we submit, necessary if the Ethics Code is to fulfill its stated purposes of working

---

<sup>61</sup> (1991 N.Y. Op. Atty. Gen. (Inf.) 1135; 91-68, October 25, 1991).

<sup>62</sup> See, e.g. Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement.

<sup>63</sup> Although decided in the context of a formal disciplinary proceeding, the per curiam opinion of the First Department in the Matter of Nancy C. Ross et. al., 276 App. Div. 2d 91 (2000) may, at least, be illustrative. In that proceeding, the respondent Nancy C. Ross was found to have misused her position as an assistant district attorney in an attempt to undermine a traffic summons issued to her husband, respondent Kenneth S. Ross, at his request. Both the Departmental Disciplinary Committee and the Appellate Division concluded that the appropriate sanction was a public censure. In reaching that conclusion nonetheless, they both noted that the respondents' conduct "appear to have been aberrational, as they had a previously unblemished record. Further, they immediately admitted their wrongdoing, cooperated with the investigation of their conduct, and expressed their remorse and contrition."

to achieve a high degree of moral conduct on the part of County officers and employees and maintaining public confidence in our unit of government.<sup>64</sup>

Our review and evaluation of the actions of the District Attorney are necessarily limited to consideration of the applicable provisions of Article 18 of the GML and the County Ethics Code. We take note, however, that District Attorney Doorley is not only an officer of the County but also an attorney and, specifically, a district attorney. The standards applicable to her by virtue of that status, while not governing on the Ethics Board, do nonetheless help to inform our deliberations as we consider whether, and to what extent, her conduct in this instance complies with or violates the standards applicable to her as a county officer, including those set forth in the County Ethics Code. Thus, for example, Rule 8.4(e) of the Rules of Professional Conduct applicable to all lawyers practicing in the State of New York states, in relevant part, that a lawyer shall not state or imply an ability to influence improperly any public official. In Comment 7 to Rule 8.4 of its Model Rules of Professional Conduct (similar to Rule 8.4 of New York's Rules of Professional Conduct), the American Bar Association states, in relevant part, that "[L]awyers holding public office assume legal responsibilities going beyond those of other citizens. A lawyer's abuse of public office can suggest an inability to fulfill the professional role of lawyers."<sup>65</sup>

#### **A. Article 18 of GML.**

The Board concludes that none of the actions taken by the District Attorney in connection with the April 22<sup>nd</sup> traffic stop by Officer Crisafulli or her actions leading up to, during and immediately following that lawful stop violate any of the provisions of Article 18 of the GML.

#### **B. County Ethics Code.**

As noted above, §45-4 of the County Ethics Code establishes the general standard of conduct applicable to all County officers and employees. It requires that no officer or employee be engaged in any "activity...of any nature which is in conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest." The determination as to whether any circumstances create such a "conflict" is necessarily subjective in nature and must be determined from the perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts. While, for reasons hereinafter more fully

---

<sup>64</sup> (County Ethics Code §45-2).

<sup>65</sup> See also Section 1-2.1 ("Standard of Conduct") of the National Prosecution Standards, Fourth Edition with Revised Commentary (Updated October 2023) published by the National District Attorneys Association. While the national standards are primarily intended as an aspirational guide to professional conduct in the performance of the prosecutorial function, Section 1-2.1 does provide, in part, that a "prosecutor should conduct himself or herself with a high level of dignity and integrity in all professional relationships, both in and out of court." In its commentary to that Section, the National District Attorneys Association states in part that, "[A] prosecutor's obligation to comply with the rules of ethical conduct of his or her jurisdiction is a fundamental and minimal requirement....The dignity and honor of the profession call for compliance with a higher standard of conduct---one of professionalism. This standard requires the prosecutor to bring integrity, fairness, and courtesy into all interactions,...This standard...should be used to inspire and invigorate all prosecutors, from the recently admitted to the very experienced, as all can be affected by the stress of the situations encountered by prosecutors."

See also "The Right Thing", Ethical Guidelines for Prosecutors, 2021, produced by the Ethics and Best Practices Subcommittees of the Committee on the Fair and Ethical Administration of Justice of the District Attorneys Association of the State of New York.

detailed, we find the actions of District Attorney Doorley in this matter to be, at the very least, disturbing and clearly not in the “public interest”, we conclude that they did not give rise to an actual conflict with the proper discharge by her of her official duties as the District Attorney of the County. Had she succeeded by her actions in preventing Officer Crisafulli from issuing a ticket for speeding on Phillips Road, or had she disposed of the ticket herself other than in accordance with the law (and, we note, she did comply with the law in the disposition of the ticket by virtue, in this instance, of her guilty plea and subsequent payment of the fine and surcharge imposed by law) we might well have reached a different conclusion. Accordingly, we find no violation of §45-4 of the County Ethics Code.

§45-13.A. of the County Ethics Code by its nature necessitates a similar subjective evaluation of the circumstances, utilizing the same standard of determination, as the Board engaged in reaching its finding with respect to §45-4. The Board is not in this instance, however, required to find an actual conflict, but rather to determine whether (i) the District Attorney’s course of conduct would “raise suspicion among the public that [she] is likely to be engaged in acts that are in violation of [her] trust”, or (ii) she used or attempted to use “[her] official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for [herself] or others.” [*emphasis added*].<sup>66</sup> We conclude that, in both respects, the actions and statements of District Attorney Doorley violated §45-13.A. of the County Ethics Code.

1. *Use of Official Position to Secure Unwarranted Privileges or Exemptions.*

We believe that certain of District Attorney Doorley’s actions and statements on April 22<sup>nd</sup> represented an attempt on her part to use her official position to secure an unwarranted privilege or exemption for herself, namely the avoidance of a lawful traffic stop and the potential issuance of a ticket for traveling in excess of the established speed limit on Phillips Road that afternoon. Even before her initial engagement with Officer Crisafulli at her residence, the District Attorney attempted to utilize her official position by calling Chief Kohlmeier to obtain his assistance. She repeated those efforts twice more while in the garage of her home during the traffic stop and even asked the Officer twice to call Chief Kohlmeier. She has since, we note, acknowledged that she should not have made those calls. She also invoked her official title on three (3) separate occasions during her interaction with Officer Crisafulli, including, notably, at the very outset when she exited her vehicle in her garage and identified herself to the Officer as “the DA.” Finally, District Attorney Doorley invoked, even if implicitly, her official standing by her repeated refusals to comply with the lawful commands and directions of Officer Crisafulli during both his efforts, starting on Phillips Road, to have her pull over and stop her vehicle and the events that took place at her residence, evidenced not only by her repeated defiance of the Officer’s directions (particularly while at her residence) but also the restrained response to her refusals by the Officer and the other Webster police officers present at the scene.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> We note that the language of §45-13.A. quoted above is virtually identical to that set forth in Section 74 of the Public Officers Law of the State of New York applicable to officers and employees of agencies of New York State.

<sup>67</sup> Our observation as to the restraint exercised by Officer Crisafulli and the other officers of the Webster Police Department does not constitute, nor is it intended to constitute, a criticism of any kind of their actions.

## 2. Conduct that Raises Suspicion of Violation of Public Trust.

We also believe that the statements and actions of the District Attorney satisfy and, in certain instances, go well beyond the threshold established under §45-13.A. regarding a course of conduct that would “raise suspicion among the public that [she] is likely to be engaged in acts that are in violation of [her] trust”. [*emphasis added*]. Her explanations regarding her failure to pull over and stop her vehicle on Phillips Road have been, as we previously noted, inconsistent. At first, she advised Officer Crisafulli that she did not see his lights or hear his siren. She later indicated that she did notice his vehicle but thought he was pursuing another matter. She explained that there were other cars on the road at the time and that she was driving a black SUV that would not have been pursued by the Officer if he had run her plates. Finally, she stated that she did not stop on Phillips Road because she did not want to. We note that District Attorney Doorley has since stated that it was a mistake for her not to do so.<sup>68</sup>

The statements made by the District Attorney on three occasions regarding the potential disposition by her of any speeding ticket violated the public trust vested in her by virtue of her office. The mere suggestion, as existed in each of those statements, that she might possibly utilize her official position to dispose of such a ticket other than in accordance with the blind application of the law goes beyond merely raising suspicion of a violation of her public trust. Likewise, the contempt that District Attorney Doorley displayed toward Officer Crisafulli throughout much of the events that transpired at her residence on the afternoon of April 22<sup>nd</sup> constituted conduct in violation of the public trust. Her comments directed to the Officer, set out in the OPI Transcript, and the tone and tenor of those comments as captured on the BWC Footage, reflected a sense of entitlement as well as a disturbing lack of respect for the Officer personally and professionally that would have proven objectionable under any circumstance but particularly so when, as in this case, emanating from a person occupying an office of such prominence in the local law enforcement and judicial community.

In the immediate aftermath of the events of April 22<sup>nd</sup>, District Attorney Doorley issued a written statement on April 25<sup>th</sup>, the full text of which is set out under the Findings of Fact section of this report. She later indicated that her purpose in issuing that statement was “for the sake of transparency. I wanted to make sure that I was being transparent in what I did.”<sup>69</sup> We find, however, that the Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement, issued as it was prior to the release of the BWC Footage was, at the very least, misleading and in one instance, we believe, inaccurate, giving rise at least to a legitimate suspicion that the District Attorney was likely engaged in acts in violation of her trust. The misleadingly antiseptic nature of the Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement is evident when contrasted with the events, and the tone and tenor of those events, that actually took place on April 22<sup>nd</sup> as evidenced by the BWC Footage. For example, in her April 25<sup>th</sup> statement, District Attorney Doorley states that “[T]he Webster Police Officer followed me to my house and issued me a speeding ticket for my speed of 55mph in a 35mph zone. I acknowledged that I was speeding and I accepted the ticket.” This statement is factually correct: Officer Crisafulli did follow her to

---

<sup>68</sup> See Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview and Doorley May 2<sup>nd</sup> Statement.

<sup>69</sup> Doorley April 30<sup>th</sup> Interview. Her full response to the question is quoted in the Finding of Facts section of this report.

her house; he did issue her a ticket; she did acknowledge that she was speeding<sup>70</sup>; and she did ultimately accept the ticket. A review of the BWC Footage and the OPI Transcript, however, paint a different, less benign and far more accurate picture of these events and her behavior during them. District Attorney Doorley also stated in her April 25<sup>th</sup> statement that she had “no intention of using my position to receive a benefit.” For the reasons detailed above, we believe that this statement is not accurate.

#### IV. Recommendations

The Ethics Board possesses very limited powers to enforce the provisions of the County Ethics Code beyond the issuance of this report. The ability to impose penalties or fines for violations pursuant to §45-13.A., for example, is not applicable in this matter. Thus, the recommendations hereinafter set forth do not have the force of law. They are, however, offered in the interest of the Ethics Board’s efforts to fulfill the goals and purposes of the County Ethics Code to ensure a high degree of moral conduct on the part of the County’s elected and appointed officers and employees and to maintain public confidence in County government. They are also offered for the purpose of assisting District Attorney Doorley to fulfill her pledge to our community to “make this right”.<sup>71</sup>

The Ethics Board acknowledges that, in the wake of the events of April 22<sup>nd</sup> and the Doorley April 25<sup>th</sup> Statement, District Attorney Doorley has gone to great lengths to publicly express, both verbally and in writing, her deep regret for her actions. She has stated that she assumes full responsibility and blame for them. Her efforts have included repeated apologies extended to Officer Crisafulli and the law enforcement community. We also acknowledge that the District Attorney has agreed to undertake certain remedial or disciplinary steps on her own initiative, at least some of which have been initiated as of this date. We commend her actions in this regard as an important first step toward restoring public trust in her as a public officer, a trust that she enjoyed prior to the events of April 22<sup>nd</sup>. We believe that her commitment toward restoring that trust must be evidenced, in part, by her also being completely transparent regarding the ethics training she committed to undertake in the Doorley April 29<sup>th</sup> Statement. District Attorney Doorley needs to make full and timely public disclosure as to that training, its duration and content, and publicly advise the community when she has completed the same.

Another essential step toward the restoration of that public trust will be her full cooperation with all agencies or entities that are, or may be, called upon to investigate her conduct on that date and evaluate or consider the potential consequences of the same. We note that District Attorney Doorley has made public assurances that she will indeed fully cooperate with such investigations and accept whatever consequences may flow from them. The OPI Report found certain violations by District Attorney Doorley of the County Vehicle Policy with a recommendation that they be handled in accordance with that Policy and in a manner consistent with other comparable violations of the Policy. We encourage the District Attorney to cooperate with whatever review or actions that may follow as a consequence of those findings and that recommendation. As noted

---

<sup>70</sup> Although she stated three times during the traffic stop that she didn’t care that she was speeding.

<sup>71</sup> Doorley May 2nd Statement.



above, the Grievance Committee of the Eighth Judicial District has, we are informed, commenced an investigation of her conduct, an investigation initiated at the request of District Attorney Doorley. Likewise, we are advised that, at the request of New York Governor Kathy Hochul, the New York State Commission on Prosecutorial Conduct (the “**Commission**”) is also undertaking an investigation of her conduct.<sup>72</sup>

Finally, in the Statement of Facts section of this report we noted that both Sergeant Johnson and Officer Crisafulli referred to a possible “arrestable offense” arising out of the District Attorney’s failure or refusal to stop her vehicle when directed to do so by the Officer. Neither officer at the time cited a specific statutory provision of New York law that could potentially subject the District Attorney to arrest though, as noted in footnote 45 to this Report, in subsequent interviews with Officer Crisafulli and Lieutenant Webster they each indicated that they believed that she could have been charged with obstructing governmental administration under the Penal Law and Officer Crisafulli also believed that a charge under Section 1144(a) of the Vehicle and Traffic Law could have been made. Whether further investigation of any potential charges emanating from her conduct may be possible or warranted at this point is beyond the scope of this report and the authority of the Ethics Board. However, in the interest of ensuring public confidence that a full and transparent review of the District Attorney’s conduct in this matter is undertaken, the Ethics Board believes that the District Attorney should consider making application to the appropriate court for the appointment of a special district attorney pursuant to Section 701 of the County Law of the State of New York (the “**County Law**”), and, if not, publicly state the reasons for that determination.

As noted in footnote 49 of this report, District Attorney Doorley had previously referred the matter to Onondaga County District Attorney William J. Fitzpatrick for review. We understand that District Attorney Fitzpatrick elected not to pursue the requested review when the Governor referred the matter submitted to her to the Commission. However, that review, while commendable in its intent and purpose, was nonetheless entirely voluntary in nature. District Attorney Fitzpatrick would not have functioned in the capacity of a special district attorney and would have been without the benefit of the provisions of County Law Section 701 and the powers granted thereunder. Absent a compelling, demonstrable reason otherwise, we believe that the due application for the appointment of a special district attorney (whether at the present time or, if necessary or appropriate, following the completion of the work of the Grievance Committee and the New York State Commission on Prosecutorial Conduct, respectively) would prove an important element of District Attorney Doorley’s continuing commitment to her efforts to restore the public’s trust in her.

This Report shall be maintained and disseminated in accordance with the provisions of the County Ethics Code.

---

<sup>72</sup> Article 15-A (§§499-a-499-j) of the Judiciary Law of the State of New York. The Commission would transmit its findings of fact, recommendations and record of proceedings to the Grievance Committee as well as to the District Attorney. If the Commission recommends removal of the District Attorney, its findings, recommendations and proceedings will also be forwarded to the Governor who has the power to remove her pursuant to Article 13, Section 3 of the New York State Constitution. Judiciary Law §499-f(7)