

September 26, 2018

The Honorable David H. Coar (Ret.) (email only)
Coar Monitoring Team
DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com

RE: Chicago Police Consent Decree Independent Monitor Selection Process
Request for Supplemental Information

Dear Judge Coar:

Thank you for responding to the Request for Proposals issued jointly by the Office of the Illinois Attorney General and the City of Chicago (collectively, “the Parties”) seeking individuals or firms interested in serving as the Independent Monitor. The Parties have had an opportunity to review your submission and would like to request supplemental information.

Please review the requests attached to this letter and provide your responses on or before the close of business October 10, 2018. Your written responses should be submitted in electronic format (PDF) and in hard copy. Please send the electronic responses to the OAG at LTScruggs@duanemorris.com and to the City at Aslagel@taftlaw.com. Please include “City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring Proposal – Supplemental Information” in the email subject line and on the package containing a hard copy of the proposal. Hard copies should be sent to the addresses below by USPS Priority Mail or overnight carrier (e.g., FedEx, UPS, DHL) to ensure timely delivery to the addresses below:

For the Attorney General for the State of
Illinois:

Lisa T. Scruggs
Special Assistant Attorney General
Duane Morris LLP
190 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3700
Chicago, IL 60603

For the City of Chicago:

Allan T. Slagel
Counsel for the City
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 2800
Chicago, IL 60601

The Parties have set the following dates for interviews and two public forums that finalists will be required to attend. Please plan accordingly. The interviews will take place on November 1 and 2, 2018 with the specific time and place to be determined later. The public forums are scheduled to take place on Saturday, November 3, 2018 at the James R. Thompson Center, 100 W. Randolph St., Chicago, IL.

We expect to provide additional information and more detailed schedules after October 15. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please direct them to the Parties via email to Lisa Scruggs and Alan Slagel.

Sincerely,

Lisa T. Scruggs
For the Office of the Attorney General
for the State of Illinois

Alan T. Slagel
For the City of Chicago

City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring RFP Parties' Joint Request for Supplemental Information

Please review the requests listed below and provide your responses on or before the close of business October 10, 2018. Your written responses should be submitted in electronic format (PDF) and in hard copy. To the extent that you believe any of the information requested was already provided as part of your initial response to the RFP, please so state and identify the page(s) where the information can be located.

1. Please provide a description of the roles and responsibilities for each member listed on your team. Please clearly define the roles and responsibilities and map them specifically to each task of monitor team members. Please be sure to tell us what the day-to-day responsibilities of each member of your leadership team will be. In your answer, you should, a) specify which of your team members will provide subject matter expertise regarding specified law enforcement functions and operations, engage in statistical or data analysis, participate in outreach to stakeholder communities, provide legal analysis, undertake project management responsibilities, or write reports and b) identify the projected amount of time or percentage of time each member will engage in each function.
2. Please describe how the size and composition of your team will allow for efficient operations. If you plan to modify the size or composition of your team, please describe your plan in more detail. If you expect to make any changes, identify the potential individual team member(s) involved and the role you expect the team member(s) to fulfill or activities they will handle and how the change will affect your overall monitoring plan. Also, to the extent changes in the team composition may affect your cost estimate, please so indicate and detail how the cost estimate would be modified.
3. Describe the distribution of work between the lawyers and the subject matter experts (SMEs) who will serve on your team, particularly between the division of responsibilities between the lawyers and the SMEs who have served in law enforcement.
4. The Parties have agreed to an annual budget cap of \$2.85 million. If your response to this request for supplemental information changes your cost estimate, or if your cost estimate exceeds the cap or you did not provide a complete cost estimate with your initial application, please provide an updated cost estimate. The updated estimate should include a description of how the applicant would fulfill the responsibilities of the Monitor within this cap and what adjustments, if any, you would make to ensure that all required work will be performed within this cap. There is no requirement to submit a revised cost estimate if your previously submitted cost estimate fell within the above-identified cap and no change is necessary.
5. Please include more detailed information to support your cost estimate, including: the total number of hours anticipated to monitor compliance with the consent decree during each of the first three years of the monitoring term, broken down by consent decree section, task (training assessment, policy review/development, technical assistance, community/police outreach), and monitoring team member(s).

6. In your cost estimate, you include projected hours that are contemplated for various activities. Please explain the basis and your rationale for each of those projections.
7. What commitment, if any, will your team make to ensure the performance of work that is necessary but that may fall outside the budget in any given year? In your response, please be sure to identify any team members who have indicated a willingness to provide work on a pro bono or non-billable basis.
8. The RFP contains a statement requesting that all communications with Parties be disclosed. To the extent you have had any communications, written or oral with either or both of the Parties or their consultants or experts before or after September 4, 2018 regarding the IM selection process or consent decree, please detail them. If your response to the RFP contained a statement regarding communications prior to September 4, 2018, there is no need to re-submit that information.
9. If any team members have government jobs and expect to retain those jobs during the term of the monitorship, please confirm that the team members' employment contracts or applicable employment policies permit outside work, and if required by their employer's policies or rules, that their employers are aware that they have applied to serve as the monitor or a member of the monitoring team in this matter.
10. If any team members intend to maintain a full-time job during the term of the monitorship in a position that does not contemplate work on a client-by-client basis (i.e., consultant or firm attorney), please describe how the team member intends to manage his or her full time employment obligation simultaneously with his or her monitorship responsibilities and confirm that their employers are aware (or will be made aware) that they have applied to serve as the monitor or a member of the monitoring team in this matter.
11. Many provisions in the proposed consent decree require the development and/or maintenance of technology systems capable of capturing and analyzing data. To meet the obligations of the consent decree, the City may need to implement significant changes to its automated data systems. The monitoring team will be responsible to assess the adequacy of the upgrades and may need to provide technical assistance. Please detail the experience your team has with the implementation of processes to collect and analyze data. In your response, identify the specific team member(s) who have that experience and how that experience might be used during the term of the monitorship.
12. What is your team's plan for gathering basic information about the Chicago Police Department and the status of its policing reform efforts at the outset of the monitorship?
13. Please provide more information on the team's proposed monitoring methodology. Specifically, describe the team's:
 - Approach to the development of a monitoring plan and staging of monitoring activities/priorities;
 - Establishment and measurement of compliance thresholds;
 - Engagement and collection of information from all stakeholder communities;

- Sources of information/data/access; and
- Capacity to provide ongoing technical assistance.

14. What is the timeline for completing various phases of your monitoring methodology?
15. Please describe in greater detail the role and responsibilities of the Community Advisory Board. What groups do you expect to participate in that capacity? Please describe how it will be formed? Who will comprise the membership of the board? How will the board be staffed? How will you ensure transparency?
16. Please describe the role of the Bronner group and what tasks it will accomplish in more detail.
17. You have listed a number of qualifications (pp. 12-16), for each prior experience or specific case or matter listed, please identify who from your team led that effort or was otherwise involved in the case or matter.
18. Please provide a copy of the Hillard Heintze publication referenced in your proposal on best practices in community policing.
19. Please provide more detailed information regarding the work done in the Laquan McDonald case. (p. 16)
20. Please explain your rationale for adopting a quarterly and annual reporting cadence when the consent decree calls for semiannual reports.

Independent Monitor

For the Consent Decree Regarding
the Chicago Police Department

**CHICAGO POLICE CONSENT DECREE INDEPENDENT MONITOR
SELECTION PROCESS REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

DATE

October 10, 2018

RECIPIENTS

For the Attorney General for the State of Illinois

Ms. Cara Hendrickson
Chief, Public Interest Division
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, Floor 12
Chicago, Illinois 60601

For the City of Chicago

Mr. Edward N. Siskel
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago
121 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602



COAR MONITORING TEAM



DHC CONSULTING LTD. | HILLARD HEINTZE | BERKELEY RESEARCH GROUP

COAR MONITORING TEAM



October 10, 2018

Ms. Cara Hendrickson
Chief, Public Interest Division
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, Floor 12
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Edward N. Siskel
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago
121 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Dear Ms. Hendrickson and Mr. Siskel:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional information in response to your September 26, 2018 letter regarding the City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring RFP Parties' Joint Request for Supplemental Information.

Based on our experience, our proposal outlined a level of work totaling 14,420 hours. This estimate is based upon our Team's experience delivering police reform and monitoring services under comparable circumstances and our knowledge of the key drivers of time and cost. Whichever team you select to assume these critical responsibilities should work close to that number of hours in order to be successful.

These factors that warrant such a time commitment include (1) the scale of the changes targeted by the Parties, especially given (2) the Department's need to continue to deliver on its service mission at the same time it attempts to reengineer some of its core operations; (3) the time required for the Department to translate Consent Decree objectives into measurable results on the ground; (4) the complexity inherent in communicating these changes appropriately to various audiences, many of whom will not understand or agree with the actions taken until they can assess the outcomes independently; and (5) the level of community engagement in the process – which we view as absolutely vital to helping ensure compliance with the Consent Decree goals and requirements.

In short, the Parties' agreement of a ceiling is understandable but does not change what we view as the required level of effort to help you rapidly instill lasting reforms in the Chicago Police Department. Because of this, we retain the original projection of 14,420 hours – but have replaced 1,310 billable hours with the same number of pro-bono hours, which reduces our proposal cost to under your funding ceiling.

We have the greatest number of projected hours (at an incredibly competitive low hourly rate) compared to the other proposals. This is a strength of our proposal and a benefit to the Court, the Parties and the public. Our rich history of reform experience has helped us recognize that true reform comes only when it is paired with a focused and determined mindset. A department cannot truly reform if the Monitor does not encourage reform by expending a great number of hours, day in and day out, to bring needed change. When the reform process is dragged out over years, or in some case, even a decade, reforms lose importance and the agency inevitably loses its focus and accountability. We believe in this Department's ability to usher in real reform and change. Our number of hours, our focus and our pace of work reflect our determination to keep the CPD motivated on reform.

On behalf of the entire Coar Monitoring Team, I am pleased to say that we are very much looking forward to the interviews on November 1 and 2 and then to communicating with and responding to citizens and the community at the public forums on November 3. If you require any additional information of our Team, we will respond and deliver it to you immediately.

Sincerely,
THE COAR MONITORING TEAM

Hon. Judge David Coar (Ret.)
DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com, 312.229.9825



- 1 **Please provide a description of the roles and responsibilities for each member listed on your team. Please clearly define the roles and responsibilities and map them specifically to each task of monitor team members. Please be sure to tell us what the day-to-day responsibilities of each member of your leadership team will be. In your answer, you should, (a) specify which of your team members will provide subject matter expertise regarding specified law enforcement functions and operations, engage in statistical or data analysis, participate in outreach to stakeholder communities, provide legal analysis, undertake project management responsibilities, or write reports, and (b) identify the projected amount of time or percentage of time each member will engage in each function.**

Below is an explanation of the responsibilities of each individual on the Coar Monitoring Team (CMT) listed in our proposal. Additionally, Attachment 2 contains a chart of the hours assigned to each task, by member of team leadership and assigned subject matter expert.

HON. DAVID COAR (RET.), INDEPENDENT MONITOR “MONITOR”

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Judge Coar (ret.) as Monitor is to assess the legal, procedural and operational progress and compliance of the City of Chicago and the Chicago Police Department’s implementation of the CCD Agreement in an independent and transparent manner and ensure accurate reporting to the Court. At the direction of the Court, the Monitor will also work with the Parties and the Chicago community and stakeholders to ensure they understand the progress, issues and shortcomings in a constructive and timely manner to help facilitate compliance. As Monitor, Judge Coar serves as the executive leading the activities of the Coar Monitoring Team to ensure all activities are consistent with the CCD Agreement and reported accurately, timely and transparently, where appropriate.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: The Monitor has the ultimate responsibility for overseeing all tasks required in the CCD.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: A Monitor, Judge Coar will set direction for the Team and review the work of the CMT including tasks such as reviewing experts’ analysis of activities, data analysis, activity reports and community engagement to ensure these activities are consistent with the Agreement, the Court and the law. He will also be the Team’s primary conduit to the Chicago community by participating in a broad range of community meetings and activities to seek input and inform progress on all aspects of the Monitor’s activities. In addition, he will participate in a broad range of activities with the CMT experts to ensure a thorough understanding of the CCD process and progress; communicate activities and findings to the Court on a regular basis; and review, approve and deliver reports to the Court, Parties and community.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,000 hours each year. The estimated time Judge Coar will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

JEFFREY CRAMER, ESQ., PRINCIPAL DEPUTY MONITOR – LAW

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. Cramer as Principle Deputy Monitor – Law, is to work on behalf of the Monitor to ensure the preparation of all documentation required by the Court and Parties with a special emphasis on overseeing the Team’s progress in assessing and reporting the CPD’s progress implementing and achieving compliance with the Consent Decree. He will oversee the data collection and reporting process required for the Monitor, which includes reporting on the status of implementation to the Court and Parties. He will serve as the primary off-hours point of contact for the Illinois Office of the Attorney General on all Consent Decree matters.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Management and Oversight, Reporting to the Court, Data Collection and Analysis, Training, Supervision and leading and participating in community outreach.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As Principle Deputy Monitor – Law, Mr. Cramer is responsible for overseeing and preparing all reports to the Court and the Parties, participating in and having knowledge of all activities of the Consent Decree, especially by providing oversight in the areas of Crisis Intervention, Data Collection and Analysis, Recruitment and Hiring, Supervision and Promotion and Officer Wellness and leading and participating in community outreach efforts. He will be responsible for ensuring the timely and accurate reporting of experts reporting under the areas above.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,260 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Cramer will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.



KENNETH BOUCHE, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY MONITOR – OPERATIONS

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. Bouche as Principle Deputy Monitor – Operations, is to work on behalf of the Monitor to manage the daily operations of the Team to ensure a unified, coordinated, timely and managed approach in the accomplishment of the requirements of the Consent Decree. He will serve as the primary off-hours point of contact for the Chicago Police Department on all Consent Decree matters.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Management and Oversight, Community Policing, Crisis Intervention, Use of Force, Training, Accountability and Transparency, Project and Program Management and leading and participating in community outreach efforts.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As Principle Deputy Monitor – Operations, Mr. Bouche is responsible for overseeing and participating in the daily operations of the Consent Decree, especially by providing oversight in the areas mapped above and project management oversight of all areas of activity under the Consent Decree. He will provide subject matter expertise regarding: Community Policing, Impartial Policing, Use of Force and Accountability and Transparency. Additionally, he will oversee and conduct analysis of law enforcement functions and operations, participate in outreach to stakeholder communities, undertake and oversee project management responsibilities to ensure the timely and accurate reporting of experts reporting under the areas above.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,500 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Bouche will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

MARCIA THOMPSON, ESQ., DEPUTY MONITOR

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Ms. Thompson as Deputy Monitor is to lead experts in the field when conducting specific tasks in the assessment and evaluation of specific CPD activities under the Agreement and to ensure the accurate and timely evaluation and reporting of this work. She will also serve as an expert on specific tasks and prepare detailed reports regarding the assessment of CPD activities.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Management and Oversight, Community Policing, Impartial Policing, and, Recruitment and Hiring, Officer Wellness and Support, and leading and participating in community outreach.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As Deputy Monitor – Law, Ms. Thompson is responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the areas mapped to her, engaging the community, reviewing reports under her supervisory areas of responsibilities to ensuring the timely and accurate reporting of experts' reporting and providing subject matter expertise regarding: law enforcement functions and operations, outreach to stakeholder communities, and legal analysis of issues related to equal employment opportunity and civil rights.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,720 hours each year. The estimated time Ms. Thompson will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

THERON BOWMAN, PH.D., DEPUTY MONITOR

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Dr. Bowman as Deputy Monitor is to lead experts in the field when conducting specific tasks in the assessment and evaluation of specific CPD activities under the Agreement and to ensure the accurate and timely evaluation and reporting of this work. He will also serve as an expert on specific tasks and prepare detailed reports regarding the assessment of CPD activities as well as their progress implementing and achieving compliance with the Consent Decree.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Management and Oversight, Use of Force, Training, Supervision and leading and participating in community outreach.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As Deputy Monitor, Dr. Bowman is responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the areas mapped to him, engaging the community, reviewing reports under his supervisory areas of responsibilities to ensuring the timely and accurate reporting of experts' reporting, and providing subject matter expertise regarding: law enforcement



functions and operations, outreach to stakeholder communities, written reports on those activities and legal analysis of issues related to equal employment opportunity and civil rights.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,000 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Bowman will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

SERGIO ACOSTA, ESQ., DEPUTY MONITOR

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: Mr. Acosta, a former Assistant U.S. Attorney and criminal civil rights coordinator, will provide legal analysis and direction on policing and its impact upon civil rights. Mr. Acosta will provide continuity from the work of the Police Accountability Task Force when those recommendations mirror the Consent Decree. He will also assist, as needed, with the Community Advisory Board and its efforts.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Accountability and Transparency.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As Deputy Monitor, Mr. Acosta will advise and review any reform efforts that could impact civil rights. He will advise the Monitor on best practices to in an effort to ensure Chicago Policing is consistent with securing individual rights. Mr. Acosta will also review and help draft any relevant Report sections.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 300 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Acosta will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

PETER HARVEY, ESQ., SPECIAL ADVISOR

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: Mr. Harvey, the current Newark Police Monitor, will assist Judge Coar and provide advice and direction on the roles outlined in the CCD. He will also provide Judge Coar with legal analysis based upon his civil rights experience and monitoring work. As a Special Advisor, Mr. Harvey provides a unique opportunity to assist Judge Coar and the CMT in performing their roles.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Assisting the Monitor by providing advisory insights on best practices in all tasks required in the CCD.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As Special Advisor, Mr. Harvey will advise the Monitor on coordinating the various roles identified in the CCD. Review impact of police policies upon civil rights laws. He will also review sections of any report on use of force, impartial policing, civil rights and related topics.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 100 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Harvey will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

CAROL ARCHBOLD, PH.D. SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Dr. Archbold will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert on Accountability and Transparency. She will conduct assessments of the policies, general orders, practices and day-to-day Departmental activities to document and evaluate the level of accountability and transparency demonstrated in all areas of activities undertaken by the Department according to the task of the Agreement. She will also instruct and assist the rest of the experts on the issues and examples they should be seeking in their task assignments, as accountability and transparency transcends many activities and will assist the lead subject matter expert in Data Collection, Analysis, and Management. She will document her evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Data Collection and Analysis, Management and Accountability and Transparency.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for the Accountability and Transparency component, Dr. Archbold will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the Accountability and Transparency area mapped to her, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to data collection and analysis, and other areas influenced by the data component. She will also lend her expertise to other areas and team members when called upon.



Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 280 hours each year. The estimated time Dr. Archbold will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

ALEX DEL CARMEN, PH.D. SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Dr. del Carmen will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert on Data Collection, Analysis, and Management. He will conduct assessments of the policies, general orders and practices pertaining to CPD's data collection of use of force incidents and review of said data and conduct body-worn and in-car camera recordings audits. He will assist in the implementation of a comprehensive Early Intervention System database to promote Departmental accountability to the public. He will instruct and assist the rest of the experts on the issues and examples they should be seeking in their task assignments as data collection, analysis and management transcends many activities. Dr. del Carmen will also assist the lead subject matter expert on Impartial Policing. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Data Collection and Analysis, Management, and Impartial Policing.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for the Data Collection, Analysis, and Management component, Dr. del Carmen will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the area mapped to him, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to data collection and analysis, and other areas influenced by this component. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 440 hours each year. The estimated time Dr. del Carmen will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

ROBERT DAVIS, SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. Davis will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert on Use of Force. He will conduct assessments of the policies, general orders and practices pertaining to CPD's current use of force policies to assist CPD in achieving full compliance with the law and Department policies to reduce the number of incidents where force is necessary (appropriate de-escalation tactics) and to ensure public accountability when use of force incidents do occur. His responsibilities will also include assessing and/or approving a new Departmental foot pursuit policy. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders. Mr. Davis will also assist the lead subject matter expert on the Training and Supervision monitoring components.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Use of Force, Training, Supervision and Community Engagement.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for the Use of Force component, Mr. Davis will lead, oversee and evaluate the Training area mapped to him, including assessing policies and practices pertaining to use of force and other areas influenced by this component. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,000 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Davis will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

MICHAEL DIRDEN, ESQ., SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. Dirden will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert for Recruitment, Hiring and Promotions and for Officer Wellness and Support. For the Recruitment component, he will conduct assessments and reviews of the policies, general orders and actual hiring practices of the CPD in order to help improve all facets of the Department's recruitment, hiring and promotion processes. His assistance to the Department will include reviewing and approving all implementation plans the CPD puts forth regarding improving promotion processes. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders. For the Officer Wellness component, Mr. Dirden will conduct assessments and reviews of the policies, general orders and actual practices of the CPD in regards to officer wellness and support, lending assistance and expertise to ensure that the Department establishes crucial programs tailored to the full range of mental health issues facing police officers.



Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Community Policing, Recruitment, Hiring and Promotions, Officer Wellness and Support, Accountability and Transparency and Community Engagement.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for both the Recruitment, Hiring and Promotions component and the Officer Wellness and Support component, Mr. Dirden will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating both areas mapped to him, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to these components. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,000 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Dirden will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

WILL JOHNSON, SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Chief Johnson will be to serve as a subject matter expert for Community Policing. He will assist the CPD in facilitating positive relationships with the public by assessing and reviewing current policies, general orders and practices to determine how to best improve the Department's relationship with the community. He will assist the CPD in incorporating community policing philosophies into Departmental training and in the improvement in community policing best practices. Chief Johnson will instruct and assist the rest of the experts on the issues and examples they should be seeking in their task assignments, as community policing transcends many activities. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders. Chief Johnson will also assist the lead subject matter expert on the Recruitment, Hiring and Promotions component.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Community Policing and Recruitment, Hiring and Promotions.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As a subject matter expert for the Community Policing and Recruitment, Hiring and Promotions components, Chief Johnson will be responsible for assisting in the lead subject matter experts' evaluations of the areas mapped to him, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to community policing and recruitment, hiring and promotions and other areas influenced by those components. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 280 hours each year. The estimated time Chief Johnson will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

GRANDE LUM, ESQ., SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. Lum will be to serve as a subject matter expert for Crisis Intervention. He will assist the CPD in improving safe interactions with individuals in crisis and connecting those individuals with the appropriate health care needed to prevent their unnecessary criminal justice involvement. Mr. Lum will be responsible for assessing and reviewing current policies, general orders and practices to determine how to best improve the Department's crisis intervention response functions through the adoption of nationwide crisis intervention best practices for all officers as well as the Crisis Intervention Team. Mr. Lum will approve and publish progress reports on CPD's CIT Implementation Plan and ensure the creation of a crisis intervention response advisory committee. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Crisis Intervention.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As a subject matter expert for the Crisis Intervention component, Mr. Lum will be responsible for assisting the lead subject matter expert in leading, overseeing and evaluating the Crisis Intervention area mapped to him, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to crisis intervention and other areas influenced by crisis intervention. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 240 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Lum will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.



MEGHAN MAURY, ESQ., SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mx. Maury will be to serve as a subject matter expert for Impartial Policing. Mx. Maury will assist the CPD in facilitating positive relationships the public by providing services to all individuals without bias and with courtesy and dignity. Mx. Maury will be responsible for assessing and reviewing current policies, general orders and practices to determine how to best improve the Department's relationship with the community, including assisting the CPD in impartial policing training and approving assessment methodologies the Department brings forth to measure continued improvement in impartial policing. Mx. Maury will instruct and assist the rest of the experts on issues and examples they should be seeking in their task assignments, as impartial policing transcends many activities and will document all evaluations and assessments of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Impartial Policing and Community Engagement.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As a subject matter expert for the Impartial Policing component, Mx. Maury will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the Impartial Policing area, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to impartial policing and other areas influenced by impartial policing. Mx. Maury will also lend expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 280 hours each year. The estimated time Mx. Maury will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

THOMAS O'REILLY, SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. O'Reilly will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert on Supervision. He will conduct assessments of the current staffing and supervision culture of the CPD in regards to supervisors providing quality leadership and direction, among other responsibilities. Mr. O'Reilly will also assist in ensuring the City and CPD deploy the sufficient amount of qualified supervisors to provide such effective supervision and will review and assess CPD's progress towards achieving the unity of command and span of control ratio specified in the Agreement. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders. Mr. O'Reilly will also assist the lead subject matter experts on the Recruiting, Hiring and Promotions and Officer Wellness and Support monitoring components.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Training, Supervision and Officer Wellness and Support.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for the Supervision component, Mr. O'Reilly will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the Supervision area mapped to him, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to this component. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 440 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. O'Reilly will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

RICK TANKSLEY, SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Mr. Tanksley will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert for Community Policing. He will assist the CPD in facilitating positive relationships with the public by assessing and reviewing current policies, general orders and practices to determine how to best improve the Department's relationship with the community. He will assist the CPD in incorporating community policing philosophies into Departmental training and in the improvement in community policing best practices. Mr. Tanksley will instruct and assist the rest of the experts on the issues and examples they should be seeking in their task assignments, as community policing transcends many activities. He will document his evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders. Mr. Tanksley will also assist the lead subject matter expert on the Crisis Intervention monitoring component.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Community Policing and Crisis Intervention.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for the Community Policing component, Mr. Tanksley will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the Community Policing area mapped to him, including assessments of



policies and practices pertaining to community policing and other areas influenced by community policing. He will also lend his expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 360 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Tanksley will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

AMY WATSON, PH.D., SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Dr. Watson will be to serve as the lead subject matter expert for Crisis Intervention. She will assist the CPD in improving safe interactions with individuals in crisis and connecting those individuals with the appropriate health care needed to prevent their unnecessary criminal justice involvement. Dr. Watson will be responsible for assessing and reviewing current policies, general orders and practices to determine how to best improve the Department's crisis intervention response functions through the adoption of nationwide crisis intervention best practices for all officers as well as the Crisis Intervention Team. She will approve and publish progress reports on CPD's CIT Implementation Plan and ensuring the creation of a crisis intervention response advisory committee. She will document her evaluation and assessment of this task for reporting to the Court, the Parties and all stakeholders. Dr. Watson will also assist the lead subject matter expert on the Data Collection, Analysis and Management monitoring component.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Crisis Intervention and Data Collection and Analysis, and Management.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: As the subject matter expert lead for the Crisis Intervention component, Dr. Watson will be responsible for leading, overseeing and evaluating the Crisis Intervention area mapped to her, including assessments of policies and practices pertaining to crisis intervention and other areas influenced by crisis intervention. She will also lend her expertise to other areas and Team members when called upon.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 240 hours each year. The estimated time Dr. Watson will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

LINDA TARTAGLIA, SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Ms. Tartaglia as Project Manager is to work on behalf of the Monitor to assist in managing the daily operations of the Team to ensure a unified, coordinated, timely and managed approach in the accomplishment of the requirements of the Consent Decree. She will assist in ensuring all deadlines previously set out in the Agreement are met in a timely manner and that constant and open communication is occurring between the Department and the Monitor to ensure optimal collaboration between the Parties.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Recruitment, Hiring and Promotion, and Training.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: Assist in ensuring all deadlines previously set out in the Agreement are met in a timely manner. Keep apprised of the communications between the Department and the Monitor to ensure optimal collaboration between the Parties and ensure the action items being discussed and implemented are on time and on budget.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 280 hours each year. The estimated time Ms. Tartaglia will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

SCOTT BAILEY, CPA, CISA, SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT AUDITING & COMPLIANCE

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: Quality Assurance on CCD Complacence.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Reporting

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: Mr. Bailey will set an audit protocol for reporting our findings to ensure our Team is collecting sufficient articulable evidence to support any reported finding of conformity and nonconformity with the Agreement. He will review all findings before submission to ensure adequate facts and supporting documentation exist to support findings.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 240 hours each year. The estimated time Mr. Bailey will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.



LINDSAY MORGAN, PMP, PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Ms. Morgan as Project Manager – Operations, is to work on behalf of the Monitor to assist in managing the daily operations of the Team to ensure a unified, coordinated, timely and managed approach in the accomplishment of the requirements of the Consent Decree. She will assist in ensuring all deadlines previously set out in the Agreement are met in a timely manner and that constant and open communication is occurring between the Department and the Monitor to ensure optimal collaboration between the Parties.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Project Management and Operational Facilitation.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: Ms. Morgan will assist in ensuring all deadlines previously set out in the Agreement are met in a timely manner. She will keep apprised of the communications between the Department and the Monitor to ensure optimal collaboration between the Parties and ensure the action items being discussed and implemented are on time and on budget.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 240 hours each year. The estimated time Ms. Morgan will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

NATALIE FOUTY, OPERATIONS/FACILITATION/PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The primary role of Ms. Fouty as Project Manager – Operations, is to work on behalf of the Monitor to assist in managing the daily operations of the Team to ensure a unified, coordinated, timely and managed approach in the accomplishment of the requirements of the Consent Decree. She will assist in ensuring all deadlines previously set out in the Agreement are met in a timely manner and that constant and open communication is occurring between the Department and the Monitor to ensure optimal collaboration between the Parties.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Project Management and Operational Facilitation.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: Ms. Fouty will assist in ensuring all deadlines previously set out in the Agreement are met in a timely manner. She will keep apprised of the communications between the Department and the Monitor to ensure optimal collaboration between the Parties and ensure the action items being discussed and implemented are on time and on budget.

Time Commitment: These activities will consume approximately 1,120 hours each year. The estimated time Ms. Fouty will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.

COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD LIAISON AND FACILITATOR

Roles and Responsibilities in CCD: The Community Advisory Board Liaisons/Facilitators will assist in the Monitor's collaboration with the community to ensure the public is heard and acknowledged in their concerns regarding the components of the Agreement. They will coordinate with public venues to schedule town hall meetings and reach out to various community interest groups for their collaboration with the Monitor.

Roles Mapped to CCD Tasks: Community Policing and leading and participating in community outreach.

Day-to-Day Responsibilities: The Community Advisory Board Liaisons/Facilitators will keep constant and open communication between the Monitor and both the community at large and specific interest groups to ensure timely collaboration between all parties. They will also oversee facilitation of scheduling, planning and heading community outreach events, such as town halls.

Time Commitment: There will be two individuals assigned to this task and these activities will consume approximately 240 hours each year for each. The estimated time the Community Advisory Board Liaison will spend on Tasks is outlined in Attachment 1.



- 2 Please describe how the size and composition of your team will allow for efficient operations. If you plan to modify the size or composition of your team, please describe your plan in more detail. If you expect to make any changes, identify the potential individual team member(s) involved and the role you expect the team member(s) to fulfill or activities they will handle and how the change will affect your overall monitoring plan. Also, to the extent changes in the team composition may affect your cost estimate, please so indicate and detail how the cost estimate would be modified.**

The Coar Monitoring Team's size and composition is optimal for this significant undertaking. The Team is lean in numbers, given the magnitude of the tasks, but also robust in its collective knowledge, experience and capacity to deliver reform. Every task has multiple experts assigned who bring deep and current knowledge to that task. The Team is designed to bring multiple expert perspectives to every critical issue to ensure we can assess, evaluate and guide change in a way that will be successful and lasting.

Our Team will be guided by our plan and methodology that has been tested and has proven to deliver positive results. Our project management methodology and reporting will demonstrate continuous attention to the entire Agreement, with clarity, accuracy, transparency and efficiency. Every member of the CMT is experienced and has delivered on police accountability, transparency and constitutional reforms in the past and stands ready to serve the City of Chicago and the People of Illinois.

We have made no changes to our Team or our monitoring plan. We believe that, as submitted, it presents both the most effective approach and the most cost-effective model to ensure success. In our review of the other plans, it is clear that **the CMT submission offers the most robust monitoring plan, with the largest effort at the lowest hourly rate.**

Because we believe our approach is the most effective proven method for success in monitoring and reform for the City of Chicago, we did not change or reduce our effort or lower our hours to meet the city's pricing ceiling. Instead **our Team has committed to 1,310 pro-bono hours to ensure we can deliver successful results for under \$2,850,000 a year as outlined in Attachment 1.**

- 3 Describe the distribution of work between the lawyers and the subject matter experts (SMEs) who will serve on your team, particularly between the division of responsibilities between the lawyers and the SMEs who have served in law enforcement.**

The distribution of work among lawyers and experts can only be described as collaborative and overlapping. We do not have a single member of our Team with the sole focus of counseling our SMEs about legal options or to simply represent the Team to the Court. While we have time dedicated to the legal aspects of reporting to the Court and ensuring the Department is meeting its legal responsibilities under the Agreement, the lawyers on CMT are also experts in areas of the Agreement. Each lawyer brings a specific expertise that will help deliver successful and positive reform. Additionally, every subject matter expert who is not a lawyer has a clear understanding of the legal requirements and issues affecting their area of expertise. While there are some new SMEs that were selected due to their specific experience for the Consent Decree, the majority of our SMEs have worked together multiple times in the past.

- 4 The Parties have agreed to an annual budget cap of \$2.85 million. If your response to this request for supplemental information changes your cost estimate, or if your cost estimate exceeds the cap or you did not provide a complete cost estimate with your initial application, please provide an updated cost estimate. The updated estimate should include a description of how the applicant would fulfill the responsibilities of the Monitor within this cap and what adjustments, if any, you would make to ensure that all required work will be performed within this cap. There is no requirement to submit a revised cost estimate if your previously submitted cost estimate fell within the above-identified cap and no change is necessary.**

As identified in Question 2, in our proposal, we laid the groundwork for what we know as the most effective and proven method for success in monitoring and reform for the City of Chicago. We suggested what we believed was the leanest team possible to undertake this significant and important work at what appears to be the lowest blended hourly rate proposed to the Parties. We are experienced in delivering major city reform and we know the level of effort required. Because of this, we



did not change or reduce our effort, lower our hours, or cut our expense budget to meet the city's pricing ceiling. **Instead, our Team has committed to providing 1,310 pro-bono hours to ensure we can deliver successful results, as proposed for under \$2,850,000 a year. Hours and costs are broken down in detail in Attachment 1.**

- 5 **Please include more detailed information to support your cost estimate, including: the total number of hours anticipated to monitor compliance with the Consent Decree during each of the first three years of the monitoring term, broken down by Consent Decree section, task (training assessment, policy review/development, technical assistance, community/police outreach), and monitoring team member(s).**

Please refer to Attachment 2 – Time Allotment by Team Member. This document outlines in detail our commitment of hours by task and SME.

- 6 **In your cost estimate, you include projected hours that are contemplated for various activities. Please explain the basis and your rationale for each of those projections.**

The hours projected in our proposal, as outlined in Attachments 1 and 2, are based upon completing the tasks through assessment, evaluation, technical assistance, final assessment and monitoring during the initial three-year contract. The estimates provided are based upon our Team's experience in conducting short- and long-term assessments, technical assistance and monitoring of dozens of police agencies.

As noted above, we **have the greatest number of projected hours (at an incredibly competitive low hourly rate)** compared to the other proposals. **This is not a weakness in our proposal; it's a strength and a benefit to the Court, the Parties and the public.** When the reform process is dragged out over years, or in some case, even a decade, reforms lose importance and the agency inevitably loses its focus and accountability.

We believe in this Department's ability to usher in real reform and change. Our number of hours, our focus and our pace of work reflect our determination to keep the CPD motivated on reform. Applying the appropriate resources in the first three years to guide and assist so real and lasting solutions can be realized and seen in the community.

- 7 **What commitment, if any, will your team make to ensure the performance of work that is necessary but that may fall outside the budget in any given year? In your response, please be sure to identify any team members who have indicated a willingness to provide work on a pro bono or non-billable basis.**

In our response to question 4 and in Attachment 1, we outlined our commitment to provide **1,310 pro bono hours** to the monitorship and the Team members who will deliver those hours. We also believe our low hourly rates demonstrate every CMT member's commitment to this project. Because our SMEs are committed to this process, they have agreed, like the companies, to work at, and offer, the city the **lowest possible hourly rates. There are no law firm or private consulting rates in our proposal.** The companies have awarded this pro bono time to ensure there are sufficient hours available to successfully complete the tasks at hand to implement reforms.

Because we have done this before, we understand both the **level of effort** required as well as a **police department's capacity to undertake, withstand and successfully adopt change.** Our experience also informs us on how and when to balance hours and resources in our budget to deliver on our proposal most effectively. Our Team will deliver on our commitment to assess, evaluate, report and most importantly help bring about lasting change to the Chicago Police Department. We have **demonstrated** those capacities time and again for cities across the country, such as delivering on USDOJ CRI-TA reform projects - **always on or under-time and on or under budget.**

Lastly, we are committed to the City of Chicago as it is our home too. When we commit to a task that needs to be completed to bring about reform, we will complete that task. It is who we are as companies and individuals and this is what our Team and our SMEs will demonstrate to you every day.



- 8 **The RFP contains a statement requesting that all communications with Parties be disclosed. To the extent you have had any communications, written or oral with either or both of the Parties or their consultants or experts before or after September 4, 2018 regarding the IM selection process or Consent Decree, please detail them. If your response to the RFP contained a statement regarding communications prior to September 4, 2018, there is no need to re-submit that information.**

We have no additional communications with the Parties to report.

- 9 **If any team members have government jobs and expect to retain those jobs during the term of the monitorship, please confirm that the team members' employment contracts or applicable employment policies permit outside work, and if required by their employer's policies or rules, that their employers are aware that they have applied to serve as the monitor or a member of the monitoring team in this matter.**

Many of the subject matter experts listed in the Coar Monitoring Team Proposal currently hold government jobs. They all see this work as an opportunity to contribute to their professions and continually hone their skills to be the best leader and expert possible. The majority of these SMEs have worked with one of our companies in the past and every one of them has demonstrated the ability to professionally deliver on monitoring and reform projects.

As part of our proposal building process, we confirmed that each individual has the capacity to contribute to this project. We take this step very seriously for any proposal as this commitment is a key driver of ensuring a successful project. We also confirmed that all of them would be working this project on approved leave and days off or is an agreed-upon activity of their current employer.

- 10 **If any team members intend to maintain a full-time job during the term of the monitorship in a position that does not contemplate work on a client-by-client basis (i.e., consultant or firm attorney), please describe how the team member intends to manage his or her full time employment obligation simultaneously with his or her monitorship responsibilities and confirm that their employers are aware (or will be made aware) that they have applied to serve as the monitor or a member of the monitoring team in this matter.**

The Coare Monitoring Team is comprised of an effective blend of experts from the companies that comprise the CMT and professionals serving on our Team in a part-time capacity. This allows us to deliver deep and current experiences from the fields of policing, law and academia. Every member of our Team who is maintaining a full-time job during the term of the monitorship has the full support of their employer to work on the Chicago Consent Decree project utilizing leave time, days off, compensatory time or flexible scheduling.

- 11 **Many provisions in the proposed Consent Decree require the development and/or maintenance of technology systems capable of capturing and analyzing data. To meet the obligations of the Consent Decree, the City may need to implement significant changes to its automated data systems. The monitoring team will be responsible to assess the adequacy of the upgrades and may need to provide technical assistance. Please detail the experience your team has with the implementation of processes to collect and analyze data. In your response, identify the specific team member(s) who have that experience and how that experience might be used during the term of the monitorship.**

Coar Monitoring Team member BRG's global technology practice includes a dedicated computer forensics team that provides forensically sound defensible data acquisition services in all regions and across all platforms. Whether collecting a targeted selection of files and folders from a single custodian, or preserving the entire contents of a corporate network, BRG's collections team bring state-of-the-art technology and expertise to every situation.

BRG has expertise in: active and legacy backup tape hardware and software including forensic restoration; email and webmail systems; email journaling and archiving systems (such as Symantec EV, Office365 and Barracuda); IM applications (such as Jabber, Lync and Skype); web/client/file servers; intranet and collaboration platforms (such as SharePoint); as well as a vast range of document management systems. BRG's collection team routinely collects and preserves content from mobile



devices, social media sites, and cloud-based storage systems. Our team also collects and interrogates structured database systems hosted either internally within an organization's firewall, or externally via the cloud (Salesforce, as one example).

One of the largest growing areas for ESI collection is data stored in the cloud. BRG has a variety of proven techniques to forensically collect ESI from different cloud-based providers. BRG has experience in collecting from Google Apps, Office 365, Box, Dropbox, Hotmail, Yahoo and others including various social media platforms. BRG is well prepared to assist the City should the automated data systems touch upon those topics.

From legacy document management systems to financial databases, BRG experts advise clients on understanding, accessing, retrieving, aggregating and analyzing large data sets and documents. BRG has collected billions of records from structured data sources, including Microsoft SQL Server, Oracle, IBM DB2, PostgreSQL, Pervasive, AS/400, and SharePoint, Documentum and other relational databases and structured data repositories.

Our approach to collecting and analyzing structured data sources uses the same forensic principles as our hard drive, e-mail and network collections. However, structured data sources require a case-by-case assessment to determine the optimal collection approach. With an understanding of the system type and configuration, the scope of the request, the content of the database and the production requirements, we work with the system's administrator to determine a collection approach that includes a work plan for collection, analysis, reconciliation and production from the database.

In addition to the physical collection of data, Coar Monitoring Team member BRG also provides consulting services relating to the management and strategy associated with large scale collections. Subject-matter experts with years of strategic and practical hands-on experience in legal departments and courtrooms provide the guidance and scalability clients need to implement best practices, integrate business departments, understand and execute leading-edge technology and meet tight deadlines.

While some may be more pertinent than others as far as the monitoring role, BRG's services in this area include:

- Discovery and information governance program assessment, recommendations and development to provide a strategic advantage
- Independent technology selection and implementation
- Litigation project and case management
- Discovery data mapping
- Policy, procedures and playbooks development (these guidelines identify the various roles and responsibilities of all participants)
- Expert and 30(b)(6) testimony and playbook
- Court-appointed neutral (discovery dispute resolution)

Our Chicago digital forensics and E-Discovery lab is led by Director David Kalat. Work performed locally will be done under his supervision. He is a testifying expert in digital forensic investigations and an eDiscovery specialist. In addition to providing expert testimony regarding the analysis of electronic evidence, he also provides compliance consulting services involving the management of large, interconnected database systems integrated between clients and their third-party vendors.

Mr. Kalat has more than 20 years of experience in digital video and ran an independent DVD publishing company from 1997 to 2011. He has applied this experience to the forensic examination of video evidence in a variety of contexts including investigations into alleged police misconduct. Mr. Kalat has examined dashcam videos, police body microphone recordings, multi-camera surveillance CCTV DVR systems and media from personal smartphones. Mr. Kalat has also collected and examined log files and video data from a law enforcement officer's Taser weapon.

He is an International Society of Forensic Computer Examiners Certified Computer Examiner, a Certified Information Systems Security Professional, an Access Data Certified Examiner, a Certified Fraud Examiner and Licensed Private Detective in Illinois and Texas. He holds a Masters in Information Science from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Prior to joining BRG, Mr. Kalat was with Duff & Phelps' Disputes and Investigations practice, where he managed an international team of forensic examiners and eDiscovery support specialists.

Assisting Mr. Kalat is William Poirier, Managing Consultant. Mr. Poirier is a member of BRG's Global Investigations practice and specializes in overseeing electronic discovery engagements and conducting computer forensic investigations. His work



involves all stages of discovery, including data mapping, collection/preservation, analysis, hosting, review and document production. He has conducted forensic investigations involving embezzlement, trade secret and intellectual property theft, data breaches, health care compliance and fraud. He is EnCase certified.

Mr. Poirier was the lead collection specialist on behalf of a governmental agency involved in litigation over a failed IT implementation. He personally collected forensic images from hundreds of sources including personal computers, USB drives, smart-phones, servers, DVDs, printer/copiers and floppy discs and administered the review platform which hosted the case's largest dataset. Mr. Poirier also led a document review team for a data set of over 20 million documents as part of a red-flag analysis on behalf of Irving Picard, the Trustee of Bernie L Madoff Investment Securities, LLC.

Having a Chicago-based computer forensic team and facilities will benefit the CPD and Monitor going forward. There may be issues to tackle that are not yet being conceptualized. BRG has the necessary capabilities and skillsets to assist where needed.

12 What is your team's plan for gathering basic information about the Chicago Police Department and the status of its policing reform efforts at the outset of the monitorship?

We have conducted numerous law enforcement assessments and our proven practice would be applied here in Chicago. It is not a small feat to assess the second largest law enforcement agency in the U.S., but we have the depth and knowledge to ensure that we will do so with accuracy, timeliness and objectivity – as we have in Milwaukee, Memphis, San Francisco – all major cities that are structured and face the same challenges as Chicago in delivering police services across an expansive metropolitan footprint.

The Coar Monitoring Team will conduct information gathering activities throughout the assessment. These activities, often completed in anticipation of site visits, include gathering background material and conducting policy reviews. Information gathering will include a request to the CPD for manuals, policies, orders, department bulletins, data and other information related to the objectives set forth in the Work Plan. Based on the information gathered, the Team will use the site visits to refine the information and develop the assessment recommendations through further document review, interviews, observations and data analyses. These activities will involve meeting with a wide array of stakeholders including law enforcement officials, government officials, community organizations and individuals.

As this Work Plan specifically relates to data analyses, it assumes that, in most cases, quality data will be available that can be used to support findings and recommendations. In pursuit of this goal, a data sharing agreement should be executed between the CPD and the Monitor that outlines protocols for requesting data to support the CCD monitoring project, including but not limited to the format, delivery and use of the data and retention of the data by the Monitor.

When awarded, the Coar Monitoring Team will develop a detailed Work Plan with a focus on ensuring sufficient groundwork review in support of research and analysis. A Work Plan focused on multi-layered development of information, observations and data will allow for the timely completion of an accurate and useful Assessment Report. The Work Plan will be developed based on initial site visits and Community Listening Sessions in areas representative of Chicago's diverse communities.

Each of the next site visits during the Assessment Phase will focus on developing the information and data needed to inform the findings and recommendations related to the goals and objectives, as directed by the Agreement.

The Team will develop a schedule for each site visit that builds on the data requests, collection and analysis of the previous site visit. The Work Plan will identify activities related to site visits and other work to advance the assessment and each site visit will be accompanied by a written schedule. It is anticipated that within the time allotted, activity to advance the Work Plan will occur every week of the Assessment Phase. As a result, the Work Plan and schedule will be a living document that will inform the overall process and will be available in the shared work environment.

Each site visit will result in a summary report to be submitted within 10 business days to the appropriate Principal Deputy Monitor, including activities conducted, preliminary observations to be considered as emerging findings and recommendations by sub-objective, status of report development and future identified areas of examination. In addition, all SMEs will produce individual summaries that will include the role and function of each person interviewed (not to include specific names), relevant observations, additional data requirements and identified trends or areas of concern.



Data analysis will inform the overall assessment and the findings and recommendations. The Team will conduct an analysis of available data through a review of published and requested data, including observations and case files relevant to the goal and objectives. Emphasis will be placed upon analyzing electronic data that informs the research inquiries. If it is determined that the data is not available, sufficiently clean, or capable of analysis, the Team will alter the assessment approach for the objectives impacted. If a lack of data affects the ability to make and support findings or recommendations, the Team will note this in its initial report to the Court.

13 Please provide more information on the team’s proposed monitoring methodology. Specifically, describe the team’s:

- 13.1 Approach to the development of a monitoring plan and staging of monitoring activities/priorities;
- 13.2 Establishment and measurement of compliance thresholds;
- 13.3 Engagement and collection of information from all stakeholder communities;
- 13.4 Sources of information/data/access; and
- 13.5 Capacity to provide ongoing technical assistance.

13.1 Approach to the development of a monitoring plan and staging of monitoring activities/priorities

A Systematic Approach: As a team of seasoned and objective experts, we have developed a systematic approach to our detailed assessments of policing and public safety organizations, one that we believe readily translates to the monitoring plan development and tasking of the activities. The following six factors, taken together, represent major differentiating characteristics of Hillard Heintze’s approach to comprehensive assessments, which is reflected in our monitoring approach.

- **Independent and Objective Analysis:** Because we provide a neutral, independent, third-party senior executive-level perspective, we can (1) avoid some, if not all, of the political implications, departmental intrigue and natural resistance to internal assessments, (2) bring a “fresh” outlook to issues, some of which may have escaped resolution over long periods of time, and (3) frame our analyses, insights and recommendations in terms of best practices currently being developed in leading police departments around the nation.
- **Solicitation of Multiple Perspectives and Viewpoints:** Longstanding issues in any organization are often hard to solve internally because positions become entrenched and it becomes difficult for even well-meaning decision-makers and influencers to (1) continually and creatively view challenges from multiple perspectives and, most importantly, (2) build the consensus that sometimes can remove obstacles.
- **An Acute Focus on Collaboration and Partnership:** Individually and as a team, we are widely recognized within the policing, public safety, law enforcement, security and emergency preparedness communities as true partners – with an institutionally-instilled understanding that the best, fastest and most enduring outcomes are achieved through the alignment, coordination and timely sharing of ideas, information and insights internally and externally across all mission- enabling functions, departments and external groups.
- **A Structured and Highly Disciplined Engagement Approach:** Our planning and project management approach both to monitoring engagements or complex, large-scale, major city police department assessments as well as those for small- to mid-size cities is designed carefully to maximize efficiency, establish accountability, delegate responsibility and coordinate all Hillard Heintze and client resources in order to meet our three key service objectives: (1) exceptional quality standards; (2) disciplined cost controls; and (3) engagement deadlines that are met on time.

THE CRUCIAL DRIVERS

At the heart of excellence in assessing performance is not – unlike some experts claim – the quality of the methodology, no matter how proven, comprehensive and best practice-based it may be.

Instead, we find that it’s the ability of the monitoring team to align key elements of the methodology and best practices to the unique needs and requirements of the organization, in this case the CPD.

This proven approach takes a different form and path for every single engagement.



- **An Information-Driven, Decision-Making Mindset:** Using information, technology and analytics to identify problem areas is an effective modern policing model that helps police executives reduce and manage risks, especially those focused on crime reduction, police accountability and budget cutbacks. By using information to identify problems, we help organizations distribute scarce resources effectively and deploy a truly preventative approach.
- **Clear and Open Lines of Communications:** At the heart of real collaboration is timely, constant and effective communication. Throughout any assessment, we communicate with our clients' project owners – in this case the Court and, where appropriate, the Parties – immediately whenever significant findings are uncovered.

13.2 Establishment and measurement of compliance thresholds

To develop the thresholds, we must first confirm the measurements. In our experience, this comes from initial engagement with stakeholders upon the project implementation. While some of the expected outcomes will be clearly defined, others will require consensus as to what their meaning. For reference, we attach the following two examples from the pending Consent Decree:

- Section 19. CPD will ensure that officers are provided with information regarding the communities they serve, including their assets and challenges, community groups and leaders, and business, residential, and demographic profiles.
- Section 20. Within 180 days of the Effective Date, CPD will develop and institute a policy prohibiting the transport of individuals with the intent to display or leave them in locations where known rivals or enemies live or congregate.

Note that Section 20 has a more specific measurement than Section 19, as it relates to specific actions that support the requirements in light of the number of communities in Chicago. Within each Consent Decree finding, a compliance measure will attach.

Change is more than measurement – but measurement sets the bar. Our experience has shown that it is helpful to engage the agency in its perspective of what it believes to be an appropriate compliance measurement as it develops a shared sense of progress requirements. We will then work with the Consent Decree stakeholders to ensure there is consistency of viewpoint for the compliance measures. Finally, we will submit the final draft of compliance measurements to the Court for approval. We anticipate the measurement to derive from the compliance measurements.

13.3 Engagement and collection of information from all stakeholder communities

Information Gathering

The Coar Monitoring Team will conduct information gathering activities throughout the assessment. These activities will include activities specific to the CPD as outlined in Section 4 of this response. Our other engagement and information collection activities will involve meeting with a wide array of stakeholders including law enforcement officials, government officials, community organizations, and individuals. Community engagement is a key component of the Work Plan. During site visits, the Team will engage with the communities of Chicago by participating in various town hall meetings, community forums, interviews, and facilitated group discussions to obtain feedback and perspectives on important issues and to keep stakeholders informed of the process. The Team will also review messages submitted to the Monitor's email address and correspond as appropriate. At community engagement venues, Team members will make themselves available, as requested, for private interviews with community groups or members.

13.4 Sources of Information/Data/Access

The Team will request detailed documentation, conduct interviews, document observations, and analyze data specifically related to the following:

- Assess CPD's policies, training, and operational practices as they relate to:
- Supervision and management, with a focus on strategic planning and organizational change management
- Communication – top down and bottom up



- Internal procedural justice, to provide for transparency, fairness, and impartiality when interacting with and managing department personnel
- Internal Affairs' processes for handling internal and external complaints and investigations
- Processes for handling discipline
- Processes for managing the CPD early warning system (EWS)
- Processes for handling sexual assault investigations
- Processes for handling domestic violence investigations

Document Review

The Team will review copies of the CPD's policies, procedures, and training materials related to supervision and management; communication; internal procedural justice; and the intake, investigation, and disposition of complaints, including discipline processes to ensure the process is objective, transparent, and timely. The Team will review a random sample of Internal Affairs investigations to assess them for quality and comprehensiveness. The Team will also review CPD's policies and procedures related to its early warning system, including the sufficiency of the identifying factors, thresholds, and alerts, and the timeliness, quality, and comprehensiveness of the review and management of alert notifications.

The CMT will also review Investigations audits and examine current CPD's policies and procedures as they relate to the recommendations from the audits. In addition, the Team will determine CPD's compliance with these recommendations in its current assault sexual investigations. Finally, the Team will conduct a review of a small sampling of sexual assault investigations to assess their quality, completeness, and compliance with promising practices.

The team will conduct a review of a small sampling of domestic violence investigations to assess their quality, completeness, and compliance with promising practices. Of special focus in both the sexual assault and domestic violence case review will be an assessment as to whether cases are being handled in the same manner for all victims, regardless of their racial/ethnic backgrounds, or where they live in the city.

The Coar Monitoring Team will use a sampling approach, assessment methodology and matrix tools, for assessing the processes under the required tasks. These matrix tools will contain the standard questions that will be evaluated in each file review, and will require documented responses of each question by the reviewer. These matrix tools will include the case number, the standard questions and the documented responses to each question and comments as needed.

Interviews

The Team will interview district commanders and supervisors to learn how they address supervision and management, communication, internal procedural justice, complaints brought to them from the community, and discipline processes as well as how they hold officers to account for proper conduct. The Team will also interview CPD personnel on all areas related to supervision and management, communication, internal procedural justice, complaints, discipline processes, the early warning system, and sexual assault and domestic violence investigations.

Focus Groups

The Team may conduct focus groups or group interviews of a particular unit, division, or rank of personnel related to supervision and management, communication, internal procedural justice, complaints, discipline processes, the early warning system, and sexual assault and domestic violence investigations.

Direct Observations

The Team will observe command and supervisor meetings, roll-calls, staff meetings, trainings, and any other meetings to conduct direct observations related to supervision and management, communication, internal procedural justice, complaints, discipline processes, the early warning system, and sexual assault and domestic violence investigations. If any public hearings are convened to address allegations of police misconduct, the Team will endeavor to attend those meetings.



Data Analysis

Data analysis is a critical component of our engagement and will inform the overall assessment and the findings and recommendations. The CMT will endeavor to determine CPD's data collection and management methods, and how the available data could be used to conduct data analyses in each of the objectives and sub-objectives for quantitative review.

The Team will develop a proposed data analyses work plan that outlines quantitative review methods related to each of the objectives, including the proposed method for analyzing each dataset with variables, sampling, and an analytic approach.

The Team will conduct an analysis of available data across the range of quantitative and qualitative data. We know that the CPD is a data rich environment – it has a significant investment in its data collection and analysis processes. We would seek to leverage existing data sets and reporting on the data that is relevant to this Consent Decree.

13.5 Capacity to Provide Ongoing Technical Assistance

The Coar Monitoring Team includes some of the most experienced police reform experts and law enforcement professionals in the United States. Our experts understand how to employ best-in-class security risk management practices – from assessment and disclosure to mitigation, monitoring, response and recovery – to manage the risks, threats and vulnerabilities confronting industries, organizations and initiatives.

CMT has assembled a team with depth and breadth that enhances our ability to: (1) rapidly advance multiple tasks simultaneously, and (2) coordinate the exchange of critical information and insights gathered by any single task-specific unit to the entire team. The CMT Management Team will immediately provide experts with direct and easy access to the right person who will be available to support the Parties on Day One upon award and through our entire engagement.

Our management approach combines a management plan with proven capabilities to deploy, manage and retain the right people in the right place at the right time. CMT's approach is detailed based on knowledge transfer, awareness building and complex project coordination for all of our engagements. This approach is anchored in the Team's broad experience managing large, geographically dispersed teams, effective deliverables and ensuring quality performance across numerous agencies.

CMT's core capabilities include:

- Extensive experience advising elected officials, police executive teams and agency managers on all components of integrated enterprise reform program management and strategy.
- Knowledge of integration imperatives across the drivers of program effectiveness: strategy, structure, people, process and technology.
- Understanding of all law enforcement domains relevant to community-focused policing and community-led policing – including problem-solving methodologies, templates and tools.
- Experience balancing technical applications with unique capacity and strengths to connect with communities using process optimization for superior advancement within law enforcement organizations.
- A deep bench of law enforcement subject matter experts – in our proposal we listed an additional 19 law enforcement, community focused and academic professionals at the ready to help Chicago succeed.

In short, we believe that no other team in the country can deliver on monitoring, reform and technical assistance as can the CMT.

14 What is the timeline for completing various phases of your monitoring methodology?

At the macro level, we based our assessments on the following high-level plan.

Initial Stages and the Assessment Phase (first 12 months with a January 1, 2019 start)

1. Conduct initial site readiness visits
2. Define initial goals, objectives and outcomes



- a. Within 75 days of appointment (March 16, 2019), we will develop and submit to all involved Parties a draft Monitoring Plan for conducting all compliance reviews and audits for the first year of implementation.
 - b. Within 90 days of appointment (March 31, 2019), the Monitoring Plan will be finalized and implemented.
3. Develop data collection and analysis plan
4. Within 180 days of appointment (June 29, 2019), we will begin conducting reliable and comprehensive surveys of broad cross-sections of the Chicago community regarding the CPD and post the survey results on our Monitor website and the CPD's website.
5. Within 365 days of appointment (January 1, 2020), we will review and approve CPD's newly developed Data Systems plan and timeline to ensure quality data management and enhance data mechanisms within the CPD.
6. Conduct direct observation and interviews
7. Undertake "as is" assessment
 - a. Review existing SOPs, general orders, administrative code, policy statements, relevant departmental communication, memos, etc.
 - b. Review pre-service and in-service training for topic area
 - c. Review training records for topic area
 - d. Interview informed sworn and non-sworn personnel in the CPD for operational understanding, identify gaps, areas requiring clarification, etc.
 - e. Review any reports, data collection, CompStat, and any other pertinent sources for relevance to topic
 - f. Conduct "ride along," if relevant
 - g. Review past complaints from the public, Internal Affairs files, newspaper coverage and other media.
8. Identify approved policies and existing best practices in the topic area. Potential sources include:
 - a. DOJ-approved plans from other agencies under similar circumstances such as consent decrees, collaborative reform efforts, and other DOJ sources
 - b. Academic and other guidance
 - c. Associations reports, best practices and recommendations
 - d. Innovative or otherwise highly regarded practices from other agencies
 - i. By July 1, 2019, we will review and approve CPD's development and issuance of a supplemental foot pursuit training bulletin reflecting best practices from other jurisdictions (this is the first step in creating a new, comprehensive foot pursuit policy by 2021, if deemed necessary).
 - ii. By September 1, 2019, we will review and approve CPD's completed needs assessment determining what additional resources are needed to ensure the best officer support services are available.
 - e. CMT's professional judgment and experience
9. Identify areas of concern
10. Recommend opportunities for technical assistance
 - a. By the end of the first year (December 31, 2019 / January 1, 2020), we will review and assess CPD's progress towards achieving appropriate staffing numbers, including unity of command and span-of-



control ratios. Our recommendations will assist the CPD in creating a formal staffing model no later than January 1, 2020 with implementation of the model no later than January 31, 2020.

- b. By the end of the first year (December 31, 2019 / January 1, 2020), we will review and approve CPD's new Crisis Intervention Plan and new Training Plan based on the CPD's needs assessments and data analysis in those areas.
11. Develop draft report on initial findings and recommendations
 12. Obtain agreement on gap analysis from the Parties and community advisory groups.
 13. Submit draft initial report to the Court and Parties
 14. Facilitate a meeting to discuss the findings and recommendations with the Parties
 15. Submit final initial report to the Court

Monitoring and Progress Reporting (months 13 to 30)

1. Develop plan to assess implementation progress
 - a. By April 1, 2020, we will work with the CPD to conduct an assessment of the frequency of all misdemeanor arrests and administrative notices of violation of persons in specific demographic categories, including race and gender. We will approve CPD's proposed methodology (and the implementation timeline that comes from the assessment) when it comports with published, peer-reviewed methodologies and the Agreement.
 - b. By June 1, 2020 (18 months from Effective Date), we will review and approve the CPD's independent experts' assessment of the Department's promotions processes for Sergeants and Lieutenants and work with CPD to implement any recommendations.
2. Identify approved areas of technical assistance
3. Develop draft report on interim progress
4. Submit draft interim progress report to the Court and Parties
5. Parties' stakeholders and external independent peer review
6. Submit final initial report to the Court
7. Conduct initial report roll-out and media activity

Monitoring of Final Report Phase (months 30 to 36)

1. Conduct a comprehensive assessment to determine the CPD's compliance with the Agreement
2. Develop final report based on 30 months of implementation and final assessment
3. Submit draft final report to the Court and Parties identifying areas of compliance and non-compliance
4. Internal stakeholders and external independent peer review
5. Submit final programmatic report

15 Please describe in greater detail the role and responsibilities of the Community Advisory Board. What groups do you expect to participate in that capacity? Please describe how it will be formed? Who will comprise the membership of the board? How will the board be staffed? How will you ensure transparency



As we have noted, Judge Coar and our team have been working on this response for over two years. We have spoken with community justice groups, residents, community activists, civil rights attorneys and others before this RFP was issued. We could have included a few names of groups with whom we have worked given that the CMT is composed of individuals who have been active on police and community matters in Chicago for decades. Given the robust community interest and participation in this process, we determined it was best to wait and select the participants in conjunction with the Parties and Court.

While the lines of communications will be direct and constantly open, we anticipate that the Community Advisory Board (CAB) will meet with Judge Coar and his designees on a quarterly basis. This will ensure transparency and a continuing effort to ensure the community, as represented by the CAB, is an active participant in the process. This will also be a way for the CMT to receive information from community groups in an informal fashion. The CAB is not a substitute for an interactive website and similar CMT's public facing efforts. Rather, it is a unique feature to get the input of those most affected by CPD reform efforts.

16 Please describe the role of the Bronner Group and what tasks it will accomplish in more detail.

The Bronner Group will be the auditing quality-assurance arm of our CCD reporting. It will set an audit protocol for reporting our findings to ensure our Team is collecting sufficient articulable evidence to support any reported finding of conformity and nonconformity with the Agreement. It will review all findings before submission to ensure adequate facts and supporting documentation exist to support findings.

17 You have listed a number of qualifications (pp. 12-16), for each prior experience or specific case or matter listed, please identify who from your team led that effort or was otherwise involved in the case or matter.

Please see Attachment 3, which identifies the appropriate team members.

18 Please provide a copy of the Hillard Heintze publication referenced in your proposal on best practices in community policing.

This is work we completed as part of our contract to the U.S. Department of Justice COPS Office CRI-TA program. This work is completed by Hillard Heintze to be re-branded as a USDOJ COPS publication. Our contract prohibits release of our deliberative working draft. The COPS Office has planned the release of this document this fall; however, a specific date has not been determined. We have requested permission to provide you with a copy, but unfortunately were advised that this would not be allowed. We did receive permission for any member of the review team to view a copy of this work in our office. Additionally, if you would prefer a reference for the work we submitted, we can supply that contact information.

19 Please provide more detailed information regarding the work done in the Laquan McDonald case. (p. 16)

Core Monitoring Team member BRG's team, led by Jeff Cramer, performed several work projects at the request of Special Prosecutor Patricia Holmes on the Laquan McDonald conspiracy investigation and Indictment. Specifically, BRG personnel served or assisted in coordinating service of approximately 100 subpoenas to civilian and police officers. This work included identifying addresses for individuals, contacting them and, in some instances, personally serving the individuals and companies. BRG also conducted a limited public records due diligence investigation on numerous individuals. As the investigation progressed, a BRG investigator took part in 12 witness interviews in preparations for Grand Jury proceedings. The company also managed the E-Discovery process for the Special Prosecutor. As part of that effort, BRG maintained a separate review environment for the Special Prosecutor to ensure all documents were vetted for Garrity compliance before being made available. BRG managed the production of Bates-branded documents in PDF form to defendants in anticipation of trial. Additionally, on an ad-hoc basis, BRG's computer forensics professionals collected and analyzed electronic evidence from various data sources pertinent to the investigation. This included converting scanned cell phone calling logs database files and then performing analysis in its Chicago computer lab to identify linkages between individuals during a defined time period.



20 Please explain your rationale for adopting a quarterly and annual reporting cadence when the Consent Decree calls for semi-annual reports.

Modelling transparency throughout the engagement is critical to ensuring that the communities of Chicago recognize that this process will truly bring change – and that they are part of that change. Our approach to the monitorship is to create a sense of community – so that the residents and stakeholders in Chicago understand that reform is a shared commitment. Too many past police reform initiatives have started here in Chicago but failed to progress – in part because there was a report produced that sat on a shelf without an obligation to implement. While the formal process of monitoring will resolve some of these issues, we believe that transparency should be a key component of this current process. We fully support the semi-annual reporting process called for and are willing and capable to meet that requirement.

However, our communications perspective and our reporting cadence meet both the judicial schedule while providing the flexibility to address the issues and accomplishments of our Community Advisory Board. We see this Board, with which we plan to meet quarterly and address more fully in our proposal and Question 15, as more than just a one-way communication channel to the community. Its key role will be ensuring the input of diverse viewpoints that build the fabric of our communities and ensuring they have not only a voice in the process, but also timely information regarding it. These reports will not have the full range of issues of the semi-annual reports, but will address emerging and key matters raised by and through the Community Advisory Board as a result of our ongoing engagement.

If our rationale is not acceptable by the Court or the Parties, we will, of course, follow the direction of the Agreement for semi-annual reports.

Qualifications Specified in RFP	Total Estimated Hours	Management, Oversight and Project Management	Community Policing	Impartial Policing	Crisis Intervention	Use of Force	Recruitment, Hiring, and Promotion	Training	Supervision	Officer Wellness and Support	Accountability and Transparency	Data Collection, Analysis, and Management	Community Engagement	Reporting	Total
Hon. David Coar (Ret.)	1,000	220	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	280	100	1,000
Jeffrey Cramer	1,240	320			40	40		80	120			280	120	240	1,240
Kenneth Bouche	1,480	300	120	40	160	120		80	40		120	40	220	240	1,480
Marcia Thompson	1,720	160	280	320			240			280			280	160	1,720
Theron Bowman	1,000	120				280		160	160				120	160	1,000
Peter Harvey	100	100													100
Sergio Acosta	300	60								160	160		40	40	300
Carol Archbold	280										160	40		80	280
Robert Davis	1,000					280		240	200				120	160	1,000
Alex del Carmen	440			200								80	80	80	440
Michael Dirden	1,000		120				240			240	120		120	160	1,000
Will Johnson	280		200				40							40	280
Grande Lum	240														240
Meghan Maury	280			160									80	40	280
Thomas O'Reilly	440							40	160	160			80	80	440
Rick Tanksley	360		200		80									80	360
Amy Watson	240				120							40		80	240
Linda Tartaglia	280						80							80	280
Scott Bailey	240	200						120						40	240
Lindsay Morgan	280	140												140	280
Peggy Daley - BRG Data Team	240											200		40	240
Natalie Fouty	10,000	480										40		480	1,000
Communications	500													500	500
Community Facilitator	240												240		240
Community Liason	240												240		240
TOTAL	23,420	2,100	960	760	600	760	640	760	720	720	600	760	1,940	3,100	14,420

Chicago Police Department Consent Decree
Attachment 2 - Budget by Labor Hour



Coar Monitoring Team Member	Assignment	Anticipated Hours	Paid Hours	Pro-bono Hours	Trips	Anticipated On-Site Hours	Anticipated Off-Site Hours
David H. Coar	Monitor	1,000	900	100		1,000	0
Jeff Cramer	Principle Deputy Monitor & SME	1,240	1,000	240		1,240	0
Ken Bouche	Principle Deputy Monitor & SME	1,480	1,240	240		1,480	0
Peter Harvey	Special Advisor	100	100			0	100
Sergio Acosta	Deputy Monitor & SME	300	300			300	0
Marcia Thomson	Deputy Monitor & SME	1,720	1,620	100		1,720	0
Theron Bowman	Deputy Monitor & SME	1,000	1,000		15	720	280
Carol Archbold	SME - Data Collection, Analysis & Mgmt.	280	280		4	220	60
Rob Davis	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	1,000	880	120	15	720	280
Alex del Carmen	SME - Data Collection, Analysis & Mgmt.	440	440		8	320	120
Michael Dirden	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	1,000	1,000		15	720	280
Will Johnson	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	280	280		5	200	80
Grande Lum	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	240	240		4	200	40
Meghan Maury	Subject Matter Expert - Community	280	280		4	220	60
Tom O'Reilly	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	440	440		8	320	120
Rick Tanksley	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	360	360		4	280	80
Amy Watson	SME - Data Collection, Analysis & Mgmt.	240	240			240	0
Linda Tartaglia	Subject Matter Expert - Law Enforcement	280	280		4	200	80
Scott Bailey	Compliance	240	240			240	0
Lindsay Morgan	Project Manager	280	200	80	3	160	200
Peggy Daley - BRG Data Team	Data Analytics	240	160	80		240	0
Natalie Fouty	Assistant Project Manager	1,000	850	150		1,000	0
Communications	Report Delivery	500	300	200		500	0
Community Meetings Facilitator	Community Liaison	240	240			240	0
Community Advisory Board Liaison	Community Liaison	240	240			240	0
Total		14,420	13,110	1,310	89	12,720	1,780
Labor Cost			2,589,225	-258,725			
Travel and Site Expenses			257,470				
Total Cost Years 1 Through 3			2,846,695				

Attachment 3 - Qualifications

The following information is in response to Question 17: You have listed a number of qualifications (pp. 12-16), for each prior experience or specific case or matter listed, please identify who from your team led that effort or was otherwise involved in the case or matter.

The qualifications of the CMT are broad and deep. Each of us, from the Monitor and CMT leaders to our carefully selected nationally recognized experts in law, policing or academia, has been a change agent within their respective area of practice. Each team member has translated their experience to reforming policing, engaging communities and developing programs that have become national practice models for community policing, use of force, building communities of trust and so many more areas that translate to supporting Chicago to achieve lasting reform.

Policing and Law Enforcement Practices

- Currently support the U.S. DOJ COPS Office CRI-TA Program. This multi-year program seeks to improve trust between police and communities by developing long-term, holistic strategies to address issues that affect public trust based upon comprehensive assessments and provision of technical assistance with a focus on use of force; de-escalation; recruiting and hiring; training; crisis intervention; and police accountability. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Tom O’Reilly, Rick Tanksley, Lindsay Morgan, Theron Bowman, Ph.D., Carol Archbold, Ph.D., and Marcia Thompson.**
- Currently serve as a use of force policy and training expert to the U.S. Attorney’s Office of the Western District of Washington and the District of Maryland for both the Seattle and Baltimore Consent Decrees. – **Rob Davis.**
- In 2015, provided the assessment and transformation strategy with 400 recommendations for the Denver Sheriff’s Department that were recently documented as complete on August 27, 2018 in the report “Denver Sheriff-Beyond Reform,” which outlines the significant advancements made by the Denver Sheriff Department resulting from our assessment and guidance. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, and Marcia Thompson.**
- Conducted an independent review of the Schaumburg Police Department in the wake of a criminal scandal involving several officers. Served as The Interim Police Chief and successfully implemented all 50 recommendations. – **Ken Bouche and Rob Davis.**
- Conducted extensive analysis of the data and practices regarding traffic and pedestrian stops in more than a dozen cities of varying size – such as Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Boulder, Colorado; and Schaumburg, Illinois – to gain insight into the impact of departmental practices on communities’ perception of police bias and to help direct reform of policing practices. – **Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Rob Davis, Ken Bouche, Marcia Thompson, Rick Tanksley, Tom O’Reilly, Linda Tartaglia, Theron Bowman, Ph.D., Chief Wil Johnson, and Alex del Carmen, Ph.D.**
- Reviewed national civilian oversight mechanisms for law enforcement agencies for Ann Arbor, Michigan and Kern, County California to develop policy and practice to improve police accountability, transparency and local practices regarding police oversight. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, and Rick Tanksley.**
- Provided the leadership resulting in Arlington, Texas Police Department’s selection by the US DOJ as one of 15 “exemplar” agencies for Advancing 21st Century Policing throughout the nation. – **Chief Wil Johnson and Theron Bowman, Ph.D.**
- Supported the Building Communities of Trust and Suspicious Activity Reporting initiatives on behalf of the U.S. DOJ in Chicago, Denver, Seattle and Miami, Florida by conducting community roundtables to hear and address community concerns. – **Tom O’Reilly, Linda Tartaglia, and Ken Bouche.**



- Conducted a study of excessive force complaints filed by citizens against officers in cities, such as Milwaukee, San Francisco and Baltimore, directed at identifying consistencies and areas for improvement. – **Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Rob Davis, Ken Bouche, Marcia Thompson, Rick Tanksley, Tom O'Reilly, Linda Tartaglia, and Theron Bowman, Ph.D.**
- Developed and delivered a certification course for Crisis Intervention Team Coordinators, covering topics related to effective law enforcement and mental health partnerships, trainings and responses to mental health crisis in the community. This program has been taught to over 500 program coordinators across the country. – **Amy Watson, Ph.D.**

Monitoring

- Team members currently serving as the Monitor and as subject matter experts for the Newark Police Department to oversee implementation of its Consent Decree. – **Peter Harvey, Tom O'Reilly, and Linda Tartaglia.**
- Currently providing the San Francisco Police Department with independent monitoring, review and reporting of the Department's organizational transformation process in collaboration with the California Department of Justice. – **Michael Dirden, Ken Bouche, and Rob Davis.**
- Served as Project Manager for the New Jersey State Police Consent Decree involving racial profiling and developed and implemented practices recognized by U.S. DOJ and the police profession as best practices in this area. – **Tom O'Reilly and Linda Tartaglia.**
- **Judge Coar** served as the court-appointed Special Independent Counsel under a consent decree involving the (Teamster's) Central States Pension and Health and Welfare Funds.
- **Judge Coar** was appointed by the Illinois Supreme Court to facilitate and oversee the implementation of 40 recommendations arising from a systematic review of Cook County's pretrial operations to reduce overcrowding at the Cook County Jail.
- **Judge Coar** oversaw the Consent Decree regarding the redevelopment plans for Chicago Cabrini Green public housing complex pursuant to the Fair Housing Act. Over a period of 11 years, addressed issues including displacements and reduced affordable housing, alleged to have discriminatory impact on people of color, women and children.
- Provided training and facilitated round-table discussions for Monitors from cities with Consent Decrees, including Seattle, New Orleans, Cleveland, Ferguson and Puerto Rico. – Alex Del **Carmen, Ph.D. and Grande Lum.**
- Served as a police practices expert for the U.S. DOJ in support of law enforcement misconduct investigations including Baltimore, Maryland. – **Rob Davis.**
- Engaged in assessment and reform recommendations regarding policies, procedures and practices for law enforcement in cities such as Baltimore; King County, Washington; Denver, Colorado; and Schaumburg, Illinois and for U.S. Customs and Border Patrol. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Michael Dirden, Chief Wil Johnson, Meghan Maurey, Tom O'Reilly, Rick Tanksley, Lindsay Morgan, Theron Bowman, Ph.D., Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Marcia Thompson, and Linda Tartaglia.**
- Have been engaged, as part of the requirements of the Cleveland Division of Police Consent Decree, to reinvestigate the backlog of 282 incomplete Internal Investigations. – **Ken Bouche.**

Communication

- Produced highly publicized reports for Monitors, the DOJ and dozens of public and private clients as seen on www.hillardheintze.com and www.thinkbrg.com. – **Hillard Heintze and Berkeley Research Group.**



- Routinely engaged client constituencies through public meetings and listening sessions to identify and address community perceptions of the police in cities such as Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Ferguson, Missouri; and San Francisco, California. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Michael Dirden, Chief Wil Johnson, Meghan Maurey, Tom O'Reilly, Rick Tanksley, Carol Archbold, Ph.D., and Marcia Thompson.**
- Facilitated community engagement related to public service delivery, safety, delinquency and policy in Washington, D.C., New Orleans and Chicago, and wrote derivative action plans shared with participants, community and city stakeholders. – **Alex del Carmen, Ph.D. and Tom O'Reilly**
- Highly skilled, comprehensive communications team that addresses strategy and approach to messaging, reporting, graphics and presentations on behalf of clients and supports interface with communities. – **Hillard Heintze Communications Team.**
- Experienced in community-based surveys on a variety of client issues that inform subsequent reporting and analysis. – **Amy Watson, Ph.D., Carl Archbold, Ph.D., and Alex del Carmen, Ph.D.**

Collaboration with Government Entities, the City, CPD and the State

- Served as a Co-Chair of Chicago's Police Accountability Task Force designed to facilitate trust between the police and the community through a roadmap for lasting transparency, respectful engagement, accountability and change. – **Sergio Acosta**
- Served on the Chicago Ethics Reform Task Force tasked with reviewing the City's ethics ordinances, regulations and procedures, studying best practices nationally, engaging subject matter experts and recommending reforms. – **Peggy Daley.**
- Designed and led the development of the Illinois Integrated Justice Information System, a collaboration of 22 Illinois justice entities, including the CPD, that work together to improve information sharing. – **Ken Bouche.**
- Facilitated engagement among the New Jersey State Police, the Camden County Prosecutor and neighborhood community groups to implement successful community policing strategies. – **Tom O'Reilly and Linda Tartaglia.**
- Developed a partnership with the Chicago police to create and fund I-CLEAR, a statewide data warehouse system that delivered consistently reported and dramatically improved information for Illinois law enforcement agencies. – **Ken Bouche.**
- Served on the Chicago De-escalation work group, focused on the response to mental health crisis calls and the development of findings and recommendations for improvements within the CPD. – **Amy Watson, Ph.D.**
- Worked with diverse stakeholders throughout Illinois including government, law enforcement and community to develop, promulgate and implement a law that serves as model for racial profiling data collection across the country. – **Ken Bouche.**

Law and Civil Rights

- Served as Civil Rights Coordinator for the DOJ in Chicago, including investigation and prosecution of civil rights violations. – **Sergio Acosta.**
- Led the investigation into broad range of cases, including public corruption and police misconduct, as well as criminal and terror cases, and led the prosecution team through Indictment in U.S. v. Burge (Northern District of Illinois). – **Jeffrey Cramer.**
- Served as Chair of the International Association of Chiefs of Police Human and Civil Rights, working on improvements



and training for police-related civil rights issues relevant to law enforcement and the community. – **Chief Wil Johnson (Chair) and Marcia Thompson (Vice Chair).**

- Entered and oversaw the Consent Decree involving the use of strip searches at the Cook County Jail. – **Honorable Judge David Coar (Ret).**
- Implemented a new police recruitment selection and training process as a settlement to NAACP suit filed against the New Jersey Attorney General and the State Police regarding underrepresentation of minorities. – **Tom O'Reilly and Linda Tartaglia.**
- Developed social justice reforms, including a court diversion program that uses mediation for delinquency matters and other reform focused practices including peace circles and group conferencing. – **Amy Watson, Ph.D. and Grande Lum**
- Developed and implemented statewide policies and practices in Illinois for videotaping all interrogations for homicide investigations and standardized identification procedures for line-ups and in-person identifications. – **Ken Bouche.**

Experience Working with Various Constituencies

- Engaged with a variety of diverse communities in public meetings over critical incidents involving police in San Francisco; Milwaukee; Baltimore; Ferguson; and Sanford, Florida, among others. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Michael Dirden, Chief Will Johnson, Meghan Maurey, Tom O'Reilly, Rick Tanksley, Lindsay Morgan, Theron Bowman, Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Marcia Thompson, Alex del Carmen, Ph.D., and Grande Lum.**
- Worked closely with community leaders, social justice advocacy groups, diverse community groups and key community stakeholders in nine CRI-TA cities, including Commerce City, Colorado and Memphis, Tennessee, to inform and drive positive police reform. - **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Michael Dirden, Chief Will Johnson, Meghan Maurey, Tom O'Reilly, Rick Tanksley, Lindsay Morgan, Theron Bowman, Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Marcia Thompson.**
- Served as co-coordinator for the DOJ's Project Safe Neighborhood (PSN) in Chicago, with focus on reform and intervention through consistent problem-solving in partnership with law enforcement, convicted individuals, work placement firms and local service organizations. University of Chicago Crime Lab personnel provided the data for PSN metrics in Chicago. – **Jeffrey Cramer.**
- Served as a liaison to diverse legal organizations, such as a Muslim Women Lawyers Human Rights group, to help build bridges with other diverse legal organizations and provide support and services to underserved communities. – **Meghan Maurey.**
- Engaged in research and provided strategies for engaging diverse communities, as reported in the COPS Office and Vera Institute Policing Perspectives Series, "Building Trust in a Diverse Nation: How to Support Trust Building in Your Agency." – **Tom O'Reilly.**

Knowledge of Chicago Communities

- Engaged Chicago is home to the Monitor, the two Principal Deputy Monitors, two Deputy Monitors and four other team members. We live here, we drive here, we work here - and most of us have dedicated our professional careers to ensuring safety and justice for all of its residents. – **Judge David Coar, Jeffrey Cramer, Ken Bouche, Sergio Acosta, Marcia Thompson, Amy Watson, Ph.D., Scott Bailey, Peggy Daley, and Natalie Fouty.** *Note – in our proposal this stated "nine other team members". This was an inadvertent error, it is four other team members, equaling nine total.*
- **Judge Coar** served as a federal judge in Chicago for 24 years – his knowledge and experience is grounded in Chicago, including presiding over numerous alleged civil rights violations brought against police agencies, including the CPD.
- **Judge Coar** served as the Arbitrator reviewing disputed claims under the Chicago Ordinance providing for reparations



to victims of police torture.

- **Judge Coar** has supported the Chicago legal community through teaching at DePaul Law School as well as through various Bar activities aimed at supporting ethical practice and diversity.
- One Principal Deputy Monitor served on the COPA Chief Administrator Search Committee, developing an awareness and understanding of the key issues surrounding police abuse complaints and the systems to address them within the CPD. – **Jeffrey Cramer**.
- One Principal Deputy Monitor served as the Illinois State Police District Chicago Commander and implemented several multi-jurisdictional programs including the Cook County Public Integrity Task Force; Multi-Disciplinary Child Homicide Task Force; and the Committee for Communicating with the Deaf. – **Ken Bouche**.
- One Deputy Monitor is actively engaged with the Hispanic and Latino communities in Illinois, achieving significant recognition for his support and leadership through the Hispanic Lawyers Association of Illinois and recognized as one of the Most Influential Latinos in the Chicago Area by *Negocios Now*. – **Sergio Acosta**.
- One Principal Deputy Monitor engaged a Cook County Initiative to identify risk issues associated with gangs and domestic violence to develop more effective responses, using a team comprised of various community-based initiatives such as Ceasefire. – **Jeffrey Cramer**

Project and Change Management

- Successfully delivered several hundred consulting and research projects throughout the world, with budgets ranging from several thousand dollars to more than \$50 million, and time frames running from a few weeks to six years. – **Hillard Heintze and Berkeley Research Group**.
- Used project management best practices to develop, implement and maintain a complex, multi-layered, resource-loaded Integrated Master Schedule, baseline and scheduling strategy for a \$900 million, eight-year major federal investment at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), including 997 technical and detailed requirements. – **Lindsay Morgan**.
- Used project management to implement an Integrated Master Schedule that accelerated assessment of San Francisco's participation in CRI-TA, from one year to 11 weeks. Resulted in a detailed assessment delivered on time and on budget. – **Lindsay Morgan, Michael Dirden, and Rob Davis**.
- Documented change management as the outcome of work in dozens of cities and resulting concrete examples of evidence-based change in cities such as Schaumburg, Illinois; Beloit, Wisconsin; and Denver and Boulder, Colorado. – **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Michael Dirden, Chief Will Johnson, Meghan Maurey, Tom O'Reilly, Rick Tanksley, Lindsay Morgan, Theron Bowman, Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Marcia Thompson**.
- Conducted climate assessments for U.S.-based companies with locations throughout the world (i.e., Singapore, Japan, Switzerland and Mexico) and provided comprehensive recommendations for organizational transformation, often focused on increased morale, better client engagement, and improved leadership effectiveness and accountability. – **Jeffrey Cramer**.
- Provided comprehensive assessment of internal affairs policies within the King County Auditor's Office resulting in innovative practices centered on transparency, community and enhanced communications between partners for police accountability. – **Rob Davis**.



Budgeting

- Extensive experience at controlling costs, especially on public engagements where cost is a public concern and subject to audit. In 2018 alone, our Team entity managed five multi-million dollar projects, maintaining cost parameters and scope to deliver successful projects on time and on budget. – **Hillard Heintze and Lindsay Morgan.**
- Received a rating of “Exceptional,” the highest rating attainable, for two consecutive years from the U.S. DOJ for management of a \$50 million contract for police reform with concurrent projects in nine cities across the country. – **Lindsay Morgan.**
- Relied on burn-rate forecasts and an Earned Value Management (EVM) program to provide consistent visibility into the budget utilization and performance metrics for all engagements, public and private. – **Hillard Heintze and Lindsay Morgan.**
- Delivered all nine CRI-TA projects on time and on budget with four cities being delivered under budget, creating savings for the U.S. DOJ COPS Office totaling \$950,000. - **Ken Bouche, Rob Davis, Michael Dirden, Chief Will Johnson, Meghan Maurey, Rick Tanksley, Lindsay Morgan, Theron Bowman, Carol Archbold, Ph.D., Marcia Thompson.**
- Managed internally by performance metrics – which include consistent budget review and project management reporting – as based upon contractually required deliverables and estimated expenditures. – **Hillard Heintze and Berkeley Research Group.**

Data Analysis and Information Technology

- Experienced in quantitative and qualitative data analysis in dozens of law enforcement agencies, such as Inspector Generals; state, local and federal agencies; financial industry; manufacturing; and corporate security. – **Berkeley Research Group and Hillard Heintze; also Alex del Carmen, Ph.D., Carol Archbold, Ph.D., and Amy Watson, Ph.D.**
- Developed statistically valid samples of documents and data sets in order to conduct analysis of practices regarding traffic and pedestrian stops, use of force, staffing and bias in policing on behalf of the U.S. DOJ and private clients, including San Francisco, California; St. Anthony Village, Minnesota; and Denver and Boulder, Colorado. – **Hillard Heintze and Alex del Carmen, Ph.D.**
- Evaluated officer decisions and data reporting and management as related to stops, arrests, gang contacts, early warning systems and other areas of oversight, while engaged with the various consent decrees in Newark, New Jersey. – **Tom O’Reilly, Linda Tartaglia, and Peter Harvey.**
- Provided assistance in collecting and analyzing the data and witness-related efforts for the Special Prosecutor on the conspiracy charges against three Chicago police officers stemming from the shooting of Laquan McDonald. – **Jeffrey Cramer and Berkeley Research Group.**
- Collected and analyzed data focused on the use of mediation to resolve citizen complaints filed against police officers across the country, in which research findings were reported in her book “The New World of Police Accountability.” – **Carol Archbold, Ph.D.**
- Have a computer forensics lab and personnel in Chicago to facilitate the collection and analysis of data. – **Berkeley Research Group.**
- Recognized national subject matter expertise for performance evaluation – i.e., designing strong and rigorous procedures for data analysis to accurately measure the effects of interventions or changes in practice in the context of monitoring. – **Amy Watson, Ph.D.**
- Served as a principal investigator for a study that examined police response to persons with mental illnesses and CIT in



Chicago. Collected, analyzed and reported data on mental health interactions, observations, interviews and resources.
– **Amy Watson, Ph.D.**

- Co-chaired a project to provide technical assistance to law enforcement agencies across the country related to responding to persons with mental illnesses and intellectual and development disabilities. Developed and implemented a statewide strategy for collecting racial profiling data in Illinois. - **Amy Watson, Ph.D.**
- Developed and implemented a law enforcement case file review methodology and research tool grounded in proven academic and research processes approved for use by the COPS Office in CRI-TA assessments. – **Rob Davis, Marcia Thompson, Rick Tanksley, and Carol Archbold, Ph.D.**
- Served as the Chair of the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative, a Federal Advisory Committee to the U.S. Attorney General and the Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council, a joint DOJ/DHS initiative designed to bring higher standards to intelligence sharing including the development of the Justice Privacy Standards and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide. – **Ken Bouche.**

NEW YORK
LONDON
SINGAPORE
PHILADELPHIA
CHICAGO
WASHINGTON, DC
SAN FRANCISCO
SILICON VALLEY
SAN DIEGO
LOS ANGELES
TAIWAN
BOSTON
HOUSTON
AUSTIN
HANOI
HO CHI MINH CITY

DuaneMorris®

FIRM and AFFILIATE OFFICES

LISA T. SCRUGGS
DIRECT DIAL: +1 312 499 6742
PERSONAL FAX: +1 312 873 3762
E-MAIL: LTScruggs@duanemorris.com

www.duanemorris.com

SHANGHAI
ATLANTA
BALTIMORE
WILMINGTON
MIAMI
BOCA RATON
PITTSBURGH
NEWARK
LAS VEGAS
CHERRY HILL
LAKE TAHOE
MYANMAR
OMAN
A GCC REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE
OF DUANE MORRIS
ALLIANCES IN MEXICO
AND SRI LANKA

October 11, 2018

VIA E-MAIL

Hon. David H. Coar (Ret.)
Coar Monitoring Team

Email: DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com

Re: Chicago Police Consent Decree Independent Monitor Selection Process

Dear Hon. Coar:

Thank you for your submissions in response to the Request for Proposals issued jointly by the Office of the Illinois Attorney General and the City of Chicago and your ongoing interest in serving as the Independent Monitor. We would like to provide some additional information regarding the next phase of the process.

We will notify those teams who have advanced to the finalist stage during the week of October 15. Please be advised that all finalists will be required to submit an answer to the following question in writing on or before October 26.

Please advise if any team member has:

- *Been terminated from employment or a consulting contract, or resigned from employment, a consulting contract, or a professional board or organization because of a report or allegation of misconduct;*
- *Been accused or adjudicated to have engaged in professional misconduct (for attorneys, only report sustained complaints to the Bar); or*

Hon. David H. Coar (Ret.)
Email: DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com
October 11, 2018
Page 2

- *Been sued for professional or employment related actions and the case was settled, either by the member or an employer of the member, or adjudicated.*

Your written responses should be submitted in electronic format (PDF) and emailed to LScruggs@duanemorris.com and to the City at Aslagel@taftlaw.com. Please include “City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring Proposal – Supplemental Information” in the email subject line. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your ability to provide a response, please contact Lisa and Allan before October 17 to schedule a mutually convenient time for discussion.

Sincerely,

Lisa T. Scruggs
For the Office of the Attorney General
For the State of Illinois

Allan T. Slagel
For the City of Chicago

LTS/saw



October 25, 2018

Ms. Cara Hendrickson
Chief, Public Interest Division
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, Floor 12
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Edward N. Siskel
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago
121 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602

RE: City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring Proposal – Supplemental Information

Dear Ms. Hendrickson and Mr. Siskel:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your October 11, 2018 letter regarding the request for supplemental information.

Our team can answer ‘**no**’ to the first two questions: (1) *been terminated from employment or a consulting contract, or resigned from employment, a consulting contract, or a professional board or organization because of a report or allegation of misconduct*, and (2) *been accused or adjudicated to have engaged in professional misconduct (for attorneys, only report sustained complaints to the Bar)*.

Regarding the third question — (3) *been sued for professional or employment related actions and the case was settled, either by the member or an employer of the member, or adjudicated* — four team members can answer ‘**yes,**’ but all cases were dismissed. Please see their responses below.

- 1 **Jeffrey Cramer, J.D.** was sued in 2016 by his former employer, Kroll, in an effort to enforce a non-compete agreement that Kroll alleged was valid when Mr. Cramer and his team joined Berkeley Research Group (BRG). Mr. Cramer contended that the agreement was not enforceable. A court denied Kroll’s application for a temporary restraining order and the case was settled.
- 2 **Chief Will Johnson**, while employed as Chief of Police, was sued as an individual for the conduct of two of officers related to an allegation of improper use of force. The cases were dismissed with prejudice. Please see the cases’ information below.
 - **Case Name:** Carreno v. The City of Arlington Texas, et al.
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Ft. Worth Division
Cause Number: 4:13-CV-009110-0
Cause of Action: 42 U.S.C., Section 1983
Disposition: Dismissed with prejudice - 8/24/15
 - **Case Name:** Waters v. City of Arlington Texas, et al.
Court: U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Ft. Worth Division
Cause Number: 4:15-CV-385-A
Cause of Action: 42 U.S.C., Section 1983
Disposition: Dismissed without prejudice - 8/21/15



3 **Ken Bouche**, during his time with the Illinois State Police (ISP), was personally named in his official capacity along with the plaintiffs' chain of command in a lawsuit filed in 1999. No allegations of wrongdoing were alleged against him or ISP members under his command. The primary cause of action was civil rights and failure to promote. The matter was dismissed with prejudice pursuant to a settlement agreement made by the ISP's attorneys. Please see the case information below.

- **Case Name:** *Tammra Byers and Paula Trehey v. ISP, et al* (Gainer, Marlin, Yokley, Kent, Johnson, Sloman, Comrie, Erlenbush, Thorpe, Bouche)
Northern District Case No. 99C8105

4 **Robert Davis**, during his time with the San Jose Police Department, was named in several cases and listed in his official capacity as Chief of Police or other command rank for the City of San Jose, California. The number of these actions reflects Northern California's extremely litigious environment.

In no case was a finding, adverse adjudication or settlement based upon any misconduct or inappropriate or illegal behavior committed by him personally or committed by another with his knowledge. All of the case docket numbers listed are from the U.S. District Court, California Northern District (San Jose). Please see the case information below.

- 5:93-c3-20744-RMW: Case dismissed with prejudice.
- 5:03-cv-04997-JW: Stipulated Dismissal.
- 5:05-cv-01986-RMW: Dismissed.
- 5:05-cv-00059-RS: Dismissed.
- 5:06-cv-04029-RMW: Dismissed.
- 5:06-cv-05302-RMW: Dismissed.
- 5:06-cv-06307-RMW: Dismissed - Summary Judgment for City.
- 5:06-cv-06331-JW: Jury Trial – Verdict for the City - Plaintiff Lost.
- 5:07-cv-02998-JF: Dismissed.
- 5:07-cv-03687-JW: Dismissed With Prejudice.
- 5:07-cv-05490-PSG: Dismissed.
- 3:07-cv-05596-SI: Dismissed with Prejudice against me. Summary Judgment for Remaining Defendants (Dismissed).
- 5:08-cv-00820-PSG: Dismissed.
- 5:08-cv-01213-JW: Jury Trial-Verdict for the City - Plaintiff Lost.
- 5:08-cv-01214-JW: Dismissed with Prejudice.
- 5:08-CV-01215-JW: Jury Trial – Verdict for the City - Plaintiff lost.
- 5:08-cv-02143-RS: Dismissed.
- 3:08-cv-02541-SI: Dismissed with Prejudice.
- 3:08-cv 02684-SI: Dismissed.
- 3:08-cv-02685-SI: Dismissed.
- 5:08-cv-02996-JF: Sent to Another Court
- 5:08-cv-04032-PSG: Case Reassigned to a Different Court.
- 5:08-cv-04485-RMW: Dismissed: Summary Judgment for City.
- 5:08-cv-05077-RS: Dismissed.
- 5:08-cv-05163-EGD: Dismissed.



- 4:09-cv-00176-KEW: Dismissal (Stipulated).
- 5:09-cv-00527-RMW: Dismissal With Prejudice.
- 5:09-cv-02617-PSG: Sent to Settlement Conference.
- 5:09-cv-04410-EGD: Case Dismissed (Due to Settlement).
- 5:09-cv-05758-EGD: Jury Trial - Verdict for City - Plaintiff Lost.
- 3:09-cv-05931-JSW: Summary Judgment for City.
- 5:10-cv 00953-RMW: Dismissed With Prejudice.
- 5:10-cv-01380-PSG: Dismissed.
- 3:11-cv-02362-SI: Dismissed With Prejudice Upon Settlement.
- 5:12-cv-04322-EGD: Dismissed.

I hope this completely answers your questions; however, if you require any further information, please let me know. We will respond and deliver it to you immediately.

Sincerely,

THE COAR MONITORING TEAM

Hon. Judge David Coar (Ret.)

DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com

312.229.9825

CC: Lisa T. Scruggs
Allan T. Slagel



October 26, 2018

Ms. Cara Hendrickson
Chief, Public Interest Division
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, Floor 12
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Edward N. Siskel
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago
121 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602

RE: City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring Proposal – Supplemental Information

Dear Ms. Hendrickson and Mr. Siskel:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your October 11, 2018 letter regarding the request for supplemental information. This response specifically pertains to Mr. Jon Maskaly, Ph.D., a recent addition to the Coar Monitoring Team proposal

Mr. Maskaly answered “**no**” to all three questions: (1) *been terminated from employment or a consulting contract, or resigned from employment, a consulting contract, or a professional board or organization because of a report or allegation of misconduct;* (2) *been accused or adjudicated to have engaged in professional misconduct (for attorneys, only report sustained complaints to the Bar);* and (3) *been sued for professional or employment related actions and the case was settled, either by the member or an employer of the member, or adjudicated*

If you require any further information, please let me know. We will respond and deliver it to you immediately.

Sincerely,
THE COAR MONITORING TEAM

Hon. Judge David Coar (Ret.)
DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com
312.229.9825

CC: Lisa T. Scruggs
Allan T. Slagel



October 26, 2018

Ms. Cara Hendrickson
Chief, Public Interest Division
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, Floor 12
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Edward N. Siskel
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago
121 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602

RE: City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring Proposal – SME Addition

Dear Ms. Hendrickson and Mr. Siskel:

This purpose of this request is to notify you and request permission to replace a member of the Coar Monitoring Team. As previously reported, Dr. Alexander del Carmen resigned from the proposal due to his promotion and increase of responsibilities in the Puerto Rico monitorship.

We are requesting to replace Dr. del Carmen with Mr. Jon Maskaly, Ph.D., of the University of Texas. Dr. Maskaly comes to our team with tremendous experience. He has worked with Hillard Heintze on Department of Justice Collaborative Reform Projects in Commerce City, Colorado; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Saint Anthony, Minnesota; and Memphis, Tennessee. He also served as a member of the monitoring team for East Haven, Connecticut.

We are confident that Dr. Maskaly will be a tremendous addition to our team. Dr. Maskaly's resume is attached for your consideration. If you require any further information, please let me know. We will respond and deliver it to you immediately.

Sincerely,

THE COAR MONITORING TEAM

Hon. Judge David Coar (Ret.)
DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com
312.229.9825

CC: Lisa T. Scruggs
Allan T. Slagel



JON MASKALY

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

University of Texas at Dallas

Assistant Professor of Criminology
Dallas, Texas

August 2016 – Present

University of Illinois at Chicago

Visiting Assistant Professor
Chicago, Illinois

August 2014 – May 2016

East Carolina University

Instructor
Greenville, North Carolina

August 2013 – August 2014

Sparks Police Department

Police Officer
Sparks, Nevada

January 2004 – May 2007

- Worked as a patrol officer handling calls for service, working with Latino residents, improving responses to domestic violence, and working on community development and revitalization projects in crime-prone neighborhoods

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy, Criminology

University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida – 2014

- **Dissertation title:** Predicting Fear of Crime using a Multilevel and Multi-Model Approach: A Study in Hillsborough County

Graduate Certificate, Measurement, Evaluation, Statistics, and Assessment (MESA)

University of Illinois at Chicago – 2016

Master of Arts, Criminal Justice

University of Nevada – 2009

Bachelor of Arts, Criminal Justice

University of Nevada – 2007

AWARDS, FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

- William L. Simon/Routledge Outstanding Paper Award – 2016
- INSPIRE Award at the University of Illinois at Chicago – 2015
- Criminology Ambassador Award at the University of South Florida – 2015
- Recognized as outstanding reviewer of the year in 2014 for *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies and Management*



- “Causes of Injury Among Law Enforcement Officers (COILES),” Submitted to National Institute of Occupational Health and Safety in April 2018 for \$421,722 – UTD Subcontract, Under Review
- “Cook County Regional Organized Crime Task Force Smart Policing Initiative.” Submitted to Bureau of Justice Assistance for \$700,000 in 2016, Not Funded
- Clara D. Mayo Grant from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues in 2008 for \$2,000, including \$1,000 match from Graduate School, Funded

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-Reviewed Manuscripts

- Donner, C.M., and Maskaly, J. “The Effects of Familial Environment on Police Recruits Adherence to the Code of Silence.” (Under Review – R&R Sent 08/05/17).
- Fridell, L.A., Maskaly, J., and Donner, C.M. “Using Organizational Justice to Prevent Police Misconduct.” (Under Review – Initial Submission Sent 08/12/17).
- Maskaly, J. et al. “Assessing the Measurement Validity of Klockars et al. (1997)” *Police Integrity Measures*. (Under Review – Initial Submission: 08/01/2018).
- Donner, C.M., & Maskaly, J. (In Press). “Self-Control and the Police Code of Silence: Examining the Unwillingness to Report Fellow Officers’ Misbehavior Among a Multi-Agency Sample of Police Recruits.” *Journal of Criminal Justice*.
- Maskaly, J., Donner, C.M., Jennings, W.G., Ariel, B., and Sutherland, A. (In press). “The effects of body-worn cameras (BWCs) on police and citizen outcomes: A state-of-the-art review.” *Policing: An International Journal*.
- Reynolds, P., Helfers, R., and Maskaly, J. (In Press). “Applying Social Exchange Theory to Police Deviance: Exploring Self-Protective Behaviors Among Police Officers.” *Criminal Justice Review*.
- Powers, R., Cochran, J.C., Maskaly, J., and Sellers, C.S. (In Press). “Social Learning Theory, Gender, and Intimate Partner Violent Victimization: A Structural Equations Approach.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*
- Maskaly, J. and Goodman, D. (2016). “Strengthening criminal justice and law enforcement: Moving into the future requires looking into the past.” In P.L. Posner, J.R. Lachance, & T.T. Neavers (Eds.) *Memos to National Leaders* (pp. 159-163). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., Maskaly, J., Lawrence, D., Christoff, T., Escamilla, J., Enciso, G., and Posick, C. (2017) “The police-community interaction survey: Measuring police performance in new ways.” *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies & Management*
- Maskaly, J. Donner, C.M. and Fridell, L.A. (2017) “Police CEOs and subordinates’ perceptions of workplace misconduct: Examining the effect of demographic similarity on attitudinal congruence.” *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies & Management*
- Enciso, G., Maskaly, J., and Donner, C.M. (2017). “Organizational cynicism in policing: Examining the development and growth of cynicism among new police recruits.” *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies & Management*
- Harper, S., Maskaly, J. Kirkner, A., and Lorenz, K. (2017). “Enhancing title ix due process standards in campus sexual assault adjudication: Considering the roles of distributive, procedural, and restorative justice.” *Journal of School Violence*
- Donner, C.M., Maskaly, J., Piquero, A.R., and Jennings, W.G., (2017). “Quick on the draw: assessing the relationship between low self-control and officer-involved police shootings.” *Police Quarterly*
- Donner, C.M., Maskaly, J., and Fridell, L.A. (2017) “The role of social bonds in explaining police misconduct.” *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies & Management*. 39(2), 416-431.



- Lorenz, K.P. & Maskaly, J. (In Press) "The relationship between victim attitudes, training, and behaviors of sexual assault investigators." *Journal of Crime & Justice*.
- Maskaly, J., and Jennings, W.G. (2016). "A question of style: Replicating and extending Engel's supervisory styles with new agencies and measures." *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies and Management*. 39 (4), 620-634.
- Cochran, J.C., Maskaly, J., Jones, S.D., and Seller, C.S. (In Press) "Using structural equations to model Akers' Social Learning Theory with data on intimate partner violence." *Crime & Delinquency*. DOI:10.1177/0011128715597694
 - Winner of William L. Simon/Routledge Outstanding Paper Award
- Donner, C.M., Maskaly, J., Fridell, L.A., and Jennings, W.G. (2015). "Policing and procedural justice: A state-of-the-art-review." *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies and Management*, 38: 153-172.
- Maskaly, J. and Donner, C.M. (2015). "A theoretical integration of social learning theory with terror management theory: Towards an explanation of police shootings of unarmed suspects." *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40: 205-224.
- Miller, M.K., Maskaly, J., Green, M. and Peoples, C.D. (2014). "The relationship between mock jurors' religious characteristics and their verdicts and sentencing decisions." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*.
- Boggess, L.N., and Maskaly, J. (2014). "The spatial context of the disorder-crime relationship in a study of Reno neighborhoods." *Social Science Research*, 43: 168-183.
- Jehle, A., Miller, M.K., Kimmelmeier, M., and Maskaly, J. (2012). "How voluntariness of apologies affects actual and hypothetical victims' perceptions of the offender." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 152: 727-745.

Book Chapters

- Maskaly, J., et al. "Improving the Measurement of Police Integrity: An Application of LTM to the Klockars et al. (1997) Scales." In Kutnak-Ivkovich and Maria Haberfeld (Eds.), *Enhancing the Measurement of Police Integrity*.
- Maskaly, J., et al. "Examining the Criterion Validity of Police Integrity Measures: Assessing the Police Integrity Scale in a Comparative Context." In Kutnak-Ivkovich and Maria Haberfeld (Eds.), *Enhancing the Measurement of Police Integrity*.
- Reaves, B. and Maskaly, J. (2015). "Employment of Hispanic or Latino Officers by federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies in the United States." In Martin Urbina (ed.), *Latino Police Officers in the United States: An Examination of Emerging Trends and Issues*.
- Maskaly, J. and Miler, M.K. (2014). "Establishing a child custody office: promoting fairness, legal compliance and psychological stability for children." In M.K. Miller, J. Chamberlain, & T. Wingrove (eds.) *Psychology, law, and the wellbeing of children*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boggess, L.N., Donner, C.M., and Maskaly, J.(2011). "Police Brutality" in William Chambliss (ed.) *Key Issues in Crime and Punishment Volume 3*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

SELECTED PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS (2013—2015)

- Lawrence, D.S., Rosenbaum, D.P., and Maskaly, J. (2015). "Mapping spatial variations in attitudes toward the police." Presented at the Stockholm Criminology Symposium in Stockholm, Sweden.
- Cochran, J.C., Maskaly, J., Sellers, C.S., and Jones, S. (2015). "Using structural equations to test Akers' social learning theory with data on intimate partner violence." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences in Orlando, Florida.
- Boggess, L.N., and Maskaly, J. (2014). "Disorder leads to fear, but where does fear lead? Assessing behavioral changes associated with disorder." Presented at the annual conference of the American Society of Criminology in San Francisco.



- Fridell, L.A., Maskaly, J., and Donner, C.M. (2014). "A multi-agency, multi-level examination of officer amenability to workplace deviance." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology in San Francisco.
- Maskaly, J. (2013). "Moving beyond the monolithic: Developing a more holistic fear of crime model." Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Society of Criminology in Atlanta, Georgia.
- Fridell, L.A., Rosenbaum D. P, and Maskaly, J. (2013). "Demographic, psychological, and experiential factors that predict willingness to use force/violence on and off the job: Data from the National Police research Platform." Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Society of Criminology in Atlanta, Georgia.

SERVICE

- Chair, Research Committee, Dallas County Criminal Justice Advisory Board (August 2016 – Present)
- Member, Public Policy Committee, Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (March 2016 – March 2017)
- Treasurer, Southwestern Association of Criminal Justice (October 2016 – October 2019)
- Comprehensive Exam Committee, University of Texas at Dallas (August 2016 – Present)
- Qualifying Exam Committee, University of Texas at Dallas (August 2016 – Present)
- Search Committee, University of Illinois at Chicago (2015); University of South Florida (2012-2013) and East Carolina University (2014)
- Criminology Graduate Student Organization, University of South Florida
 - President (2012-2013)
 - Vice-President (2011-2012)
 - Treasurer (2010-2011)
 - First Year Representative (2009-2010)
- American Field Service, 2015 – 2017
- American Youth Soccer Organization, Fall 2014 – Present
- Guardian ad Litem in 13th District of Florida (Hillsborough County), 2009 – 2013



October 29, 2018

Ms. Cara Hendrickson
Chief, Public Interest Division
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, Floor 12
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Edward N. Siskel
Corporation Counsel
City of Chicago
121 North LaSalle Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60602

RE: City of Chicago Police Department Independent Monitoring Proposal – Supplemental Information

Dear Ms. Hendrickson and Mr. Siskel:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the questions you posed to the Coar Monitoring Team during the October 22, 2018 phone conference with Ms. Scruggs and Mr. Slagel, and representatives from both party's staff. Please find our responses below.

1. We would like to hear more about your effectiveness as team members and as a group.

Our approach to monitoring and reform is fundamentally grounded in a team-based methodology for assessing the organization and understanding the root causes identified in the City of Chicago Consent Decree Agreement (Agreement). After identifying, documenting and reporting our findings, we will work to help the Chicago Police Department (CPD or Department) (1) resolve or mitigate those causes, (2) focus its internal priorities on reform while still maintaining core day-to-day police operations, (3) assess its efforts in implementing required reforms, and (4) engage the community to ensure its voices are heard and its members are engaged and invested in this process.

Our experience demonstrates that a highly collaborative and engaged team plays a crucial role in helping ensure that the Department's personnel, processes and practices target and achieve both the immediate operational requirements and Agreement-mandated change. In conjunction with that engagement, our team will maintain a significant and sufficient presence within the Department, which has the greatest ability to either advance or undermine the Agreement's success.

Think of it this way: in any organization, employees spend their entire day just doing their jobs. Generally, when asked to embrace change, most view the new demand as a job-and-a-half or a doubling of their duties. Our team-based methodology compensates for such systemic and behavioral roadblocks to change by using a collaborative and in-person approach to help Department leaders view their decision options more broadly. We help them remain vigilant for opportunities to achieve both operational and Agreement objectives at the same time through the same expenditure of resources. When police leaders view both operational and change objectives as synonymous, reform accelerates.

This effort requires individuals who are informed, committed and present – not just collectively as a team but also personally as professionals deeply committed to the Monitor's goals. The leadership and experts we have invited onto the team we built for Chicago thrive in this teaming environment and have previously worked together to address many, and perhaps all, of the challenges we expect to encounter. Most



importantly, every single one of these experts knows that driving lasting change at this level of complexity requires many hands on the oars and a disciplined, adaptive and synchronized approach to achieving the Monitor's mandate.

To enhance this effectiveness as a team, we use a highly collaborative, cross-functional approach that includes the input of team members with a diverse history of experiences and perspectives on police reform. Our subject-matter experts (SMEs) are highly skilled and experienced in a variety of policing issues. By informing and engaging them across the range of Chicago Consent Decree (CCD) activities, our SMEs gain a better, high-level view of the Department's challenges and opportunities and greater insight into how the Monitor's team can complete its tasks.

Our on-the-ground practices include weekly kick-off meetings with all SMEs – and stakeholders when appropriate – to establish the assignments and goals for the current and following week across the Monitor's planned activities. Meeting attendees also review a series of progress reports including, but not limited to, ongoing project status updates, burn-rate forecasts, subject-matter research assignments and emerging issues and findings. Both the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and the client departments we have served in collaborative reform have continuously rated our teams highly in effectiveness and collaboration.

2. Explain project management time spent off site versus time on the ground.

We use a dual project management approach: one facet addresses the actual operational performance, and the other establishes the appropriate oversight and measurement mechanisms. Creating lasting reform in a three- to five-year period is an aggressive and complex task. Coar Monitoring Team (CMT) member Hillard Heintze has experienced firsthand – on many engagements – that a constricted time frame, while difficult, keeps the topic of collaborative reform front and center and encourages positive engagement within the department. Although the structure and goals of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office Collaborative Reform Initiative for Technical Assistance (CRI-TA) assessments were distinct from monitoring, Hillard Heintze succeeded in implementing complex reforms in major cities by leveraging focused, deliberate and consistent project management in a manner that addressed the need for site-level tasking and reporting and project-level reporting and measurement. The CMT views this project management approach as vital for this Monitoring engagement.

We have two project managers with hours budgeted to the project. Natalie Fouty, a Chicago-based employee, will spend more than 1,000 hours on the ground in Chicago. She will work with the team's leadership and experts to ensure tasks, site visits and community meetings are scheduled, coordinated, documented and successfully completed while also handling a multitude of other administrative responsibilities. Lindsay Morgan, PMP, is an experienced and accomplished project manager. She will supervise and guide Fouty and work closely with the monitor and leadership team to drive project excellence. Morgan is based in Washington, D.C. However, we do not believe significant travel is required for her work. She has been assigned 280 hours, 200 of which will be used off-site.



This specific project management process allowed Hillard Heintze to complete nine complex CRI-TA projects across the country on time or early and on or under budget. Morgan and the firm received “excellent” performance ratings in the Federal Government Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) from the COPS Office for their work and project management process. We are confident this project management process is a key to success and a differentiator of our services and reform methodology from those of others.

3. How will we address impartial policing and crisis intervention?

We will use a traditional assessment approach, as detailed below. This process is evidence-based and seeks to identify how effectively the policies and protocols are engaged in actual practice. We have experts experienced in these issues, both from a police practice and reform perspective as well as an academic and data-centric one. Our Co-Lead on Critical Incident Technique (CIT) Amy Watson has been conducting CIT interviews, ride-alongs and observing dispatchers to assess and report on CIT issues in Chicago for the past decade.

- **Document Review and Data Analysis:** The Coar Monitoring Team will conduct a document review of policies, procedures and training curriculum related to bias. As part of the document review, our team members will examine how community complaints regarding potential bias are addressed. Our team members will evaluate Chicago Police Department (Department) practices and its organizational approach to addressing bias. They also will conduct an analysis of CPD’s arrests, traffic stops, use-of-force incidents and pedestrian encounters to identify trends or patterns of bias. Then, they will compare their findings to national best practices, particularly with respect to identifying bias and creating changes in behavior and interactions with the community.

In addition to the document review, our team will assess the Department’s training on implicit bias and how it (1) integrates this training into policy, (2) creates accountability measures and benchmarks, and (3) obtains continuous feedback from the community and the Department. This involves conducting a variety of interviews with key Department members and stakeholders within City government, such as the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA), the Chicago Police Board, partner governmental agencies and elected officials.

- **Interviews and Focus Groups:** Our team members will conduct interviews and focus group sessions with CPD personnel at all levels, including recruits, line officers, supervisors and command staff, and will meet with a variety of community organizations and members throughout Chicago. Where available and appropriate, we also will consult previous efforts in this area to avoid losing recent historical data from interest groups that focuses on bias and crisis intervention.
- **Ride-Alongs:** Members of our team will participate in ride-alongs to observe officers during their routine interactions with community members and sit-alongs at OEMC to observe protocols for identifying CIT calls and dispatching CIT-certified officers.
- **Scientific Analysis:** Our team members will conduct a rigorous scientific analysis of quantitative data predicated on known factors that reflect potential bias in policing decisions. Our team will review these factors to determine if they indicate disparate practices within the



CPD. Our team members will request and examine data sets, including data on stops, arrests, officer characteristics, reported crime, traffic collision, deployment and U.S. Census results. As outlined in Question 5, we have several professionals on the team with experience interacting with Chicago law enforcement data.

- **Body Camera Footage:** Our team will develop a plan to randomly sample body-camera footage for interactions with the public and with individuals on CIT calls. The team members will use standardized assessment guides to code the footage while looking for adherence to legal standards and for compliance with departmental policy and national best practices. In addition to reviewing the body camera footage, the auditing process also will serve to estimate the frequency with which CPD officers are failing to activate or appropriately categorize body camera footage for retention.

Our results on this topic will be reported at the end of Year 1, and they will guide our work in Year 2 and Year 3.

Please see the response to Question 7 for the crisis intervention specific response.

4. An evaluator was concerned about your broad approach to the Consent Decree – which does not seem to stay strictly within the boundaries of the Monitor’s role.

We do not view this as a mutually exclusive approach. A Monitor reports to the court on ordered reform requirements. We recognize this as our primary role and responsibility. However, we believe that true reform requires engagement, not just measurement.

We are 100 percent focused on one single, strategic objective: to ensure the CPD fulfills its responsibilities under the Agreement in a way that facilitates lasting reform. A collaborative approach does not mean honest and critical reporting of activities does not occur. Rather, critical reporting is accurate and delivered in a timely manner designed to assist in the Department’s success.

We use a methodology that has successfully driven reform in many cities across the country. The topics we address in our proposal and our persistent presence on the ground are critical in helping the City and the Department successfully identify and implement reforms. We concur that this is different from traditional approaches to monitoring – which some might characterize as a “hands-off, check the box” approach. As the outcomes of many other monitoring engagements have demonstrated over the past few years, the traditional approach significantly raises the risks related to (1) extended review timeframes, (2) increased costs and (3) missed opportunities to resolve even basic obstacles for long-term success.

If selected, we recognize that we will be responsible for working under the Consent Decree parameters. In addition to reporting to the Court, we will ensure the Department and the City (1) have clear guidance on the technical areas that require change; (2) have access to the best practices, training and experts that can help them facilitate change; and (3) receive an honest evaluation of their progress in a manner that guides the agency in real reform. We believe this is our responsibility and duty as Monitor. We recognize and respect the parameters of the CCD. Our approach and hours were formulated with those parameters in mind, not an expansive view of the Monitor’s role.



5. What is the CMT's capacity and experience on legacy IT systems?

Legacy IT systems are an inherent challenge for law enforcement agencies, including those we have dealt with across the country. The CMT has a range of expertise in law enforcement data, including specific experience with CPD data. We recognize the challenge of data as well as the need for identification of how and where it is stored and how it is to be accessed. The Department has some strengths around its data, but its administrative data, including figures focused on accountability, is less robust. We address these issues on nearly every engagement – and have extensive experience in this regard.

CMT member BRG has tremendous depth in dealing with large volumes of disparate data. In fact, Jeffrey Cramer has worked with data from the Chicago Crime Lab as part of his responsibilities as co-coordinator of DOJ's Project Safe Neighborhoods. Moreover, CMT member Hillard Heintze has experts in law enforcement data, including CPD data.

Kenneth Bouche, of Hillard Heintze, served as the Chief Information Officer for the Illinois State Police (ISP) and led the technological advancement of the ISP and statewide law enforcement agencies. His division was responsible for consolidating, modernizing and standardizing all of the ISP's technology functions, as well as the delivery of critical real-time information to more than 1,000 police agencies in Illinois. This process specifically had to map the use of legacy data as part of the modernization of the ISP technology approach. Bouche directed the rebuilding of several failing information and intelligence systems; implemented a project management and quality assurance office as well as a strategic planning office; and created several public and private partnerships to reduce cost and increase effectiveness of technological programs. Several of these partnerships serve as models across the country today. Additionally, Bouche led the ICLEAR initiative in which CPD data was extracted and entered into a statewide system that was distributed to local law enforcement agencies across the state. This effort deeply enhanced local law enforcement agencies' ability to understand criminal patterns and behavior that transcended multiple jurisdictions. This required a strong fundamental understanding of the CPD data – how it is captured and, more importantly, how it is stored.

Bouche led technology advancement in Illinois through ISP and as the Chairman of the Illinois Integrate Justice Information Sharing Initiative (ILJIS). He also served as a member the national Integrate Justice Information Sharing Initiative (IJIS). Bouche served as a member the IJIS Institute's Board of Directors from 2009 to 2013 and as Chairman of the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative, which is an advisory committee to the U.S. Attorney General on justice information sharing and integration initiatives. Bouche led the development of the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan and the Fusion Center Guidelines, which are the current standards for intelligence sharing in the United States. He also oversaw the development of subcommittee projects, such as the development of Global Justice XML and National Privacy Standards. This group was tasked with helping to identify and establish data standards for analysis across the disparate IT systems of law enforcement agencies across the country.

Steve Bova, another CMT expert, served in ISP as the Bureau Chief of the ISP's Information Services Bureau. In his ISP role, Bova was responsible for architecture leadership, management and delivery of an average of 54 million law enforcement transactions to 44,000 officers across Illinois. Bova led the, governance and implementation strategy aspects of the Chicago Police data conversion for ICLEAR, which was an early



transition of legacy data held by the CPD. In his capacity as Bureau Chief, Bova served on the Board of Directors for the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS), the national interstate justice and public safety network for the exchange of information related to law enforcement, criminal justice and public safety. Bova also was a key member of the Information Technology Committee for NLETS. In this role, he addressed and resolved data exchange issues across the 50 states.

The expansion of technology in law enforcement has generated a multitude of system challenges – legacy systems, software incompatibility and identification and usage of good data. Members of our team have successfully worked with disparate data from police agencies on bias, use of force, staffing and many other issues to understand, analyze, measure and improve agency and officer behavior. Often, our data analysts extract raw data from the backend of the legacy system when the application is incapable of exporting usable, accurate data. We believe few proposals can compete with the CMT's capacity in the area of data examination, especially on legacy systems, or its understanding across the range of policing and law enforcement data, its challenges and the need for accuracy as a means of measurement for organizational performance.

6. Why is Grande Lum tasked to Crisis Intervention if he is an expert in Community Engagement?

Although Lum is an expert and national leader in community engagement, he also has extensive expertise in crisis intervention gained from his community engagement work. While working with the DOJ's Community Relations Service (CRS), he managed and led crisis intervention in police-community disputes, including incidents involving individuals in crisis. We believe his well-rounded background brings a strong skill set and broad perspective to this team.

Using his skills in mediation, dialogue facilitation, cultural competency training and crisis intervention technical assistance, Lum provided valuable insights into the unique challenges facing police when interacting with individuals in crisis. These challenges could involve individuals in the midst of mental health crises or during strife-filled incidents and community flashpoints, such as those following the deaths of Trayvon Martin in Sanford, Florida; Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri; and Freddie Gray in Baltimore, Maryland.

Personally working on the ground during these incidents shaped Lum's understanding of the need for a fully functional crisis intervention team (CIT) to ensure the safety and well-being of the community. Lum will co-lead Crisis Intervention with University of Illinois – Chicago Professor Amy Watson, Ph.D., who is a national expert in crisis intervention and in matters involving the CPD. Watson brings to this critical topic deep experience and leadership in data-collection, field interviews and program implementation, compliance monitoring and evaluation.

All of our teams are under the management umbrella of the CMT leaders, but we feel that the experience and vision of the key team members in CIT bring a holistic approach to this significant issue.



7. How will we address Crisis Intervention and do we have sufficient hours and resources allocated for this priority?

Based on our understanding of the effort and time required during the first year of the Consent Decree, we believe the hours and resources we allotted to crisis intervention and CPD's Crisis Intervention Team program are appropriate. We understand the Agreement stipulates that the CPD must develop a CIT Implementation Plan based on its analysis of the demand for crisis intervention services within 180 days of the effective date.

Based on this stipulation, the Monitor's primary responsibility in the first year will be to (1) review and approve the CIT report within 180 days of the CPD's completion of this plan, and (2) publish the report to the public within 45 days of the report's submission.

Additional Monitor responsibilities will include, but not be limited to, ensuring the following.

- 1 CPD's momentum on policy and procedures compliance or development, including the development of new policies based on problems and solutions identified by the Crisis Intervention Response Advisory Committee.
- 2 CPD's CIT officer selection process is consistent with Consent Decree and Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board (ILETSB) requirements for CIT officer certification;
- 3 CPD's CIT training is implemented according to best practices and ILETSB requirements.
- 4 CPD's development of the CIT Refresher Training, with input from the Crisis Intervention Response Advisory Committee, to ensure all certified CIT officers receive up-to-date training in current best practices when interacting with individuals in crisis.
- 5 CPD's use of tactical de-escalation skills (e.g., maintaining distance and moving slowly), which is one of the most common ways departments demonstrate they have "successfully" implemented CIT. A more critical and necessary change in behavior is verbal de-escalation skills, which are more impactful in reducing use-of-force encounters. However, these skills are often more difficult to implement as officers must be convinced to change the way in which they communicate with individuals.
- 6 CPD's comprehensive data analysis of CIT reports and chain-of-command reviews.
- 7 CPD's development and maintenance of an adequate infrastructure to support the CIT program, CPD's collaboration with partner agencies and organizations, and CIT-certified officers in the field.
- 8 The Department and City's provision of appropriate, comprehensive mental health and CIT awareness training for all telecommunicators at least once a year.
- 9 CPD's continued development and implementation of pre-service academy and in-service training for non-CIT officers (with input from the Crisis Intervention Response Advisory Committee), is adequate to prepare personnel to interact with individuals in crisis and access CIT support when indicated.

Based on this projected workload for the first year, we believe our planned hours are sufficient to properly address the Monitor's duties in this regard. After the first year, the assessment of the CPD's progress – not



only in policy and training, but also in practice – will begin, and the hours will be adjusted accordingly, as larger action items and CIT implementations are addressed and rolled out.

Our team will also conduct thorough review of CPD and OEMC policies, procedures and training curriculum related to mental health crisis response. The team will examine CPD's practices and overall organizational approach to responding to mental health crisis and other incidents involving persons with mental illnesses in the community. It will review data systems for tracking mental-health-related contacts and response to identify trends and patterns and CPD, OEMC and mental health system capacity issues. CMT members will pay particular attention to identification of CIT calls, CIT officer response, patterns of use of force, call outcomes and the involvement of partner agencies (e.g., CFD, mobile crisis) in mental health crisis response. The team will also review the incorporation of advisory committee recommendations, data analysis, and community feedback into the ongoing operation of the CIT program.

The majority of police encounters address some form of a person in crisis and the accompanying issues that are prevalent in Crisis Intervention programs for law enforcement. The range of matters covered under this Consent Decree touch upon factors that are present in many aspects of Crisis Intervention – such as use of force, impartial policing and community policing – and that have a role in ensuring appropriate police action for individuals in crisis.

While crisis intervention is not a stand-alone issue, the CIT program is a specific function within broader patrol functions – to manage the demand for response to persons experiencing mental health crisis in the community and those with mental illnesses who come to police attention for other reasons. Thus, CPD must maintain adequate infrastructure to support this – which includes policy, training, and continued partnership with other agencies as well as the use of data to examine trends, identify issues and determine if CIT program capacity is adequate. It also requires support to officers who are implementing CIT in the field and continued engagement with the community. We believe the above approach and requirements integrate well as part of a holistic method to improve the CPD's interactions with individuals in crisis.

8. Why is Rob Davis on Data Analytics?

In our proposal, Rob Davis is specifically assigned to use of force. However, Davis is a highly experienced, former major city police chief and a seasoned expert in a very wide range of policing domains. He will serve in a variety of functions in our examination of the Department. In the past eight years, Davis has led the Hillard Heintze Law Enforcement Practice. In that role, he leads data experts and reviews complex data findings. We have no doubt he will add value in this area, but he is not a data expert, nor is this his main assignment. Our SMEs have broad experiences so most, if not all, can add value beyond their main focus when required. As noted in our Proposal, Responses to Supplemental Questions and this submission, the CMT brings a wealth of data credentials. Davis' input may be beneficial.

9. We question some of the SMEs' capacity to do work in Chicago, particularly T. Bowman and Grande Lum.

We spent significant time with our experts – and have double-checked with them – to ensure they can meet our time requirements they have both the capacity and approval to commit to the CCD if they are employed full time. We are confident the entire team – every single member – has the capacity to deliver



on its time commitments.

Bowman is retired from full-time work and has committed to a minimum of 1,000 hours annually on the CCD. We understand Bowman has some commitments in other cities on reform or Consent Decree projects. However, we discussed these with him and do not believe they will create a conflict. On the contrary, his work in in other Consent Decree projects can provide additional nationwide perspectives to key measures of the CPD and the CCD. We have no concerns about his commitment.

Lum is limited to the 280 hours committed to this project. These hours have been approved by his employer, and we have no concerns about his commitment.

10. Megan Maury's experience to address impartial policing.

The term "impartial policing" generally first brings to mind a program or methodology for combating racial bias through bias awareness and professional, respectful policing. Our team recognizes that racial bias is the most prevalent concern and will be a significant focus. However, successful impartial policing requires more than just a solution to race-based bias. Minority groups – based on race, gender, sex, religion, disability and many others – do not exist in individual vacuums. They intersect on multiple levels, creating the need to have the appropriate training for law enforcement officers on thoughts, words and actions that are appropriate, respectful and inclusive when interacting with the community at large.

Maury's experience as the Policy Director and Criminal and Economic Justice Project Director for the National LGBTQ Task Force has included firsthand work with socially oppressed minority groups that intersect on a daily basis. Maury's work has included combatting the disproportionate impact of the criminal justice system on LGBTQ people of color and creating economic policy agendas to help minority groups living in poverty. Maury's efforts, however, are not limited to the LGBTQ community, but rather they include non-LGBTQ African Americans, Hispanics and other affected segments of our society.

Maury leads a national coalition on public housing and the rampant homelessness issue that disproportionately affects minorities. Simply due to their housing situations, these individuals are more likely to interact with law enforcement and, therefore, are more prone to the subtle – or not-so-subtle – biases officers bring into these interactions, implicit or not. Through experience with these minority populations, Maury is an authority on how to be impartial while policing and to treat all minorities with respect.

Maury's career has led to deep relationships and professional connections with the heads of federal agencies, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the DOJ and the Bureau of Prisons. These agencies have sought Maury's expertise in impartial policing training in cities such as San Francisco, where Maury served as an invaluable resource in building the police departments' impartial policing training curriculum.

While serving as an impartial policing expert in the San Francisco Collaborative Reform Assessment, Maury did an excellent job of leading the public, the San Francisco Police Department, SMEs and data analysts to present a complete picture of the issues in San Francisco. We have no doubt that Maury is capable of doing



the same work in Chicago.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional input on our approach and capabilities. We look forward to providing even further insight during the interviews this week.

Sincerely,

THE COAR MONITORING TEAM

Judge David Coar (Ret.)

DHC@coarmonitoringteam.com

312.229.9825

CC: Lisa T. Scruggs
Allan T. Slagel