PUBLIC FORUM FOR THE CHICAGO POLICE CONSENT DECREE
INDEPENDENT MONITOR FINALISTS

VOLUME 1

PAGES 1-191

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the

above-entitled cause on the 3rd day of November, A.D.

2018, at 9:30 a.m.

REPORTED BY:

MS. CATHERINE ARMBRUST RAJCAN,

 CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC

2

CAROL ADAMS: Good morning. Good morning, and welcome to the public forum for the Chicago Police Consent Decree Independent Monitor finalists.

My name is Dr. Carol Adams, and I will be the moderator for today's event. On behalf of the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago, who are hosting this forum, thank you for being here.

First, we have sign language and Spanish language interpreters in the auditorium today. The sign language interpreters are in the front, near the stage. If you would like to listen to a live translation of the program in Spanish, there are headphones at the table in the back of the auditorium.

During this morning's session we will hear and learn from each of the four finalists being considered for the job of Independent Monitor of the Chicago Police Consent Decree. Before we bring out the first finalist team, I will provide a little bit of background on the Consent Decree and the role of

3

the Independent Monitor, the selection process for the Independent Monitor, and what we can expect during this morning's forum session.

First, some background on the Consent Decree. The proposed Consent Decree was filed in federal court on October 13, 2018, by the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago. It was meant to settle a 2017 lawsuit filed by the Illinois Attorney General's office against the City of Chicago alleging that the Chicago Police Department engaged in a pattern or practice of unconstitutional uses of force that disproportionately impacted black and Latino communities in Chicago. This lawsuit included findings stemming from the United States Department of Justice's investigation of the Chicago Police Department in 2016 as well as findings from the City's Police Accountability Task Force.

The Consent Decree is a court order that, if approved, will be enforce by federal judge. The objectives of the Consent Decree are to ensure that CPD delivers services in a manner that fully

4

complies with the Constitution, federal and state laws; respects the rights of the people of Chicago; builds trust between officers and the communities they serve; and promotes community and officer safety. It will require broad reforms to ten substantive areas of policing: Community policing; impartial policing; crisis intervention; use of force; recruitment, hiring and promotion; training; supervision; officer wellness, accountability and transparency; and data collection analysis and management.

The proposed Consent Decree requires an outside Independent Monitor to assess the City's compliance with the requirements of the Decree and report on the City's progress to the Court and to the public. The Independent Monitor will review new and revised policy, procedures, and training materials required by the Consent Decree; it will comment on those materials; and if necessary, it will object if it has an issue.

The Monitor will hold public meetings and meet with various community and officer

5

stakeholders to provide information regarding the implementation of the agreement, and to obtain feedback. The Monitor will also conduct community surveys of a broad cross-section of the city every two years. Each year the Monitor will prepare annual monitoring plans that describe how and when the Monitor and his or her team will conduct compliance reviews and audits.

The Monitor will also publish semiannual reports on compliance with the Consent Decree and a comprehensive assessment three years after implementation.

Finally, the Consent Decree requires that the Independent Monitor team's budget stay within $2.85 million each year.

The Independent Monitor will be an agent of the Court; and therefore, it will ultimately be chosen and appointed by the federal judge overseeing the Consent Decree. That person is Judge Robert Dow. However, the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago will work to jointly recommend a candidate to Judge Dow from among the

6

four finalists who will be in attendance today.

The proposed Consent Decree that has been filed with the Court lays out the overall process for selecting the Independent Monitor as well as the minimum qualifications of the Independent Monitor. I will briefly summarize each of those things.

The selection process for the Independent Monitor goes like this: On July 27th, the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago released a Request for Proposals for Independent Monitor. Nine candidates submitted written proposal, including supplemental responses; and on October 18th, four finalists were announced based on their written submissions. All nine monitor applications as well as requests for proposals can be found online at chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org.

On November 1st the representatives from the Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago interviewed each of the four finalist teams; and yesterday each of the teams participated in a second set of interviews conducted by a group of

7

engaged community stakeholders.

The engaged stakeholder committee is a nine-member group made up of individuals and organizations who have been involved in the Consent Decree policies -- excuse me -- the Consent Decree process, police reform litigation, or are engaged in policing matters in Chicago. This group, which includes members of the Communities United and Campbell plaintiffs' groups, as well as members of CPD's sergeant's union, will provide input to the Attorney General's office and to the City on the four finalists.

The public forum today is another part of the selection process. Each of the teams will make a short presentation and respond to written questions submitted by audience members. Members of the public, including those of you in attendance today, can provide feedback to the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City, as I will describe further a little later.

In the coming weeks the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City will evaluate

8

the finalists based on their written submissions, interviews, performance at today's public forum, and community feedback, and will work to jointly make a recommendation to the Court.

The expectation is that the parties will reach agreement on a single team to recommend; however, in the off chance that they cannot agree on a recommendation, they will each submit a separate recommendation to the judge.

So what are we looking for in an Independent Monitor?

Well, the Consent Decree as well as the Request for Proposals provides some detail on this. The Independent Monitor must have expertise in policing and law enforcement practices; monitoring and oversight; preparation of reports or other written materials for diverse audiences; law and civil rights; project management; data analysis; and information technology; communication; and budgeting. It will also have to demonstrate the ability to collaborate with government entities; and members of the monitoring team should have knowledge of the

9

Chicago communities and experience working in Chicago with various constituencies.

Finally, the Independent Monitor and its team must act with integrity and consistently demonstrate professionalism and respect in all interactions with the community, CPD members, and all others with whom they interact in the course of performing the Monitor's duties.

Today the four finalist teams will each have 50 minutes on the stage, with 20 minutes to make presentations, and 30 minutes to answer audience questions. During each team's presentation, please begin to write your questions on the question cards that have been circulated. Try to write so that I could clearly read your question.

During each team's -- if you would like for your question to be asked to all of the teams, please indicate that on your question card so that we know to reread your question when the next team comes on stage.

Once you filled out the question card, please raise it in the air or signal to a staff

10

member; someone will come by to collect cards from you and hand them to me. Please raise your hand or signal to a staff member if you need additional cards or need assistance completing a card; someone will come by to help.

I will read out your questions to the finalist team. I will read as many questions as I can in the 30-minute time period allotted.

If there are multiple questions on the same topic, I may choose one as an example so that we can hear a variety of questions. Because it is important that we stay on topic, I will only read questions that are relevant to the role of the Independent Monitor and the finalist's ability to perform that role.

So that we can assure that each finalist has an opportunity to answer as many of your questions as possible, please refrain from clapping or speaking out while people are on the stage.

Following today's session, the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City encourage you to share your thoughts with them about

11

the finalists by filling out the feedback forms that were provided to you when you checked in at the desk. Please turn in completed feedback forms at the same table outside the auditorium before you leave.

The chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org website provides other methods for submitting comments regarding the finalists. The Illinois Attorney General's office and the City will consider all feedback received by this Monday, November 5th.

Okay. So let's get started. We'll now hear from the first presenter --

Excuse me -- the Coar Monitoring Team.

DAVID COAR: Good morning. My name is David Coar, and I'd like to introduce our principal team members as we go along and myself, and also tell you who we are and how we came to be involved. I'll start with myself.

I'm a retired federal judge; I'm not a subject-matter expert -- you will hear a little later about some of our subject-matter experts -- but I'd like to tell you a little bit about why I'm involved in this application.

12

I was born and raised in segregated Birmingham, Alabama; I attended public school there. At the time that I was in high school, it was a largest African -- all-African American high school in the country. It was -- to say it was an inner city school would be a gross misstatement. It was directly across the street from the largest African American public housing project in the city. Most of the people that I knew in Birmingham had lived in the projects at one time or another, as had my own family.

I was -- I grew up in an area of town called Dynamite Hill. Dynamite Hill was the dividing point between a traditionally African American community and a traditionally white community. There were several bombings over the years in that area, hence the name Dynamite Hill.

One of my earliest memories was my father -- seeing my father walking in armed patrol around the house of a lawyer who lived about three blocks away, who was the local counsel for civil rights groups coming in, bringing lawsuits against

13

the City and the Board of Education.

After graduation from high school, college, and active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps., I came to Chicago to attend law school at Loyola. I was here as a student during the rights following Dr. King's assassination and during the 1968 Democratic Convention.

I had -- I lived a couple blocks from Cabrini Green, and so I had a chance to witness some of the interactions between the police and the public during that period.

My first job after law school was as a Carnegie Foundation intern at the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in New York. The role included a year in New York doing appeals of civil rights cases, followed by three years in Alabama in civil rights -- in civil liberties cases. I tried all types of cases: Excessive force cases against the police, school desegregation cases, criminal defense, employment discrimination, and a case -- and cases involving the maldistribution of municipal resources.

After my four-year commitment was up,

14

I received an offer to return to Chicago. And when I left Chicago following law school, I vowed never to come back. The -- the incidents in 1968 left a bad taste in my mouth. But I came back, intending to stay for two years. That's about 40 years ago; and I'm still here.

I was -- I was appointed -- after teaching for ten years, I was appointed bankruptcy judge in 1986, into the U.S. District Court in 1994. In that latter capacity, I presided over dozens of excessive force cases against police officers in the city, and several consent decrees, including the one involving the redevelopment of the Cabrini Green housing project.

Since I retired from the court at the end of 2010, I've served as a private arbitrator and mediator. In 2011 I was appointed special independent counsel under the Consent Decree involving the Teamster Central States Pension and Welfare Funds. As special independent counsel I attend all board meetings of the fund, review financial transactions, and file quarterly reports

15

with the court.

About five years ago the Illinois Supreme Court asked me to be -- to co-chair a stakeholders' group that included the president of the County Board, the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court, the Sheriff, the State's Attorney, the Public Defender, and the County Clerk to try to find ways to improve the pretrial criminal process in Cook County. The impetus for that effort was the chronic overcrowding in the jail. There was concern that people were being held before trial in jail simply because they couldn't pay bail.

We made great inroads in -- in that situation, the jail is -- population is about 2,000, on average, less than -- while it was before, but we still got a long way to go.

About two years ago, Jeff Cramer, who's sitting to my right now, and I were discussing a problem of police reform in Chicago over coffee. This was -- this was before there was a Justice Department investigation, before there was a report, before there was any talk of a Consent Decree.

16

Jeff was aware -- Jeff is a former federal prosecutor. He was aware of some of the issues involved. He was the guy who had to go out and find witnesses to testify, witnesses who were afraid to testify sometimes because they didn't want to get involved. They were either afraid of the gangs, or afraid of the police.

So he had some of the same experiences I did. We talked about it, we talked about who could help.

That led us to Ken Bouche, who's sitting to my left, at Hillard Heintze. They were the people who for a long time had been out there doing consulting work and other work in police reform.

From once the Consent Decree was announced, we started talking -- the lawsuit was filed, and we started talking about who would be the proper people to be on the team. We identified a number of people, talked about those folks, moved on to other people.

Marcia Thompson, who's sitting to

17

Ken's left, was one of those folks.

So that's who I am. That's generally people you see here. I'll let them talk a little bit more about their experience.

Okay. What we bring as a monitoring team. It's essential that the Court and all members of the community have confidence that the collection, analysis, and reporting of information be honest, accurate, and complete. This team has no agenda other than achieving the goals set out in the Consent Decree and in the matters spelled out there.

We are a Chicago-based team. All four of us are Chicago people. We will -- why is that important?

Let me just say, from my own point of view, when my two sons were about 11 years old, I had to give them the talk. I now have a grandson who is 8 years old, and I assume my son's going to give him the talk too.

We were here before the Consent Decree, we will be here during the Consent Decree, we'll be here after the Consent Decree. So we're

18

Chicagoans. We have a personal stake in the outcome.

Members of the team are deeply involved in -- in all aspects of police reform. We have members of the team who were involved in monitorships, other reform activities, including guiding troubled police agencies, and investigating and prosecuting corrupt police officers.

KEN BOUCHE: Good morning. My name is Ken Bouche. I'm going to breeze through my introduction so we can save some time for questions.

I spent my law enforcement career here in Illinois. Twenty four years with the Illinois State Police, the first almost 18 years were in Chicago, in the rank of trooper through lieutenant colonel. Served in almost every position here.

That's really where I started to gain an interest in police reform; it's a lot of the work that the state police does. I was involved in the beginning, the development of Public Integrity Unit in Cook County, the child homicide task force, the video confessions and interrogations program that put cameras in every police department in Illinois, as

19

well as racial profiling and data collection law in Illinois, that we're very proud of, that stood the test of time and been in place and not been at all really dramatically changed since the beginning.

In 2009 I left the -- well, actually in 2006, I left the State Police; took a job with a small company in 2009, was recruited to come to Hilliard Heintze, really with the purpose of starting a law enforcement reform program. At that point Hillard Heintze was about four years old -- has been in business for about 14 years now.

And the whole focus of the company was -- regardless of who our clients were -- really was protecting what matters. And in the law-enforcement side we really started looking at how do we bring services to police departments that will help them bring about reform, when really the tools at the time were either, one, you could apply for grants and you could apply reforms on your own, or you could get a Consent Decree; and there wasn't a lot in the middle.

Since then we've done a little bit over 40 programs with police departments, some

20

lasting six months, some lasting several years. One of the most we're proud of is collaborative reform. And I'm sure you're going to hear a lot about that today, because many of the people were involved in it.

We've done nine cities, ranking from size from San Francisco, Milwaukee, Baltimore, down to places like Commerce City, Colorado, and St. Anthony Village. And really what most of them have -- all of them have in common is really breaking trust and critical incidents for -- along with standing problems with the public. And we've been very successful with that.

We're really proud to apply a lot of what we learned in those cities here and really move forward in a way that presents reform in a way that the Monitor needs to do; but also keeps a pace that allows the city to feel, see reform every day so they know it's important and continues to move forward until it's fixed.

MARCIA THOMPSON: My name is Marcia Thompson. I started in federal law enforcement

21

intelligence almost 30 years ago, straight out of undergrad. During that time when I worked on federal side, I became EEO counselor, and got my first glimpse into the world of discrimination.

And I worked in federal law enforcement intelligence for about eight years, when I finished law school. Once I finished law school, I started practicing law, worked as a junior defense attorney, worked as a child advocate, guardian ad litem, I worked as a prosecutor for child abuse and neglect, worked as a federal ombudsman. I'm a certified mediator; I've worked for about 20 years as a mediator and trust-builder, peace-builder.

I've taught collaborative efforts. I was professor for about ten years of criminal justice, social justice, and peace studies. And I've also worked as a police administrator. And I've also worked in -- throughout the courts, the Attorney General's office in Virginia as well.

In 2014 I had the luxury of moving here to the city of Chicago, and started working with Hilliard Heintze. I worked as the vice president for

22

law enforcement advisory, worked in several cities --
as Ken mentioned -- collaborative reform. I was one
of the leads in the Baltimore collaborative reform
effort. Also worked in four or five other cities
doing police reform during that time.

And after that I worked as a vice
president of another company doing organizational
development, internal to organizations, and creating
change and respectful workplaces.

I've worked throughout as an
investigator for EEO and discrimination cases, all
throughout the country. I've taught investigations
for discrimination and civil rights violations all
across protected classes.

Married; have one son. Living here in
Chicago as well.

Thank you.

JEFF CRAMER: Good morning. My name
is Jeff Cramer.

As the Judge indicated, I'm a former
federal prosecutor here in Chicago. I started my
career as a prosecutor in New York; went from there

23

to a criminal and civil defense practice in Boston;
and then came to Chicago under then U.S. Attorney
Scott Lassar, and then worked for Patrick Fitzgerald
about nine or ten years.

I'll fast forward to the end of my
term at DOJ. I led the team that indicted Jon Burge:
myself and Sergio Acosta, who is part of the team --
has a family wedding, so couldn't be here -- also
intimately involved in that, is head of the civil
rights prosecutions for the U.S. attorney's office.

Since then I've worked with several
special prosecutors, one with Dan Webb on the
Koschman case. If you remember, that was the case of
Mr. Vanecko, who ultimately pled guilty, killed Mr.
Koschman on Rush Street. Mr. Vanecko was then Mayor
Daley's nephew, so the investigation was not just of
the events, but also to make sure there was no police
misconduct, or everything was done well with the
process itself.

The second special prosecutor case I
worked on is ongoing right now, with Judge Patricia
Holmes. She's prosecuting, along with her team, the

24

three individuals in the Van Dyke case, the three
individuals charged with conspiracy. We worked and I
worked with witness, witness preparation, and also
did data work for the special prosecutor as well.

The other item I'd like to bring up
because I think has some bearings in this as well as
the U.S. Attorney's office, I co-led Project Safe
Neighborhood, PSN. And briefly, PSN is a DOJ program
throughout all the U.S. Attorney's office; I was
co-coordinator of that for several years. Really as
two -- two programs there, if you will. One was to
go in and talk to convicted felons who had a gun
prosecution, to show them that if the next time they
had a gun, instead of taking a case statewide, it
would go federally, which penalties are much more
severe.

The second component of that I think
was more important, and frankly, more productive,
which was at these meetings there was GED
opportunities there, there were drug-treatment
opportunities there, there were job-placement
opportunities there.

25

So several individuals were able to
take advantage of those in those monthly hearings --
or monthly forums, rather, which went on for years.

Currently I'm a managing director of
Berkeley Research Group. Berkeley Research Group is
about 1,000-person international investigation and
consulting firm. And my team here focuses on that,
investigations, corporate fraud, data collection,
data analysis, and things along those lines.

DAVID COAR: Let us introduce the --
the team. You've met me. In the slide there's Peter
Harvey, who will serve as a special advisor. Peter
is the -- is an attorney in New Jersey. He is the
Monitor in Newark.

When we talked about monitorships
around the country with the folks at Hilliard
Heintze, we identified Newark as one of the places
that had been most successful in getting a
monitorship off the ground and moving expeditiously
to a -- to reform. So Peter will serve as a special
advisor so that we can get his insight as to what
works and what doesn't work in monitorship.

26

And you've met Jeff; you've met Ken. Sergio Acosta, as Jeff said, is a former federal prosecutor. He has also served as civil rights coordinator for Department of Justice.

You've met Marcia. Theron Bowman, who will be a deputy monitor, was a former police officer in Texas for 14 years, later a police chief. He served as a police practices expert for Department of Justice in Newark; Maricopa County, Arizona; Seattle; Cleveland; Albuquerque; Los Angeles; and New Orleans.

Ken?

KEN BOUCHE: To take a minute and talk about our team. I think if you got up this early on a Saturday, you probably looked at all the information we have on our team, so I won't go into all the individual members.

But I think it's important to note that the team of experts that serves this team ranges from really deep police experts who have been in the reform side as well as the police side; lawyers who have been both on the community engagement side and civil rights side; academics who have done anything

27

from data analysis to studies including police accountability.

Carol on the end there actually wrote -- we like to say she wrote the book on police accountability, The New World of Police Accountability, which is -- really sits on most police chiefs' desks that are forward-thinking and looking for police reform.

We have Amy Watson, who spent the last decade working on CIT, Critical Incident Teaming and Techniques, here in Chicago. Tom O'Reilly, who is deep into the Rutgers piece. And the rest of our team brings the skills and techniques that we need to truly bring about reform.

DAVID COAR: The point of all this and the reason we wanted you to see who was going to be on the team is it should be clear that our team has extensive experience. We've worked on everything from federal Consent Decrees, police misconduct investigation, collaborative reform initiatives, worked with police agencies, experienced practitioners and experienced reformers.

28

There's a synergy from this team. We have a -- the largest team, I think, of all the applicants.

The team -- you know, there's an old saying, some things are too important to be left to the experts. We have experts, but nobody is an expert -- a total expert on any one thing. We want to assign -- we will assign responsibilities, primary responsibilities to a particular expert, the experts will communicate with each other. We've been trying to develop a synergy here to best accomplish the goals of the Consent Decree.

KEN BOUCHE: One of the important pieces of the synergy and our study of the Consent Decree and how we structured our team -- I'm not going to go deeply into any of these Consent Decrees -- and some were more successful than others, but in the end, all of these are going to be successful. And what we found is the key to success is collaboration, focus; and reform really needs to be persistent and omnipresent. Can't have a team that will come in, do some work, go back, come back two

29

months later and come in and do some work.

We will be on the ground. Our leadership team that you see here, and so many of our team are Chicago-based; and we have experts from around the country to bring in best practices.

And in the end we believe that our success will be defined by real engagement with the department, with the community, with the parties to the suit; and that will be our focus.

DAVID COAR: We can go to the last slide. Why us? We believe that we're the most experienced team in police reform. We have the deepest bench. We have more subject matter experts, more people who have been involved on the ground in police reform; and we have a demonstrated commitment to Chicago.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. We'd like to proceed to the question period.

We have a number of questions from the audience I'd like to address to you.

First of all, in your opinion, what is the most important thing the Chicago Police can do to

30

restore trust in the police by the communities in
Chicago?

DAVID COAR: Well, respect, I think.
Respect and communication are two of the most
important things.

When -- when a policeman leaves home
in the morning, I want that policeman to come home
safely. When I leave home in the morning, I want to
come home safely.

I would expect all members of the
public be to be respectful of police officers; I
would expect all members of the police force to be
respectful to members of the community.

As we know, that doesn't always
happen. Sometimes people will interact with the
police -- members of the community will interact with
the police in a disrespectful way.

I would expect that the police to be
professional. It's human nature: If you say
something ugly to me, then I'm likely to say
something ugly to you. That's human nature.

But I expect the policemen to be

31

better that than that, I expect them to act in a
professional way. If we can accomplish, that I think
we're most of the way home.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Are there
aspects of the Consent Decree that concern you in any
way? And if so, why?

KEN BOUCHE: Sure. I -- you know,
there's the -- the major areas of the Consent Decree
truly define the issues in Chicago. And we believe
that they're all critically important. Some are more
technical than others, and some are really deeply --
address the divide in trust, such as community
policing, CIT, and impartial policing.

So there are some that will really
rise to -- to cross every area, but none that we have
concerns about that they're inappropriate or wrong.
It wouldn't be our choice anyways, but we think that
they're all very valid.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. How will
your monitoring plan account for CPD's culture of
denial or code of silence?

Specifically, how will your team look

32

beyond CPD's-generated data and check compliance on
personnel?

JEFF CRAMER: I think a lot of that --
start with the data component. We have a lot of
experience in working with the data here in Chicago,
whether it's from Chicago crime lab, Invisible
Institute, or wherever. But there's a lot of data
out there. But we will have a responsibility of
looking at it at the primary source.

In Chicago, unlike a lot of cities,
really has a lot of that. That will be the first
part.

With respect to first part of the
question, how do you change really the culture. It's
not going to get changed in a week, or a month, or
six months, certainly not here in Chicago. But I
think as the Chicago Police Department and the
community looks at this Consent Decree -- which is
different than other reports that have been issued in
the past -- but this Consent Decree, with a
monitoring team that they know their backgrounds,
they know where they're coming from, and they have

33

trust that whoever is the Monitor will basically call
balls and strikes, I think that's going to do a lot
to move it forward.

The last point I'll make on that, we
talked a lot about trust, we saw it -- that word was
brought up a lot in Judge Dow's hearings; we talked a
lot about it. It's not just a goal in and of itself.
Trust is really a means to an end.

And Judge and I have talked about
this. As we said, we've talked about this for years.
Effective policing, closing cases, solving murders, a
lot of time relies on community input, tips. That's
only going to happen when there's trust. It's a
direct correlation -- I have seen in the homicides I
prosecuted in New York as well as here in Chicago --
there's a direct correlation between solving crimes
and the community trust.

And that's what we're trying to
instill. I think that's going to change culture.

KEN BOUCHE: Specifically, to tag on
to that, the important pieces of that we kind of
touched on, one is going to be the persistence, the

34

constant persistence of the monitoring team to make
sure that we can -- we touch and feel what's going
on. And community engagement, and I mean deep
community engagement, to make sure that the Monitor
has the voice of the community in our expressions as
well.

CAROL ADAMS: Will you monitor and
evaluate internal and external communications from
CPD regarding Consent Decree compliance?

And if so, what metrics or key
performance indicators would you apply?

KEN BOUCHE: So -- well, first I think
once the -- you know, we've spent a lot of time -- we
sped through our slides, but we have a slide about
our process. And our process begins by identifying
all of the key areas, all of the key steps, and all
of the key outcomes, putting that into a
project-management approach, developing our results,
our timeline.

And it's something that we really
learned by doing major reform in three major cities
and -- and six mid-sized cities; that you really have

36

And it would be through -- through that where we
would really focus on communications.

And there's really two modes of
communications, one that goes to the Court, and then
one that goes to the Court and the community. And
that is really how we would continue to keep that
focus and keep information flowing about the
Monitor's activities and how things are moving
forward.

MARCIA THOMPSON: One of the things we
wanted to point out about the community piece is we
want to have touch points that are part of our
process. The beginning of the process, having
community engagement, listening sessions, focus
groups, help surveys, one person asked about
accountability measures. Aside from data, the data
points will also be the community's perception. If
the community doesn't perceive that movement as
happening, we want to find out what it is and we want
those interactions are that they're having with the
police force that are not moving that ball towards
reform.

35

to keep your eye on the ball, and you have to clearly
define what the measurements are, what the outcomes
are, and you have to follow that. We follow that
really through a project-management approach.

I think what we will also have to do
is define communications within the boundaries of the
Consent Decree between the Department and the Monitor
and the Court. And between those, use the tools that
we have to stay on track and fucused, and then
continuously report back those in -- in our
community-engagement approach, and obviously through
our reports to the Court.

CAROL ADAMS: Will your Independent
Monitor team have a member assigned to lead Monitor
support and evaluation of the communications effort?

DAVID COAR: Communications.

KEN BOUCHE: Yeah. All right. Sorry.
One of the things is when you -- you look at our
structure, and we -- we didn't name a first community
engagement team. We have an advisory board reporting
to our senior team -- and actually "reporting" is the
wrong word -- working closely with our senior team.

37

So we're going to have ongoing
communications with the community, through the
community advisory board, but it's going to be
structured touch points that will be part of our
process. And also ad hoc, if necessary, to make sure
that we're moving also the perception of the
community along with the reforms.

CAROL ADAMS: To that point, what
specific plans does the monitoring team have to
engage youth in the planning process and
implementation phase?

MARCIA THOMPSON: Touch on that.
We're hopeful that part of our advisory board will
have a voice as we -- youth voice. As we know, the
youth in the community -- the judge mentioned that he
had the talk with his sons growing up. I have a
14-year-old son growing up here in the City of
Chicago.

And the youth perspective and,
unfortunately, ongoing fear of the police is
something that, one, we -- I don't want my son
walking with a perception or fear that may be

38

warranted or unwarranted. I want him to feel -- to
walk up to police officer and have trust.

So that youth voice and that youth
perspective is next generation. So engaging the
youth, that hopefully will be a part of our advisory
board, and there will be representatives from the
youth community. There are many advocacy groups in
the -- in the community that represent youth voice.

But we also -- I know one of us will
probably touch on, but we also plan to have a social
media avenue for communication as well. You talked
about communications with the community; and we know
that the youth are really engaged in social media.
So putting our plans out there, putting policies out
there, putting the reports from the monitoring team
out so that the community as well as the youth will
have access to that information, as well as a vehicle
to get that information back to us.

CAROL ADAMS: How do you view COPA's
role in the Consent Decree compliance process?

DAVID COAR: You know, if you --
simplified way of looking at the areas of reform, you

39

got selection of police officers, training of police
officers, accountability of police officers. And
COPA comes in primarily at the -- at that
accountability stage. There has to be
accountability.

The code of silence plays into
accountability. Feedback from the community feeds
into accountability.

So COPA has a very important role.
COPA, or whatever the agency is that -- that's
directed toward accountability, has an essential
role.

JEFF CRAMER: Let me add, if I may.
We worked with COPA before. I was on the selection
committee to pick the new chief administrator for
COPA, so I think we'll end up -- the monitoring team
needs to end up working very well closely with COPA
as well as other agencies, that it could have
overlapping jurisdiction here in Chicago.

CAROL ADAMS: How would your proposed
community advisory board interact with the community
coalition that's been named within the Consent

40

Decree?

DAVID COAR: The community coalition,
if you -- if you remember that slide that we had up
with the team, you'll notice that that blue box was
left unfilled. We spent a lot of time talking about
whether or not we should actually name the members of
that advisory board. In our judgment we should not.

The people who put together the
Consent Decree, the City, the Attorney General's
office, and the coalition all have been involved in
this process on the ground for a long time. So we
wanted to make sure that we consulted with those
folks in -- in talking to the people who have been
involved in other Consent Decrees.

We learned that sometimes when you
name the -- the advisory board beforehand, you pick
the wrong people. We want to make sure we get the
right people and -- and one way to do that is to talk
to the people who have been involved in -- and who
has been effective and who hasn't.

CAROL ADAMS: How will you incorporate
the voices of people who are hesitant to report to

41

police or hesitant to report police abuse and
misconduct, such as women, people engaged in sex
work, undocumented people?

How do you get them engaged in the
compliance findings?

MARCIA THOMPSON: One of the things
that we know -- and this is not uncommon to other
cities that we've worked on -- there's a lot of
communities that feel disenfranchised and don't have
trust with -- with police, and therefore may have a
-- trust with people who are working with police
reform.

So one of our goals is to reach out to
advocacy groups here that represent those
communities, that those communities have trust with,
have -- feel like they are their champions and they
have a voice through those groups, and then work with
those groups to funnel information to us, for us to
reciprocate, funnel information to them. And then
hopefully build that trust through their champions so
that we can engage with those communities.

And if we get the opportunity for them

42

to open those doors of trust, then we will go into those communities and reach out to the communities personally through personal engagement, through focus groups, surveys, whatever we can do to make their voices be heard in safe place.

And so much of what we've done in the past, we've worked with victims and survivors of domestic violence. We've worked with groups where their names are shielded, but their voices are still heard.

CAROL ADAMS: Please describe your approach to crisis-intervention programs and how your team will provide support to the CPD in implementing provisions of the draft Consent Decree that address crisis intervention.

KEN BOUCHE: So you know, our approach in the first year will not be significantly different from many of the areas where we really have to go in and assess. We are really fortunate, we believe that, because crisis intervention is such an important part of this Consent Decree, an important part of police reform, our teams are heavy with

43

different aspects of crisis-intervention experts. As we said, we have Amy Watson from the University of Illinois at -- at Chicago, who has done significant work here in Chicago and across the country on this; as well as several other members of our team that will work together, first to analyze the program, to look at exactly what it is in the Consent Decree, and the steps that are to be followed, and really what are the best practices across the country.

Because even in the steps that are outlined in the Consent Decree, most of our team believes that there's -- there's things that can be done in furtherance to improve the CIT training. And that is, looking at what are the resources that are available, what are the type of techniques that are being used, who are the -- what's the selection process. And those will be key pieces.

And then most importantly is what are the tools that we're teaching our police officers. Because what we've seen in CIT across the country -- as amazing of a program as it is -- it often does not keep up with the tools that the officers need. And

44

the most significant area we think needs advancement is the type of tools that officers need to deal with young African American men in crisis, particularly in -- in event, on the heat of the moment. And it's really different than the standard CIT tools at that revolve around mental illness.

So those are the types of things we'll focus on early, and then we'll build our compliance measures from that.

JEFF CRAMER: If I may respond to that. As we were selecting the subject-matter experts, we had that in mind.

In Chicago you have to know Chicago, and you have to understand Chicago Police and the community and the history here. But you also need an outside perspective.

So if you remember the slide, Theron Bowman, T. Bowman, who's a nationally renown expert in police reform, has done essential work in New Orleans and other places; and we have other experts that can give that outside perspective.

You really need both, certainly here

45

in Chicago. You need to understand the issues, the policing issues that have been here and the problems for decades and generations; but also need the voice from outside. And that's what we've tried to do.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. A blog of one person on a finalist group states that, quote, most professional police agencies realize that police pursuits cause more harm than good.

Does your group agree that police pursuits are harmful?

Why or why not?

KEN BOUCHE: I don't know if that's my blog, but it's something that I've said; so I think I should take ownership for that.

I think that we've seen such an evolution of the understanding of police pursuits across the country; that it really is to the point where, unless letting an individual get away is undoubtedly going to cause severe harm to the community by letting them get away with police pursuits -- nine times out of ten, when they end badly, end badly for the community, they end badly

ABSOLUTE REPORTERS (312) 444-9882
www.absolutereporters.net

46

for the police; and they don't bring about the response that was warranted by the pursuit.

So I would say we're very much in agreement with the fact that, while police pursuits, as a rule shouldn't exist, and there should be exceptions; rather than having a -- a police pursuit policy with exceptions that shouldn't exist. Yes, we would agree with that statement.

CAROL ADAMS: If selected to be an Independent Monitor, what is going to be your approach during the first year of execution?

KEN BOUCHE: I'm going to talk through a slide real quick -- might be helpful -- that we skipped. And you can look -- we kind of charted out -- this is at a high level. But when we look at it, when we look at -- you know, really month one is -- would be getting everything together, getting our team set up. Really walking through the deliverables with the parties, developing our work plan. When we develop a work plan, as I talked about earlier, it really is a sophisticated work breakout structure that will allow us to stay on track.

47

And then when we -- in months 2 to 12, we start the assessment and we really dive deep. This is where you'll see our team on the ground almost persistently. Whether -- you know, it's -- every week there will be someone doing something.

So the monitorship continues to move forward, and we get the assessment, we bring about the assessment from there.

After year one, when the monitoring starts, it will be based on the assessment and the identification of where the gaps are, where the strengths are, and really how we need to move forward.

During the first year, community engagement will be significantly heavier. And I would say that there won't be a month that goes by that didn't have several events in it from the Monitor trying to really learn and understand what the focuses of the community are and what the focuses are of the individual communities with within the city.

CAROL ADAMS: Will the chosen

48

Independent Monitor -- excuse me -- overseeing the Consent Decree ensure all civilian complaints against CPD officers be looked at more closely than IPRA and COPA have in the past?

And -- yeah, that's it.

DAVID COAR: As I said earlier, accountability is key; that there has to be -- there have to be policies in place and consequences for bad action.

Now, the consequences don't always have to be a criminal prosecution. They don't always have to be termination. But there has to be some review and some determination for violations of policy.

We're going to take a look at the policies themselves to see whether or not the policies are adequate; and we're going to take a look at whether or not the policies are being enforced. But absolutely there has to be an internal process for accountability.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. What role should the community have in the implementation of

49

the Decree?

And how will your team ensure community involvement -- I believe you've addressed that sound byte. If you have anything you want to add to that.

MARCIA THOMPSON: I'll just touch on it. I mean, one of the things that we want to do is we want this -- we want the community to understand they have a voice; that the voice is a meaningful voice; that it's a voice that's heard; and that it's going to have impact.

A lot of times the community will be heard, but then there's no impact on what they say. And so part of our -- our goal is to make sure that that is part of the process. So implementation, review -- if you look at the slide that's up there, the first and second -- second bullet there is community service. Observations and interviews; looking at policies, practice and procedures; community engagement.

But that's the biggest part of our first year is being in the community, hearing the

50

community's voice, and using that along with national best practices and promising practice to set up the framework for compliance for the rest of the monitoring team.

So as you could see, that's a big emphasis of where we're looking at; not internal -- not only internal operations for the department, but the community's perceptions. And then using that, modelling that with national and promising best practices, and the wealth of our experience as a team -- I know we've mentioned before that we have a large team, but the diversity of expression, of experiences, and diversity they can form, is all going to come together with communities' perspective and on the policies. And then that will be ongoing throughout our process.

But one other thing I want to mention is we live this work every day. This is not something that we just started doing. And you know, looking at creative ways to do good is something that we strive to do every day.

I was talking to my colleague before

51

we started this morning about how long this week has been. I started out my week in racial healing circle training, as a practitioner here in the city. I had 30 people selected to do that. And my role was to bring that racial healing service to Chicago for police.

So this wasn't part of me sitting up here talking about this today, this was already on my schedule, was already part of my life, to bring new practices and new expression. Trauma-informed training, all of those things, things that I do every day, that are creative, new practices that are being brought to, hopefully, the law enforcement community that are out there and other aspects.

So I think that that's something that we want to make sure, is that the voices, the way the community wants to move on from improvements and reform and from trauma that they've experienced, we want to hear that, and we want to try to incorporate that in the reform efforts.

KEN BOUCHE: I really would like to add one quick thing. It's very important that -- for

52

us, in the over 40 assessments and reform projects that we've had, we've also learned quite a bit in the last ten years. And one of the most important pieces that we've learned is that, without community engagement -- and not just engagement, not just sitting and talking to them -- community having a voice at the table that's equal and that's enforceable, reform won't happen. And that will be our goal.

CAROL ADAMS: Describe your understanding of community policing. What recommendations will you make to ensure that community policing initiatives do not result in increased police surveillance of black and brown communities?

KEN BOUCHE: It's an excellent question. First, building off the last question -- and I think that the exciting thing is this is one thing that the Chicago Police are already starting -- and it is a program that came out of New York University on what's called co-produced policing -- to build that equal voice.

53

And so first community policing moves from being a program of saying what can the police do for its community, to being what can we do together in this partnership to solve the problems that you have? And how does that voice become equal?

And when that voice becomes equal, community policing won't turn into a program of surveillance or -- or more active enforcement of minor crimes in the minority community, it will address the true problems of the community that the program is built around. And that needs to get down to the community level, both to the district level and the subcomponents of districts in large districts as well.

MARCIA THOMPSON: And I don't think that it's a program, it's a philosophy and it's a culture of policing when we have community policing. And I believe it's based on collaborative problem-solving.

CAROL ADAMS: We're getting close to time. I'm going to try to get all of these remaining questions in as quickly as possible.

54

How will you interact with the FOP,
Fraternal Order of Police?

DAVID COAR: The FOP and all of the
unions are stakeholders too. They represent the rank
and file members of the police department. We
certainly want to find out what their perspectives
are. We will engage them the same way we will engage
the leadership of the department and the community.
We need to hear from them.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Okay. What
will you do as Monitor to ensure that individuals and
communities most impacted by CPD violence are
empowered partners in remedying CPD's pattern and
practice of civil rights violations?

DAVID COAR: You know, one of the
things -- hey, again, in an oversimplified way of
looking at this is that the police deliver a service,
and the community is a -- is a consumer of those
services. In the rest of the economy, the rest of
the world, if a consumer doesn't like what you're
producing, they don't buy it.

Police have a monopoly over that

55

service. And where you have a monopoly, the -- the
need to go in and to survey the community, see
whether or not they're satisfied with the services
being delivered, becomes even more important.
Because you don't have an option.

So getting community feedback, seeing
how the community thinks that they're being served or
not served is important.

JEFF CRAMER: One thing I would chime
in -- I know we're short on time -- we just saying
that we're somewhat unique in that we don't need to
read a report or a study about the violence here in
Chicago: I've seen that firsthand with some of the
cases I've worked with respect to the police and the
community.

That knowledge is going to inform the
rest of us, as well with the community advisory
board. I think we come at it really with a -- a
level of expertise, if you will. I think it's pretty
unique for what you're going to see today.

CAROL ADAMS: There's a related
question and probably the final question, which is:

56

Do you believe certain provisions in the FOP and
other collective bargaining agents to be impediments
to accountability?

DAVID COAR: Put it this way: I'm
sure that my grandkids think that I am an impediment
to their well being.

Anytime you have accountability, you
have resistance. And so I -- I'm not naive enough to
think that there won't be resistance from a lot of
different areas. We may get resistance from the
community. And that resistance is something that
needs to be talked about and hopefully overcome.

KEN BOUCHE: I also think these are
the issues that will need to be looked at during our
assessment period, to look at specific areas where
the contract interacts with service, and make sure
that it's not violating constitutional rights or
services that -- which should be provided by the
police.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. I want to
thank you. We did get all of the questions in.

And we will be transitioning and

57

having a ten-minute break before the next group comes
to present.

Thank you.

DAVID COAR: Thank you.

KEN BOUCHE: Thank you.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: We're ready to begin
quizzing our next finalist; and this is the Police
Foundation team.

Good morning. We have a series of
questions for you from the audience. The first
being, in your opinion -- I'm so sorry. I was
getting straight time -- I'm like, hey, I'm really
moving this thing along.

Please forgive me. We're going to
take this period of time for you to present and
introduce us to your firm.

BLAKE NORTON: Thank you very much. I
appreciate you wanting to jump right into the
questions. My name is Blake Norton, I'm the senior
vice president of the National Police Foundation in
Washington, D.C.; I have been there for five years.

58

I lead our police reform work and civic engagement work.

I -- prior to coming to the National Police Foundation, I was at the Council of State Governments Justice Center where I led a portfolio primarily focused on the law enforcement response to persons with mental illness and CIT work; and prior to that I spent 20 years at the Boston Police Department doing community engagement work I was the director of public affairs and community programs, and did juvenile diversion work, did prisoner reentry work, worked with the faith community.

And that's what brings me to work today. I am representing for our president, Jim Bueermann, the National Police Foundation. We are the oldest nonprofit, nonpartisan, nonmembership organization that has been doing research and technical assistance and policy-focussed work on policing. Our research has -- dates back to the 1970s. We had been looking at women in policing, looking at the efficacy of community policing, and community engagement.

59

Our work was borne out of the Ford Foundation providing an endowment after the riots in the '60s and '70s, to look at the role of police, community, and civil disobedience. We -- our work is fucused on innovation and science and evidence. And we work at the state, local, and federal level doing training, technical assistance, and research. And we've been doing this work nationally for approximately 50 years.

We focus on collaborative reform, critical incident reviews. We look at events after mass demonstrations, we look at community policing and enhancing community-police relationships. We conduct organizational, operational, and technological studies; and we focus on evidence and how to bring police and community together.

RICK BRAZIEL: I'm an executive fellow with the Police Foundation.

Little bit about my background: 33 years with the Sacramento Police Department. Little about Sacramento. The civil rights project at Harvard University identified the most diverse center

60

in the nation as the city/county that is Sacramento, California. I worked there for 33 years.

Since retiring in 2012, I've been doing work for the Police Foundation. And that includes critical incident reviews, but more importantly -- relates to this work in Chicago -- I was on two separate DOJ teams in Ferguson, Missouri. One team did a review of the police response to the shooting of Michael Brown, and the second team, which was run by the Police Foundation, was collaborative reform.

Collaborative reform is very much like a Consent Decree, except that it's DOJ working with the agency before there's a forced federal order. And so this is more trying to collaborate with the agency.

So all the things that were done in St. Louis -- looking at use of force, recruitment, retention, school resource officers -- the things that you see in the Consent Decree for Chicago, we did in not only St. Louis, but we also did in North Charleston. We've got experience in that regard.

61

I'm currently an inspector general for Sacramento County. That contract expires this month.

I've been doing oversight for the eighth largest county in California, accepting community complaints, negotiating and mediating issues between the community and sheriff's department, and reviewing all their in-custody desks and officer-involved shootings.

BRIAN MAXEY: Good morning. My name is Brian Maxey, I'm the former chief operating officer of the Seattle Police Department.

Seattle has been under a Consent Decree with the United States government since 2012. And I've been involved in all aspects of that.

I'm an attorney by trade. When the Department of Justice initiated its investigation, I was the lead attorney shepherding that through, providing the documents and connecting all of our resources. After the Consent Decree went into place, I was brought in as general counsel, into the Seattle Police Department, where my job was to shepherd the reforms forward, ensure compliance.

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

62

Year later was promoted to chief operating officer; which was a huge asset in driving reforms forward for me personally, because I could affect the systems of technology, policy, training, force review, and internal systems of oversight directly, and implement them.

All this culminated last year in a finding of full and effective compliance, since Seattle right now is in its sustainment period.

Prior to working with Seattle, I was an attorney by trade working with the Washington Department of Corrections, with the New York Police Department, and the Seattle Police Department.

So what I bring to this team is a -- is legal background, strong emphasis in civil rights law, and the hands-on implementation of a Consent Decree. I've seen the challenges within police departments; I've dealt with unions; I've certainly listened to communities; and I hope to be able to do that here.

GANESHA MARTIN: Good morning, everyone. My name is Ganesha Martin. I am the

63

former chief of the Department of Justice, Compliance, Accountability, and External Affairs division for the Baltimore Police Department. In that role I assisted with the negotiation of the Consent Decree. It's one of the only, I believe, where you actually had the police and the community stand together saying, we want a Consent Decree, when other parties did not.

Prior to actually entering into the Consent Decree, it was my job to interact with the Department of Justice, and along with their investigation to make sure that they had everything that they needed to complete investigation. At the same time, on a parallel track, I went to different jurisdictions across the United States that had been in Consent Decree to see what they had done right and what they had done wrong; and I created a mini type of Consent Decree in the police department, so while we were being investigated, we were also making changes. And by the time the monitoring team -- after we finished the process just like this that I put together in Baltimore -- when the monitoring team

64

landed, we had touched 581 paragraphs and subparagraphs of the Consent Decree that had been written.

And we did those things under use of force, CIT, police wellness, technology, accountability, and transparency.

And so what I believe about this process is that the monitoring team is here to help build a bridge. Obviously, if you watch the news, a lot of these issues in policing are endemic, but the solutions lie until the police department and in the community. And I hope to help facilitate to build that bridge, because the only way we're going to get through this is actually working together.

So with that, we'll stop talking, and now turn it over to you for those -- those burning questions that you have.

CAROL ADAMS: Well, thank you very much. All right. The first is just, in your opinion, what is the most important thing the Chicago Police can do to restore trust in the police, in the communities in Chicago?

65

GANESHA MARTIN: So just a few things. I think the first thing is that you have to listen and -- and actually go beyond listening to the community, but hear them.

One of the things that I saw in Baltimore, there's always a distrust. And that distrust is going to be there probably throughout the process on both sides, because it's been built up for a very long time.

But when you actually start seeing -- or the community actually starts seeing those conversations manifest into action in the police department, in policy, in -- in the Consent Decree language, in a change in attitude, and more of a partnership, I think that that's when you really start having meaningful change in the process, and the community starts believing -- a little bit, not a lot, but a little bit -- in the process and in moving forward.

BRIAN MAXEY: Add just a little bit to that. The Consent Decree in many ways leads to things that are very similar to grieving in police

66

departments. Immediately departments start out with denial, in my experience. They reject the findings, they point to external factors, they try to rationalize rather than accept the internal need for change.

That is the most important step a department can take, and one of the most -- in my experience -- significant initial acts that a department can do is increase the level of transparency; is to show their hands and welcome others to help them develop the systems of critical self-analysis. But they have to -- have to be willing to open the doors and let the -- let the sunlight in so that others can validate date what's going on and help them through it.

So I think transparency --

CAROL ADAMS: If selected to be an Independent Monitor, what would be your approach for the first year of execution?

RICK BRAZIEL: It is meet with community, meet with community, meet with community.

The community of Chicago is -- in kind

67

of basic terms, is the customer. And we've got to find out what the customer expectations are.

There are a lot of different definitions of community policing -- we throw that out -- but the easiest thing to define community policing is you go out to your communities, your neighborhoods, down to the street level and ask them, what do you expect from the Chicago Police Department?

Recently had the opportunity to meet with one of the -- a lady that spent her entire life here, she's 78 years old, she lives on the South Side. And I asked her, what do you expect from your police department?

And very much like we talked a second ago, I would like the officers to get out and talk with us; would like to see more members of the department look like us on the South Side.

So getting the conversations going within the community.

Then it's getting out to the organization at the same time with the officers, and

68

talking with them, and asking them what is their vision of the Consent Decree.

Fortunately for the Police Foundation, we've done that work. We were here several months ago with that exact forum within the organization, asking the officers, you know, what is your view of the Consent Decree, where do you think the impacts are, and how does it change your role?

So we have some of that information. But the first thing we need to do in the first year -- any team that's here -- is understand Chicago's unique community -- communities -- and that's plural. You have a lot of unique communities that have different expectations of the Chicago Police Department and City government. And we want to find out what those expectations are.

GANESHA MARTIN: And in add- -- if I may, in addition to that, the Consent Decree is a document with timelines for a reason: So that the police and the community understand the obligations that they have under the agreement that they made.

And so what needs to happen almost

69

yesterday is also a conversation with the folks that have been working inside the police department on reform efforts, to see where they are, and then begin to plot out those timelines on trying to comply with the mandates that are in the Consent Decree.

CAROL ADAMS: You mentioned understanding some of the uniqueness about Chicago and its communities, which leads right into this next question.

How would you compensate for your team's relatively sparse connections or experience with the Chicago area and the Chicago Police Department?

RICK BRAZIEL: See, we actually look at that as kind of a benefit in some regards. We have no preconceived notions, we have no biases towards particular political parties or entities; we're a very neutral body.

We do have to hit the ground running; we've already started doing that. We did a lot of research, find out a lot, read a lot, look at news stories, talk to people every chance we can.

70

But we come in very neutral. And that's really important, because that's the Monitor's role. There's a Consent Decree, there's certain benchmarks, like Ganesha mentioned, we have certain timelines. And any perceived bias we have coming into it can reduce the effectiveness of that neutrality. Because it's super critical that your Monitor is that neutral body reporting to the federal magistrate.

GANESHA MARTIN: And I, quite frankly -- I was not from Baltimore. Most people didn't know that, because I didn't -- I was humble, I ingratiated myself into the community.

And I think it served we well, because I didn't owe anybody anything. My job was to the mission of the Consent Decree and the folks who the Consent Decree was written for. And that was for the community and the police.

And so if people were not about that mission, then it was very easy for me not to -- to have to engage with all of the rhetoric that goes around it.

71

Quite frankly, I don't think that Chicago and many other cities would be in -- in the Consent Decree -- in a place where it's necessary to have a Consent Decree, where you have decades and decades and decades of neglect of communities and of the police, if you didn't have all these political ties and people kind of inserting themselves in a way into a process that removes the fairness, and puts in a patriarchy and a system where folks that do things that they're not supposed to do are rewarded.

And so I do think that you absolutely have to learn the community.

The other thing unfortunate about Consent Decree processes is that the reason why we have them across the country is because there's a lot of things underlying policing in general. Right?

And so -- and unfortunately, a lot of the experiences for black and brown people are the same around the country. And so some -- some of those things you get, and understand, and you feel, and you see the pain, and you understand those things. And then you see then how they manifest in

72

specific communities, and then you talk to those communities about how those solutions have to be crafted to rectify what's been going on for so long.

CAROL ADAMS: How would you incorporate the voices of people who are hesitant to report police abuse and misconduct, such as women, people engaged in sex work, and undocumented people?

How would you incorporate them into your compliance findings?

GANESHA MARTIN: I don't want to keep talking, but...I will say this really quickly, and then I'll turn it over to members of my team.

You know, you have to show up, whether there's one person or zero people in the room. Every time, all the time.

But beyond that, there are people that have been in the community for decades, for years; and so you have to work with those organizations. And then through that you talk to those folks and find out why, beyond the obvious.

But if -- you know, we talked about this yesterday, folks that have -- sex workers;

73

right?

You know, we did this study in Baltimore to talk about what type of environment, where we would come into the community, what houses, what neighborhoods, what advocacy groups. Where could we come? Who should we send?

Maybe it's not a police rep right away. Maybe -- you know, so you have to have conversations with the advocacy groups and with those folks who have been victims, to talk to them about what the environment looks like to best get their information. And sometimes you may have to go for a little bit only getting information secondhand, because they're not going to have that trust initially.

But again, I think when you start seeing results that come from the information that you get, that trust starts to be build.

CAROL ADAMS: What plans do you have to engage youth in the planning and implementation phases?

RICK BRAZIEL: Youth is -- I'm going

74

to jump in, and let Ganesha finish.

Much like we talked about with the disenfranchised communities where they don't want to talk to us, we need to reach out -- we have the community meetings, and we have neighborhood meetings, and we have service organizations where people show up. We get that.

We have to find out not just with youth, the people who don't want to talk or don't feel they have a voice. And that is looking at all of the -- the current infrastructure, going to the schools, using the faith-based community, using the Y's and Boys and Girls Clubs to get the message out that we are here, and go talk to people, quite frankly. Walk the streets and talk to people.

One of the biggest things that we look at in the Consent Decree and how does the Chicago -- and this is a conversation I had with a community member from the South Side -- how does Chicago look more like -- the Chicago Police Department look like the community they serve?

It's recruiting from within. It's

75

taking the youth, giving them a role within the organization, encouraging them to be part of the organization, and getting not just us, but Chicago P.D. out to the youth. Because ten years from now, those youth will be sitting in those chairs as leaders of this community, and potential leaders. And sometimes we forget that.

CAROL ADAMS: How do you view COPA's role in the Consent Decree compliance process?

BRIAN MAXEY: So COPA's role is going to be critically important, especially as we get towards the end of the Consent Decree. Ultimately the goal of the Consent Decree is to create community-police trust; and the only way you can achieve that is by having critical systems that -- of accountability within the police department, that they take care of their own issues, when there's a bad use of force, they call it out and they deal with it appropriately; they're reviewing officer activity, whether it's a stop and detention, whether it's use of force, arrest, crisis engagement.

Whatever it is that's being measured,

76

there needs to be critical eyes on it. Just data sitting in a vault does no one any good. Should be transparent and analyzed.

All that should happen within the police department.

COPA is one of the external systems of accountability. There are actually several in the City of Chicago: Police board, and COPA, and others. But ultimately, at the end, when the monitoring team and the Court are in a position to say Chicago's ready to walk it alone, those external systems of accountability are what in the future are going to continue to hold the Police Department accountable for its own internal systems of critical self-analysis.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Please describe your approach to crisis-intervention programs and how your team will provide support to the CPD in implementing the provisions of the draft Consent Decree that address CIT.

BRIAN MAXEY: So you know, CIT, the -- obviously there are many paragraphs in the Consent

77

Decree dealing with it. CIT, or Crisis Intervention Training, addresses many different issues. It's dealing with people with mental disability, it's dealing with people with drug and alcohol addiction, and dealing with people with perhaps physical disabilities.

A person in crisis is someone that has reached a state where their ability to cope with the situation is overwhelmed. And the entire approach to crisis intervention is to deal with the person where they're at.

In Seattle we developed a model in which all of our officers, 100 percent of them, went through an eight-hour crisis intervention training. This augmented what they had already learned at the academy. This set sort of the baseline of understanding.

We then did a 40-hour training to ensure that as many officers as -- as possible were what we called CIT-certified. The department hovers at about 60 percent, and it's at such point where, any given shift, 50 percent of the officers available

78

have the CIT certification, this advanced. And then
we continue to roll out regular in-service trainings
to deal with specific issues, whether it's
Alzheimer's, or bipolar disorder, or how these issues
manifest.

It's not to make officers clinical --
you know, clinicians out on the street. What they
need to know is what the symptoms are and how it will
manifest and what the best approach is.

We then have a crisis response team
that's really an investigative unit, it's not --
despite its name, it's not generally showing up on
the scene. What it's doing is taking a look at the
people that the police encounter most often, and
developing plans for those individuals. Does not
include any medical information, but again, it
includes the symptomology so that officers, when
they're going to a call, are provided by dispatch --
which has also been trained in crisis intervention --
about what the needs of that specific person is, what
their specific triggers are, and how to approach
them.

79

And I think it's an incredible
effective model, it's worked in other jurisdictions;
and I think that's the direction Chicago needs to go.

GANESHA MARTIN: In addition to that,
in Baltimore we did all of those things; we also had
specially trained crisis-intervention officers. But
something that we piloted -- and we can only pilot,
because it's very expensive -- is also having
licensed clinical professionals respond with police
officers. And in that case the police officer and
the clinician would work together, but there would be
a handoff where the clinician could actually make
sure that the person in crisis got the services they
needed, as opposed to being incarcerated and not
getting those services. And it was working out very,
very well.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. How will
your monitoring plan account for CPD's culture of
denial or code of silence?

Specifically, how will your team
investigate -- I'm sorry; some of the writing is
challenging -- how will your team check -- I'm going

80

to start this over.

How will your monitoring plan account
for CPD's culture of denial and code of silence?

Specifically, how will your team look
beyond CPD-generated data and check compliance?

GANESHA MARTIN: So a couple of
things. You know, I think there are folks that are
in denial; and what I've seen in a lot of different
Consent Decree jurisdictions is those folks, as the
-- it starts to become clear that the organization
has a different mission, it is moving forward in the
way that the Consent Decree dictates, those people
tend to no longer have the darkness to hide in, and
they start moving out of the department.

And for those who decide to stay and
continue to try to hide in the dark -- and I am not
talking about the entire department; because there's
a lot of good officers, and those officers become
allies of the work that you're doing, because they
want a better department. They know -- they didn't
sign up to be on the front news of the page -- of the
paper every day as a negative influence and enforcer

81

in Chicago.

The other thing that we would do --
and I've done this on other monitoring teams that
I've been on, is we have access to databases, we have
access to discipline records, we have access to trial
boards and things of that nature. And what has
happened in other jurisdictions is when we recognize
that things are not changing, we then go to the
department and give the department the opportunity to
come up with a remedy to fix that. And where it's
appropriate, the community can be involved as well.

If that does not happen -- and this is
different than every other initiative that's --
reform initiative that's happened in Chicago -- you
also have now a federal judge that, you know, you
utilize that as your absolute last result, but that
is kind of the ace card where you can push, you know,
for the changes that need to happen.

You want to do that at the -- as a
very last resort. Because the idea here in -- and
Rick has talked about this before -- it's -- it is
having -- creating an environment in which the police

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

82

officers see and understand, along with the
community, that what the Consent Decree is trying to
accomplish is a better environment for them to come
to work and do their job.

CAROL ADAMS: I'm --

GANESHA MARTIN: Oh, sorry.

CAROL ADAMS: I'm trying to give you
enough time to -- so you can get the rest of the
questions in.

GANESHA MARTIN: Okay.

CAROL ADAMS: Because you have maybe
ten minutes more for questions.

GANESHA MARTIN: Okay.

CAROL ADAMS: So I want to get some
things in. Many of them -- many members of your team
are former police officers or have voice around law
enforcement in their background.

How will you contrast your own
internal biases and ensure that the coalition and
community members are genuine and empowered partners
in remedying CPD's pattern of civil rights
violations?

83

RICK BRAZIEL: I think that one is for
me. So first, what we need to know is, who am I?
And again, there's -- there tend to be -- and we know
this going into it -- a bias, because I come from law
enforcement, I naturally will default to that side.

In 1999 I co-authored a book on
community policing. So I've been living the
community policing world passionately since the mid
'90s; this is not something new for me. And that
book was called Cop Talk: Essential Communication
Skills for Community policing. It was teaching
officers and command staff how to get out and talk
with the community, not at the community.

And so I've been living that my entire
career. If you go back and look at the work that
I've done -- quite candidly, my contract expires at
the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department at the end
of this month because they were not happy with my
oversight in telling them that they needed to
improve. They've got significant issues. The
sheriff did not like that, so there's a big
controversy -- you can Google me -- but I've been

84

locked out of the sheriff's department because he
didn't like that civilian independent oversight.

So I firmly believe that past conduct
and behaviors are a predictor of future performance.
And I think if you look at the folks that we have on
the team, you'll realize that we're passionate about
what we do.

We also have the ability -- and it
goes to the prior question -- we have the ability to
push the button that says no, no, no, no; no, that's
not right. We know law enforcement from the inside,
and what you're trying to describe, nope, that
doesn't fly. So we have the inside game.

CAROL ADAMS: We have several
questions that relate a to your evaluation processes
and the metrics you're going to use and how you plan
to measure compliance, how you take a look at that.

BRIAN MAXEY: So building the internal
systems, in order to do any sort of quantitative
analytic, you need to have the data available. And
we're going to have to take a big step back and find
out what systems exist at CPD, how officers are

85

recording the data; and we're going to have to figure
out ways to ensure that officers are recording all of
their activity.

I know there's been controversy about
the ACLU settlement that led to the recording of
stops and detentions. From my standpoint it's basic
law enforcement practice that, when you have a
contact with a person, you record what happens.

And that is something we will have to
develop, if it does not exist, to ensure that all of
the that information -- whether it's a stop, whether
it's a crisis intervention, whether it evolves into
an arrest or emergent detention, whether there's an
associated use of force -- soup to nuts, we need to
have the information about what happened in those
events.

Once that information is connected,
then it can be brought up, and you can look at trends
over time, you can look at patterns in different
units, you can look across peer groups. There's a
whole bunch of analytics that can be done once the
systems are there.

86

But quantitative analysis is only one piece of this. The qualitative analysis, reading the reports -- like Ganesha said -- getting in to the investigations, reading the interviews, figuring out what detectives are doing, what questions they're asking, how they're treating people, all of that we are going to have to be on the ground, learning, riding along, experiencing, and viewing personally.

We will of course talk with the community about their experiences; because as was said at the fairness hearing -- you know, that brought a whole bunch of people together, and that was a room full of experts. Not just substantively about policing, but about Chicago, about its communities. And we will tap into that; and hopefully they will be the eyes and ears.

And we will also listen to the officers about their experiences, about the training they -- that seems to be a point of agreement, that they do not have the training and resources that they need to successfully do their jobs.

Again, building those systems up is

87

part of the monitoring job.

CAROL ADAMS: We have a couple of questions about the Fraternal Order of Police and the role of collective bargaining agreements, and whether or not you see them as an impediment to accountability; and what level of interaction do you intend to have with the Fraternal Order of Police?

GANESHA MARTIN: Well, I think just the same way we're hitting the ground running talking to the community, we have to have a conversation with the -- the FOP. And whether it's pleasant or not, those conversations have to continue. Because to whatever extent, whether it's 5 percent or 50 percent, they represent some of the contingent in the police department. And you can't act like they're not there.

I will say that that was something that I did in Baltimore; and when I decided to resign, the two people that called me was the -- the advocate who used to be the most angry at the police department, who over years we became friends; and FOP president. And I was quite shocked when he called

88

me, but he said, we understood, Ganesha, that what you were trying to do, despite the fact that it was reform, you were trying to do the best thing for police officers.

And so I think that by having those conversations early and often, whether we agree or not, trying to show that really the job of the FOP is to make sure that you have better, great working conditions for the men and women that you represent. And right now, if you read the investigation, that's not what's going on. And it's not putting them in a good position for the community, and it's not putting them in a good position for them to be able to do the job the best that they can.

And so I think that we have conversations as best we can on the things that we agree about.

And to your other point about the bargaining agreement, just like in Baltimore, the Consent Decree in Chicago had to maneuver around some of those bargaining agreements. And say, if the things can be worked out, we would like for them to

89

be worked out. If they can't, we can't change the bargaining agreement; we'll have to work around those things. And I think we will be able to do that.

CAROL ADAMS: You spoke to community engagement earlier; and a couple of questions revolving around that.

Who specifically will walk the streets to ensure that the perspectives of youth and other people who might not ordinarily come to hearings are incorporated into the monitoring process?

And what is your approach to transparency in that regard?

BLAKE NORTON: Thank you for the question. We plan on hiring two people who are Chicagoans, a project director and a community engagement manager. Community engagement manager will be working on the ground in Chicago; their sole responsibility will be to be leading meetings, to be engaging with community members all across the city. They will work closely with our assistant monitor, Reverend Jeffrey Brown, who will be doing community engagement as well. He's already doing work in

ABSOLUTE REPORTERS (312) 444-9882
www.absolutereporters.net

90

Chicago.

We see this as a critical role as part of our team; and having someone who's native to Chicago participating in this, building a strategy with the monitoring team, and building those bridges, listening intently and engaging the community every single day throughout the process.

GANESHA MARTIN: And specifically you mentioned youth. I will tell you, something that I've seen work very well is utilizing youth to talk to youth.

And so I often had members of different youth groups that would go out and engage other members of the youth and add kind of their own conversation, and then bring back the information that we would utilize in formulating the things that we did.

And one other thing that we did was created youth and community dialogues. And it actually became -- it ended up -- it worked so well that it became part of the in-service at the academy. So it's something that police officers and youth do

91

where they have conversations.

And really what came out of that is the police said, you guys don't respect me; and the youth said, well, you don't respect us. And so they started having conversations about how to respect each other.

CAROL ADAMS: The blog of one of the people who's a finalist, or one person in the finalist group says that, quote, most professional police agencies realize that police pursuits cause more harm than good.

Does your group agree, police pursuits are detrimental?

Why or why not?

GANESHA MARTIN: I'll say this and I'll pass it on, because I know you guys have opinions on it.

I think what happens is you have a lot of emotion and adrenaline going. And so it does have a tendency to end in ways that probably could be de-escalated. But I think that's why you have to really focus on training that will deals with

92

de-escalation. And de-escalation training should be woven into most if not all of the training that's done at the academy.

And I think, at least in jurisdictions that I've seen that happen, the incidence of use of force or excessive force did reduce at the end of pursuits.

BRIAN MAXEY: Just say all the analysis, all the research that I've ever seen on this has shown that the risk-benefit to pursuits is -- is always you're better off not engaging in the pursuit. There certainly are those critical times when the person that is fleeing from you presents such an imminent risk of serious harm to a specific person or group of persons that at that point you would pursue; but certainly for traffic stops, for misdemeanors, for stolen cars, those -- the risk to the public, to the officers, and the suspect are far -- outweigh the benefits of continuing the pursuit.

CAROL ADAMS: We have two questions relating to COPA. One, how do you view their role with respect to the Consent Decree compliance

93

process?

And secondly, if you were chosen as the Independent Monitor overseeing the Chicago Police Consent Decree, how would you ensure that the civilian complaints against CPD officers were looked at more seriously than they have been by IPRA and COPA?

BRIAN MAXEY: So I mean, the -- those accountability systems that we've been talking about, that really are at the core of what needs to be developed, you know, from everything that I've understood -- and I've read a lot of reports over many years in Chicago, and they all seem to say the same thing -- I don't think identifying the problem is really the challenge here.

The investigations need to be thorough and complete. Whether that's, you know, internal affairs, or whether that's COPA doing it, depending on the jurisdiction of that type of complaint, both of those systems have got to get much better at really exhausting the investigation and finding out what happened, not taking short cuts, not making

94

assumptions, and you know, as alleged, certainly not covering up information and protecting.

This is part of true accountability, true transparency. And if those systems are not empowered to do that correctly, the problem continues.

CAROL ADAMS: And finally, would you describe your understanding of community policing?

What recommendations would you make to ensure that community policing initiatives do not result in increased police surveillance in black and brown communities?

RICK BRAZIEL: Sure. We discussed already community policing at its core is the police department going out in the community and asking the community what are your priorities? What do you expect from us?

Community policing is not stop-and-frisk, it is not massive arrests; it's identifying what are the priorities within the community.

And when done correctly, a lot of

95

times there's that ah-ha moment for a law enforcement agency: We had no idea that was your highest priority. We tend to assume that law enforcement knows the answers, when in fact they don't.

You only know the answer when you actually ask the question. And asking the question is: What's the number one issue in your neighborhood; because we want to help solve that issue.

That's -- that's really the basics of community policing. It's not about enforcement; it's about identifying the problem that's a priority and dealing with that number one problem.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you all very much for your presentation and for your answers to the questions from this audience.

RICK BRAZIEL: Thank you.

BLAKE NORTON: Thank you.

BRIAN MAXEY: Thank you all for your questions.

CAROL ADAMS: And we will have a ten-minute break between now and the presentation

96

from the next group, which will be Schiff Hardin.

Excuse me, the next presentation will not be Schiff Hardin, it will be StoneTurn. Scheduling change.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: Good afternoon. We're ready to proceed with the third finalist group.

I would like to indicate, in case some of you weren't here earlier in the morning, that there are cards available for your questions. You can get them at a table in the back, or you can raise your hand and someone will come to you to give you a question card.

Having said that, again, good afternoon; and we're pleased to have our third presenter, and that is the firm of StoneTurn. They'll have 30 minutes to present, after which we will -- excuse me, 50 minutes to present --

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: 20.

CAROL ADAMS: They will have 20 minutes to present, and then we'll have questions from the audience. Thank you so much.

97

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Good morning. My name is Katie Lemire, and I'm leading the StoneTurn team. If you were to choose our team, I would be the Monitor, the Independent Monitor.

I want to start first by introducing team members. I've got too my right, Dr. Monte Long. I have to my left, Dr. Carol Rasor-Cordero. I have David Burroughs to my left; and down at the end of the table to my left is Michael Costa.

We have one core member of our team, Brent Larrabee, who could not be here with us today; he had an impossible conflict. Otherwise he would be here.

So I want to talk first about the experience on our team. And I want to tell you that we have the experience to get the work done, to make sure that the mandates of the Consent Decree are met.

Collectively we are former federal and local prosecutors, law enforcement experts, data analytic specialists, and compliance professionals.

We are well versed in policing practices, monitorships; we're lawyers, we know

98

federal and local laws; we know change management, how to change organizations; we know data analytics; and we know collaboration; and we know how to communicate with people who feel like they haven't been listened to. We will make sure that everything -- again, everything -- that is required by the Consent Decree will get done.

So a little bit about each of us, each of our team members here. And I'm referring to us as our core team members.

Myself, I'm a career federal prosecutor. I was a federal prosecutor in New York City. Before that I was a local prosecutor, I was an assistant D.A. Also in Manhattan.

After 12 years working as a prosecutor, I became counsel to the police commissioner at the New York City Police Department. I did a lot of things there. I had a big portfolio, which ranged from looking at specific pieces of the police department that were broken; I worked on relations with community groups; I worked on particular issues specific to those community groups;

99

I overhauled training in connection with one aspect of constitutional policing; and I spearheaded an organizational change project, something affecting nearly every aspect of this 53,000-person police department.

After I left the police department, I started my own firm, I ran a firm; I'm an experienced manager. Because let's get one thing straight, if things are going to get done, as they need to get done in this Consent Decree, you've got to have a strong manager at the top; someone who's going to make sure things are going to get done, that they're going to get done on time, that everybody knows what's getting done, that there's transparency; and that we don't spend huge amounts of money in the process.

And I can do that. I have that experience. I want to speak now about Dr. Long, sitting to my right. Dr. Long has an extensive law enforcement career. He was 20 years at the New York City Police Department. And while he was there, he oversaw big pieces of the police department. He was

100

the commanding officer of the police academy, he also oversaw -- he was the commanding officer of the office of community affairs, as well as the school safety division, which addresses in part, relations between youth and police. He can speak to more on that. He also had a high level position in the internal affairs bureau.

And I do want to state -- I don't know if it's in the slide -- when I met yesterday and the day before -- want to correct one thing -- I think I said both times that he was the number two person running internal affairs; that was not accurate. He was a supervisor within internal affairs. So I want to correct that.

He is now teaching at Pace University. And especially relevant, why we're all here today, he is now working on the monitorship team; he's on the outside of the NYPD, working on the federal Consent Decree that was imposed on the New York City Police Department in connection with stop-and-frisk policing.

I'm going to speak to Dr.

101

Rasor-Cordero next. She also has a law enforcement career. She spent 25 years in the Tampa area, in the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office. There she worked as the agency's, the sheriff's office's training advisor.

Some of the highlights of her career is that she established the Citizens Community Policing Institute while she was at the sheriff's office. She also established the agency's first domestic violence unit and sex offender units.

Since leaving law enforcement, she started a second career, and what I refer to as being a law enforcement change agent. And in that role she's provided technical assistance to police departments all over the United States, she's worked as a trainer, she's advised in all kinds of things ranging from managerial and executive development, to promotions, and she's just helped overall in project management assistance.

Moving on to David Burroughs, who's sitting to my left, Mr. Burroughs had a 25-year career with the Federal Bureau of Investigations, we

102

all know as the FBI, federal law enforcement. And in
that he worked on a lot of different squads,
including the squad that oversees street violence in
New York City.

He spent his last years there as a
supervisor over one of the squads that oversaw pieces
of some of the most sensitive investigations in the
United States.

He now works with me at StoneTurn.
He's a partner there with me. And Dave, like myself,
has a lot of experience in running monitorships, and
supervising monitorships, and making sure things get
done as they're supposed to get done.

He's got a lot of management
experience. And he would be a huge help to me if we
were appointed as the monitorship team. How am I
doing on time? I don't like to see those cards start
flashing in my face.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: 11.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Great. Thank you.
Then second to last is Mr. Costa, down at the end,
Michael Costa. He's our quant guy. If you have read

103

the Consent Decree, you know that there's a lot of
data crunching that would need to happen, there's a
lot of collection of data, not only through surveys,
but through reports, reporting by the Chicago Police
Department. And he would be our man on the ground in
that respect.

And lastly is Brent Larrabee, who's
not here with us today. He headed multiple police
departments in the United States. These are much,
much smaller police departments than Chicago Police
Department.

But it's -- I thought that was someone
very important to have on our team, because he's been
involved in a real granular way with things that need
to change within police departments. He understands
how you change things from the inside out.

And he brings something particularly
unique to our monitorship team. When he was -- there
was a -- a federal investigation, the U.S. Department
of Justice investigated the East Haven Police
Department, that's in Connecticut. And while that
federal investigation was going on, there was

104

realization that they needed to change the person at
the top, the chief.

And so Brent Larrabee was brought in
to handle, to deal with, to respond to the federal
investigation. And then there was a federal Consent
Decree that was handed down. It wasn't like the one
here, but again, it was a federal Consent Decree,
covering a lot of similar areas. And he continued on
within the East Haven, Connecticut Police Department,
making sure that all the mandates of that Consent
Decree were met.

So he was on the inside, making sure
not only that changes happen, but they happened in a
way that they stuck. So things wouldn't just go back
and change back to the way they were after the
Consent Decree was done.

There's one other very important
piece, member of our team, who also is not here; and
that's the community liaison. We did not fill that
role yet. And we did that for a few reasons.

There's an argument, you could say,
that that role is the most important or the second

105

most important role in our team. Because that
Consent Decree speaks not only to making changes
within the Chicago Police Department, but making the
community feel like they're being heard; and creating
a sense of transparency, a sense of transparency not
only so communities feel like they know what's going
on in the Chicago Police Department, but also so
communities know that they know what's going on with
the monitorship team.

Of course there's going to be a
website. We're going to have reports posted, we're
going to let everybody know what we're doing. That's
not really enough. And there are plenty of people
who live in the city of Chicago who probably don't
look at the Internet, or maybe aren't able to look at
the Internet.

So we need to have that community
liaison, that very, very important person, who would
be the person who does -- not the only person on the
team, but the one who spearheads reach out. Who's
out there at town hall meetings, who's talking to
people, who's talking to people and the people who

106

represent those people; to politicians who represent
the communities, to -- to churches, leaders of
churches; of nonprofits, other faith-based groups.

So that community liaison is very,
very important. And I'm going to tell you something:
We deliberately left that spot open for a reason, and
it's because we did not think we could, before we are
chosen, before we are boots on the ground, before
we're out there meeting with people and talking more
with people, we didn't think we'd be able to pick
just the right person. And we didn't want to risk
picking someone who in the end was going to alienate
some big -- some big swath of the community.

So we waited; and we're waiting. But,
if we are chosen, that will be one of the two most
important things we get going on right away.

We met with a group of stakeholders
yesterday, we met with the Attorney General's office
already, and we also met with the City of Chicago
already, and representatives from the Police
Department.

And it is real important, in our view,

107

that all the of those groups -- the stakeholders,
communities, the parties, even the judge -- think
that we've chosen someone who's the right choice. So
we have not filled that slot. But that is a very,
very important slot to fill.

So I'm going to put up here something
that, looks, frankly, real nice, neat, and clean;
right?

It's our methodology. And boy,
doesn't this Consent Decree look easy when you look
at that; huh?

Also looks a little silly to me, quite
frankly, I'm going to be honest with you. It gives
you generally the big buckets of things that have to
get done through the Consent Decree. I'm going to
talk a little bit about each of them.

But there's a reality that this looks
like it's a straight line, but this -- this will not
be a perfectly straight line. I think all of us know
that. And I don't want to put this slide up there
and make anyone think that we think this is going to
be easy.

108

But some of the things that we got to
do to get this done are methodology, is first
reviewing and assessing. That means gathering data,
looking at police reports, getting briefings from
talking to people within the Chicago Police
Department. Just as important, talking to people in
the community, talking to stakeholders.

Talking to all those people I
mentioned before, and their representatives.

And it's also assessing, it's looking
at what reforms the City, the Police Department has
instituted already. We've read up, we've seen that
there have been some things that have been pushed
through, changes that have happened already. So we'd
want to look at that, and then we want to make sure
that those changes are actually being done in the
right way and that they're actually happening.

We're also going to do a gap analysis,
in plain English that means we're going to look and
see what remains to be done. We're going to
implement policies and procedures -- or rather, we
will be reviewing policies and procedures that are to

109

be implemented. We may be working to draft some of
those things ourselves, if that's needed.

And we're going to be all the time
measuring compliance and reporting. And that doesn't
mean just looking at data, looking at reports,
talking to people; but that also means reporting out
to the judge, of course, reporting out to the
community, reporting out to the parties. Everybody
knowing what -- what needs to happen still, what has
happened already. Transparency.

And again, like I said, it's not a
straight line. There's going to be some doubling
back. There's a lot of overlap there. There will be
things that won't get done that we have to come back
to.

There's all kinds of deadlines in that
Consent Decree. There's so many deadlines, that's a
given. There will likely be some deadlines that are
missed. There's just so much to do.

But that's why you need a team that's
experienced in managing like this, all the while,
while maintaining transparency as well.

110

So we -- one thing -- one last thing I want to say to you is that we are -- we are independent. And you know, that should be obvious, of course. The title of the job is Independent Monitor. We have to be independent.

But I want to -- to let you know that yesterday, when I was preparing for this, I sat down and I read through the entire Department of Justice findings report that came out in January 2017; and I sat down -- it took me about three hours -- and I read the whole thing, cover to cover. And it was good to do, because it brought me back really to what this is all about. It's been a real tangled road, I think, getting from January 2017 to here. We all know that.

But there's -- there are important, important, important aspects, swaths of that report that should not be forgotten. And so much of what it points to is not only about what needs to happen, but the road that already was traveled. And it all underscores the need for someone independent, independently perceived by the community, of course,

111

and also independently perceived by the police department.

Change is not easy within police departments. Almost everybody at this table has dealt with that issue. Mr. Larrabee has as well.

And if we come in and we're not perceived as independent by the communities, by the Police Department, we don't have a chance of making sure that the reforms that have to happen are going to stick. And they've got to stick. This can't be some -- this can't be some five-year, three-year project where we write a clean bill of health, and the judge stamps it, and we walk out and we leave, and then everything slides back to the way it was. It's got to be reform that lasts.

And for that to happen, we have to be perceived as independent.

The flipside of that -- I'm going to admit -- is that we have fewer Chicago ties than some of the other teams. You can see it if you look at our proposals, these are our bios; there's a lot of New York in this room. That's not to say New York

112

knows how to do everything better; that is not at all the case.

But we have fewer Chicago ties. And there's a reason for that: That independence I spoke of. We do have some Chicago ties. And I will tell you, I went to law school here, I worked for the Legal Aid Foundation when I was in law school. I have family here.

Mike Costa lives in Chicago; he works at StoneTurn in Chicago; we have a Chicago office. We're going to have that community liaison, and we may have even more people added to that community liaison team.

If you looked at our budget -- it's posted online -- there's a lot of wiggle room. There's a cap that the City and the AG's office wants, the City and the State. And we come in way below that. Not because we think we're only going to spend, say, half of the money that's available, but we're leaving purposely a lot of wiggle room, because there's some unknown roads ahead, and there are certainly going to be areas where we're going to need

113

to beef up, and we're only going to know that once we're here.

But independence is paramount. And that's what our team is.

And I just want to thank you for listening to us today. I want to thank you for being here. Especially those that are here now for the third day in a row, and anyone else who's come and joined, because of how very important this is.

It's a Saturday morning. We can see by how few people are in the room, that, you know -- I'm sure many people had the intention of coming here; but actually, coming downtown on a Saturday morning and listen to all of us might -- might not have been on the top of everybody's list.

Those of you who are here, I appreciate you coming down and listening to us; and we welcome your questions. Thank you.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. We are ready to go. Are there aspects of the Consent Decree that concern you in any way? And if so, why and why are they going to change?

114

KATHERINE LEMIRE: There is a lot in that Consent Decree. That is a big question.

And I hesitate to speak to any one piece of it, because there's so much importance throughout that Consent Decree.

But I'm going to pull up and flip into my list of all of those areas. I mean, it's very hard to pick out one area.

There's community policing, impartial policing, use of force, crisis intervention. The list goes on. It's all important.

And -- but I think the question also spoke to -- I think the question also spoke to not quite is there anything we would change or is there anything more important, et cetera.

As the Independent Monitor, I want to make clear, we would be bound by that Consent Decree. There's a little bit of wiggle room in there, there's some language that says that -- that we might have some flexibility to change some things, if possible. But when we come in, it will already be something signed by the judge, and by the State, and by the

115

City. And so I don't want to come in and say there's anything that we would or could change in the course of our work. It might be that when we're looking at things, we'll decide some things have to be tweaked, or something needs to be added that's not already in there.

But coming in right now, there's nothing that I would be critical about in that Consent Decree.

Do any of my team members have anything to add?

DOMESTHENES LONG: Just the nature -- the nature of the recommendations that's contained in the Consent Decree, they're interrelated and interconnected, and they're complex. So, you know, addressing one area, you necessarily are addressing two, three other areas. So it's really hard to kind of tease out one as being more important than others.

CAROL ADAMS: What is going to be your approach in your first year of execution?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: I can tell you what will happen right when we get here, when we get

116

started. And that's two things. One I spoke to already, which is that filling that community liaison role. That's got to be accomplished very, very quickly.

The second thing is, is that within 75 days we got to pull together a monitoring plan. And that's -- there's a lot of work that goes into that. And that folds in a lot of what was in that first block on that nice graphics chart page. And that's a lot of gathering information and assessing what's already been done.

And there have been some things done, like I said.

So we've got to -- while we're writing that monitoring plan, we've got to see what's out there already so that we're coming up with a monitoring plan that is tied to reality, that is not pie in the sky, that's not academic, that's not theoretical; but tied strictly to what's got to get done, and laying out the order of which things need to get done.

CAROL ADAMS: We had several questions

117

here relating to stop-and-frisk.

First, whether or not you believe that stop-and-frisk is an effective and constitutional policy practice.

Another says that when working in -- with the New York Police Department, why didn't you curb their practice relating to stop-and-frisk prior to the litigation?

And the third, that just mentions again that -- to Dr. Long, specifically, you worked in NYPD during the height of the department's use of stop-and-frisk. Did you challenge that practice before the Court found it unconstitutional?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Apologies, but could you repeat Question 2?

I didn't catch that.

CAROL ADAMS: Says, given your position as counsel to Commissioner Kelly, why didn't you curb NYPD's practices related to stop-and-frisk prior to the litigation?

And why would you allow the City to fight the litigation instead of implementing changes

118

before the federal court ordered changes?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: So I'm going to have Dr. Long speak first, and then I will answer as well. Not only that second question, but some of the other questions. Go ahead.

DOMESTHENES LONG: I retired from the NYPD in 2002. That was approximately 16 years ago. And if you look at the data on stop-question-and-frisk, the NYPD conducted approximately 97,000 stop-question-and-frisk -- those were reported.

The -- the strategy of using stop-question-and-frisk occurred many years after that. So if you look at the stop data, it -- took off in terms of increasing, when stop-question-and-frisk was used as a strategy.

With respect to the constitutionality of stop-question-and-frisk, it's lawful. Terry versus Ohio, United States Supreme Court established -- or recognized the practice that police officers have the ability to stop individuals when they are reasonably suspected they are about to or have

119

engaged in criminal activity.

And in New York side, we also have a court case, People versus DeBour, which actually lays out the level of engagement -- there's four different levels -- and what you need at each level to engage members of the public in that practice. So the practice is constitutional.

The problem with the NYPD is that they practiced it in an unconstitutional way.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: And if I could speak -- we're really working backwards, so I'm going to speak to the second question, which related to my role at the NYPD and stop-and-frisk, and why didn't I -- I'll paraphrase -- put a stop to it.

When I arrived at the police department in 2009, I already had a career as a federal prosecutor and a local prosecutor and assistant D.A. in New York. And so certainly I was and I still am of course very familiar with what the legal standards are as they relate to police talking to, questioning, frisking, arresting people on the street.

120

When I came to the New York City Police Department, the litigation that's referred to in that question, the Floyd litigation, was already underway. And the way it works in New York City is that the law department becomes the lawyers for the police department when there's litigation like that.

And it was -- it was being litigated back then. And I know this is not the most satisfying answer -- you probably -- be better if I could say, well, I jumped in, and I told everybody stop this immediately and settle this; but it wasn't in my ambit, wasn't within what my portfolio was.

But in a sense it was in the following way. I want to tell you, when I got there at the police department, I -- it became -- I became aware of the following: On public housing grounds, there was a real pattern of police officers stopping people, without the right basis, if they didn't answer the police officer's questions.

And it would go something like this: Somebody would be walking into the entrance to public housing building, they may live there, they might not

121

have had their I.D. on them, the police officer would come up to them and say, why are you here? And if that person walked away, that person would get arrested.

That's not constitutional policing. That's not what's supposed to happen.

I didn't have to look in any law books to know that. I litigated that, I worked on stuff like that when I was an assistant D.A. and a federal prosecutor; and I knew that was wrong.

The problem is we saw a real pattern of it. And there seemed to be a big -- a big misconception going on such that lot of cops thought that if they were patrolling public housing grounds, that they had expanded power, so to speak, that the usual laws -- Dr. Long spoke to them: DeBour, Terry -- that they didn't apply because it was public housing.

Well, they were wrong. And so I spent quite some time in the course of those first solid six months working on that issue. And that meant not only, unfortunately, I had to duke it out with the

122

legal bureau, because there were some people who
didn't quite get it, who hadn't had the career I had
already. And then it took rewriting policies. We
rewrote the patrol guide, we rewrote the policies, we
put examples in so people would see exactly what they
were doing was wrong.

And we also then rolled out training.
And I inserted myself -- let me tell you, another
good reason for me to be the Monitor is I'm hands-on.
You don't pick me -- I have issues, and I delegated
all the way to somebody. I'm in there in the
trenches. And on this issue I was in the trenches.

And I was there at the police academy,
working with the police academy to make sure the
right training was being rolled out in the right way.

I wasn't doing the training.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. We have a
few other questions that also relate to the team.
I'd like to get them in.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Okay.

CAROL ADAMS: Says most of the members
of your panel have spent their careers within the

123

realm of law enforcement or as prosecutors.

Why should communities and
organizations who have been targeted by or objects of
police abuse trust that your team can truly address
their concerns regarding civil rights violations by
the Chicago Police?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: I'm going to let
some of my team members do more of the talking.

Do you want to start with that one,
Dr. Rasor-Cordero?

CAROL RASOR-CORDERO: Certainly.
During my time at the Pinellas County Sheriff's
Office I was the commander of the community services
division. So a big part of my job was dealing with
the diverse communities within Pinellas County. And
I can tell you that the foundation is to treat
everyone with justice, respecting the constitutional
rights, and more than anything, with respect,
regardless of the communities that they are from.

And I think that coming from a
different department, and not being part of Chicago
gives me a little bit of a benefit, because I will

124

look at things a little bit differently in terms of
communities being treated in the fairest way
possible, on equal grounds, and in a respectful way.

And I think that our other panel
members would have the same approach that I would.
Because I know, working with communities, while you
have one entire city, you have a multitude of
different communities with different problems,
different challenges. So you cannot have one size
fits all to fix it. You have to look at what are the
challenges and concerns for that particular
community. How do you set up that communication?

Which would be through our community
liaison or liaisons, to make sure every community has
a voice in this process.

This Consent Decree is not going to be
a success unless we get the community and the police
to work together. And the first step in that is some
strong conversation and understanding of differences
and a commitment to this Consent Decree that we have
to have.

And I feel that what our team brings

125

as a strength is a passion to the issue.

CAROL ADAMS: There is a question
specifically directed at you, that asks whether or
not you have advocated training civilians to be armed
and confront wrong-doers.

If that is true, and do you still
believe that?

CAROL RASOR-CORDERO: I have concern
-- I'm a former firearms instructor, defensive
tactics instructor, and police driving instructor.

I have concerns about arming civilians
unless they are given substantial training; and that
training has to be based on not just hitting a
target, but decision-making of it. Also with
firearms, you have to know defensive tactics; because
I can tell you, it's easy to get a gun off of someone
if you're standing up close to them and you know how
to do it.

So that is a very, very careful issue
that I cannot give a blanket response.

One of the things, though, that I
would like to add on that is that I really believe

126

there needs to be a hard look at the use-of-force
training done by the Chicago Police Department, how
many times they qualify during the year, how -- what
is the curriculum?

Is it decision-making, or is it just
shooting as the target?

Do they have the resources of their
own range, that they can significantly put through
12,000 members through firearms training?

Which I believe must be on a yearly
basis, in-depth, and also using other technology
that's available. One of the things available is a
F.A.T.S. Machine in which there's decision-making,
there is new technology out there that gives a
360-look for the officer to make decisions.

But my first choice would be, let's
get the police training to the best extent that we
possibly can; and then if there is civilian police
training, we've got to take a hard look at the extent
of it. Because in fact, we are also putting people
in danger too, unless they're properly trained.

There's a difference if someone just

127

got out of the U.S. Marines, and their MOS was
weapons, I can tell you that they are going to be
much prepared, better prepared for this. But someone
that's never picked up a gun before, it's tough; it
takes a lot of training to get people up to the
speed. It can be done.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Thank you.
How will your monitoring plan account for the CPD's
culture of denial, also referred to as a code of
silence?

Specifically, how will your team look
beyond CPD-generated data and check compliance, which
-- and check compliance?

I can't read this last part.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: So the piece of our
-- one piece of our monitoring plan that would deal
with that and have a sense of whether there is an
ongoing culture of denial is, again, talking --
talking to the people who are out there being
policed, talking to the citizens of the City of
Chicago.

And when I worked for the New York

128

City Police Department, if I had to tackle some
difficult issues, I would start with -- within the
police department, and getting those briefings,
listening to what was being done. But you always
have to validate. You've got to validate. No matter
what you're looking at.

And a sure way of validating is
getting out there, getting out to community, and
hearing what is happening to people, what they sense
is going on. What they sense is going on, what they
sense is really changing.

CAROL ADAMS: What do you think is the
most important thing that the Chicago Police can do
to restore trust in the police by the communities in
the city?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: That's a very good
question. Dr. Long, do you want to start with that?

DOMESTHENES LONG: So there's this
notion of procedural justice. And it's four pillars
of procedural justice.

And so there's four pillars of
procedural justice, and a couple of them is -- one's

129

transparency. Right?

So your policies, practices, the way
you operate has to be open. That members of the
community, members within the department can see and
understand what you're doing and why you're doing it.
Because if it's not clear, if it's -- if it's a
closed system, then people are going to question it
in terms of why is it closed?

The other thing is that you have to be
neutral and unbiased. Right?

So you have to approach the situation
as a -- as a -- an unbiased, independent individual.
And you want to make your determinations based on the
facts that are presented to you, and not any
preconceived notions that you may have.

When you look at those notions, the
tenets of procedural justice, I think that that is a
good start to -- to help address this issue.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How will you
incorporate the voices of people who are hesitant to
report police abuse and misconduct, such as women,
people engaged in sex work, undocumented people?

130

How will you incorporate them into
your investigation?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Yeah, someone asked
a similar question to this yesterday, particularly
within the immigrant community. And you know,
focusing, for example, on what's coming out of
Washington, the idea that people would be asked in
the course of answering census questions to report
whether they were here legally or not.

That kind -- if that were to happen, I
think that would only make that question even more
important because you could get people who don't want
to come to any town hall meeting, any community
meeting if they think there is some kind of police
presence there. And given that we are -- would be
the independent monitorship team over the Chicago
Police Department, we could be perceived that way.

So again, we have to be -- we would
have -- of course, you know, there's the website.
I've spoken to that. But we'd also have to get the
word out -- again, circling back to the importance of
that community liaison, liaisons -- and making sure

131

that we're getting out there -- there could be a part
of this, quite frankly, that is going door to door
and talking to people. And it's not just having big
meetings and big places like this where people might
be afraid to come.

And so it's got to be handled in a
very -- in a very careful way and being mindful of
people's reluctance, potentially, to come forward and
talk at any of these meetings, and come to talk to
us.

CAROL ADAMS: Speaking of community
liaisons, what are the qualifications, and how would
you go about selecting the community liaison?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Well, one of the
qualifications, certainly, is that they are someone
of course who is of the community. We're not going
to appoint -- we're not going to bring in someone
from New York to be the community liaison; let's make
that clear.

So it has to be someone who is of
here, someones, I should say again, getting to that
idea that we've left wiggle room in our -- in our

132

budget, so that we could really beef this up.

But it's got to be someone who -- or
someones who people feel like is of -- of -- can't
have one person who's from every community in the
city of Chicago, but people who represent pieces of
Chicago, particularly those areas addressed in the --
in the Consent Decree and the DOJ findings as well,
South and West Sides.

And you've got to have someone who is
perceived as a good listener, someone who's perceived
as ethical and transparent. And the place to start,
where we would be starting to look for someone like
this, is we would be talking to the parties; and
frankly, we looked at all the other proposals, and
the other proposals have some -- some really great
people mentioned there.

And I know that's potentially a
dangerous thing to say, that, hey, we're going to
come and cherry-pick from the other teams, frankly,
they've got some great people. We'd want to vet
them, we'd want to make sure they wouldn't be people
who would be seen as biased or alienated, one side or

133

the other. But we would be looking there as well.

I also went to law school here, went
to Northwestern. And there are members of the
faculty who have strong ties to the community and
have a sense of sort of who's who out there.

So I know it sounds like a lot, given
the short time frame, but it's priority number one.

CAROL ADAMS: There are a few
questions here that I will -- are somewhat
theological [sic] in content.

How do you plan to measure compliance
within the Consent Decree?

Seems like that may be one of the
hardest tasks, but it doesn't seem to be explained in
your application.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: So measuring
compliance, that's -- that comes in multiple ways;
but one way that it would come in is through Michael
Costa, who we have here, who would be our data
analytics professional.

Michael, could you speak to that a
little bit?

ABSOLUTE REPORTERS (312) 444-9882
www.absolutereporters.net

134

MICHAEL COSTA: Yeah. So coming into this, or potentially coming into this Consent Decree, understanding that the City has somewhat old IT infrastructure systems -- and the City's already put that forward as one of their -- one of the items they hope that this independent monitorship can help solve.

So first and foremost, getting into understanding the data systems we're working with, how to improve those, how to extract the relevant data, how to supplement and enhance that, and to use that in analytics going forward.

CAROL ADAMS: There's a question regarding the evaluation.

Will you evaluate or monitor internal/ external communications from CPD regarding the Consent Decree compliance; and if so, what metrics or key performance indicators would you apply?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

That's a hard one.

CAROL ADAMS: Yeah. Asking about what

135

in your evaluation -- what are the key performance indicators you would be looking at?

What metrics are you going to track when it comes to looking at compliance with the Consent Decree?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Yeah. So there is a lot of that that is written into the Consent Decree; but I can tell you, picking up where Michael left off, there's all kinds of reporting within the police department that has happened or, frankly, not happened in the past. It would be looking at random sampling, at police reports, to see what it is that is -- how, for example, when there is -- there are instances of use of force -- I'm going to go to the most extreme example -- police-involved shootings, looking at what happened in those instances; what kind of discipline was imposed. Looking at -- looking for patterns, looking to see if one sergeant, for example, in particular, was continually signing off on reports where there was misconduct, where it was very clear that there should be -- should have been additional inquiries made.

136

It's looking at repeat offenders among police officers. It's looking at -- it's looking at training and how often is train -- training is done, and how well it's done. It's looking at promotions, it's looking at supervisors and how effective they are.

There's just -- there's so, so many things, it's a big question to answer.

But fortunately, the Consent Decree, in some respects, is so very well written that it provides, to a large degree, a road map of what needs to happen and what should be looked at.

CAROL ADAMS: A couple questions regarding COPA and your relationship with that.

First, just a question as to whether or not you all would look more seriously, more closely at complaints that have been filed against the Chicago Police Department than has been the case with IPRA and COPA, where only 29 percent of civilian complaints resulted in the disciplining of CPD officers.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Yes. So certainly

137

looking at COPA would be a very important thing to do. For multiple reasons. I understand, in reading the DOJ findings, reading other coverage of what's happened, that there were big, big problems with IPRA.

COPA is still relatively new. And I think it's fair to say that it's -- it's still early days in some sense. And there needs to be a look at how COPA is doing its work.

I understand there were all kinds of issues with IPRA; and one should look and make sure that those issues are not happening with COPA. I know that budgeting has been expanded, I know that the investigation staff has been expanded for COPA, I know there are more resources being devoted.

There will be a question as to whether that is quite enough, whether those investigators have the requisite experience to do what they need to do.

And it's not just looking at how the investigations are done, but also whether there's a feedback loop. I know there was a real problem

138

before with complainants, witnesses never hearing
back about anyone ever looking at their complaint in
the first place. There needs to be built-in feedback
loops.

There are all kinds of issues to deal
with there. And that absolute -- to come back to
your question, it absolutely would be of great
importance for us to be looking at the functioning of
COPA. It's still pretty new.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. We've got a
little under five minutes, so I'm going to try to get
in as many of the remaining questions as possible,
one of which has to do with community policing.

Describe your understanding of
community policing and what recommendations you would
make to ensure that community policing initiatives do
not result in increased surveillance in black and
brown communities.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Care or...

DOMESTHENES LONG: I mean, there are
various forms of community policing. You know,
there's community policing, there's problem-solving

139

policing; there's kind of a wide range. But the most
important part of all the kind of theme that runs
through is community input, community participation.

So in terms of, you know, the
operational framing of particular strategies or
policy, it has to involve members of the community.
And so that's going to be a very, very important part
of the community policing practice. And that's why
it's been broadly accepted in terms of policing.

CAROL ADAMS: How would you encourage
young African Americans to consider careers in police
work?

DOMESTHENES LONG: So I can tell you
one of the things I did when I was a commanding
officer of the school safety division.

The law enforcement explorer program
is a program that's run by the Boy Scouts -- and they
have young men and women ages 14 to 21. So one of
the things that I did was, because we have the
students in the schools, is I had my officers set up
explorer posts at certain schools. And the reason
why that was important -- so one, it gets the -- the

140

connection between the officers in the school and the
students in the school; but I looked at it further as
a recruitment source.

And because -- so we would keep them,
while they went through their high school years --
and the NYPD had a cadet program, which was basically
you would -- we would give students money towards
their tuition if they would work as a cadet and then
join the police department for two years thereafter,
and they wouldn't have to pay the money back.

So we would get them young, when they
were 14, and we would keep them until they graduated
from college and put them right through the academy.

So there's a number of programs like
that where you can reach out to the youth, and you
get them and you stay with them for a long period of
time. And they develop those relationships.

CAROL ADAMS: Speaking of youth, what
plans would you have to engage youth in the process
of monitoring and in the planning and implementation
of monitoring the Consent Decree?

DOMESTHENES LONG: Well, so --

141

certainly the interaction of youths are different
than they are with adults. And I think it would be
important to kind of talk to them and get their
professional understanding of what do they see are
their major concerns in terms of police engagement
with them.

And based on that, we would take that
kind of perspective, and you can apply it in terms of
what you're going to add to the monitorship.

CAROL ADAMS: We'd like to thank you
and the entire team for your answers and your
presentation. Our time is up.

And again, we appreciate you.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: And thank you all.

CAROL ADAMS: There will be a
ten-minute break before the next and final
presentation of the morning.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: Good afternoon, we're
ready to reconvene.

I want to remind, to say to anybody
who may have come in recently, that the comment cards

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

142

-- comment cards are available in the back -- excuse
me -- question cards available, or if you're already
complete, just raise your hand if you would like
question cards, and they will bring them up to me.

Yes. We will begin shortly.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Thank you.
And so the next team that we'll be hearing from is
Schiff-CNA. We would like you to make a presentation
to us of about 20 minutes, and then we'll open to
questions that I have received from the audience. I
have a number of them already, because some people
submitted questions that they wanted asked to every
group. And then there are some later that are
specific to your group.

So you may begin. Thank you.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Thank you very much,
Dr. Adams. This team understands how much of the
healing and transformation depends on the input and
the leadership of the community. We seek your
expertise; we promise to bring our very, very best to
every aspect of this process; because everyone in

143

Chicago deserves to be safe.

My name is Maggie Hickey, and I'm the
team Monitor. I'm currently a partner at Schiff
Hardin, but I have spent approximately 23 of the last
27 years as a public servant.

I worked most recently as the
Inspector General for the State of Illinois, and over
13 to 14 years in the U.S. Attorney's office, the
last five leading the U.S. Attorney's office as the
executive inspector -- I've got too many titles that
are all like ee-I-ee-I-oh -- but as the Executive
Assistant United States Attorney, EAUSA.

I'm grateful for all of you for
showing up on a Saturday morning -- it's Saturday
afternoon now. And thank you very much.

Chicago has been used as an example of
a city besieged by violence. And we -- our team is
here out of a deep love and respect for Chicago and
out of dedication to all that we can do to be
excellent Monitors of this important opportunity that
the Consent Decree process presents for us.

Police officers account for

144

approximately 12,000 residents of Chicago. Having a
deep divide between these officers and the fellow
residents serves no one. We see it in the reluctance
in the community members who refuse to call the
police because they are afraid and they fear improper
use of force. And we see it in the low clearance
rates that are often blamed on the lack of trust
between law enforcement and the public.

This Consent Decree is critical to the
future of Chicago. Our team understands the
overarching goal of this monitoring project is to
make Chicago communities safer. A successful
completion of the monitoring process will transform
the Chicago Police Department into a model of
constitutional policing.

Our team includes local experts who
understand the complexity, current challenges, and
unique aspects of policing in Chicago; and also
national experts who have successfully tackled
problems with constitutional policing and
organizational change in policing.

Our team, with deputy monitor Chief

145

Rodney Monroe, and deputy monitor Director Chip
Coldren, have experience in all aspects of
independent police agency monitoring. We offer a
proven monitoring and assessment approach based on
successful methodologies that incorporate best
practices, evidence-based research, and through
lessons we have learned that will lend technical
assistance to the Chicago Police Department.

We will conduct the analysis required
by the Consent Decree through collaboration with the
Chicago Police Department, and through partnerships
with the Chicago community, working with our
community engagement team. I have four of the five
members of our community engagement team here with us
today.

Sodiqa Williams, who is the vice
president of external affairs and general counsel at
the Safer Foundation.

Elena Quintana, who is the executive
director of the Institute on Public Safety and Social
Justice at Adler University.

Joseph Hoereth, who is the director of

146

the Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement at the University of Illinois in Chicago -- and for those that grew up here, UIC.

And Steve Rickman, who is currently the associate monitor for community policing under the Albuquerque Police Department court-approved settlement agreement.

Together we will actively seek engagement, community stakeholders in the monitoring process to ensure that monitoring benefits the community directly, and that CPD reforms build community trust and community and police legitimacy.

Last but not least, we have with us also Dan Giaquinto, our associate monitor for accountability and transparency deputy. He is the former director of the New Jersey Office of State Police and Affairs, and is currently the deputy monitor for the Albuquerque Police Department court-approved settlement agreement.

Legitimacy of the Chicago Police Department is so important, but we are only going to be able to achieve that if CPD gains the community

147

trust; and that will be gained through a transparent monitoring process.

I want to turn it over now to Chief Monroe, a national leader in urban crime-fighting, who's going to talk more about our team's depth of experience.

RODNEY MONROE: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Rodney Monroe. I have spent approximately 40 years in law enforcement, and had the opportunity and the pleasure of leading three urban police departments across the country in very vibrant cities.

Prior to even becoming a police chief, my basic philosophy in policing has always been rooted in community relations. I recognize very early on the value that creating viable relationships with the community leads to much greater success than either one of us trying to address issues and problems by ourselves.

You can truly recognize the value of viable police community relations; it gives you the opportunity to do a host of things. Not only the

148

ability to reduce crime, but also you're able to manage other things as well, because you'll each become the eyes and ears of one another as it relates to keeping each other in check, and creating the greatest amount of accountability. Whether it's dealing with use of force, crime rates, closure rates. All of these things make up not only a police department, but make up those things that are critical within each and every one of our communities.

The relationships that we've been able to develop in our individual and collective work across the country has brought great value not only to police organizations, but even greater value to communities, when we can surely recognize and articulate the value of communities and what role they should and can play in helping not only to keep our communities safe, each other safe, as well as the men and women that serve in the different law enforcement agencies.

I've had an opportunity to be a part of what I believe is a very great team, especially

149

under the leadership of Maggie Hickey, who is a beneficial -- who has a great passion and devotion not only to the City of Chicago, but also to the causes that Chicago has been dealing with for a number of years.

These issues are not insurmountable. These issues are ones in which others have actually addressed these challenges; where we as a team have actually addressed these challenges. Whether it be through Consent Decrees, elaborate reforms, constitutional transformations within police organizations, we have each had not only the professional experience but the dedicated passion that it takes to move these things forward.

With that I'd like to turn it over to Chip Coldren, who will discuss some of those in more detail, some of the activities that we've been engaged in, not only as individual, but as a team.

JAMES COLDREN: Thank you, Chief. And good afternoon, everybody.

Again, my name is Chip Coldren; and I just wanted to say a word about some of my

150

experience. I've been a resident of Chicago and Chicago area on and off for the past 33 years. I have been involved in a number of justice system improvement and reform efforts in Chicago and the State of Illinois over that time.

Dr. Adams, I'm sure, will remember the work that we did on Redeploy Illinois in which we successfully reduced youth incarcerations citywide. And I was in on the ground floor when community policing came to Chicago, and I actually worked on a series of projects called Youth and Community Policing where we teamed up groups of youth from places like Englewood and Austin and other parts of the city, working with the Police Department on community policing issues.

I was also the prisoner's advocate in Illinois for five years, I worked for the John Howard Association; and in that capacity I was the federal court monitor for the Cook County Department of Corrections under the Duran versus Elrod Consent Decree.

So that's just a little bit about me.

151

I would like to point out a few of the...initiatives that our team has been involved in over the years and explain our direct involvement in consent decrees and other similar formal efforts to improve and reform the justice system.

You see up here Cook County is mentioned. Currently several members of our team are involved in the Albuquerque, New Mexico court order, as you heard, which addresses use of force, citizen engagement, and dealing with individuals with mental health problems in crises.

Dan Giaquinto was the monitoring coordinator for the New Jersey State Police under their Consent Decree, also related to profiling traffic stops.

Chief Monroe is the court monitor for Meridian, Mississippi, which involves police interaction and engagement with youth.

And we're currently involved in a multi-year effort to provide the analytical support for the Maricopa County Sheriff's office, which is an extensive analysis of traffic stops and bias and

152

racial profiling.

So we have had a -- quite a number of different experiences in monitoring and assisting in reform and agency reform. I think we can say with confidence that every place we have worked has experienced significant improvement in the areas that we focused on. We have a very good track record that way.

So thank you.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Our team brings knowledge, commitment, and experience. I myself most recently led an investigation into the independent review of sexual misconduct policies and procedures at the Chicago Public Schools.

We are also very committed to community engagement. And I want to introduce our community engagement team. And we're having technical difficulties; we aren't moving our slides as quickly as we need to. And I apologize to you, as the best laid plans always go awry. And I believe that we have handouts for everyone in the public that they can take home with them. And most important,

153

the words that we are saying -- we all know PowerPoints and technology -- my kids are the best at it -- and the truth is I'm the best when I just tell a story. So we're just going to tell a story to you; so if our slides don't match up, please forgive us.

I want to introduce our community engagement team. And the community is really at the heart and soul of this Consent Decree. And I believe that our community engagement team is really one of the things that make us unique, and our monitoring team.

We have thought about this. We know how important the community is. And the community is really what has led us here to the Consent Decree thus far. So I'd like to turn it over to our community engagement team.

JOE HOERETH: Thank you, Maggie, everyone. Good morning -- yeah -- afternoon, everyone. I'm Joe Hoereth, director of the Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement.

And as the slide points out, that our team has a team of diverse and experienced community

154

connectors as part of this engagement team. And I'm
a part of this team because I really believe that the
community engagement aspect of this project is
thoroughly integrated into the overall plan. You'll
hear more about that as we talk about our -- our
approach.

The Decree calls for a wide range of
different kinds of engagement. And we recognize
that. There will be times where we will be reporting
information out to the community. There will be
times when we're asking for the community to have its
input. Sometimes that's the same meeting.

There will be a whole host of all
kinds of different meetings and engagements that
we'll have; so it's very difficult to talk about
those specifics. However, we did think a lot about
some principles that we will bring and that we are
committed to in -- across all of our community
engagement work related to this.

The first principle is clarity of
purpose. So throughout all of our engagements we
will be explaining the purpose of that particular

155

meeting, how that relates to the Decree, as well as
the broad purpose of the Decree, reminding people
what the Decree is about, how we came to that place.

We want to recognize that there may be
a whole host of ways that people are connecting with
us. Maybe our first meeting, those folks are very
familiar with the Decree, but two years down the
line, we may have people connecting with us for the
first time. And it's very important for people to
understand the context for which we are asking for
their input.

The second principle is that of
inclusion. And it's very important to us to make
sure that we're hearing all voices who have something
to share related to the Consent Decree. And so we'll
be making extra effort to reach out to all aspects of
our community and thinking about who's participating
and how we can maximize that -- that input and that
participation; because that is related to the quality
of information that we'll pass along.

The third principle is one of safe
space. And this is really, really important. We

156

recognize the history around this issue. We
recognize that this is an emotional issue. We
recognize that there may be folks participating in
things, sharing stories that are highly emotional or
sensitive in nature. We want to make sure that
everyone is comfortable participating.

And that -- that principle applies
whether we're in the community, whether we're in a
meeting with officers as well. Officers need to feel
comfortable speaking in the engagements which we will
have with them.

We'll have ground rules that we share
with folks and ask for them to commit to those
principles of civility and respect when we're in our
conversations.

And the fourth principle is really
that of trust. And we're not going to walk out the
door here, if we're selected to do this work, with
trust from anyone. That's something we are committed
to earning with the community, with the City, with
all the parties involved.

We'll be doing this by being clear

157

about our -- honest about our role and the
limitations of the Decree and our role within that;
recording as best we can, in some way, shape, or form
any comment that comes our way; making sure that
we're demonstrating to people that their voice is
being captured, their voice is being heard.

And then the consistency of
follow-through, where in our meetings, in our
engagements, if an issue has been raised in a
previous meeting that we need to pass along somewhere
along the information chain, and we're circling back
to that group again, we will be informing folks what
we did with the information we heard from them last
time.

So those are the real sort of
overarching principles that we'll bring to our
community engagement work. And I'm going to turn it
over to Sodiqa Williams, who's going to talk a little
bit more about approach.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: Good afternoon,
everybody. My name is Sodiqa Williams; and I'm the
vice president of external affairs for the Safer

158

Foundation.

I am honored and I am humbled to be considered and to be a part of this team here today to talk to all of you.

And I am committed to working with this team. And it's related to my personal experience that I have had in my life, with my family, and the experiences I've had living in the city of Chicago; but it also was in the work that I do presently and I that have been doing in the community, helping to remove barriers and create opportunity.

I believe in this team and approaches that you just heard Joe cover. And in particular, inclusion, we believe, is fundamentally important as we move forward. And the integrated approach that you heard Joe mention in terms of community engagement will be important to our success.

We have a number of ideas in how we want to expand the community engagement team, and -- but we are always open to more ideas from the community, because we understand that a lot of you

159

have been doing work in the community, and we need your voices and any ideas as we move forward.

I'll share with you some of the ideas that we have, but it could be researchers, facilitators, community liaisons, subject-matter experts, translators. Again, these are our ideas; and we have amongst us different community-based organization and individuals that we know, but we look to you for your input, if we are selected, to continue to inform our strategy and how we can be inclusive within our team.

And I'm going to pass it over to Elena. Thank you.

ELENA QUINTANA: Good afternoon. I'm going to be incredibly brief, because I know that we are dying to get to questions. We think that that's the real substance of this particular forum, so we're really looking forward to that.

I just -- are we -- okay. I want to make sure we're on the right slide, basically. But basically the title is "community dialogues." And it's really that. We think that this is an

160

integrated team in terms of people with expertise specific to monitoring in police departments, but also people who are experts in going out into the communities, and particularly communities most affected by all of the conditions that necessitate a Consent Decree.

And we want to listen. We want to talk, and we want to hear.

And so we want to be as accessible as possible in a number of ways; that includes -- I know that Joe already mentioned this -- but you know, we'll probably have office space; right?

The Monitor will have office space, and so we plan to use that for -- to hold published office hours. We want to make sure that people, experts from outside the city, but also experts from inside the city, are there on a regular basis.

It's not like people are just going to come in once in a while. There will be monitoring staff here all the time.

And that's something that will be an ongoing thing with a lot of access to the public,

161

including a website, of course, which will be available 24/7, phone contact, information.

And then we plan to go far beyond what is required in the quarterly meetings to be able to reach in to communities and sections of communities that we feel have a lot to say but may have felt that their voices were either disregarded or ignored.

And you know, some of those groups may be people who are not English-speakers, or people who have been harmed by police misconduct, or homeless people, immigrant, et cetera.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you so much.

ELENA QUINTANA: That's our -- that's our pledge.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. So we're going to jump right in so that you have a chance to respond to all of the questions that we have.

The first of which is: In what opinion -- excuse me -- in your opinion, what is the most important thing the Chicago Police can do to restore trust in the police and the communities of Chicago?

162

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'll let chief respond to that. I know he started even before I suggested that.

RODNEY MONROE: Well, I think that, you know, it's rooted in why we're here. And I think, in my opinion, one of the best things that, you know, not only the Chicago Police Department, but the community as a whole can do is to try to find ways of coming together.

If you were to look at the -- the enormous amount of comments and concerns that have been brought about by the community as relating to how they feel and believe things are in Chicago, whether it's based on their engagement with the police, their treatment by police, the uses of force, the citizen complaints, and if you kind of line that up with things that members of the Chicago Police Department has identified as some of their concerns, they too are looking for better relationships with the community.

But you know, a lot of that is rooted in training, of how do you engage, how do you develop

163

plans to work better with the community; is rooted in supervision, how do you supervise officers in a manner in which they believe that they're valued, that they're listened to, and that gives them the tools and the ability to go out and establish those engagements with community.

And policy. Policy talks about uses of force, it talks about stops, whether it be traffic stops, whether it be citizen contacts. And I think the more we're able to wrap some structure around each one of those particular items, I think we will see that we will be able to address each other's concerns and strengthen ourselves, not only as an organization, but as a community.

Because we depend on one another. Officers depend on citizens for their safety, and citizens depend on officers for their safety. So the closer we can bring those two dynamics together, I think the more prosperous we will be as a city.

CAROL ADAMS: Are there aspects of the Consent Decree that concern you in any way?

And if so, why and what could we do --

164

or what could you do in order to address them?

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'll let Dr. Coldren answer that one.

JAMES COLDREN: So I -- you know, we have looked at several Consent Decrees over the past several years across the country; and I just have to say that this Consent Decree is actually rather thorough. The thing that stands out to us is the -- the volume and the number of paragraphs and the number of issues pertaining to community policing that are presented in this Consent Decree.

So I can talk about a few things that maybe could have been done a little bit better, that we may have a little concern about. But the comprehensiveness of this Consent Decree and the focus on community policing is actually something quite special.

There are two things that came up in our minds as we were reviewing the Consent Decree and discussing various matters. One of them has to do with the way that community oversight is handled in the Consent Decree. We think that the language could

165

be stronger and more directive.

So that's one thing that we're looking at and we're concerned about.

The other thing is the -- it's commendable that there is a very strong statement and a strong requirement for high quality, credible social science research to back up the work that we're doing with the Chicago Police Department in terms of community surveys and surveys of police officers.

We think that the language around the survey work and the research is a little bit ambitious. And so we have some ideas about how we can resolve that and how we can approach that. But you know, having the parties get creative, the Consent Decree, sitting in the room here with us, I think by and large it was a very thorough and commendable job. But there are a few things that we're thinking about.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Could I add in one thing? Is we would dig into the job -- the Consent Decree does allow language in Paragraphs 656, 57, and

166

696 that provide for the Monitor to make suggestions, changes, or amendments to the parties as needed. So that is important to note that there is language in the Consent Decree that would allow us, as we are going on in the monitoring process, to make recommendations. I think it's important for everyone to know that.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. There's also a train of questions that have to do with the engagement of various elements of the community.

So one of the questions is: Will you incorporate the voices of people who are often hesitant to report police abuse or misconduct, such as our people engaged in sex work, women, undocumented people?

Will they be incorporated into your community engagement design?

And let me just ask the second part. And also, how will you involve youth?

MAGGIE HICKEY: Absolutely. And I think I will let Elena start, and then another person from our people may add on after that.

167

ELENA QUINTANA: So absolutely our mantra, the mantra of this team, that has very integrated community aspect, is that of relentless inclusivity. And that means that we really want to hear and bring to light the voices of people who are most affected. And I think I said that in my statement before.

In terms of the way that youth -- I personally work a lot with court-involved youth. And so I see through a lens of the way that they have experienced policing in the city.

They will be very integral to our process in terms of being able to have lots and lots of access to this panel.

CAROL ADAMS: If selected to be a Monitor for this decree, what's going to be your approach year one of execution?

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'll let -- Chip will go on the approach regarding policies, and then I'll have the community engagement team follow up on community engagement.

JAMES COLDREN: So I think there are

168

several things that are important to think about as this monitoring work begins.

There's an awful lot to be learned about the resources and the capacities and particularly the information resources at the Chicago Police Department. We have to have a very good handle on those resources as we put the monitoring plan together.

I think, in large part, the first year is going to be primarily concerned with policy work. There's a number of policies that have to be reviewed and revised. And you really can't go about the work of addressing change -- training or if addressing other aspects of the department until you get the policies where you want them to be.

So I think our first year will be largely around harnessing and understanding the capacities; and the reform work that's already been underway in the Police Department for the past several years.

But -- and then working -- getting the policies to the place that we need them so we can go

169

about the important work of training and organizational change.

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'd like our community engagement team to also talk, because they will have an approach that first year also. And I think it's important to hear that, not just how we're going to dig into the data, but how we're going to engage the community and work with the community and the data at the same time. Because only when you have the community and the data together, showing the same things, can you show compliance.

ELENA QUINTANA: So dovetailing on to what I said before, we really do want to map the places where there are the most arrests, and make sure that we hold forums there.

In order to do this well, and particularly for people -- as posed in the question before -- in order to work with people who may not be likely to come to a forum around policing, we need community ambassadors. Everyone will speak to someone. And I know this a lot based on lots of the community work I've done.

170

And so we need to make sure that we are partnering with people in the neighborhood that can credibly link us in a -- and can basically lend their trust in us and our trust in them to speak to some of the people that are most affected. Because we do feel like there is a deep wound.

And one of the things we can do as good Monitors to really do our part to heal or repair is to make sure that everybody who's affected gets a chance to lend their insights and their expertise with us.

CAROL ADAMS: How do you plan to measure compliance with the Consent Decree?

RODNEY MONROE: I'll start off by recognizing that, you know, there's two facets to -- Chip talked earlier about policies and the amount of data that will be coming in from a variety of different sources. And how do we streamline those data sources, how are we able to -- we may want to measure one thing, but the data is not actually measuring the same thing. And how do we craft and massage that data so that it does better align with

171

what we're seeking to measure.

And if we were just to take use of force, for example, you know, in order to truly measure the use of force, you have to first have a viable policy that gives direction on the use of force. You must also have training as relates to when, how, where and why to use force.

But a third element to that is the supervision; is there a policy wrapped around the supervisors to make sure that they are responsive to those particular issues and are following up on those issues.

And then the discipline associated with use of force, and is it appropriate, is it timely. Is it based on actual policy violation versus is it based on what this individual may believe or don't believe should have happened.

Is there follow-up with the community, advising them on the justification or not justification of that use of force?

And then once you have that particular data, those data sets that you can kind of measure,

172

as Joe and Elena have talked about, you now have to match that back up with what the community is saying. Are they experiencing or believe they're experiencing less uses of force?

Are they talking about that they were contacted and followed up on in a timely manner?

So you have to use both data and voice in order to measure things to make sure that they are occurring as you have set out in the Decree.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How much experience does your team have in acting as a Monitor under other Consent Decrees? Would you -- how would you address some relative lack of experience in that area?

MAGGIE HICKEY: So we will get to hear from some of the people that haven't had an opportunity to speak yet.

Dan and Steve, you want to talk a little bit about your monitoring experience?

If we have enough time, then the others will follow up.

DAN GIAQUINTO: Yes. I first got

173

involved as a -- in a monitoring process when I was act -- when I was the assistant attorney general division of state police affairs director, if you will. And it was a position that was sort of compliance officer and legal officer at the same time for the New Jersey State Police. And I was a representative to the Department of Justice and to the Independent Monitoring team.

And basically my job was compliance officer, to get the state police to comply with the Consent Decree in New Jersey that they were under back in the early 2000s.

I'm also the -- at this time the Deputy Monitor for the Albuquerque court-approved settlement agreement where my area is basically internal affairs and police -- and civilian oversight of disciplinary matters.

Also not as a Monitor, kind of related to the process, I've been appointed as an independent internal affairs investigator by the District of Arizona, arising out of the litigation entitled Melendres v. Arpaio, to be an independent internal

174

affairs investigator for certain select matters that
the Court gave me by that grant of authority.

In addition, at one point in my career
I was a municipal court judge in the City of Trenton,
New Jersey, where I handled matters very pertinent to
the community; and I was also County D.A. -- or as
you say, County State's Attorney -- for a term, where
I was in charge of law enforcement in the County for
an appointed term.

So I believe that experience all
blends and I can bring that to bear at the monitoring
experience. And my colleague, Steve Rickman, also
has experience.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Two minutes or less
for your 30 years of experience.

STEVE RICKMAN: Good afternoon,
everyone. Steve Rickman.

And I've spent much of my professional
career trying to include relationships between police
and community and helping them to transform law
enforcement agencies. It's a long story on how that
got started.

175

But real quickly, most recently I have
been working as the associate monitor in Albuquerque,
New Mexico. We first started that assignment, we
went into a community that was experiencing a great
deal of mistrust in their police department. There
was issues of excessive use of force, issues
involving the treatment of -- of mentally ill. And
it was -- I wouldn't characterize it as a caustic
environment when we started the work.

And it's been quite a learning
experience over the past 40 years, and hopefully I
can apply many of those lessons in Chicago.

You know, clearly one of the things
that I've learned from my experience was establishing
important expectations of what the Monitors can do,
what they can't do. Also really -- really clearly
defining what constitute compliance. Lot of back and
forth on that.

So I learned that you have to really
have fully defined metrics, and -- and definitions of
compliance. And then you work jointly with CPD and
the community in how efforts are made to -- to meet

176

those requirements.

And so hopefully I can bring some of
those lessons here to Chicago. And I can say this:
When we started working in Albuquerque, we were met
with -- it was -- it was reluctance, there was
skepticism, there was doubt about whether or not we
would achieve our objectives.

And it's been four years. We're not
there yet, but we have made a lot of progress. And I
feel we can do the same in Chicago.

Thank you.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. There are a
couple of specific questions in terms of the time to
this effort.

One directed to Ms. Hickey, which
says, is it true that only 30 percent of your time
would be devoted to this project?

Is that enough time? And one to Dr.
Rosenbaum that says, have you ever been critical of
CPD in your work; and if so, how?

MAGGIE HICKEY: Well, I'll go first.
I am committed to whatever it takes to see this

177

project through. When you are applying, you have to
estimate the time, and I estimated 800 hours, which
is one third of my 2400-hour billable requirement at
my law firm. But if it takes more than 800 hours,
then we'll do it.

Schiff Hardin is committed to if
anything -- amount over, we would do it pro bono.
And I have never in my career not seen a job to
completion or its success. And so I will do whatever
it takes to get the job done.

I'm local, I'm here in Chicago, I was
born and raised in Chicago. My family lives here, I
care about it. So I promise I'll get the job done.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Dr.
Rosenbaum.

JAMES COLDREN: Dr. Rosenbaum is
actually not here today. I can say a few words, if
you'd like. I've known him my entire professional
career.

CAROL ADAMS: Please.

JAMES COLDREN: But just be aware that
I'm not --

178

CAROL ADAMS: The question is whether or not he's been critical of CPD.

JAMES COLDREN: Yeah. So, he has been involved in several major evaluations of the work of the department. I know he was involved for many years in the evaluation of CAPS; and he in recent years has been involved in evaluation and implementation of body-worn cameras, and evaluation of their efforts at procedural justice.

So as an evaluator, he has been critical of the Department. I would say, knowing him as well as I do, and knowing his work as well as I do, it was always constructively critical. I think he always had the best interest of the Department at heart.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you.

JAMES COLDREN: Yeah.

CAROL ADAMS: So there's a saying that you can't train yourself out of poor hiring decisions.

So how would your plan address or correct CPD's hiring processes?

179

RODNEY MONROE: Well, I think you look at any hiring -- there's challenges within law enforcement when it comes to recruitment and hiring, especially when it comes to minority candidates. But I believe that you have to truly be deliberate in your approach to both recruiting and hiring, and always have a willingness to take a look first at your standards and what you're looking for in a police officer.

You know, we've all been hearing talk about the difference between warriors and guardians as relates to policing, and how do we do a better job in identifying the true attributes of a guardian within our police force, and how do we not only hire them, but how do we develop them?

You know, what are some of the characteristics associated with a guardian as it relates to a person willing to serve a community.

You know, all too often, at least in the past, we've had a war on drugs, we've had a war on gangs, we've had a war on just about everything. And you create a mentality sometimes that officers

180

believe that I have to go into communities and fight a tough battle.

Yes, sometimes you do have to fight a tough battle, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you have to go in with a warrior mentality.

I think the more that you can learn to engage people -- and again, how do you identify candidates that have the ability to engage others that can -- that have viable communication skills?

So I think that, you know, we have to start with looking at, you know, what it is and who it is that we're looking to bring into our police forces, and more so how do we go about developing them?

How do we partner with others that can help in the recruitment of potential officers?

Sometimes having an officer -- just an officer go to a college class or historically black university to speak, may not be the method that you may want to use. Sometimes you want to take a member of the community with you when you're out there trying to recruit individuals so that they can see

181

and hear from a community's perspective the type of officer that they're looking for bringing to their particular ranks.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: May I add something to that? Hopefully, as time goes on and the trust improves and relationships improve within the community, more and more young people and others who are interested from those communities will be interested in going in that -- you know, with that career. So we hope that as we continue to work together and build trust, that that also will affect that process.

CAROL ADAMS: There are a couple questions regarding Fraternal Order of Police and collective bargaining.

One is: Do you believe that certain provisions in the FOP and other collective bargaining agreements are impediments to accountability?

And the other is: How would you interact with the FOP?

DAN GIAQUINTO: Yes; as it relates to internal affairs and police discipline, we as a

182

monitoring team have to act in accordance with the
Consent Decree and with applicable law.

If there are contractual provisions
that -- and I'm certainly aware there's a feeling of
certain contractual provisions, of certain practices
that impede the disciplinary system. One of which,
for example, is the affidavit required to go forward
with a Complaint.

And I see how the Consent Decree
addresses it in saying an affidavit is not necessary
for a preliminary investigation. And if after that
preliminary investigation there's enough evidence to
go forward, the department can then seek an
overriding affidavit.

So I see where the Consent Decree
itself has already addressed some of these concerns.

As Maggie has said previously, if we
come up against things which we feel are in need of
improvement or prohibit us from doing our job as a
Monitor, or prohibit us from what we think the police
should be doing -- not prohibit us, but we think are
getting in the way, we can certainly make

183

recommendations. But the point to remember is we
have to take the system as it exists, both Illinois
-- federal law, Illinois law, collective bargaining
agreements, whatever they may be, the Consent Decree;
and then we have to work within those parameters.

Within those parameters we'll
certainly do our best, call it like we see it -- we
are calling balls and strikes -- we call it like we
see it, and we make our recommendations.

RODNEY MONROE: I think one of the
things that Maggie has included in our team are labor
law experts that will help us navigate through some
of those issues as well.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Thank you.
Also in regard to COPA there's some questions. How
do you view COPA's role in the Consent Decree
compliance process? And related to that is the
question that says, will the chosen -- will you, if
you're the chosen Independent Monitor overseeing
Chicago Police Consent Decree, ensure that all
civilian complaints against CPD officers are looked
at seriously and closely?

184

There's a feeling that IPRA and COPA
have not seriously considered these things, and that
it is reflected in the fact that only 2 percent of
civilian complaints result in any disciplinary
actions.

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'm going to have Dan
answer that question.

DANIEL GIAQUINTO: Well, COPA plays a
very, very important role in the Consent Decree and
future of the Police Department. It is a -- an
investigative arm, and it's an integral part of the
disciplinary process. So we will be monitoring the
performance of COPA.

I've taken a look at your disciplinary
system; it is, I guess shall we say, fairly layered.
There's jurisdictional boundaries between COPA and
PIA. And then there's a system of going forward as
charges are sustained. There's the police board
also; there's also arbitration. So there's a lot
there.

But certainly COPA plays an important
role. And we'll -- we will be monitoring their

185

performance in terms of the quality of their
investigations and their recommendations as part of
the monitoring process.

In terms of civilian complaints and
making sure they're taken seriously, we'll first be
looking at the information that's put out there by
CPD, and the availability and the accessibility of
citizens and residents to make complaints. And we'll
be looking at whether those complaints are properly
categorized, whether they're accepted, whether
they're given to the proper agency for investigation,
and whether they're taken seriously.

We're looking to make sure that
complainants are treated with respect, that their
complaints are taken seriously, that their complaints
are thoroughly investigated, and that proper findings
are made based on the relevant standard of proof; and
if charges are sustained, whether discipline is
consistent and progressive. And in short, we're
looking for a system that we're going to be building
into our methodology ways to gauge whether the system
is true. That is whether it's fair, whether it's

186

effective, and whether it's efficient.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. We'll got a little -- four minutes. So I'm going to do the lightning round and just try to get the -- these other questions in, because they are things that people are very concerned about.

One has to do with just describing your understanding of community policing and what recommendations you might make to ensure that community policing initiatives do not result in increased police surveillance in black and brown communities.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Chip will handle that one.

JAMES COLDREN: So we have some very specific views about community policing and what community policing should look like. And the way I describe it is it should exhibit and demonstrate the notion of shared responsibility and -- and shared governance.

So the responsibility for safety in our communities is everybody's responsibility; it's

187

not something that we simply hand off to the police department and expect them to solve all the problems and not have any community involvement.

But by the same token, if -- if it's truly a shared responsibility, then citizens have to be empowered to work hand in hand with police and identify problems, build solutions to problems, and work on the resolution of those problems hand in hand with the police.

CAROL ADAMS: You give the perfect lead for these three questions that all relate to citizen involvement.

One has to do with if your monitoring team is selected, how do community members get to introduce strategies to your team; and would you allow community presentation groups?

And the other is how would you ensure that individuals in communities that are most impacted by CPD violence are empowered partners in your process?

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'm going to let our community engagement team and -- Sodiqa, do you want

188

to start with that?

SODIQA WILLIAMS: Sure. Thank you. Elena, when she spoke earlier, mentioned that she would be looking at communities that are the most impacted. The one thing that I wanted to stress was in this first year we want to approach this as if -- although we do have expertise, but like we want to hear from the community. We have questions that we want to ask of the community. We can't presume to know it all; with the understanding that those who are on the ground and being impacted have input that we need to receive.

I think the meetings -- and we -- that we would schedule, whether they're larger or individual meetings, we are accessible, and we are listening.

So if there are any proposals or any recommendations, we're going to take that information, we're going to take it seriously, we're going to talk about it amongst our team, and we're going to make sure that Maggie and the rest of the team has that information. Because we respect their

189

voices, and we want to make sure that they're included in the process.

CAROL ADAMS: Last question, brief response. Has to do with your evaluation and metrics, and what you would consider key performance indicators in your process.

JAMES COLDREN: That's a very complex question. There are over 700 paragraphs in this Consent Decree, and every paragraph has to have a metric associated with it.

So I can't give the specifics; I can just tell you that our job in the first 75 days of this Consent Decree is to come up with a plan that addresses every one of those paragraphs, how we're going to measure compliance, and what information we're going to use to make those measurements.

I want to stress the point that the measurements come from two places; it comes from the information we hear from the police department, and it comes from the information we get from the community. So there's two aspects to that.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you.

190

JAMES COLDREN: Yeah. Okay.

CAROL ADAMS: So --

JAMES COLDREN: I'm done.

CAROL ADAMS: I knew you couldn't do 700. Thank you so much. And I wanted to thank everybody who has participated with us this morning, and remind you to please turn in evaluations or any other recommendations, comments that you have, perhaps written on cards, before you leave.

Also...yeah. So that's feedback for -- that was what they reminded me of. So fill out those forms; and thank you all for giving us part of your Saturday to engage in this process.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Thank you very much.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: Thank you.

DAN GIAQUINTO: Thank you very much.

(The Public Comment Forum was recessed until 1:00 p.m. this date November 3, 2018.)

191

I, CATHERINE A. RAJCAN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported stenographically by means of machine shorthand the proceedings had at the hearing aforesaid, thereafter reduced to typewriting via computer-aided transcription under my personal direction, and that the foregoing is a true, complete and correct transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed under my personal direction. I further certify that my certificate attached hereto applies to the original transcript and copies thereof, signed and certified under my hand only. I assume no responsibility for the accuracy of any reproduced copies not made under my control or direction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my hand on this 6th day of November, 2018.

/s/ CATHERINE ARMBRUST RAJCAN,
CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC
Certificate No. 084-002503

backgrounds 32:48
backwards 119:28
bad 14:12 48:22
   75:42
badly 45:50,50,50
bail 15:30
ball 35:8 36:48
balls 33:10 183:22
Baltimore 20:20
   22:12 63:12,50
   65:18 70:28 73:12
   79:16 87:42 88:44
bankruptcy 14:22
bargaining 56:10
   87:14 88:44,48
   89:10 181:36,40
   183:12
barriers 158:28
based 6:36 8:8
   47:26 53:42
   125:32 129:32
   141:20 145:14
   162:34 169:48
   171:36,38 185:40
baseline 77:38
basic 67:8 85:18
   147:34
basically 33:8
   140:18 159:46,48
   170:12 173:24,36
basics 95:26
basis 120:42 126:28
   160:40
battle 180:10,14
bear 174:28
bearings 24:18
becoming 147:32
beef 113:8 132:8
beginning 18:44
   19:14 36:32
begins 34:36
   168:10
behalf 2:18
behaviors 84:14
believe 29:18,28
   31:24 42:44 49:12

53:42 56:8 63:16
   64:20 84:12
   117:10 125:20,50
   126:26 148:50
   152:46 153:22
   154:10 158:32,36
   162:32 163:12
   171:40,40 172:12
   174:26 179:16
   180:8 181:38
believes 43:30
believing 65:40
bench 29:32
benchmarks 70:14
beneficial 149:10
benefit 69:36
   123:50
benefits 92:44
   146:26
Berkeley 25:16,16
besieged 143:40
best 28:28 29:16
   43:24 50:10,24
   73:28 78:24 88:12
   88:34,38 126:40
   142:48 145:16
   152:46 153:10,12
   157:12 162:18
   178:34 183:20
better 31:8 80:46
   82:12 88:22 92:28
   93:46 112:8
   120:24 127:12
   162:44 163:8
   164:32 170:50
   179:30
beyond 32:8 65:12
   72:38,46 80:16
   127:30 161:12
bias 70:16 83:14
   151:50
biased 132:50
biases 69:38 82:44
big 50:16 83:48
   84:48 98:42 99:50
   106:32,32 107:34

114:10 121:30,30
   123:34 131:12,14
   136:22 137:14,14
biggest 49:48 74:38
bill 111:30
billable 177:12
bios 111:48
bipolar 78:14
Birmingham 12:10
   12:24
bit 2:48 11:48
   17:12 19:48 52:10
   59:44 65:40,42,46
   73:32 98:22
   107:38 114:42
   123:50 124:8
   133:50 150:50
   157:44 164:32
   165:30 172:44
black 3:32 52:34
   71:42 94:28
   138:40 180:42
   186:28
Blake 57:42,46
   89:32 95:42
blamed 144:20
blanket 125:46
blends 174:28
block 116:24
blocks 12:48 13:22
blog 45:16,32 91:20
blue 40:14
board 13:8 14:48
   15:16 35:46 37:12
   37:32 38:18 39:48
   40:20,38 55:42
   76:22 184:42
boards 81:18
body 69:42 70:22
body-worn 178:22
bombings 12:38
bono 177:20
book 27:14 83:18
   83:26
books 121:20
boots 106:22

born 12:8 177:30
borne 59:8
Boston 23:8 58:22
Bouche 16:28
   18:22,24 26:30
   28:32 31:20 33:46
   34:30 35:40 42:38
   45:30 46:30 51:48
   52:38 56:32 57:16
bound 114:40
boundaries 35:18
   184:38
Bowman 26:16
   44:42,42
box 40:14
boy 107:24 139:40
Boys 74:32
BRAZIEL 59:40
   66:46 69:34 73:50
   83:8 94:32 95:40
break 57:8 95:50
   141:38
breaking 20:26
breakout 46:48
breeze 18:24
Brent 97:28 103:20
   104:12
Brian 61:24,26
   65:46 75:26 76:48
   84:42 92:22 93:22
   95:44
bridge 64:24,32
bridges 90:16
brief 159:36 189:12
briefings 108:14
   128:12
briefly 6:18 24:22
bring 2:46 17:16
   19:36,40 24:16
   27:34 29:16 46:8
   47:20 51:16,24
   59:38 62:34 90:36
   131:40 142:14,48
   154:40 157:38
   163:42 167:16
   174:28 176:10

180:30
bringing 12:50
   181:10
brings 27:32 58:32
   103:40 124:50
   152:26
broad 4:16 5:14
   155:10
broadly 139:24
broken 98:46
brought 33:18
   51:32 61:46 85:42
   86:30 104:12
   110:30 148:32
   162:30
brown 52:34 60:24
   71:42 89:48 94:30
   138:42 186:28
buckets 107:34
budget 5:34 112:34
   132:8
budgeting 8:44
   137:32
Bueermann 58:36
build 41:46 44:22
   52:50 64:24,30
   73:42 146:28
   181:28 187:20
building 52:40
   84:42 86:50 90:14
   90:16 120:50
   185:46
builds 4:12
built 53:28 65:22
built-in 138:12
bullet 49:40
bunch 85:48 86:30
bureau 100:20
   101:50 122:8
Burge 23:18
burning 64:38
Burroughs 97:22
   101:46,48
business 19:28
button 84:26
buy 54:48

byte 49:14

C

Cabrini 13:24 14:32
cadet 140:18,22
California 60:10 61:14
call 33:8 75:42 78:42 144:14 183:20,22
called 12:32 52:48 77:46 83:26 87:44 87:50 150:28
calling 183:22
calls 154:20
cameras 18:50 178:22
Campbell 7:24
candidate 5:50
candidates 6:30 179:14 180:22
candidly 83:38
cap 112:38
capacities 168:14 168:42
capacity 14:26 150:42
CAPS 178:18
captured 157:18
card 9:42,48 10:14 81:40 96:32
cards 9:32 10:8,12 96:26 102:40 141:50 142:8,10 142:14 190:24
care 75:40 138:44 177:32
career 18:28 22:50 83:36 98:28 99:46 101:10,18,30,50 119:38 122:10 174:12,44 177:22 177:44 181:26
careers 122:50 139:28

careful 125:44 131:20
Carnegie 13:32
Carol 2:8,16 27:12 29:40 31:14,44 34:20 35:32 37:22 38:44 39:46 40:48 42:28 45:16 46:24 47:50 48:48 52:26 53:46 54:26 55:48 56:46 57:20 64:42 66:40 69:18 72:14 73:44 75:22 76:38 79:40 82:16,20,28 82:34 84:34 87:10 89:14 91:20 92:46 94:20 95:34,48 96:18,46 97:20 113:44 115:44 116:50 117:40 122:40,48 123:28 125:10,22 127:20 128:30 129:44 131:28 133:22 134:32,50 136:32 138:26 139:26 140:42 141:26,36 141:44 142:20 161:30,36 163:46 166:22 167:36 170:30 172:26 176:30 177:34,46 178:8,38,42 181:32 183:34 186:10 187:26 189:12,50 190:10 190:14
cars 92:40
case 13:46 23:32,32 23:46 24:8,34 79:26 96:22 112:10 119:12 136:42
cases 13:36,40,40 13:42,44,46 14:28 22:28 33:28 55:34

catch 117:38
categorized 185:26
CATHERINE 1:32 191:8,48
cause 1:22 45:22,44 91:26
causes 149:14
caustic 175:22
census 130:22
center 58:16 59:50
Central 14:44
certain 56:8 70:12 70:14 139:48 174:8 181:38 182:16,16
certainly 32:38 44:50 54:18 62:42 92:30,38 94:8 112:50 119:42 123:28 131:36 136:50 141:8 182:14,50 183:20 184:48
certificate 191:28 191:50
certification 78:8
certified 21:30 191:8,32
certify 191:12,28
cetera 114:36 161:28
chain 157:28
chairs 75:16
challenge 93:36 117:30
challenges 62:40 124:24,28 144:40 149:22,24 179:10
challenging 79:50
champions 41:38 41:46
chance 8:20 13:24 69:50 111:22 161:38 170:26
change 22:24 32:34 33:44 65:34,38

66:16 68:22 89:8 96:14 98:8,10 99:12 101:32 103:36,38 104:8 104:36 111:12 113:50 114:34,46 115:10 144:48 168:32 169:10
changed 19:14 32:36
changes 63:46 81:42 104:32 105:10 108:34,38 117:50 118:8 166:10
changing 81:22 128:28
characteristics 179:40
characterize 175:22
charge 174:22
charged 24:10
charges 184:42 185:42
Charleston 60:50
chart 116:24
charted 46:34
check 32:8 79:50 80:16 127:30,32 148:14
checked 11:10
cherry-pick 132:44
Chicago 1:8 2:12 2:22,46 3:20,26 3:26,34,38 4:10 5:48 6:28,46 7:20 9:8,8 13:14 14:8 14:10 15:44 17:32 18:34 21:48 22:38 22:48 23:10 27:28 29:38,50 30:10 31:24 32:16,18,26 32:38,40 33:36 37:42 39:44 43:12 43:14 44:32,32,34

45:8 51:16 52:44 55:32 60:18,46 64:46,50 66:50 67:22 68:34 69:20 69:30,30 71:10 74:40,44,46 75:12 76:22 79:12 81:8 81:34 86:34 88:46 89:40 90:8,14 93:12,32 103:14 103:26 105:12,20 105:34 106:44 108:16 111:44 112:12,16,24,26 112:26 123:18,48 126:10 127:48 128:32 130:38 132:16,18 136:42 143:8,38,42 144:8 144:26,30,34,42 145:22,28,30 146:10,46 149:12 149:14 150:8,10 150:14,26 152:34 158:24 161:46,50 162:20,32,40 165:22 168:16 175:30 176:12,26 177:28,30 183:46
Chicago's 68:28 76:26
Chicago-based 17:30 29:14
Chicagoans 18:8 89:36
chicagopolicecon... 6:40 11:16
chief 15:16 26:20 39:36 61:26 62:8 63:8 104:10 144:50 147:12,32 149:44 151:38 162:8
chiefs' 27:20
child 18:46 21:24 21:26

chime 55:24
Chip 145:8 149:38
   149:48 167:42
   170:38 186:32
choice 31:40
   107:12 126:38
choose 10:26 97:12
chosen 5:42 47:50
   93:10 106:22,36
   107:12 183:42,44
chronic 15:24
churches 106:10,12
circle 51:10
circling 130:48
   157:28
Circuit 15:16
circulated 9:34
CIT 27:26 31:32
   43:32,46 44:16
   58:20 64:16 76:46
   76:48 77:8 78:8
CIT-certified
   77:46
cities 20:18,36 22:8
   22:14 32:26 34:48
   34:50 41:22 71:10
   147:30
citizen 151:24
   162:38 163:24
   187:30
citizens 101:20
   127:46 163:38,40
   185:22 187:16
city 2:20 3:20,24
   5:14,48 6:26,44
   7:28,44,50 10:48
   11:22 12:18,22
   13:8 14:30 20:22
   20:42 21:48 37:40
   40:24 47:48 51:12
   68:36 76:22 89:44
   98:32,40 99:48
   100:44 102:14
   105:34 106:44
   108:28 112:38,40
   115:8 117:48

120:8,14 124:20
   127:46 128:8,36
   132:16 134:12
   143:40 149:12
   150:34 156:46
   158:24 160:38,40
   163:44 167:28
   174:14
City's 3:42 4:32,36
   134:14
city/county 60:8
citywide 150:22
civic 58:8 146:8
   153:46
civil 8:42 12:48
   13:36,38,38 22:32
   23:8,24 26:12,50
   54:34 59:14,48
   62:36 82:48
   123:16
civilian 48:10 84:10
   93:16 126:42
   136:44 173:38
   183:48 184:14
   185:14
civilians 125:14,28
civility 156:34
clapping 10:42
clarity 154:46
class 180:42
classes 22:34
clean 107:20
   111:30
clear 27:40 80:26
   114:40 129:18
   131:44 135:48
   156:50
clearance 144:18
clearly 9:36 35:8
   175:32,38
Clerk 15:20
Cleveland 26:26
clients 19:32
clinical 78:18 79:24
clinician 79:28,30
clinicians 78:20

close 53:46 125:40
closed 129:20,22
closely 35:50 39:40
   48:12 89:46
   136:40 183:50
closer 163:42
closing 33:28
closure 148:18
Clubs 74:32
co-authored 83:18
co-chair 15:12
co-coordinator
   24:26
co-led 24:20
co-produced 52:48
coalition 39:50
   40:10,26 82:44
Coar 11:30,32,34
   25:26 27:36 29:26
   30:12 35:38 38:48
   40:10 48:18 54:12
   54:36 56:14 57:14
code 31:48 39:18
   79:44 80:12
   127:24
coffee 15:44
Coldren 145:10
   149:38,44,48
   164:10,14 167:50
   177:38,48 178:12
   178:40 186:36
   189:20 190:8,12
collaborate 8:48
   60:36
collaboration
   28:46 98:12
   145:26
collaborative 20:10
   21:34 22:10,12
   27:46 53:42 59:26
   60:26,30
colleague 50:50
   174:30
collect 10:8
collection 4:26
   17:20 19:8 25:22

103:12
collective 56:10
   87:14 148:30
   181:36,40 183:12
Collectively 97:42
college 13:12
   140:32 180:42
colonel 18:36
Colorado 20:22
come 10:8,16 14:12
   19:20 28:50,50
   29:8 30:20,24
   50:34 55:42 70:8
   73:14,18,40 81:26
   82:12 83:14 89:24
   96:30 109:34
   111:18 112:40
   113:22 114:48
   115:8 121:10
   130:32 131:16,22
   131:24 132:44
   133:42 138:18
   141:50 160:44
   169:44 182:42
   189:32,42
comes 9:46 39:12
   57:8 133:40
   135:14 157:14
   179:12,14 189:42
   189:46
comfortable 156:18
   156:26
coming 7:48 12:50
   32:50 58:12 70:16
   113:30,32,40
   115:20 116:38
   123:46 130:18
   134:8,10 162:24
   170:40
command 83:30
commander 123:32
commanding 100:8
   100:10 139:34
commendable
   165:16,42
comment 4:42

141:50 142:8
   157:14 190:40
comments 11:20
   162:28 190:22
Commerce 20:22
commissioner
   98:40 117:42
commit 156:32
commitment 13:50
   29:36 124:46
   152:28
committed 152:36
   154:42 156:44
   158:16 176:50
   177:18
committee 7:10
   39:36
common 20:26
communicate
   28:26 98:14
communication
   8:44 30:14 38:28
   83:26 124:30
   180:24
communications
   34:22 35:18,36,38
   36:10,14 37:10
   38:30 134:38
communities 3:34
   4:12 7:22 9:8
   30:8 41:24,36,36
   41:48 42:10,10
   47:46 52:36 54:30
   62:44 64:50 67:18
   68:30,32 69:22
   71:16 72:8,10
   74:12 86:36 94:30
   105:18,22 106:10
   107:10 111:20
   123:10,36,44
   124:10,18,22
   128:34 138:42
   144:30 148:26,36
   148:38,42 160:14
   160:14 161:16,16
   161:48 180:8

181:22 186:30,50
187:42 188:14
communities'
50:34
community 4:14,18
4:50 5:12 7:8
8:12 9:18 12:36
12:36 17:20 26:48
29:22 30:32,38
31:30 32:42 33:30
33:40 34:12,14,16
35:44 36:16,28,34
36:42 37:10,12,20
37:36 38:20,22,30
38:38 39:20,48,48
40:10 44:36 45:46
45:50 47:34,44
48:50 49:12,22,30
49:42,46,50 51:32
51:40 52:14,18,28
52:32 53:8,12,20
53:24,26,30,40
54:22,42 55:10,18
55:20,36,40 56:28
58:24,26,30,48,50
59:14,30,38 61:16
61:18 63:18 64:30
65:14,28,40 66:48
66:48,48,50 67:14
67:16,46 68:30,46
70:32,42 71:30
72:40 73:14 74:16
74:30,42,48 75:18
81:28 82:10,46
83:20,22,28,32,32
86:26 87:26 88:30
89:14,36,38,44,48
90:18,44 94:22,26
94:34,36,38,42,48
95:28 98:48,50
100:12 101:20
104:44 105:14,40
106:14,32 108:20
109:22 110:50
112:28,30 114:24
116:10 123:32

124:30,32,34,40
128:22 129:14
130:16,32,50
131:28,32,38,42
132:14 133:14
138:32,36,38,48
138:50 139:12,12
139:18,22 142:46
144:14 145:30,32
145:34 146:16,24
146:28,30,30,50
147:36,40,48
150:24,28,36
152:38,40 153:18
153:20,24,32,32
153:38,50 154:12
154:26,28,42
155:40 156:22,46
157:40 158:28,40
158:46,50 159:8
159:16,48 162:22
162:30,46 163:8
163:18,34 164:26
164:38,48 165:24
166:26,40 167:12
167:46,48 169:12
169:22,22,26,46
169:50 171:42
172:10 174:18,46
175:14,50 179:42
180:48 181:20
186:22,26,38,40
187:12,34,38,50
188:22,24 189:48
community's 36:40
50:8,22 181:8
community-based
159:20
community-enga...
35:28
community-police
59:32 75:34
company 19:20,30
22:20
compensate 69:26
complainants

138:8 185:34
complaint 93:44
138:10 182:22
complaints 48:10
61:16 93:16
136:40,46 162:38
183:48 184:14
185:14,22,24,36
185:36
complete 17:24
63:32 93:40
142:12 191:20
completed 11:12
completing 10:14
completion 144:32
177:24
complex 115:36
189:20
complexity 144:40
compliance 4:34
5:20,26 32:8
34:24 38:46 41:16
44:22 50:12 61:50
62:22 63:10 72:24
75:24 80:16 84:40
92:50 97:46
109:14 127:30,32
133:28,40 134:40
135:14 169:28
170:32 173:16,24
175:40,48 183:40
189:36
complies 4:8
comply 69:14
173:26
component 24:40
32:14
comprehensive
5:28
comprehensiven...
164:36
computer-aided
191:18
concern 15:26
31:16 113:48
125:22 163:48

164:34
concerned 165:12
168:26 186:18
concerns 31:38
123:16 124:28
125:28 141:16
162:28,42 163:32
182:38
conditions 88:24
160:16
conduct 5:12,20
59:34 84:12
145:24
conducted 6:50
118:24
confessions 18:48
confidence 17:20
152:16
conflict 97:30
confront 125:16
connected 85:40
Connecticut
103:48 104:24
connecting 61:42
155:16,22
connection 99:8
100:46 140:8
connections 69:28
connectors 154:8
consent 1:8 2:12,46
2:50 3:14,16,44
3:48 4:30,42 5:26
5:32,44 6:10 7:14
7:16 8:30 14:30
14:42 15:50 16:38
17:26,46,48,50
19:46 27:44 28:30
28:34,38 31:16,22
32:42,46 34:24
35:20 38:46 39:50
40:24,34 42:34,48
43:20,28 48:10
60:32,46 61:30,44
62:38 63:16,20,26
63:38,42 64:10
65:32,48 68:10,20

68:42 69:16 70:12
70:38,40 71:12,14
71:34 74:40 75:24
75:30,32 76:46,50
80:24,30 82:10
88:46 92:50 93:14
97:40 98:20 99:26
100:42 103:8
104:16,20,26,38
105:10 107:26,36
109:40 113:46
114:10,16,40
115:24,34 124:38
124:46 132:20
133:30 134:10,40
135:16,20 136:24
140:48 143:48
144:24 145:26
149:26 150:46
151:12,34 153:22
153:34 155:36
160:18 163:48
164:16,20,28,36
164:44,50 165:38
165:48 166:14
170:32 172:30
173:28 182:10,24
182:36 183:14,38
183:46 184:24
189:24,32
consequences
48:22,26
consider 11:22
139:28 189:16
considered 2:44
158:12 184:10
consistency 157:20
consistent 185:44
consistently 9:14
conspiracy 24:10
constant 34:8
constituencies 9:10
constitute 175:40
Constitution 4:8
constitutional
56:40 99:10

117:12 119:20
121:16 123:40
144:36,46 149:28
constitutionality
118:40
constructively
178:32
consulted 40:30
consulting 16:34
25:20
consumer 54:42,46
contact 85:22
161:10
contacted 172:18
contacts 163:24
contained 115:32
content 133:26
context 155:26
contingent 87:34
continually 135:44
continue 36:18
76:32 78:10 80:38
87:30 159:26
181:26
continued 104:22
continues 20:44
47:18 94:18
continuing 92:44
continuously 35:26
contract 56:38
61:10 83:38
contractual 182:12
182:16
contrast 82:42
control 191:36
controversy 83:50
85:14
Convention 13:20
conversation 69:8
74:42 87:26 90:36
124:44
conversations
65:30 67:44 73:24
87:30 88:18,38
91:8,16 156:36
convicted 24:30

Cook 15:22 18:46
150:44 151:18
coordinator 26:14
151:32
Cop 83:26
COPA 39:12,24,26
39:34,38,40 48:14
76:18,22 92:48
93:20,42 136:34
136:44 137:8,18
137:24,30,34
138:24 183:36
184:8,22,32,38,48
COPA's 38:44
75:22,26 183:38
cope 77:22
copies 191:30,36
cops 121:32
core 93:26 94:34
97:26 98:26
corporate 25:22
Corps 13:12
correct 100:26,34
178:50 191:22
Corrections 62:30
150:46
correctly 94:16,50
correlation 33:34
33:38
corrupt 18:20
Costa 97:24 102:48
102:50 112:24
133:44 134:8
Council 58:14
counsel 12:48
14:42,46 61:46
98:38 117:42
145:40
counselor 21:12
country 12:16
22:30 25:38 29:16
43:14,24,46 45:40
71:36,44 147:28
148:32 164:18
county 15:16,20,22
18:46 26:24 61:10

61:14 83:40
101:12 123:30,36
150:44 151:18,48
174:18,20,22
couple 13:22 80:18
87:10 89:16
128:50 136:32
176:32 181:32
course 9:20 86:24
105:26 109:20
110:14,50 115:10
119:44 121:46
130:22,44 131:38
161:8
court 3:18,44 4:36
5:40 6:12 8:14
14:24,36 15:8,12
15:18 17:18 35:22
35:30 36:14,16
76:26 117:32
118:8,44 119:12
150:44 151:22,38
174:10,14
court-approved
146:18,44 173:34
court-involved
167:24
courts 21:42
cover 110:28,28
158:34
coverage 137:12
covering 94:10
104:22
CPD 3:50 9:18
34:24 42:32 48:12
54:30 76:44 84:50
93:16 134:38
136:46 146:28,50
175:48 176:46
178:10 183:48
185:20 187:44
CPD's 7:26 31:46
54:32 79:42 80:12
82:48 127:22
178:50
CPD's-generated

32:8
CPD-generated
80:16 127:30
craft 170:48
crafted 72:12
Cramer 15:40
22:42,44 32:12
39:32 44:26 55:24
CRC 1:34 191:49
create 75:32 158:28
179:50
created 63:40
90:44
creating 22:22
81:50 105:14
147:38 148:14
creative 50:46
51:30 165:36
credible 165:18
credibly 170:12
crime 32:18 148:8
148:18
crime-fighting
147:14
crimes 33:38 53:24
criminal 13:44
15:22 21:36 23:8
48:28 119:8
crises 151:28
crisis 4:20 42:36,46
44:12 75:48 77:8
77:20,26,34 78:26
78:44 79:32 85:30
114:26
crisis-intervention
42:30 43:8 76:40
79:18
critical 20:28 27:26
59:28 60:16 66:28
70:20 75:36 76:8
76:34 90:10 92:30
115:22 144:24
148:24 176:44
178:10,28,32
critically 31:26
75:28

cross 31:36
cross-section 5:14
CRR 1:34 191:49
crunching 103:10
CSR 1:34 191:49
culminated 62:20
culture 31:46 32:34
33:44 53:40 79:42
80:12 127:24,42
curb 117:20,44
current 74:28
144:40
currently 25:14
61:8 143:12
146:14,40 151:20
151:44
curriculum 126:14
customer 67:8,10
cuts 93:50

D

D.A 98:34 119:42
121:24 174:18
D.C 57:50
Daley's 23:38
Dan 23:30 146:34
151:30 172:42,50
181:48 184:18
190:38
danger 126:48
dangerous 132:42
DANIEL 184:22
dark 80:38
darkness 80:32
data 4:26 8:42 19:8
24:14 25:22,24
27:8 32:8,14,16
32:20 36:38,38
76:8 80:16 84:46
85:8 97:44 98:10
103:10,12 108:12
109:16 118:22,34
127:30 133:44
134:24,28 169:20
169:22,26 170:40
170:44,46,50

171:50,50 172:20
databases 81:14
date 66:34 190:42
dates 58:44
Dave 102:26
David 11:32,34
25:26 27:36 29:26
30:12 35:38 38:48
40:10 48:18 54:12
54:36 56:14 57:14
97:22 101:46
day 1:22 20:42
50:42,48 51:30
80:50 90:20
100:26 113:22
191:42
days 116:18 137:22
189:30
de-escalated 91:48
de-escalation 92:8
92:8
deadlines 109:38
109:40,42
deal 44:10 75:42
77:26 78:12
104:14 127:38
138:16 175:16
dealing 77:8,12,14
77:16 95:32
123:34 148:18
149:14 151:26
deals 91:50
dealt 62:42 111:16
DeBour 119:12
121:38
decade 27:26
decades 45:12
71:14,16,16 72:40
decide 80:36
115:14
decided 87:42
decision-making
125:34 126:16,32
decisions 126:36
178:46
decree 1:8 2:12,46

2:50 3:16,16,44
3:48 4:30,34,42
5:28,32,44 6:10
7:16,16 8:30
14:42 15:50 16:38
17:28,48,48,50
19:46 28:30,36
31:16,22 32:42,46
34:24 35:20 38:46
40:8,24 42:34,48
43:20,28 48:10
49:8 60:32,46
61:32,44 62:40
63:16,20,26,38,42
64:10 65:32,48
68:10,20,42 69:16
70:12,38,40 71:12
71:14,34 74:40
75:24,30,32 76:46
77:8 80:24,30
82:10 88:46 92:50
93:14 97:40 98:20
99:26 100:44
103:8 104:18,20
104:28,38 105:10
107:26,36 109:40
113:46 114:10,16
114:40 115:24,34
124:38,46 132:20
133:30 134:10,40
135:16,22 136:24
140:48 143:48
144:24 145:26
150:48 151:34
153:22,34 154:20
155:8,10,12,20,36
157:10 160:18
163:48 164:20,28
164:36,44,50
165:38,50 166:14
167:38 170:32
172:24 173:28
182:10,24,36
183:14,38,46
184:24 189:24,32
decrees 14:30

27:44 28:38 40:34
149:26 151:12
164:16 172:30
dedicated 149:32
dedication 143:44
deep 26:44 27:30
34:12 47:10
143:42 144:10
170:18
deepest 29:32
deeply 18:10 28:38
31:28
default 83:16
Defender 15:20
defense 13:32,44
21:22 23:8
defensive 125:24
125:36
define 31:24 35:10
35:18 67:16
defined 29:20
175:46
defining 175:40
definitions 67:14
175:46
degree 136:28
delegated 122:26
deliberate 179:16
deliberately 106:18
deliver 54:40
deliverables 46:42
delivered 55:14
delivers 3:50
Democratic 13:18
demonstrate 8:46
9:16 186:42
demonstrated
29:36
demonstrating
157:16
demonstrations
59:30
denial 31:48 66:10
79:44 80:12,22
127:24,42
department 3:28

3:36,40 15:48
18:50 26:14,22
29:22 32:40 35:20
50:20 54:16,22
58:24 59:46 61:20
61:28,38,48 62:30
62:32,32 63:8,12
63:28,42 64:28
65:32 66:20,24
67:24,34,42 68:36
69:10,32 74:46
75:38 76:16,32
77:46 80:34,40,46
81:24,24 83:40
84:8 87:36,48
94:36 98:40,46
99:16,18,48,50
100:46 103:16,28
103:44,48 104:24
105:12,20 106:48
108:18,28 110:22
111:10,22 117:18
119:38 120:10,16
120:18,36 123:48
126:10 128:8,12
129:14 130:40
135:26 136:42
140:24 144:34
145:22,28 146:18
146:42,48 148:22
150:34,44 162:20
162:42 165:22
168:18,34,44
173:20 175:16
178:16,28,34
182:32 184:26
187:10 189:44
department's
117:28
departments 19:38
19:50 62:42 66:8
66:8 101:36
103:24,26,36
111:14 147:28
160:10
depend 163:36,38

163:40
depending 93:42
depends 142:44
depth 147:16
deputy 26:18
144:50 145:8
146:36,40 173:34
describe 5:18 7:44
42:28 52:26 76:40
84:30 94:22
138:34 186:42
describing 186:20
desegregation
13:44
deserves 143:8
design 166:40
desk 11:10
desks 27:20 61:20
despite 78:30 88:10
detail 8:32 149:40
detectives 86:16
detention 75:46
85:32
detentions 85:18
determination
48:32
determinations
129:32
detrimental 91:32
develop 28:28
46:46 66:28 85:26
140:40 148:30
162:50 179:36
developed 77:30
93:28
developing 34:42
46:44 78:36
180:32
development 18:44
22:22 101:40
devoted 137:36
176:40
devotion 149:10
dialogues 90:44
159:48
dictates 80:30

difference 126:50
179:28
differences 124:44
different 32:44
42:40 43:8 44:16
56:26 63:34 67:12
68:34 77:10 80:22
80:28 81:32 85:44
90:32 102:10
119:14 123:48
124:22,22,24
141:8 148:44
152:12 154:22,34
159:20 170:42
differently 124:8
difficult 128:10
154:36
difficulties 152:42
dig 165:48 169:20
direct 33:34,38
151:12
directed 39:28
125:12 176:36
direction 79:12
171:16 191:20,26
191:38
directive 165:8
directly 12:20
62:18 146:28
director 25:14
58:26 89:36 145:8
145:46,50 146:38
153:44 173:12
disabilities 77:18
disability 77:12
disciplinary 173:40
182:18 184:14,30
184:34
discipline 81:16
135:40 171:32
181:50 185:42
disciplining 136:46
discrimination
13:46 21:14 22:28
22:32
discuss 149:38

discussed 94:32
discussing 15:42
164:46
disenfranchised
41:24 74:12
disobedience 59:14
disorder 78:14
dispatch 78:42
disproportionately
3:32
disregarded 161:20
disrespectful 30:40
district 14:24 53:30
173:46
districts 53:32,32
distrust 65:18,20
dive 47:10
diverse 8:40 59:50
123:36 153:50
diversion 58:28
diversity 50:30,32
divide 31:30 144:10
dividing 12:32
division 63:12
100:14 123:34
139:36 173:12
document 68:44
documents 61:42
doing 13:36 16:34
22:16,20 34:48
47:16 50:44 58:24
58:40 59:18,22
60:14 61:12 69:46
78:32 80:44 86:16
89:48,50 93:42
102:40 105:30
122:18,38 129:16
129:16 137:24
156:50 158:26
159:8 165:22
182:44,48
DOJ 23:18 24:22
60:20,32 132:20
137:12
DOMESTHENES
115:30 118:18

128:42 138:46
139:32 140:50
domestic 42:22
101:26
door 131:10,10
156:42
doors 42:8 66:32
doubling 109:30
doubt 176:18
dovetailing 169:30
Dow 5:46,50
Dow's 33:18
downtown 113:32
dozens 14:26
Dr 2:16 13:16
97:18,20 99:42,44
100:50 117:26
118:12 121:38
123:26 128:40
142:42 150:18
164:10 176:42
177:34,38
draft 42:34 76:44
109:8
dramatically 19:14
driving 62:10
125:26
drug 77:14
drug-treatment
24:46
drugs 179:46
duke 121:50
Duran 150:46
duties 9:22
duty 13:12
dying 159:38
Dyke 24:8
dynamics 163:42
Dynamite 12:32,32
12:40
_____
E
earlier 46:46 48:18
89:16 96:24
170:38 188:12
earliest 12:42

early 26:32 44:22
88:18 137:20
147:38 173:30
earning 156:46
ears 86:38 148:12
easiest 67:16
East 103:46 104:24
easy 70:46 107:26
107:50 111:12
125:38
EAUSA 143:30
economy 54:44
Education 13:8
ee-I-ee-I-oh 143:28
EEO 21:12 22:28
effective 33:28
40:46 62:22 79:10
117:12 136:16
186:8
effectiveness 70:18
efficacy 58:48
efficient 186:8
effort 15:24 22:14
35:36 151:46
155:38 176:34
efforts 21:34 51:46
69:12 150:14
151:14 175:50
178:24
eight 21:18
eight-hour 77:34
eighth 61:14
either 16:18 19:42
147:42 161:20
elaborate 149:26
element 171:22
elements 166:26
Elena 145:44
159:32,34 161:32
166:48 167:8
169:30 172:8
188:12
Elrod 150:46
emergent 85:32
emotion 91:44
emotional 156:10

156:14
emphasis 50:18
62:36
employment 13:44
empowered 54:32
82:46 94:16
187:18,44
encounter 78:34
encourage 10:50
139:26
encouraging 75:10
ended 90:46
endemic 64:26
endowment 59:10
enforce 3:46
enforceable 52:22
enforced 48:42
enforcement 8:36
18:28 19:24 20:50
21:18 22:8 51:32
53:22 58:18 82:40
83:16 84:28 85:20
95:8,12,28 97:44
99:46 101:8,28,32
102:8 123:8
139:38 144:22
147:24 148:46
174:22,48 179:12
enforcer 80:50
engage 37:26 41:48
54:20,20 70:48
73:46 90:32
119:16 140:44
162:50 169:20
180:20,22 190:32
engaged 3:28 7:8
7:10,18 38:32
41:10,14 72:20
119:8 129:50
149:42 166:34
engagement 26:48
29:20 34:12,14
35:46 36:34 42:12
47:36 49:46 52:16
52:16 58:8,24,50
75:48 89:16,38,38

89:50 119:14
141:16 145:32,34
146:8,24 151:26
151:42 152:38,40
153:20,24,38,46
154:8,12,22,44
157:40 158:42,46
162:34 166:26,40
167:46,48 169:14
187:50
engagements
154:34,48 156:26
157:24 163:18
engaging 38:14
89:44 90:18 92:28
Englewood 150:32
English 108:44
English-speakers
161:24
enhance 134:28
enhancing 59:32
enormous 162:28
ensure 3:48 48:10
49:10 52:30 54:28
61:50 77:44 82:44
85:10,26 89:22
93:14 94:26
138:38 146:26
183:46 186:24
187:40
entering 63:24
entire 67:28 77:24
80:40 83:34
110:22 124:20
141:28 177:42
entities 8:48 69:40
entitled 173:48
entrance 120:48
environment 73:12
73:28 81:50 82:12
175:24
equal 52:20,50
53:16,18 124:12
especially 75:28
100:38 113:20
148:50 179:14

essential 17:18
39:28 44:44 83:26
establish 163:16
established 101:20
101:24 118:44
establishing 175:34
estimate 177:10
estimated 177:10
et 114:36 161:28
ethical 132:28
evaluate 7:50 34:22
134:36
evaluation 35:36
84:36 134:34
135:8 178:18,20
178:22 189:14
evaluations 178:14
190:20
evaluator 178:26
event 2:18 44:14
events 23:40 47:40
59:28 85:38
everybody 99:32
105:30 109:22
111:14 120:26
149:46 157:48
170:24 190:18
everybody's 113:36
186:50
evidence 59:16,36
182:30
evidence-based
145:18
evolution 45:38
evolves 85:30
exact 68:16
exactly 43:20
122:16
example 10:26
130:18 135:32,36
135:44 143:38
171:12 182:20
examples 122:16
excellent 52:38
143:46
exceptions 46:18

46:20
excessive 13:42
14:28 92:18
175:18
exciting 52:42
excuse 7:16 11:30
48:8 96:10,42
142:8 161:44
execution 46:28
66:44 115:46
167:40
executive 59:40
101:40 143:26,28
145:44
exhausting 93:48
exhibit 186:42
exist 46:16,20
84:50 85:26
exists 183:10
expand 158:46
expanded 121:36
137:32,34
expect 3:10 30:26
30:30,42,50 31:8
67:22,32 94:40
187:10
expectation 8:16
expectations 67:10
68:34,38 175:36
expeditiously 25:44
expensive 79:22
experience 9:8
17:14 27:42 32:16
50:26 60:50 66:10
66:22 69:28 97:36
97:38 99:42
102:28,36 137:42
145:10 147:18
149:32 150:8
152:28 158:20
172:28,32,44
174:26,30,32,36
175:28,34
experienced 27:48
27:50 29:30 51:42
99:20 109:48

152:18 153:50
167:28
experiences 16:22
50:32 71:42 86:26
86:42 152:12
158:22
experiencing 86:22
172:12,12 175:14
expert 11:44 26:22
28:20,20,24 44:42
expertise 8:34
55:44 142:48
160:8 170:26
188:20
experts 11:46 26:42
26:44 28:18,18,24
29:14,32 43:8
44:30,46 86:32
97:44 144:38,44
159:18 160:12,38
160:38 183:30
expires 61:10 83:38
explain 151:12
explained 133:34
explaining 154:50
explorer 139:38,48
expression 50:30
51:26
expressions 34:16
extensive 27:42
99:44 151:50
extent 87:32 126:40
126:44
external 34:22
63:10 66:12 76:18
76:28 134:38
145:40 157:50
extra 155:38
extract 134:26
extreme 135:36
eye 35:8
eyes 76:8 86:38
148:12

F

F.A.T.S 126:32

face 102:42
facets 170:36
facilitate 64:30
facilitators 159:16
fact 46:14 88:10
95:14 126:46
184:12
factors 66:12
facts 129:34
faculty 133:14
fair 137:20 185:50
fairest 124:10
fairly 184:36
fairness 71:22
86:28
faith 58:30
faith-based 74:30
106:12
familiar 119:44
155:20
family 12:28 23:22
112:22 158:22
177:30
far 92:42 153:36
161:12
fast 23:16
father 12:44,44
FBI 102:8
fear 37:46,50
144:16
federal 3:18,46 4:8
5:42 11:42 16:10
20:50 21:10,16,28
22:48 26:10 27:44
59:18 60:34 70:22
81:36 97:42 98:8
98:28,30 100:42
101:50 102:8
103:44,50 104:14
104:16,20 118:8
119:40 121:24
150:42 183:12
federally 24:36
feedback 5:12 7:42
8:12 11:8,12,24
39:20 55:18

137:50 138:12
190:26
feeds 39:20
feel 20:42 34:10
38:8 41:24,38
71:46 74:26 98:14
105:14,18 124:50
132:12 156:24
161:18 162:32
170:18 176:26
182:42
feeling 182:14
184:8
fellow 59:40 144:10
felons 24:30
felt 161:18
Ferguson 60:20
fewer 111:44
112:12
fight 117:50 180:8
180:12
figure 85:8
figuring 86:14
file 14:50 54:16
filed 3:16,22 6:12
16:42 136:40
fill 104:44 107:16
190:28
filled 9:48 107:14
filling 11:8 116:10
final 55:50 141:38
finalist 2:48 6:46
9:24 10:20,40
45:18 57:22 91:22
91:24 96:20
finalist's 10:34
finalists 1:9 2:14,42
6:8,34 7:30 8:8
11:8,20
finally 5:32 9:12
94:20
financial 14:50
find 15:20 16:14
36:44 54:18 67:10
68:36 69:48 72:46
74:22 84:48

162:22
finding 62:22 93:48
findings 3:36,40
41:16 66:10 72:24
110:24 132:20
137:12 185:38
finish 74:8
finished 21:20,20
63:48
firearms 125:24,36
126:24
firm 25:20 57:40
96:38 99:20,20
177:14
firmly 84:12
first 2:26,48 3:14
11:28 13:30 18:32
21:12 29:48 32:28
32:32 34:30 35:44
42:40 43:18 46:28
47:34 49:40,50
52:40 53:8 57:28
64:44 65:10 66:44
68:26,26 83:10
97:16,34 101:24
108:10 115:46
116:22 117:10
118:12 121:46
124:42 126:38
134:22 136:36
138:12 154:46
155:18,24 161:42
168:24,38 169:16
171:14 172:50
175:12 176:48
179:20 185:16
188:18 189:30
firsthand 55:32
fits 124:26
Fitzgerald 23:12
five 15:10 22:14
57:50 138:28
143:24 145:32
150:40
five-year 111:28
fix 81:26 124:26

fixed 20:46
flashing 102:42
fleeing 92:32
flexibility 114:46
flip 114:18
flipside 111:42
floor 150:24
flowing 36:20
Floyd 120:12
fly 84:32
focus 19:30 28:46
29:24 36:10,20,34
42:12 44:22 59:26
59:36 91:50
164:38
focused 58:18
152:20
focuses 25:20 47:44
47:44
focusing 130:18
folds 116:22
folks 16:46 17:8
25:38 40:32 69:8
70:38 71:24 72:44
72:50 73:26 80:20
80:24 84:16
155:18 156:12,32
157:30
follow 35:12,12
167:46 172:48
follow-through
157:22
follow-up 171:42
followed 13:36
43:22 172:18
following 10:46
13:16 14:10
120:32,38 171:28
FOP 54:8,12 56:8
87:28,48 88:20
181:40,46
force 3:30,42 4:22
13:42 14:28 18:46
30:30 36:48 60:42
62:16 64:16 75:42
75:48 85:34 92:18

92:18 114:26
135:34 144:18
148:18 151:24
162:36 163:22
171:12,14,18,20
171:34,46 172:14
175:18 179:34
forced 60:34
forces 180:32
Ford 59:8
foregoing 191:20
foremost 134:22
forget 75:20
forgive 57:36
153:16
forgotten 110:42
form 50:32 157:12
formal 151:14
former 16:8 22:46
26:10,18 61:26
63:8 82:38 97:42
125:24 146:38
forms 11:8,12
138:48 190:30
formulating 90:38
forth 175:42
fortunate 42:44
fortunately 68:12
136:24
forum 1:8 2:10,22
3:12 7:32 8:10
68:16 159:40
169:44 190:40
forums 25:12
169:36
forward 20:38,44
23:16 33:12 36:24
47:20,32 61:50
62:12 65:44 80:28
131:22 134:16,30
149:34 158:38
159:10,42 182:20
182:32 184:40
forward-thinking
27:20
found 6:40 28:44

117:32
foundation 13:32
57:24,48 58:14,36
59:10,42 60:14,26
68:12 112:20
123:38 145:42
158:8
four 2:42 6:8,34,46
7:28 9:24 17:30
18:30 19:26 22:14
119:14 128:44,48
145:32 176:22
186:12
four-year 13:50
fourth 156:38
frame 133:20
framework 50:12
framing 139:16
Francisco 20:20
frankly 24:42
70:26 71:8 74:36
107:20,32 131:10
132:34,44 135:26
Fraternal 54:10
87:12,20 181:34
fraud 25:22
friends 87:48
frisking 119:48
front 2:32 80:48
fucused 35:24
59:16
full 62:22 86:32
fully 3:50 175:46
functioning 138:22
fund 13:34 14:48
fundamentally
158:36
Funds 14:46
funnel 41:42,44
further 7:46 140:10
191:28
furtherance 43:32
future 76:30 84:14
144:26 184:26

———— **G** ————

109:26 135:26,28
135:38 137:14
171:40
happening 36:44
108:40 128:24
137:30
happens 85:22
91:42
happy 83:42
hard 114:22 115:40
126:8,44 134:48
hardest 133:34
Hardin 96:8,12
143:14 177:18
harm 45:22,44
91:28 92:34
harmed 161:26
harmful 45:26
harnessing 168:40
Harvard 59:50
Harvey 25:30
Haven 103:46
104:24
head 23:24
headed 103:22
headphones 2:36
heal 170:22
healing 51:10,16
142:44
health 111:30
151:28
hear 2:42 10:28
11:28,44 20:12
51:44 54:24 65:14
154:16 160:22
167:16 169:18
172:36 181:8
188:22 189:44
heard 42:16,26
49:26,32 105:14
151:24 157:18,32
158:34,40
hearing 49:50
86:28 128:24
138:8 142:22
155:34 179:26

191:16,24
hearings 25:10
33:18 89:24
heart 153:22
178:36
heat 44:14
heavier 47:36
heavy 42:50
height 117:28
Heintze 16:30
19:22,26 21:50
25:40
held 15:28
help 10:16 16:26
19:38 36:36 64:22
64:30 66:28,36
95:22 102:36
129:42 134:18
180:38 183:30
helped 101:42
helpful 46:32
helping 148:40
158:28 174:46
hereto 191:28
hereunto 191:40
hesitant 40:50 41:8
72:16 129:46
166:32
hesitate 114:12
hey 54:38 57:32
132:42
Hickey 142:40
143:10 149:8
152:26 162:8
164:10 165:46
166:46 167:42
169:12 172:36
174:34 176:36,48
184:18 186:32
187:48 190:34
hide 80:32,38
high 12:12,14
13:10 46:36
100:18 140:16
165:18
highest 95:10

highlights 101:18
highly 156:14
Hill 12:32,32,40
Hillard 16:30 19:26
Hilliard 19:22
21:50 25:38
hire 179:34
hiring 4:22 89:34
178:44,50 179:10
179:12,18
historically 180:42
history 44:36 156:8
hit 69:44
hitting 87:24
125:32
hoc 37:16
Hoereth 145:50
153:40,44
hold 4:48 76:32
160:34 169:36
Holmes 23:50
home 30:18,20,22
30:24 31:12
152:50
homeless 161:26
homicide 18:46
homicides 33:34
honest 17:22
107:32 157:8
honored 158:10
hope 62:44 64:30
134:18 181:26
hopeful 37:32
hopefully 38:16
41:46 51:32 56:30
86:38 175:28
176:10 181:16
host 147:50 154:32
155:16
hosting 2:22
hours 110:26
160:36 177:10,14
house 12:46
houses 73:14
housing 12:22
14:34 120:38,50

121:34,42
hovers 77:46
Howard 150:40
huge 62:10 99:36
102:36
huh 107:28
human 30:44,48
humble 70:30
humbled 158:10

I

I.D 121:8
idea 81:46 95:10
130:20 131:50
ideas 158:44,48
159:10,12,18
165:32
identification
47:28
identified 16:44
25:40 59:50
162:42
identify 180:20
187:20
identifying 34:36
93:34 94:46 95:30
179:32
ignored 161:20
ill 175:20
Illinois 2:20 3:18
3:24 5:46 6:26
7:42,48 10:48
11:20 15:10 18:30
18:30,50 19:10
43:12 143:20
146:10 150:16,20
150:40 183:10,12
191:10
illness 44:18 58:20
immediately 66:8
120:28
immigrant 130:16
161:28
imminent 92:34
impact 49:28,32
impacted 3:32

54:30 187:44
188:16,28
impacts 68:20
impartial 4:20
31:32 114:24
impede 182:18
impediment 56:16
87:16
impediments 56:10
181:42
impetus 15:24
implement 62:18
108:48
implementation
5:10,30 37:28
48:50 49:36 62:38
73:46 140:46
178:22
implemented 109:8
implementing
42:32 76:44
117:50
importance 114:14
130:48 138:22
important 10:30
17:34 20:44 24:42
26:40 28:16,32
29:50 30:16 31:26
33:48 39:24 42:48
42:48 51:50 52:12
55:14,22 64:46
66:18 70:10 75:28
103:32 104:40,50
105:8,42 106:16
106:38,50 107:16
108:18 110:38,40
110:40 113:24
114:28,36 115:42
128:32 130:30
137:8 139:10,20
139:50 141:12
143:46 146:48
152:50 153:32
155:24,32,50
158:36,42 161:46
166:12,18 168:8

investigators 137:40

Invisible 32:18

involve 139:18 166:44

involved 7:14 11:38 11:48 16:12,18 18:12,14,42 20:14 23:24 29:34 40:26 40:34,44 61:34 81:28 103:34 150:12 151:10,22 151:44 156:48 173:8 178:14,16 178:20

involvement 49:12 151:12 187:12,30

involves 151:40

involving 13:46 14:32,44 175:20

IPRA 48:12 93:18 136:44 137:16,28 184:8

issue 4:46 95:20,24 111:16 121:48 122:30 125:8,44 129:42 156:8,10 157:24

issued 32:44

issues 16:12 31:24 45:8,10 56:34 61:18 64:26 75:40 77:10 78:12,14 83:46 98:50 122:26 128:10 137:28,30 138:16 147:42 149:18,20 150:36 164:26 171:28,30 175:18 175:18 183:32

item 24:16

items 134:16 163:28

J

jail 15:26,28,34

JAMES 149:44 164:14 167:50 177:38,48 178:12 178:40 186:36 189:20 190:8,12

January 110:24,34

Jeff 15:40 16:8,8 22:42,44 26:8,10 32:12 39:32 44:26 55:24

Jeffrey 89:48

Jersey 25:32 146:38 151:32 173:18,28 174:16

Jim 58:34

job 2:44 13:30 19:18 61:48 63:26 70:36 82:14 87:8 88:20,34 110:14 123:34 165:42,48 173:24 177:22,26 177:32 179:30 182:44 189:30

job-placement 24:48

jobs 86:48

Joe 153:40,44 158:34,40 160:28 172:8

John 150:40

join 140:24

joined 113:24

jointly 5:48 8:12 175:48

Jon 23:18

Joseph 145:50

judge 3:46 5:42,44 5:50 8:24 11:42 14:24 15:16 22:46 23:48 33:18,24 37:36 81:36 107:10 109:20 111:32 114:50 174:14

judgment 40:20

July 6:24

jump 57:44 74:8 161:38

jumped 120:26

junior 21:22

jurisdiction 39:44 93:44

jurisdictional 184:38

jurisdictions 63:36 79:10 80:24 81:20 92:14

justice 15:46 21:38 21:38 26:14,24 58:16 61:38 63:8 63:28 103:46 110:22 123:40 128:44,46,50 129:40 145:48 150:12 151:16 173:20 178:24

Justice's 3:38

justification 171:44 171:46

juvenile 58:28

K

KATHERINE 97:8 102:46 114:8 115:48 117:34 118:10 119:26 122:46 123:20 127:36 128:38 130:12 131:34 133:38 134:44 135:18 136:50 138:44 141:34

Katie 97:10

keep 35:8 36:18,20 43:50 72:26 140:14,30 148:40

keeping 148:14

keeps 20:40

Kelly 117:42

Ken 16:28 18:22,24 22:10 26:8,28,30 28:32 31:20 33:46

34:30 35:40 42:38 45:30 46:30 51:48 52:38 56:32 57:16

Ken's 17:8

key 28:44 34:26,38 34:38,40 43:40 48:20 134:42 135:8 189:16

kids 153:10

killed 23:34

kind 33:48 46:34 66:50 69:36 71:20 81:40 90:34 115:40 130:26,34 135:40 139:8,10 141:12,22 162:38 171:50 173:42

kinds 101:38 109:38 135:24 137:26 138:16 154:22,34

King's 13:18

knew 12:24 121:26 190:14

know 9:44 20:44 28:14 30:34 31:20 32:48,50 34:32 37:34 38:24,30,48 41:20 42:38 44:32 45:30 46:38 47:14 50:28,44 54:36 55:26 68:18 70:28 72:32,48 73:10,22 76:48 78:20,22 80:20,46 81:36,40 83:10,12 84:28 85:14 86:28 91:38 93:28,40 94:8 95:16 97:50 98:8 98:10,12,12 100:22 102:8 103:8 105:18,22 105:22,30 107:44 110:12,18,36 113:8,28 115:36 120:22 121:22

124:18 125:36,40 130:16,44 132:40 133:18 137:32,32 137:36,50 138:48 139:14 153:8,30 159:22,36 160:26 160:28 161:22 162:10,16,20,48 164:14 165:36 166:20 169:48 170:36 171:12 175:32 178:16 179:26,38,44 180:26,28 181:24 188:26

knowing 109:24 178:28,30

knowledge 8:50 55:38 152:28

known 177:42

knows 95:14 99:32 112:8

Koschman 23:32 23:36

L

lab 32:18

labor 183:28

lack 144:20 172:32

lady 67:28

laid 152:46

landed 64:8

language 2:26,28 2:30 65:34 114:44 164:50 165:28,50 166:12

large 50:28 53:32 136:28 165:40 168:24

largely 168:40

larger 188:34

largest 12:14,20 28:10 61:14

Larrabee 97:28 103:20 104:12 111:16

Lassar 23:12
lasting 20:8,8
lastly 103:20
lasts 111:36
Latino 3:32
law 8:36,40 13:14
  13:30 14:10 18:28
  19:8,24 20:50
  21:16,20,20,22
  22:8 51:32 58:18
  62:38 82:38 83:14
  84:28 85:20 95:8
  95:12 97:44 99:44
  101:8,28,32 102:8
  112:18,20 120:16
  121:20 123:8
  133:10 139:38
  144:22 147:24
  148:44 174:22,46
  177:14 179:10
  182:10 183:12,12
  183:30
law-enforcement
  19:34
lawful 118:42
laws 4:10 98:8
  121:38
lawsuit 3:22,34
  16:40
lawsuits 12:50
lawyer 12:46
lawyers 26:46
  97:50 120:16
layered 184:36
laying 116:46
lays 6:12 119:12
lead 35:34 58:8
  61:40 187:28
leader 147:14
leaders 75:18,18
  106:10
leadership 29:12
  54:22 142:46
  149:8
leading 89:42 97:10
  143:24 147:26

leads 22:12 65:48
  69:22 147:40
learn 2:42 47:42
  71:30 180:18
learned 20:36
  34:48 40:36 52:10
  52:14 77:36
  145:20 168:12
  175:34,44
learning 86:20
  175:26
leave 11:14 30:22
  111:32 190:24
leaves 30:18
leaving 101:28
  112:46
led 16:28 23:18
  58:16 85:16
  152:30 153:34
left 14:10,12 16:30
  17:8 19:16,18
  28:16 40:16 97:20
  97:22,24 99:18
  101:48 106:18
  131:50 135:24
legal 13:32 62:36
  112:20 119:46
  122:8 173:16
legally 130:24
legitimacy 146:30
  146:46
Lemire 97:8,10
  102:46 114:8
  115:48 117:34
  118:10 119:26
  122:46 123:20
  127:36 128:38
  130:12 131:34
  133:38 134:44
  135:18 136:50
  138:44 141:34
lend 145:20 170:12
  170:26
lens 167:26
lessons 145:20
  175:30 176:12

let's 11:26 99:22
  126:38 131:42
letting 45:42,46
level 46:36 53:30
  53:30 55:44 59:18
  66:24 67:20 87:18
  100:18 119:14,16
levels 119:16
liaison 104:44
  105:42 106:14
  112:28,32 116:10
  124:34 130:50
  131:32,42
liaisons 124:34
  130:50 131:30
  159:16
liberties 13:40
licensed 79:24
lie 64:28
lieutenant 18:34
life 51:24 67:28
  158:20
light 167:16
lightning 186:14
limitations 157:10
line 107:42,44
  109:30 155:22
  162:38
lines 25:24
link 170:12
list 113:36 114:20
  114:28
listen 2:32 65:10
  86:40 113:34
  160:20
listened 62:44
  98:16 163:14
listener 132:26
listening 36:34
  65:12 90:18
  113:18,40 128:14
  188:38
litem 21:26
litigated 120:20
  121:22
litigation 7:18

  117:22,46,50
  120:10,12,18
  173:48
little 2:48 7:46
  11:44,48 17:12
  19:48 59:44,46
  65:40,42,46 73:32
  98:22 107:30,38
  114:42 123:50
  124:8 133:50
  138:28 150:50
  157:42 164:32,34
  165:30 172:44
  186:12
live 2:34 50:42
  105:34 120:50
lived 12:24,46
  13:22
lives 67:30 112:24
  177:30
living 22:36 83:20
  83:34 158:22
local 12:48 59:18
  97:44 98:8,32
  119:40 144:38
  177:28
locked 84:8
long 15:38 16:32
  40:28 51:8 65:24
  72:12 97:18 99:42
  99:44 115:30
  117:26 118:12,18
  121:38 128:40,42
  138:46 139:32
  140:38,50 174:48
longer 80:32
look 31:50 35:42
  43:20 46:34,36,38
  48:36,40 49:38
  56:36 59:12,28,30
  67:42 69:34,48
  74:38,44,46 78:32
  80:14 83:36 84:16
  84:40 85:42,44,46
  105:36,36 107:26
  107:26 108:36,44

  111:46 118:22,34
  121:20 124:8,26
  126:8,44 127:28
  129:38 132:30
  136:38 137:22,28
  159:24 162:26
  179:8,20 184:34
  186:40
looked 26:34 48:12
  56:34 93:16
  112:34 132:34
  136:30 140:10
  164:16 183:48
looking 8:26 19:36
  27:22 32:24 38:50
  43:34 49:44 50:18
  50:46 54:40 58:46
  58:48 60:42 74:26
  98:44 108:14,26
  109:16,16 115:12
  128:18 133:8
  135:10,14,28,38
  135:40,42,42
  136:8,10,10,14,16
  137:8,46 138:10
  138:22 159:42
  162:44 165:10
  179:22 180:28,30
  181:10 185:18,24
  185:32,46 188:14
looks 32:42 73:28
  107:20,30,40
loop 137:50
loops 138:14
Los 26:26
lot 18:40 19:46
  20:12,34 32:12,14
  32:20,26,28 33:10
  33:16,18,20,30
  34:32 40:16 41:22
  49:30 56:24 64:26
  65:42 67:12 68:32
  69:46,48,48 71:36
  71:40 80:22,42
  91:42 93:30 94:50
  98:42 102:10,28

102:34 103:8,12
104:22 109:32
111:48 112:36,46
114:8 116:20,22
116:26 121:32
127:16 133:18
135:20 154:38
158:50 160:50
161:18 162:48
167:24 168:12
169:48 175:40
176:24 184:44
lots 167:32,32
169:48
Louis 60:42,48
love 143:42
low 144:18
Loyola 13:14
luxury 21:46

M

machine 126:32
191:14
Maggie 142:40
143:10 149:8
152:26 153:40
162:8 164:10
165:46 166:46
167:42 169:12
172:36 174:34
176:48 182:40
183:28 184:18
186:32 187:48
188:48 190:34
magistrate 70:24
maintaining
109:50
major 31:22 34:48
34:48 141:16
178:14
making 63:44
93:50 102:30
104:26,30 105:10
105:12 111:22
130:50 155:38
157:14 185:16

maldistribution
13:48
man 103:16
manage 148:10
management 4:28
8:42 98:8 101:44
102:34
manager 89:38,38
99:22,28
managerial 101:40
managing 25:14
109:48
mandates 69:16
97:40 104:26
maneuver 88:46
Manhattan 98:34
manifest 65:30
71:50 78:16,24
manner 3:50
163:12 172:18
mantra 167:10,10
map 136:28 169:32
Marcia 16:50 20:48
20:48 26:16 36:26
37:30 41:18 49:18
53:36
Maricopa 26:24
151:48
Marine 13:12
Marines 127:8
Married 22:36
Martin 62:48,50
65:8 68:40 70:26
72:26 79:14 80:18
82:18,26,32 87:22
90:22 91:36
mass 59:30
massage 170:50
massive 94:44
match 153:16
172:10
materials 4:40,44
8:40
matter 29:32
128:16
matters 7:20 17:28

19:34 164:46
173:40 174:8,16
Maxey 61:24,26
65:46 75:26 76:48
84:42 92:22 93:22
95:44
maximize 155:42
Mayor 23:36
mean 34:12 49:20
93:22 109:16
114:20 138:46
180:14
meaningful 49:24
65:38
means 33:22
108:12,44 109:18
167:14 191:14
meant 3:22 121:48
measure 84:40
133:28 170:32,46
171:8,14,50
172:22 189:36
measured 75:50
measurements
35:10 189:38,42
measures 36:38
44:24
measuring 109:14
133:38 170:48
media 38:28,32
mediating 61:16
mediator 14:40
21:30,32
medical 78:38
meet 4:50 66:46,48
66:48 67:26
175:50
meeting 106:24
130:32,34 154:30
155:8,18 156:24
157:26
meetings 4:48
14:48 24:44 74:16
74:18 89:42
105:48 131:14,24
154:34 157:22

161:14 188:32,36
Melendres 173:50
member 10:8,12
35:34 74:44 97:26
104:42 180:46
members 7:22,24
7:38,38 8:48 9:18
11:36 17:18 18:10
18:14 26:38 30:26
30:30,32,38 40:18
43:16 54:16 67:40
72:30 82:36,46
89:44 90:30,34
97:18 98:24,26
115:26 119:18
122:48 123:22
124:16 126:24
129:12,14 133:12
139:18 144:14
145:34 151:20
162:40 187:34
memories 12:42
men 44:12 88:24
139:42 148:44
mental 44:18 58:20
77:12 151:26
mentality 179:50
180:16
mentally 175:20
mention 50:40
158:40
mentioned 22:10
37:36 50:28 69:18
70:14 90:24
108:24 132:38
151:20 160:28
188:12
mentions 117:24
Meridian 151:40
message 74:32
met 25:28 26:8,8,16
97:40 100:24
104:28 106:40,42
106:44 176:14
method 180:44
methodologies

145:16
methodology
107:24 108:10
185:48
methods 11:18
metric 189:26
metrics 34:26
84:38 134:40
135:12 175:46
189:16
Mexico 151:22
175:12
Michael 60:24
97:24 102:50
133:42,48 134:8
135:22
mid 83:22
mid-sized 34:50
middle 19:46
Mike 112:24
million 5:36
Milwaukee 20:20
mind 44:30
mindful 131:20
minds 164:44
mini 63:40
minimum 6:16
minor 53:24
minority 53:24
179:14
minute 26:30
minutes 9:26,26,28
82:30 96:40,42,48
138:28 142:26
174:34 186:12
misconception
121:32
misconduct 23:42
27:44 41:10 72:18
129:48 135:46
152:32 161:26
166:32
misdemeanors
92:40
missed 109:44
mission 70:38,46

186:44
notions 69:38
129:36,38
November 1:22
6:42 11:24 190:42
191:42
number 16:46
29:44 95:20,32
100:28 133:20
140:34 142:30
149:16 150:12
152:10 158:44
160:26 164:24,26
168:28
nuts 85:34
NYPD 100:42
117:28 118:20,24
119:22,32 140:18
NYPD's 117:44

O

O'Reilly 27:28
object 4:44
objectives 3:48
176:20
objects 123:12
obligations 68:46
Observations
49:42
obtain 5:10
obvious 72:46
110:12
obviously 35:28
64:24 76:50
occurred 118:32
occurring 172:24
October 3:18 6:34
offender 101:26
offenders 136:8
offer 14:8 145:12
office 2:20 3:20,24
5:48 6:26,44 7:28
7:44,50 10:48
11:22 21:44 23:26
24:20,24 40:26
100:12 101:12,24

106:42 112:26,38
123:32 143:22,24
146:38 151:48
160:30,32,36
office's 101:14
officer 4:14,24,50
26:18 38:10 61:28
62:10 75:44 79:26
100:8,10 121:8
126:36 139:36
173:16,16,26
179:24 180:40,42
181:10
officer's 120:44
officer-involved
61:22
officers 4:12 14:28
18:20 30:28 39:8
39:10,10 43:44,50
44:10 48:12 60:44
67:38,50 68:18
77:32,44,50 78:18
78:40 79:18,26
80:42,42 82:8,38
83:30 84:50 85:10
86:42 88:14 90:50
92:42 93:16
118:46 120:40
136:10,48 139:46
140:8 143:50
144:10 156:24,24
163:10,38,40
165:26 179:50
180:38 183:48
Oh 82:18
Ohio 118:44
okay 11:26 17:16
54:26 82:26,32
122:46 159:44
190:8
old 17:38,42 19:26
28:14 67:30
134:12
oldest 58:38
ombudsman 21:28
omnipresent 28:48

once 9:48 16:38
21:20 34:32 85:40
85:48 113:8
160:44 171:48
one's 128:50
ones 149:20
ongoing 23:48 37:8
37:46 50:36
127:42 160:50
online 6:40 112:36
open 42:8 66:32
106:18 129:12
142:26 158:48
operate 129:12
operating 61:26
62:10
operational 59:34
139:16
operations 50:20
opinion 29:48
57:30 64:46
161:44,44 162:18
opinions 91:40
opportunities
24:46,48,50
opportunity 10:40
41:50 67:26 81:24
143:46 147:26,50
148:48 158:30
172:40
opposed 79:34
option 55:16
order 3:44 54:10
60:34 84:44 87:12
87:20 116:46
151:22 164:8
169:38,42 171:12
172:22 181:34
ordered 118:8
ordinarily 89:24
organization 58:40
67:50 68:16 75:10
75:12 80:26
159:22 163:34
organizational
22:20 59:34 99:12

144:48 169:10
organizations 7:14
22:22 72:42 74:18
98:10 123:12
148:34 149:30
original 191:30
Orleans 26:26
44:46
other's 163:30
outcome 18:8
outcomes 34:40
35:10
outlined 43:28
outside 4:32 11:14
44:38,48 45:14
100:42 160:38
outweigh 92:44
overall 6:12 101:42
154:14
overarching
144:28 157:38
overcome 56:30
overcrowding
15:26
overhauled 99:8
overlap 109:32
overlapping 39:44
overriding 182:34
oversaw 99:50
100:10 102:18
overseeing 5:44
48:8 93:12 183:44
oversees 102:12
oversight 8:38
61:12 62:16 83:44
84:10 164:48
173:38
oversimplified
54:38
overwhelmed
77:24
owe 70:36
ownership 45:34

P

P.D 75:14

p.m 190:42
pace 20:40 100:36
page 80:48 116:24
PAGES 1:18
pain 71:48
panel 122:50
124:14 167:34
paper 80:50
paragraph 189:24
paragraphs 64:8
76:50 164:24
165:50 189:22,34
parallel 63:34
parameters 183:16
183:18
paramount 113:12
paraphrase 119:34
part 7:32 23:20
32:30,32 36:30
37:14,32 38:16
42:48,50 49:34,36
49:48 51:20,24
75:10 87:8 90:10
90:48 94:12
100:14 123:34,48
127:34 131:8
139:10,20 148:48
154:8,10 158:12
166:42 168:24
170:22 184:28
185:10 190:30
participated 6:48
190:18
participating 90:14
155:40 156:12,18
participation
139:12 155:44
particular 28:24
69:40 98:50
124:28 135:44
139:16 154:50
158:34 159:40
163:28 171:28,48
181:12
particularly 44:12
103:40 130:14

132:18 160:14
168:16 169:40
parties 8:16 29:22
46:44 63:22 69:40
107:10 109:22
132:32 156:48
165:36 166:10
partner 102:26
143:12 180:36
partnering 170:10
partners 54:32
82:46 187:44
partnership 53:14
65:36
partnerships
145:28
parts 150:32
pass 91:38 155:46
157:26 159:30
passion 125:8
149:10,32
passionate 84:18
passionately 83:22
patriarchy 71:24
Patricia 23:48
Patrick 23:12
patrol 12:44 122:14
patrolling 121:34
pattern 3:28 54:32
82:48 120:40
121:28
patterns 85:44
135:42
pay 15:30 140:26
peace 21:38
peace-builder
21:32
peer 85:46
penalties 24:36
Pension 14:44
people 4:10 10:44
12:24 15:28 16:32
16:44,46,48 17:12
17:32 20:14 29:34
30:36 40:22,32,40
40:42,44,50 41:10

41:12,28 51:14
69:50 70:28,44
71:20,42 72:16,20
72:20,34,38 74:20
74:24,34,36 77:12
77:14,16 78:34
80:30 86:18,30
87:44 89:24,34
91:22 98:14
105:32,50,50,50
106:8,24,26
108:16,18,22
109:18 112:30
113:28,30 119:12
119:48 120:42
122:8,16 126:46
127:16,44 128:24
129:20,46,50,50
130:20,30 131:12
131:14 132:12,16
132:38,46,48
142:30 155:10,16
155:22,24 157:16
160:8,12,36,42
161:24,24,28
166:30,34,36,50
167:16 169:40,42
170:10,16 172:38
180:20 181:20
186:18
people's 131:22
perceive 36:42
perceived 70:16
110:50 111:8,20
111:40 130:40
132:26,26
percent 77:32,48
77:50 87:32,34
136:44 176:38
184:12
perception 36:40
37:18,50
perceptions 50:22
perfect 187:26
perfectly 107:44
perform 10:36

performance 8:10
34:28 84:14
134:42 135:8
184:32 185:8
189:16
performing 9:22
period 10:22 13:28
29:42 56:36 57:38
62:24 140:38
persistence 33:50
34:8
persistent 28:48
persistently 47:14
person 5:44 36:36
45:18 72:34 77:20
77:26 78:46 79:32
85:22 91:22 92:32
92:36 100:28
104:8 105:42,44
105:44 106:28
121:12,12 132:14
166:48 179:42
personal 18:8
42:12 158:18
191:18,26
personally 42:12
62:12 86:22
167:24
personnel 32:10
persons 58:20
92:36
perspective 37:44
38:14 44:38,48
50:34 141:22
181:8
perspectives 54:18
89:22
pertaining 164:26
pertinent 174:16
Peter 25:28,30,46
phase 37:28
phases 73:48
philosophy 53:38
147:34
phone 161:10
physical 77:16

PIA 184:40
pick 39:36 40:38
106:26 114:22
122:26
picked 127:14
picking 106:30
135:22
pie 116:42
piece 27:30 36:28
86:10 104:42
114:14 127:36,38
pieces 28:34 33:48
43:40 52:12 98:44
99:50 102:18
132:16
pillars 128:44,48
pilot 79:20
piloted 79:20
Pinellas 101:12
123:30,36
place 19:12 42:16
48:22 61:44 71:12
132:28 138:12
152:16 155:12
168:50
places 20:22 25:40
44:46 131:14
150:32 169:34
189:42
plain 108:44
plaintiffs' 7:24
plan 31:46 38:26
46:44,46 79:42
80:10 84:38 89:34
116:18,36,40
127:22,38 133:28
154:14 160:34
161:12 168:22
170:30 178:48
189:32
planning 37:26
73:46 140:46
plans 5:18 37:24
38:34 73:44 78:36
140:44 152:46
163:8

play 148:40
plays 39:18 184:22
184:48
pleasant 87:28
please 9:30,42,50
10:10,42 11:12
42:28 57:36 76:38
153:16 177:46
190:20
pleased 96:36
pleasure 147:26
pled 23:34
pledge 161:34
plenty 105:32
plot 69:14
plural 68:30
point 12:34 17:36
19:24 27:36 33:14
36:28 37:22 45:40
66:12 77:48 86:44
88:42 92:36 151:8
174:12 183:8
189:40
points 36:30,40
37:14 110:44
153:48
police 1:8 2:12,46
3:26,38,42 7:18
13:26,42 14:28
15:44 16:20,34
18:12,18,20,32,40
18:42,50 19:18,38
19:50 21:40 22:16
23:40 26:18,20,22
26:44,46 27:8,14
27:16,20,22,44,48
29:30,36,50 30:8
30:28,30,38,40,42
32:40 36:48 37:46
38:10 39:8,8,10
41:8,8,26,28
42:50 43:44 44:34
44:44 45:20,20,24
45:38,46 46:8,14
46:18 51:18 52:34
52:44 53:10 54:10

54:16,40,50 55:34
56:44 57:22,48
58:8,14,22,36
59:12,38,42,46
60:14,22,26 61:28
61:48 62:30,32,40
63:12,18,42 64:16
64:28,48,48 65:30
65:50 67:22,34
68:12,34,46 69:10
69:30 70:42 71:18
72:18 73:20 74:46
75:38 76:16,22,32
78:34 79:24,26
81:50 82:38 87:12
87:20,36,46 88:14
90:50 91:12,26,26
91:30 93:12 94:28
94:34 98:38,40,46
99:14,18,48,50
100:8,16,44
101:34 103:14,22
103:26,26,36,46
104:24 105:12,20
106:46 108:14,16
108:28 111:8,12
111:22 117:18
118:46 119:36,46
120:10,18,36,40
120:44 121:8
122:32,34 123:14
123:18 124:40
125:26 126:10,40
126:42 128:8,12
128:32,34 129:48
130:34,40 135:26
135:30 136:10,42
139:28 140:24
141:16 143:50
144:16,34 145:12
145:22,28 146:18
146:30,40,42,46
147:28,32,48
148:20,34 149:28
150:34 151:32,40
160:10 161:26,46

161:48 162:20,36
162:36,40 165:22
165:24 166:32
168:18,44 173:12
173:18,26,38
174:44 175:16
179:24,34 180:30
181:34,50 182:46
183:46 184:26,42
186:28 187:8,18
187:24 189:44
police-involved
135:36
policed 127:46
policeman 30:18,20
policemen 30:50
policies 7:16 38:34
48:22,38,40,42
49:44 50:36
108:48,50 122:12
122:14 129:10
152:32 167:44
168:28,36,50
170:38
policing 4:18,18,20
7:20 8:36 31:32
31:32 33:28 45:10
52:28,32,48 53:8
53:20,40,40 58:44
58:46,48 59:30
64:26 67:14,18
71:38 83:20,22,28
86:34 94:22,26,34
94:42 95:28 97:48
99:10 100:48
101:22 114:24,26
121:16 138:32,36
138:38,48,50
139:8,22,24
144:36,42,46,48
146:16 147:34
150:26,30,36
164:26,38 167:28
169:44 179:30
186:22,26,38,40
policy 4:40 46:20

48:34 62:14 65:32
117:14 139:18
146:8 153:46
163:20,20 168:26
171:16,24,36
policy-focussed
58:42
political 69:40
71:18
politicians 106:8
poor 178:44
population 15:34
portfolio 58:16
98:42 120:30
posed 169:40
position 18:36
76:26 88:30,32
100:18 117:42
173:14
possible 10:42
53:50 77:44
114:46 124:12
138:30 160:26
possibly 126:42
posted 105:28
112:36
posts 139:48
potential 75:18
180:38
potentially 131:22
132:40 134:10
power 121:36
PowerPoints
153:10
practice 3:28 23:8
49:44 50:10 54:34
85:20 117:14,20
117:30 118:46
119:18,20 139:22
practiced 119:24
practices 8:36
26:22 29:16 43:24
50:10,26 51:26,30
97:50 117:44
129:10 145:18
182:16

practicing 21:22
practitioner 51:12
practitioners 27:50
preconceived 69:38
129:36
predictor 84:14
preliminary 182:28
182:30
preparation 8:38
24:12
prepare 5:16
prepared 127:12
127:12
preparing 110:20
presence 130:36
present 57:10,38
96:40,42,48
presentation 7:36
9:30 95:36,50
96:10 141:30,40
142:24 187:38
presentations 9:28
presented 129:34
164:28
presenter 11:28
96:38
presently 158:26
presents 20:38
92:32 143:48
presided 14:26
president 15:14
21:50 22:20 57:48
58:34 87:50
145:40 157:50
presume 188:24
pretrial 15:22
pretty 55:44 138:24
previous 157:26
previously 182:40
primarily 39:12
58:18 168:26
primary 28:22
32:24
principal 11:34
principle 154:46
155:30,48 156:20

156:38
principles 154:40
156:34 157:38
prior 58:12,20
62:26 63:24 84:24
117:20,46 147:32
priorities 94:38,46
priority 95:12,30
133:20
prisoner 58:28
prisoner's 150:38
private 14:38
pro 177:20
probably 26:34
38:26 55:50 65:20
91:46 105:34
120:24 160:30
problem 15:44
93:34 94:16 95:30
95:32 119:22
121:28 137:50
problem-solving
53:44 138:50
problems 20:30
45:10 53:14,26
124:22 137:14
144:46 147:44
151:28 187:10,20
187:20,22
procedural 128:44
128:46,50 129:40
178:24
procedures 4:40
49:44 108:48,50
152:32
proceed 29:42
96:20
proceedings 1:20
191:14,22
process 3:8 6:14,22
7:18,34 15:22
23:44 34:36,36
36:32,32 37:16,26
38:46 40:28 43:40
48:44 49:36 50:38
63:48 64:22 65:22

65:38,42 71:22
75:24 89:26 90:20
93:8 99:38 124:36
140:44 142:50
143:48 144:32
146:26 147:10
166:16 167:32
173:8,44 181:30
183:40 184:30
185:12 187:46
189:10,18 190:32
processes 71:34
84:36 178:50
producing 54:48
productive 24:42
professional 30:44
31:10 45:20 91:24
133:46 141:14
149:32 174:42
177:42
professionalism
9:16
professionals 79:24
97:46
professor 21:36
profiling 19:8
151:34 152:8
program 2:34
18:48 19:24 24:22
43:18,48 52:46
53:10,20,28,38
139:38,40 140:18
programs 19:50
24:28 42:30 58:26
76:42 140:34
progress 4:36
176:24
progressive 185:44
prohibit 182:44,46
182:48
project 8:42 12:22
14:34 24:20 59:48
89:36 99:12
101:42 111:30
144:28 154:12
176:40 177:8

project-manage...
34:42 35:14
projects 12:26 52:8
150:28
promise 142:48
177:32
promising 50:10,24
promoted 62:8
promotes 4:14
promotion 4:22
promotions 101:42
136:14
proof 185:40
proper 16:44
185:28,38
properly 126:48
185:24
proposal 6:32
proposals 6:28,38
8:32 111:48
132:34,36 188:40
proposed 3:16 4:30
6:10 39:46
prosecuted 33:36
prosecuting 18:20
23:50
prosecution 24:32
48:28
prosecutions 23:26
prosecutor 16:10
21:26 22:48,50
23:46 24:14 26:12
98:30,30,32,38
119:40,40 121:26
prosecutors 23:30
97:44 123:8
prosperous 163:44
protected 22:34
protecting 19:34
94:10
proud 19:10 20:10
20:34
proven 145:14
provide 2:48 5:8
7:26,42 42:32
76:42 151:46

166:8
provided 11:10
56:42 78:42
101:34
provides 8:32
11:18 136:28
providing 59:10
61:42
provisions 42:34
56:8 76:44 181:40
182:12,16
PSN 24:22,22
public 1:8 2:10
4:38,48 7:32,40
8:10 12:10,22
13:26 15:18 18:44
20:30 30:28 58:26
92:42 119:18
120:38,48 121:34
121:40 143:16
144:22 145:46
152:34,48 160:50
190:40
publish 5:24
published 160:34
pull 114:18 116:18
purpose 19:22
154:48,50 155:10
purposely 112:46
pursue 92:38
pursuit 46:10,18
92:30,44
pursuits 45:22,26
45:38,48 46:14
91:26,30 92:20,26
push 81:40 84:26
pushed 108:32
put 18:48 40:22
56:14 63:50
107:18,46 119:34
122:16 126:22
134:14 140:32
168:20 185:18
puts 71:22
putting 34:40 38:34
38:34,36 88:28,30

126:46

Q
---

qualifications 6:16
131:30,36
qualify 126:12
qualitative 86:10
quality 155:44
165:18 185:8
quant 102:50
quantitative 84:44
86:8
quarterly 14:50
161:14
question 9:32,36,40
9:42,44,48 29:42
32:34 52:40,40
55:50,50 69:24
84:24 89:34 95:18
95:18 96:32
114:10,30,32
117:36 118:14
119:30 120:12
125:10 128:40
129:20 130:14,28
134:32 136:22,36
137:38 138:20
142:10,14 169:40
178:8 183:42
184:20 189:12,22
questioning 119:48
questions 7:38 9:30
9:32 10:18,20,24
10:28,32,42 18:26
29:44 53:50 56:48
57:28,46 64:40
82:24,30 84:36
86:16 87:12 89:16
92:46 95:38,46
96:26,48 113:42
116:50 118:16
120:44 122:42
130:22 133:24
136:32 138:30
142:28,32 159:38
161:40 166:24,28

176:32 181:34
183:36 186:16
187:28 188:22
quick 46:32 51:50
quickly 53:50
72:28 116:14
152:44 175:8
Quintana 145:44
159:34 161:32
167:8 169:30
quite 52:10 70:26
71:8 74:34 83:38
87:50 107:30
114:34 121:46
122:10 131:10
137:40 152:10
164:40 175:26
quizzing 57:22
quote 45:18 91:24

R
---

racial 19:8 51:10
51:16 152:8
raise 9:50 10:10
96:28 142:12
raised 12:8 157:24
177:30
RAJCAN 1:32
191:8,48
ran 99:20
random 135:28
range 126:22 139:8
154:20
ranged 98:44
ranges 26:42
ranging 101:40
rank 18:34 54:14
ranking 20:18
ranks 181:12
Rasor-Cordero
97:20 101:8
123:26,28 125:22
rates 144:20 148:18
148:20
rationalize 66:14
RDR 1:34 191:49

reach 8:18 41:32
  42:10 74:14
  105:46 140:36
  155:38 161:16
reached 77:22
read 9:36 10:18,20
  10:30 55:30 69:48
  88:26 93:30
  102:50 108:30
  110:22,28 127:34
reading 86:10,14
  137:10,12
ready 57:20 76:28
  96:20 113:44
  141:46
real 29:20 46:32
  103:34 106:50
  107:20 110:32
  120:40 121:28
  137:50 157:36
  159:40 175:8
reality 107:40
  116:40
realization 104:8
realize 45:20 84:18
  91:26
really 18:38 19:14
  19:22,32,36,40
  20:24,26,34,36
  24:26 26:44 27:18
  28:46 31:28,34
  32:28,34 33:22
  34:46,50 35:14
  36:10,12,18 38:32
  42:42,44 43:22
  44:16,50 45:40
  46:38,42,48 47:10
  47:30,42 51:48
  55:42 57:32 65:36
  70:10 72:28 78:28
  88:20 91:10,50
  93:26,36,48 95:26
  105:32 110:30
  115:40 119:28
  125:50 128:28
  132:8,36 153:20

153:24,34 154:10
  155:50,50 156:38
  159:42,50 167:14
  168:30 169:32
  170:22 175:38,38
  175:44
realm 123:8
reason 27:38 68:44
  71:34 106:18
  112:14 122:24
  139:48
reasonably 118:50
reasons 104:46
  137:10
receive 188:30
received 11:24 14:8
  142:28
recessed 190:40
reciprocate 41:44
recognize 81:20
  147:36,46 148:36
  154:22 155:14
  156:8,10,12
recognized 118:46
recognizing 170:36
recommend 5:50
  8:18
recommendation
  8:14,22,24
recommendations
  52:30 94:24
  115:32 138:36
  166:18 183:8,24
  185:10 186:24
  188:42 190:22
reconvene 141:46
record 85:22
  152:20
recording 85:8,10
  85:16 157:12
records 81:16
recruit 180:50
recruited 19:20
recruiting 74:50
  179:18
recruitment 4:22

60:42 140:12
  179:12 180:38
rectify 72:12
Redeploy 150:20
redevelopment
  14:32
reduce 70:18 92:18
  148:8
reduced 150:22
  191:16
reentry 58:28
refer 101:30
referred 120:10
  127:24
referring 98:24
reflected 184:12
reform 7:18 15:44
  16:36 18:12,16,40
  19:24,40 20:10,38
  20:42 22:10,12,16
  25:46 26:46 27:22
  27:34,46 28:46
  29:30,36 34:48
  36:50 38:50 41:30
  42:50 44:44 51:42
  51:46 52:8,22
  58:8 59:26 60:28
  60:30 69:12 81:34
  88:12 111:36
  150:14 151:14
  152:14,14 168:42
reformers 27:50
reforms 4:16 19:44
  37:20 61:50 62:12
  108:28 111:24
  146:28 149:26
refrain 10:42
refuse 144:14
regard 60:50 89:30
  183:36
regarding 5:8
  11:20 34:24
  123:16 134:34,38
  136:34 167:44
  181:34
regardless 19:32

123:44
regards 69:36
regular 78:10
  160:40
reject 66:10
relate 84:36 119:46
  122:42 187:28
related 55:48
  117:44 119:30
  151:34 154:44
  155:36,44 158:18
  173:42 183:40
relates 60:18
  148:12 155:8
  171:18 179:30,42
  181:48
relating 92:48
  117:8,20 162:30
relations 98:48
  100:14 147:36,48
relationship 136:34
relationships 59:32
  140:40 147:38
  148:28 162:44
  174:44 181:18
relative 172:32
relatively 69:28
  137:18
released 6:28
relentless 167:12
relevant 10:32
  100:38 134:26
  185:40
relies 33:30
reluctance 131:22
  144:12 176:16
remaining 53:48
  138:30
remains 108:46
remedy 81:26
remedying 54:32
  82:48
remember 23:32
  40:12 44:40
  150:18 183:8
remind 141:48

190:20
reminded 190:28
reminding 155:10
remove 158:28
removes 71:22
renown 44:42
rep 73:20
repair 170:22
repeat 117:36
  134:46 136:8
report 4:36 15:48
  35:26 40:50 41:8
  55:30 72:18
  110:24,40 129:48
  130:22 166:32
reported 1:30
  118:28 191:12
Reporter 191:10
reporting 17:22
  35:46,48 70:22
  103:14 109:14,18
  109:20,22 135:24
  154:24
reports 5:26 8:38
  14:50 32:44 35:30
  38:36 86:12 93:30
  103:14 105:28
  108:14 109:16
  135:30,46
represent 38:22
  41:34 54:14 87:34
  88:24 106:8,8
  132:16
representative
  173:20
representatives
  6:42 38:18 106:46
  108:24
representing 58:34
reproduced 191:36
Request 6:28 8:32
requests 6:38
require 4:16
required 4:42
  98:18 145:24
  161:14 182:20

requirement 165:18 177:12

requirements 4:34 176:8

requires 4:30 5:32

requisite 137:42

reread 9:44

research 25:16,16 58:40,44 59:20 69:48 92:24 145:18 165:20,30

researchers 159:14

resident 150:8

residents 144:8,12 185:22

resign 87:44

resistance 56:22,24 56:26,28

resolution 187:22

resolve 165:34

resort 81:46

resource 60:44

resources 13:48 43:34 61:44 86:46 126:20 137:36 168:14,16,20

respect 9:16 30:12 30:14 32:32 55:34 91:12,14,16 92:50 103:18 118:40 123:42 143:42 156:34 185:34 188:50

respectful 22:24 30:28,32 124:12

respecting 123:40

respects 4:10 136:26

respond 7:36 44:26 79:24 104:14 161:40 162:8

response 46:10 58:18 60:22 78:26 125:46 189:14

responses 6:32

responsibilities

28:22,24

responsibility 32:22 89:42 186:44,48,50 187:16 191:34

responsive 171:26

rest 27:30 50:12 54:44,44 55:40 82:22 188:48

restore 30:8 64:48 128:34 161:48

result 52:32 81:38 94:28 138:40 184:14 186:26

resulted 136:46

results 34:42 73:40

retention 60:44

retired 11:42 14:36 118:18

retiring 60:12

return 14:8

Reverend 89:48

review 4:38 14:48 48:32 49:38 60:22 62:16 152:32

reviewed 168:28

reviewing 61:20 75:44 108:12,50 164:44

reviews 5:22 59:28 60:16

revised 4:40 168:30

revolve 44:18

revolving 89:18

rewarded 71:26

rewriting 122:12

rewrote 122:14,14

rhetoric 70:48

Rick 59:40 66:46 69:34 73:50 81:48 83:8 94:32 95:40

Rickman 146:14 174:30,38,40

riding 86:22

right 15:42 23:48 31:44 35:40 40:42

45:16 48:48 56:46 57:44 62:24 63:38 64:44 69:22 71:38 73:8,20 76:38 79:40 84:28 88:26 97:18 99:44 106:28,38 107:12 107:22 108:40 113:44 115:20,50 120:42 122:36,36 129:8,26 140:32 142:20 159:46 160:30 161:36,38 183:34 186:10

rights 4:10 8:42 12:50 13:16,36,38 22:32 23:26 26:12 26:50 54:34 56:40 59:48 62:36 82:48 123:16,42

riots 59:10

rise 31:36

risk 92:34,40 106:28

risk-benefit 92:26

RMR 1:34 191:49

road 110:32,46 136:28

roads 112:48

Robert 5:46

Rodney 145:8 147:20,22 162:14 170:34 179:8 183:26

role 2:50 10:32,36 13:34 38:46 39:24 39:30 48:48 51:14 59:12 63:14 68:22 70:12 75:8,24,26 87:14 90:10 92:48 101:32 104:46,50 105:8 116:12 119:32 148:38 157:8,10 183:38 184:24,50

roll 78:10

rolled 122:20,36

room 72:34 86:32 111:50 112:36,46 113:28 114:42 131:50 165:38

rooted 147:36 162:16,48 163:8

Rosenbaum 176:44 177:36,38

round 186:14

row 113:22

rule 46:16

rules 156:30

run 60:26 139:40

running 69:44 87:24 100:30 102:28

runs 139:10

Rush 23:36

Rutgers 27:30

S
---

s/ 191:48

Sacramento 59:46 59:48 60:8 61:10 83:40

safe 24:20 42:16 143:8 148:42,42 155:48

safely 30:22,24

safer 144:30 145:42 157:50

safety 4:16 100:14 139:36 145:46 163:38,40 186:48

sampling 135:30

San 20:20

sat 110:20,26

satisfied 55:12

satisfying 120:24

Saturday 26:34 113:26,32 143:34 143:34 190:32

save 18:26

saw 33:16 65:16 121:28

saying 28:16 53:10 55:26 63:20 153:8 172:10 178:42 182:26

says 84:26 91:24 114:44 117:16,40 122:48 176:38,44 183:42

scene 78:32

schedule 51:24 188:34

Scheduling 96:14

Schiff 96:8,12 143:12 177:18

Schiff-CNA 142:24

school 12:10,12,14 12:18 13:10,14,30 13:42 14:10 21:20 21:20 60:44 100:12 112:18,20 133:10 139:36 140:8,10,16

schools 74:30 139:46,48 152:34

science 59:16 165:20

Scott 23:12

Scouts 139:40

Seattle 26:24 61:28 61:30,46 62:24,26 62:32 77:30

second 6:50 23:46 24:40 49:40,40 60:24 67:36 101:30 102:48 104:50 116:16 118:14 119:30 155:30 166:42

secondhand 73:32

secondly 93:10

sections 161:16

see 17:12 20:42 27:38 29:12 47:12 48:38 50:16 55:10 55:46 60:46 63:38 67:40 69:12,34

71:48,50 82:8
87:16 90:10
102:40 108:46
111:46 113:26
116:36 122:16
129:14 135:30,42
141:14 144:12,18
151:18 163:30
167:26 176:50
180:50 182:24,36
183:20,24
seeing 12:44 55:18
65:26,28 73:40
seek 142:46 146:22
182:32
seeking 171:8
seen 33:34 43:46
45:36 55:32 62:40
80:22 90:26 92:16
92:24 108:30
132:50 177:22
segregated 12:8
select 174:8
selected 46:24
51:14 66:40
156:42 159:24
167:36 187:34
selecting 6:14
44:28 131:32
selection 3:8 6:22
7:34 39:8,34
43:38
self-analysis 66:30
76:36
semiannual 5:26
send 73:18
senior 35:48,50
57:46
sense 105:16,16
120:32 127:40
128:24,26,28
133:16 137:22
sensitive 102:20
156:16
separate 8:22 60:20
sergeant 135:42

sergeant's 7:26
Sergio 23:20 26:10
series 57:26 150:28
serious 92:34
seriously 93:18
136:38 183:50
184:10 185:16,30
185:36 188:44
servant 143:16
serve 4:14 25:30,46
74:48 148:44
179:42
served 14:38 18:36
26:12,22 55:20,22
70:34
serves 26:42 144:12
service 49:42 51:16
54:40 55:8 56:38
74:18
services 3:50 19:38
54:44 55:12 56:42
79:32,36 123:32
session 2:40 3:12
10:46
sessions 36:34
set 6:50 17:26
46:42 50:10 77:38
124:30 139:46
172:24 191:40
sets 171:50
settle 3:22 120:28
settlement 85:16
146:20,44 173:36
severe 24:38 45:44
sex 41:10 72:20,50
101:26 129:50
166:34
sexual 152:32
shape 157:12
share 10:50 155:36
156:30 159:12
shared 186:44,44
187:16
sharing 156:14
shepherd 61:48
shepherding 61:40

sheriff 15:18 83:48
sheriff's 61:18
83:40 84:8 101:12
101:14,22 123:30
151:48
shielded 42:24
shift 77:50
shocked 87:50
shooting 60:24
126:18
shootings 61:22
135:36
short 7:36 55:26
57:18 93:50 96:16
133:20 141:42
142:18 185:44
shorthand 191:10
191:14
shortly 142:16
show 24:32 66:26
72:32 74:20 88:20
169:28
showing 78:30
143:34 169:26
shown 92:26
sic 133:26
side 19:36 21:12
26:46,46,48,50
67:32,42 74:44
83:16 119:10
132:50
sides 65:22 132:22
sign 2:26,30 80:48
signal 9:50 10:12
signed 114:50
191:32
significant 43:12
44:8 66:22 83:46
152:18
significantly 42:40
47:36 126:22
signing 135:44
silence 31:48 39:18
79:44 80:12
127:26
silly 107:30

similar 65:50
104:22 130:14
151:14
simplified 38:50
simply 15:28 187:8
single 8:18 90:20
sits 27:18
sitting 15:42 16:30
16:50 51:20 52:18
75:16 76:10 99:44
101:48 165:38
situation 15:34
77:24 129:28
six 20:8 32:38
34:50 121:48
size 20:20 124:24
skepticism 176:18
skills 27:32 83:28
180:24
skipped 46:34
sky 116:42
slide 25:28 29:28
34:34 40:12 44:40
46:32 49:38
100:24 107:46
153:48 159:46
slides 34:34 111:34
152:42 153:16
slot 107:14,16
small 19:20
smaller 103:26
social 21:38 38:26
38:32 145:46
165:20
Sodiqa 145:38
157:42,46,48
181:14 187:50
188:10 190:36
sole 89:40
solid 121:46
solutions 64:28
72:10 187:20
solve 53:14 95:22
134:20 187:10
solving 33:28,38
somebody 120:48

122:28
someones 131:48
132:12
somewhat 55:28
133:24 134:12
son 22:36 37:40,48
son's 17:42
sons 17:38 37:38
sophisticated 46:48
sorry 35:40 57:30
79:48 82:18
134:44
sort 77:38 84:44
133:16 157:36
173:14
soul 153:22
sound 49:14
sounds 133:18
soup 85:34
source 32:24
140:12
sources 170:42,44
South 67:30,42
74:44 132:22
space 155:50
160:30,32
Spanish 2:28,34
sparse 69:28
speak 99:42 100:16
100:50 114:12
118:12 119:28,30
121:36 133:48
169:46 170:14
172:40 180:44
speaking 10:44
131:28 140:42
156:26
speaks 105:10
spearheaded 99:10
spearheads 105:46
special 14:40,46
23:30,46 24:14
25:30,46 164:40
specialists 97:46
specially 79:18
specific 37:24

56:36 72:8 78:12
78:46,48 92:34
98:44,50 142:36
160:10 176:32
186:38
specifically 31:50
33:46 79:46 80:14
89:20 90:22
117:26 125:12
127:28
specifics 154:38
189:28
sped 34:34
speed 127:18
spelled 17:28
spend 99:36 112:44
spent 18:28 27:24
34:32 40:16 58:22
67:28 101:10
102:16 121:44
122:50 143:14
147:22 174:42
spoke 89:14 112:14
114:32,32 116:8
121:38 188:12
spoken 130:46
spot 106:18
squad 102:12
squads 102:10,18
St 20:22 60:42,48
staff 9:50 10:12
83:30 137:34
160:46
stage 2:32 9:26,46
10:44 39:14
stake 18:8
stakeholder 7:10
stakeholders 5:8
7:8 54:14 106:40
107:8 108:20
146:24
stakeholders'
15:14
stamps 111:32
stand 63:20
standard 44:16

185:40
standards 119:46
179:22
standing 20:30
125:40
standpoint 85:18
stands 164:22
start 11:40 32:14
47:10 65:26,38
66:8 73:38 80:8
80:34 97:16
102:40 123:24
128:10,40 129:42
132:28 166:48
170:34 180:28
188:8
started 11:26 16:40
16:42 18:38 19:36
20:50 21:22,48
22:48 50:44 51:8
51:10 69:46 91:16
99:20 101:30
116:8 162:10
174:50 175:12,24
176:14
starting 19:22
52:44 132:30
starts 47:26 65:28
65:40 73:42 80:26
state 4:8 18:32,42
19:18 58:14 59:18
77:22 100:22
112:40 114:50
143:20 146:38
150:16 151:32
173:12,18,26
191:10
State's 15:18
174:20
statement 46:22
165:16 167:20
states 3:36 14:44
45:18 61:32 63:36
101:36 102:22
103:24 118:44
143:30

statewide 24:34
stay 5:34 10:30
14:16 35:24 46:50
80:36 140:38
stemming 3:36
stenographic
191:24
stenographically
191:12
step 66:18 84:48
124:42
steps 34:38 43:22
43:26
Steve 146:14
172:42 174:30,38
174:40
stick 111:26,26
stolen 92:40
StoneTurn 96:12
96:38 97:10
102:24 112:26
stood 19:10
stop 64:36 75:46
85:28 118:34,48
119:34 120:28
stop-and-frisk
94:44 100:46
117:8,12,20,30,44
119:32
stop-question-an...
118:24,26,32,38
118:42
stopping 120:40
stops 85:18 92:38
151:36,50 163:22
163:24
stories 69:50
156:14
story 153:14,14
174:48
straight 21:8 57:32
99:22 107:42,44
109:30
strategies 139:16
187:36
strategy 90:14

118:30,38 159:26
streamline 170:42
street 12:20 23:36
67:20 78:20
102:12 119:50
streets 74:36 89:20
strength 125:8
strengthen 163:32
strengths 47:30
stress 188:16
189:40
strictly 116:44
strikes 33:10
183:22
strive 50:48
strong 62:36 99:28
124:44 133:14
165:16,18
stronger 165:8
structure 35:44
46:48 163:26
structured 28:36
37:14
stuck 104:34
student 13:16
students 139:46
140:10,20
studies 21:38 27:8
59:36
study 28:34 55:30
73:10
stuff 121:22
subcomponents
53:32
subject 29:32
subject-matter
11:44,46 44:28
159:16
submissions 6:36
8:8
submit 8:22
submitted 6:30
7:38 142:32
submitting 11:18
subparagraphs
64:10

substance 159:40
substantial 125:30
substantive 4:18
substantively 86:32
success 28:44 29:20
124:40 147:40
158:42 177:24
successful 20:32
25:42 28:40,42
144:30 145:16
successfully 86:48
144:44 150:22
suggested 162:10
suggestions 166:8
suit 29:24
summarize 6:18
sunlight 66:34
super 70:20
supervise 163:10
supervising 102:30
supervision 4:24
163:10 171:24
supervisor 100:32
102:18
supervisors 136:16
171:26
supplement 134:28
supplemental 6:32
support 35:36
42:32 76:42
151:46
supposed 71:26
102:32 121:18
Supreme 15:12
118:44
sure 20:12 23:40
31:20 34:10,14
37:16 40:30,40
49:34 51:38 56:16
56:38 63:30 79:32
88:22 94:32 97:40
98:16 99:30
102:30 104:26,30
108:36 111:24
113:30 122:34
124:34 128:20

130:50 132:48
137:28 150:18
155:34 156:16
157:14 159:46
160:36 169:36
170:8,24 171:26
172:22 185:16,32
188:10,48 189:8
surely 148:36
surveillance 52:34
53:22 94:28
138:40 186:28
survey 55:10
165:30
surveys 5:14 36:36
42:14 103:12
165:24,24
survivors 42:20
suspect 92:42
suspected 118:50
sustained 184:42
185:42
sustainment 62:24
swath 106:32
swaths 110:40
symptomology
78:40
symptoms 78:22
synergy 28:8,28,34
system 71:24
129:20 150:12
151:16 182:18
183:10 184:36,40
185:46,48
systems 62:14,16
66:28 75:36 76:18
76:28,34 84:44,50
85:50 86:50 93:24
93:46 94:14
134:14,24

───────────
T
───────────
T 44:42
table 2:36 11:14
52:20 96:28 97:24
111:14

tackle 128:8
tackled 144:44
tactics 125:26,36
tag 33:46
take 25:10 26:30
45:34 48:36,40
57:38 66:20 75:40
84:40,48 126:44
141:20 152:50
171:10 179:20
180:46 183:10
188:42,44
taken 184:34
185:16,30,36
191:26
takes 127:16
149:34 176:50
177:14,26
talk 15:50 17:12,40
17:44 24:30 26:30
37:38 40:42 46:30
67:38 69:50 72:8
72:44 73:12,26
74:14,24,34,36
83:26,30 86:24
90:26 97:34
107:38 131:24,24
141:12 147:16
154:16,36 157:42
158:14 160:22
164:30 169:14
172:42 179:26
188:46
talked 16:24,24,46
25:36 33:16,18,24
33:26 38:28 46:46
56:30 67:36 72:48
74:10 81:48
170:38 172:8
talking 16:40,42
40:16,32 50:50
51:22 52:18 64:36
68:8 72:28 80:40
87:24 93:24
105:48,50 106:24
108:16,18,20,22

109:18 119:46
123:22 127:42,44
127:46 131:12
132:32 172:16
talks 163:20,22
Tampa 101:10
tangled 110:32
tap 86:36
target 125:34
126:18
targeted 123:12
task 3:42 18:46
tasks 133:34
taste 14:14
taught 21:34 22:30
teaching 14:22
43:44 83:28
100:36
team 2:48 5:20 8:18
8:50 9:14,46
10:20 11:30,36
16:44 17:18,24,30
18:10,14 23:18,20
23:50 25:20,28
26:32,36,42,42
27:32,40,40 28:8
28:10,14,36,48
29:12,14,30 31:50
32:48 34:8 35:34
35:46,48,50 37:24
38:36 39:38 40:14
42:32 43:16,28
46:42 47:12 49:10
50:14,26,30 57:24
60:22,24 62:34
63:46,50 64:22
68:28 72:30 76:24
76:42 78:26 79:46
79:50 80:14 82:36
84:18 90:12,16
97:12,12,18,26,36
98:24,26 100:40
102:38 103:32,42
104:42 105:8,24
105:46 109:46
112:32 113:14

115:26 122:42
123:14,22 124:50
127:28 130:38
141:28 142:22,42
143:12,40 144:26
144:38,50 145:32
145:34 148:50
149:22,42 151:10
151:20 152:26,40
153:20,24,28,38
153:50,50 154:8
154:10 158:12,18
158:32,46 159:28
160:8 167:10,46
169:14 172:28
173:22 182:8
183:28 187:34,36
187:50 188:46,50
team's 5:34 9:30,38
69:28 147:16
teamed 150:30
Teaming 27:26
teams 6:46,48 7:34
9:24,42 42:50
60:20 81:12
111:46 132:44
Teamster 14:44
tease 115:42
technical 31:28
58:42 59:20
101:34 145:20
152:42
techniques 27:28
27:32 43:36
technological 59:36
technology 8:44
62:14 64:16
126:28,34 153:10
tell 11:36,48 90:24
97:36 106:16
112:16 115:48
120:34 122:22
123:38 125:38
127:10 135:22
139:32 153:12,14
189:30

telling 83:44
ten 4:16 14:22
21:36 23:14 45:48
52:12 75:14 82:30
ten-minute 57:8
95:50 141:38
tend 80:32 83:12
95:12
tendency 91:46
tenets 129:40
term 23:18 174:20
174:24
termination 48:30
terms 67:8 118:36
124:8 129:22
139:14,24 141:16
141:22 158:40
160:8 165:24
167:22,32 176:32
185:8,14
Terry 118:42
121:38
test 19:12
testify 16:14,16
Texas 26:20
thank 2:22 22:40
29:40 31:14 54:26
56:48 57:12,14,16
57:42 64:42 89:32
95:34,40,42,44
96:50 102:46
113:16,18,42
122:40 127:20,20
129:44 138:26
141:26,34 142:20
142:38,40 143:36
149:44 152:24
153:40 159:32
161:30 166:22
172:26 176:28,30
177:34 178:38
183:34 188:10
189:50 190:16,16
190:30,34,36,38
theme 139:10
theological 133:26

tried 13:40 45:14
triggers 78:48
trooper 18:34
troubled 18:18
true 53:26 94:12,14
 125:18 176:38
 179:32 185:50
 191:20
truly 27:34 31:24
 123:14 147:46
 171:12 179:16
 187:16
trust 4:12 20:28
 30:8 31:30 33:8
 33:16,22,32,40
 38:10 41:26,28,36
 41:46 42:8 64:48
 73:34,42 75:34
 123:14 128:34
 144:20 146:30
 147:8 156:40,44
 161:48 170:14,14
 181:16,28
trust-builder 21:32
truth 153:12
try 9:34 15:20
 51:44 53:48 66:12
 80:38 138:28
 162:22 186:14
trying 28:26 33:42
 47:42 60:36 69:14
 82:10,20 84:30
 88:10,12,20
 147:42 174:44
 180:50
tuition 140:22
turn 11:12 53:20
 64:38 72:30
 147:12 149:36
 153:36 157:40
 190:20
tweaked 115:14
Twenty 18:30
two 5:16 14:16
 15:40 17:38 24:28
 24:28 28:50 30:14

36:12 60:20 87:44
 89:34 92:46
 100:28 106:36
 115:40 116:8
 140:24 155:20
 163:42 164:42
 170:36 174:34
 189:42,48
type 43:36 44:10
 63:40 73:12 93:44
 181:8
types 13:40 44:20
typewriting 191:16

_____
 U
U.S 13:12 14:24
 23:10,26 24:20,24
 103:44 127:8
 143:22,24
ugly 30:46,48
UIC 146:12
ultimately 5:40
 23:34 75:30 76:24
unbiased 129:26,30
uncommon 41:20
unconstitutional
 3:30 117:32
 119:24
undergrad 21:10
underlying 71:38
underscores
 110:48
understand 44:34
 45:8 47:42 49:22
 68:28,46 71:46,48
 82:8 129:16
 137:10,26 144:40
 155:26 158:50
understanding
 45:38 52:28 69:20
 77:40 94:22
 124:44 134:12,24
 138:34 141:14
 168:40 186:22
 188:26
understands

103:36 142:42
 144:26
understood 88:8
 93:30
underway 120:14
 168:44
undocumented
 41:12 72:20
 129:50 166:36
undoubtedly 45:44
unfilled 40:16
unfortunate 71:32
unfortunately
 37:46 71:40
 121:50
UNIDENTIFIED
 96:44 102:44
union 7:26
unions 54:14 62:42
unique 55:28,46
 68:30,32 103:42
 144:42 153:26
uniqueness 69:20
unit 18:44 78:28
 101:26
United 3:36 7:22
 61:32 63:36
 101:36 102:22
 103:24 118:44
 143:30
units 85:46 101:26
university 43:10
 52:48 59:50
 100:36 145:48
 146:10 180:44
unknown 112:48
unwarranted 38:8
urban 147:14,28
use 4:20 35:22
 60:42 64:14 75:42
 75:46 84:38 85:34
 92:16 114:26
 117:28 134:28
 135:34 144:18
 148:18 151:24
 160:34 171:10,14

171:16,20,34,46
 172:20 175:18
 180:46 189:38
use-of-force 126:8
uses 3:30 162:36
 163:20 172:14
usual 121:38
utilize 81:38 90:38
utilizing 90:26

_____
 V
v 173:50
valid 31:42
validate 66:34
 128:16,16
validating 128:20
value 147:38,46
 148:32,34,38
valued 163:12
Van 24:8
Vanecko 23:34,36
variety 10:28
 170:40
various 4:50 9:10
 138:48 164:46
 166:26
vault 76:10
vehicle 38:40
versed 97:48
versus 118:44
 119:12 150:46
 171:38
vet 132:46
viable 147:38,48
 171:16 180:24
vibrant 147:30
vice 21:50 22:18
 57:48 145:38
 157:50
victims 42:20 73:26
video 18:48
view 17:38 38:44
 68:18 75:22 92:48
 106:50 183:38
viewing 86:22
views 186:38

Village 20:24
violating 56:40
violation 171:36
violations 22:32
 48:32 54:34 82:50
 123:16
violence 42:22
 54:30 55:30
 101:26 102:12
 143:40 187:44
Virginia 21:44
vision 68:10
voice 34:16 37:34
 37:34 38:12,22
 41:40 45:12 49:24
 49:24,26,26 50:8
 52:20,50 53:16,18
 74:26 82:38
 124:36 157:16,18
 172:20
voices 40:50 42:16
 42:24 51:38 72:16
 129:46 155:34
 159:10 161:20
 166:30 167:16
 189:8
volume 1:16 164:24
vowed 14:10

_____
 W
waited 106:34
waiting 106:34
walk 38:10 74:36
 76:28 89:20
 111:32 156:40
walked 121:12
walking 12:44
 37:50 46:42
 120:48
want 16:16 28:20
 30:20,22 36:30,44
 36:44 37:48 38:8
 40:40 49:14,20,22
 49:22 50:40 51:38
 51:44,44 54:18
 56:46 63:20 68:36

72:26 74:12,24
80:46 81:44 82:34
95:22 97:16,34,36
99:42 100:22,26
100:32 106:28
107:46 108:36,36
110:10,18 113:16
113:18 114:38
115:8 120:34
123:24 128:40
129:32 130:30
132:46,48 141:48
147:12 152:38
153:18 155:14
156:16 158:46
159:44 160:20,20
160:22,24,36
167:14 168:36
169:32 170:44
172:42 180:46,46
187:50 188:18,20
188:24 189:8,40
wanted 27:38 36:28
40:30 142:32
149:50 188:16
190:16
wanting 57:44
wants 51:40 112:40
war 179:46,46,48
warranted 38:8
46:10
warrior 180:16
warriors 179:28
Washington 57:50
62:28 130:20
wasn't 19:46 51:20
104:18 120:28,30
122:38
watch 64:24
Watson 27:24
43:10
way 15:38 20:38,38
30:40 31:10,12,18
38:50 40:42 51:38
54:20,38 56:14
64:32 71:20 75:34

80:30 87:24
103:34 104:34,36
108:40 111:34
112:40 113:48
119:24 120:14,34
122:28,36 124:10
124:12 128:20
129:10 130:40
131:20 133:42
152:22 157:12,14
163:48 164:48
167:22,26 182:50
186:40
ways 15:20 50:46
65:48 85:10 91:46
133:40 155:16
160:26 162:24
185:48
we'll 11:26 17:50
39:38 44:20,22
64:36 89:10 96:48
115:14 142:22,26
154:36 155:36,46
156:30,50 157:38
160:30 177:16
183:18 184:50
185:16,22 186:10
we're 17:50 19:10
20:10,34 29:28
31:12 33:42 37:8
37:18,32 43:44
46:12 48:36,40
50:18 53:46 55:26
55:28 57:20,36
64:32 69:42 84:18
84:48 85:8 87:24
96:18,36 97:50
100:38 105:28,28
105:30 106:24,34
108:42,44,46
109:12 111:18
112:28,42,46,50
113:8,10 115:12
116:34,38 119:28
131:8,38,40
132:42 134:24

141:44 151:44
152:40 153:14
154:28 155:34
156:22,22,34,40
156:42 157:16,28
159:40,46 161:36
162:16 163:26
165:10,12,22,44
169:18,20 171:8
176:22 180:30
185:32,44,46
188:42,44,44,46
189:34,38
we've 19:48 20:18
20:30 27:42 28:26
33:26 34:32 41:22
42:18,20,22 43:46
45:14,36 50:28
52:10,10,14 59:22
60:50 67:8 68:14
69:46 93:24
107:12 108:30,30
116:34,36 126:44
131:50 138:26
148:28 149:40
179:26,46,46,48
wealth 50:26
weapons 127:10
Webb 23:30
website 11:18
105:28 130:44
161:8
wedding 23:22
week 32:36 47:16
51:8,10
weeks 7:48
welcome 2:10
66:26 113:42
Welfare 14:46
wellness 4:24 64:16
went 22:50 25:12
61:44 63:34 77:32
112:18 133:10,10
140:16 175:14
weren't 96:24
West 132:22

WHEREOF
191:40
white 12:36
wide 139:8 154:20
wiggle 112:36,46
114:42 131:50
Williams 145:38
157:42,46,48
181:14 188:10
190:36
willing 66:32
179:42
willingness 179:20
witness 13:24 24:12
24:12 191:40
witnesses 16:14,14
138:8
women 41:10 58:46
72:18 88:24
129:48 139:42
148:44 166:34
word 33:16 35:50
130:48 149:50
words 153:8 177:40
work 5:48 8:12
16:34,34 18:40
24:14 25:50 28:50
29:8 41:12,40
43:14,18 44:44
46:44,46,48 50:42
58:8,10,20,24,28
58:30,32,42 59:8
59:14,18,22 60:14
60:18 68:14 72:20
72:42 79:28 80:44
82:14 83:36 89:10
89:46,50 90:26
97:38 115:12
116:20 124:42
129:50 137:24
139:30 140:22
148:30 150:20
154:44 156:42
157:40 158:24
159:8 163:8
165:20,30 166:34

167:24 168:10,26
168:30,42 169:8
169:22,42,50
175:24,48 176:46
178:14,30 181:26
183:16 187:18,22
worked 21:10,16
21:22,24,26,28,30
21:40,42,50 22:8
22:14,18,26 23:12
23:28,48 24:10,12
27:42,48 39:34
41:22 42:20,22
55:34 58:30 60:10
79:10 88:50 89:8
90:46 98:46,48
101:12,36 102:10
112:18 117:26
121:22 127:50
143:18 150:26,40
152:16
workers 72:50
working 9:8 21:48
27:26 32:16 35:50
39:40 41:28 60:32
62:26,28 64:34
69:10 79:36 88:22
89:40 98:36
100:40,42 109:8
117:16 119:28
121:48 122:34
124:18 134:24
145:30 150:34
158:16 168:48
175:10 176:14
workplaces 22:24
works 25:50 102:24
112:24 120:14
world 21:14 27:16
54:46 83:22
wouldn't 31:40
104:34 132:48
140:26 175:22
wound 170:18
woven 92:10
wrap 163:26

wrapped 171:24
write 9:32,34
  111:30
writing 79:48
  116:34
written 6:32,36
  7:36 8:8,40 64:12
  70:40 135:20
  136:26 190:24
wrong 31:38 35:50
  40:40 63:40
  121:26,44 122:18
wrong-doers
  125:16
wrote 27:12,14

——————— X ———————

——————— Y ———————
Y's 74:32
yeah 35:40 48:16
  130:12 134:8,50
  135:18 153:42
  178:12,40 190:8
  190:26
year 5:16,36 13:34
  42:40 46:28 47:24
  47:34 49:50 62:8
  62:20 66:44 68:26
  115:46 126:12
  167:40 168:24,38
  169:16 188:18
yearly 126:26
years 5:16,28 12:38
  13:38 14:16,16,22
  15:10,40 17:38,42
  18:30,32 19:26,28
  20:8 21:8,18,30
  21:36 23:14 24:26
  25:12 26:20 33:26
  52:12 57:50 58:22
  59:24,46 60:10
  67:30 72:40 75:14
  87:48 93:32 98:36
  99:46 101:10
  102:16 118:20,32
  140:16,24 143:16

143:22 147:24
149:16 150:10,40
151:10 155:20
164:18 168:46
174:36 175:28
176:22 178:18,20
yesterday 6:48 69:8
  72:50 100:24
  106:42 110:20
  130:14
York 13:34,36
  22:50 33:36 52:46
  62:30 98:30,40
  99:46 100:44
  102:14 111:50,50
  117:18 119:10,42
  120:8,14 127:50
  131:42
young 44:12 139:28
  139:42 140:28
  181:20
youth 37:26,34,36
  37:44 38:12,12,16
  38:20,22,32,38
  73:46,50 74:24
  75:8,14,16 89:22
  90:24,26,28,32,34
  90:44,50 91:14
  100:16 140:36,42
  140:44 150:22,28
  150:30 151:42
  166:44 167:22,24
youths 141:8

——————— Z ———————
zero 72:34

——————— 0 ———————
084-002503 191:50

——————— 1 ———————
1 1:16
1-191 1:18
1,000-person 25:18
1:00 190:42
10 10:3
100 77:32 100:3

101 101:3
102 102:3
103 103:3
104 104:3
105 105:3
106 106:3
107 107:3
108 108:3
109 109:3
11 11:3 17:38
  102:44
110 110:3
111 111:3
112 112:3
113 113:3
114 114:3
115 115:3
116 116:3
117 117:3
118 118:3
119 119:3
12 12:3 47:8 98:36
12,000 126:24
  144:8
120 120:3
121 121:3
122 122:3
123 123:3
124 124:3
125 125:3
126 126:3
127 127:3
128 128:3
129 129:3
13 3:18 13:3 143:22
130 130:3
131 131:3
132 132:3
133 133:3
134 134:3
135 135:3
136 136:3
137 137:3
138 138:3
139 139:3
14 14:3 19:28 26:20

139:42 140:30
  143:22
14-year-old 37:40
140 140:3
141 141:3
142 142:3
143 143:3
144 144:3
145 145:3
146 146:3
147 147:3
148 148:3
149 149:3
15 15:3
150 150:3
151 151:3
152 152:3
153 153:3
154 154:3
155 155:3
156 156:3
157 157:3
158 158:3
159 159:3
16 16:3 118:20
160 160:3
161 161:3
162 162:3
163 163:3
164 164:3
165 165:3
166 166:3
167 167:3
168 168:3
169 169:3
17 17:3
170 170:3
171 171:3
172 172:3
173 173:3
174 174:3
175 175:3
176 176:3
177 177:3
178 178:3
179 179:3

18 18:3,32
180 180:3
181 181:3
182 182:3
183 183:3
184 184:3
185 185:3
186 186:3
187 187:3
188 188:3
189 189:3
18th 6:34
19 19:3
190 190:3
191 191:3
1968 13:18 14:12
1970s 58:46
1986 14:24
1994 14:24
1999 83:18
1st 6:42

——————— 2 ———————
2 2:3 47:8 117:36
  184:12
2,000 15:34
2.85 5:36
20 9:26 20:3 21:30
  58:22 96:44,46
  99:46 142:26
2000s 173:30
2002 118:20
2006 19:18
2009 19:16,20
  119:38
2010 14:38
2011 14:40
2012 60:12 61:32
2014 21:46
2016 3:40
2017 3:22 110:24
  110:34
2018 1:24 3:18
  190:44 191:42
21 21:3 139:42
22 22:3

23 23:3 143:14
24 24:3
24/7 161:10
2400-hour 177:12
25 25:3 101:10
25-year 101:48
26 26:3
27 27:3 143:16
27th 6:24
28 28:3
29 29:3 136:44

3
---

3 3:3 190:42
30 9:28 21:8 30:3
    51:14 96:40
    174:36 176:38
30-minute 10:22
31 31:3
32 32:3
33 33:3 59:44 60:10
    150:10
34 34:3
35 35:3
36 36:3
360-look 126:36
37 37:3
38 38:3
39 39:3
3rd 1:22

4
---

4 4:3
40 14:16 19:50 40:3
    52:8 147:24
    175:28
40-hour 77:42
41 41:3
42 42:3
43 43:3
44 44:3
45 45:3
46 46:3
47 47:3
48 48:3
49 49:3

5
---

5 5:3 87:32
50 9:26 50:3 59:24
    77:50 87:32 96:42
51 51:3
52 52:3
53 53:3
53,000-person
    99:14
54 54:3
55 55:3
56 56:3
57 57:3 165:50
58 58:3
581 64:8
59 59:3
5th 11:24

6
---

6 6:3
60 60:3 77:48
60s 59:12
61 61:3
62 62:3
63 63:3
64 64:3
65 65:3
656 165:50
66 66:3
67 67:3
68 68:3
69 69:3
696 166:8
6th 191:42

7
---

7 7:3
70 70:3
700 189:22 190:16
70s 59:12
71 71:3
72 72:3
73 73:3
74 74:3
75 75:3 116:16
    189:30

---

76 76:3
77 77:3
78 67:30 78:3
79 79:3

8
---

8 8:3 17:42
80 80:3
800 177:10,14
81 81:3
82 82:3
83 83:3
84 84:3
85 85:3
86 86:3
87 87:3
88 88:3
89 89:3

9
---

9 9:3
9:30 1:24
90 90:3
90s 83:24
91 91:3
92 92:3
93 93:3
94 94:3
95 95:3
96 96:3
97 97:3
97,000 118:26
98 98:3
99 99:3