

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF ILLINOIS,) Case No. 17 C 6260
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF CHICAGO,) Chicago, Illinois
) April 14, 2026
Defendant.) 1:07 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE REBECCA R. PALLMEYER

APPEARANCES:

For the State: OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
BY: MS. MARY GRIEB
MR. WILLIAM A. LOWRY, JR.
100 W. Randolph Street, 11th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
BY: MR. MICHAEL M. TRESNOWSKI
MR. CHRISTOPHER G. WELLS
MS. ELENA S. METH
115 S. LaSalle Street, 35th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603

For the City: TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
BY: MR. ALLAN T. SLAGEL
111 E. Wacker, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601

For the Coalition: ROGER BALDWIN FOUNDATION OF ACLU, INC.
BY: MS. MICHELLE T. GARCIA
150 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60601

For the Monitor: ARENTFOX SCHIFF LLP
BY: MS. MARGARET A. HICKEY
MR. ANTHONY-RAY SEPULVEDA
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 7100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

1 APPEARANCES CONT'D:

2 Also Present: Superintendent Larry Snelling, CPD
3 Commander Joe Berlage, CPD
4 Deputy Director Noé Flores, CPD
5 Executive Director Allyson Clark Henson,
6 CPD
7 Michael Harrington, Network 49
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Court Reporter: HANNAH WILLIAMS, RMR, CRR, FCRR
22 Official Court Reporter
23 219 S. Dearborn Street, Room 2504
24 Chicago, Illinois 60604

25 * * * * *
PROCEEDINGS REPORTED BY STENOTYPE
TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED USING COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

1 (Proceedings heard by video:)

2 THE COURT: Well, good afternoon, everyone. Thank you
3 for joining us for our monthly public hearing. Happy to have
4 you here and happy to hear where we stand with respect to the
5 ongoing progress on our Consent Decree.

6 Just as a reminder, please recall that you are not
7 permitted to record or make a transcript of today's proceeding
8 in any way. The monitor will obtain and post a transcript as
9 she always does on the monitor website and that source of
10 information is the best place to find out what's going on and
11 to see specifically what happened at these hearings if that's
12 what you'd like to do.

13 Let me begin then by hearing from the Monitor with
14 brief opening remarks and then we'll proceed with the rest of
15 our agenda.

16 MS. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honor, and thank you to
17 all of you who are joining us for our monthly status hearing.
18 My name's Maggie Hickey and I am the independent monitor for
19 the Consent Decree.

20 During today's public hearing, we will hear from the
21 parties to the Consent Decree, the City of Chicago, and the
22 Office of the Attorney General. They will provide us with
23 status updates regarding use of force, the Workforce Allocation
24 Study, and the Civic Consulting Alliance Project.

25 Before I turn it over to the parties, I would first

1 I like to highlight that the Independent Monitoring Team filed, I
2 would say this morning but maybe just moments before this
3 hearing, Independent Monitoring Report Number 13. This latest
4 monitoring report provides an update on the City of Chicago and
5 the Chicago Police Department's compliance progress through the
6 13th reporting period, which was from July 1st, 2025, through
7 December 31st of 2005.

8 For the original 552 monitorable paragraphs, the City
9 has now achieved at least preliminary compliance with 536
10 paragraphs, approximately 97 percent of the Consent Decree; at
11 least secondary compliance with 395 paragraphs, about
12 72 percent of the original monitorable paragraphs; and full
13 compliance with 146 paragraphs or approximately 26 percent of
14 the original monitorable paragraphs.

15 In addition to the paragraphs where the City and the
16 CPD maintain compliance, the City gained additional levels of
17 compliance in the 13th reporting period with about 60 of these
18 paragraphs, including 13 paragraphs that moved into preliminary
19 compliance, 29 paragraphs that moved into secondary compliance,
20 and 18 paragraphs that moved into full compliance.

21 As I stated above, most of the City and CPD's
22 compliance gains were made towards secondary compliance. This
23 is consistent with the fact that the City and the CPD continue
24 to improve their systems to incorporate community perspectives
25 into the development and delivery of CPD training.

1 As the parties continue to provide updates every
2 month, the work is ongoing, and there is still much to do and
3 much to improve upon, but the City and the CPD are positioned
4 for continued progress in 2026.

5 Sustaining progress and momentum will require aligning
6 staffing and resources with the Consent Decree and community
7 needs and demonstrating an ability to transparently
8 self-evaluate and adjust course when needed. We hope that the
9 recent Workforce Allocation Study that will be discussed here
10 today can serve as a guide for the City and the CPD.

11 Because we have a full agenda on critical topics, I
12 will provide a more thorough overview of IMR 13 at next month's
13 public hearing on May 12th, 2026.

14 Finally, I would also like to highlight some
15 additional changes to the public hearing schedule.
16 Specifically the Community Policing section is moving from
17 May to the June hearing, and the Performance Evaluation System
18 is moving from July to May. As a result, the topics of next
19 month's hearing will be Impartial Policing section and the
20 Performance Evaluation System. The June hearing will now focus
21 on Crisis Intervention and Community Policing.

22 The updated schedule will be available on our website,
23 CPDMonitoringTeam.com. Thank you, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Hickey, and thank you as
25 always for -- not only for the report that we're about to

1 review but also for maintaining the CPD's Monitoring Team
2 website, which is, again, a great way to keep track of what's
3 going on.

4 All right. The next item on our agenda this afternoon
5 is a presentation from the superintendent about the Use of
6 Force Policy and I know we'll be hearing from Mr. Snelling, and
7 I believe Mr. Tresnowski of the Illinois Attorney General will
8 be responding.

9 MR. SNELLING: First of all, good afternoon, Your
10 Honor. It's good to see you again.

11 THE COURT: You too.

12 MR. SNELLING: And good afternoon to everyone on the
13 call. I'm going to try to go through this as briefly as I
14 possibly can. It's a lot of information. But we have several
15 other presentations after this, so I just want to hit the heavy
16 points.

17 So when we're talking about use of force, we can go
18 back to 2015 when we really got started working to bring down
19 uses of force and deal with our use of force policy on a
20 different level that was going to work for everyone, not only
21 our police department, but for our community members.

22 So I can tell you from 2015, this department is
23 completely different from what it once was, especially as it
24 relates to the use of force. Now when we talk about
25 deescalation and we talk about how often officers use force, in

1 95 percent of the encounters in the field, there's no force
2 used by officers when they're responding to jobs. And
3 unfortunately, that other 5 percent usually are cases where
4 things have not worked out on a level of deescalation.

5 That being said, deescalation doesn't mean that
6 there's no force used. Deescalation can also mean that there
7 was a lower level of force used than what was -- what would
8 have been justified. And we've taken the mindset that just
9 because you can does not mean that you should.

10 So if you look back at the sheet that we're looking at
11 right now, we look at the establishment of force mitigation
12 principles and the sanctity of human life, where we reaffirmed
13 that that's our number one priority.

14 In 2016, there was an expansion of the Taser and
15 availability of alternative uses of force, because in the
16 Laquan McDonald case, if you really study that case, there were
17 officers calling for a Taser and there wasn't one available.
18 So because of that, we expanded the availability of Tasers and
19 now all officers carry those now to avoid having to use a
20 higher level of force.

21 The Force Review Board or Force Review was created at
22 the Department level to review all uses of force. We solicited
23 information from SMEs, our subject matter experts, and got
24 feedback on our policies. We also made major revisions to our
25 use of force policies, our Use of Force Model, which I'll show

1 you pretty soon here.

2 So when the Consent Decree came into play in 2019,
3 2020, obviously this was something that was a priority for the
4 Department and we started to build training around those
5 Consent Decree policies.

6 In 2020, 2021, the mayor convened a Use of Force
7 Community Working Group. And you'll see later in this
8 presentation where we continue to engage the community when it
9 relates to use of force in development of our policies. And as
10 time changes, obviously we have to be fluid and we change with
11 those times.

12 When we look at revisions to our deescalation policy,
13 once again, bringing everyone in. We also brought mental
14 health experts in, which was part of the training that was
15 designed in 2017, which was our force mitigation training.

16 Community engagement, we continued to engage the
17 community and like we said, we're going to talk about that.

18 Now the establishment of TRED has been extremely
19 important. You know, as we create our policies and we deal
20 with our officers in our training, we have to take into
21 consideration the Safety Act, because it affected a lot of how
22 our officers are responding to jobs and what the expectations
23 are around that.

24 So let's move to the next slide.

25 So this is our Use of Force Model. I'm proud to say

1 that a lot of work went into this. I designed this in 2017 and
2 it was approved. Now what this is, it's a training tool and
3 it's a quick reference guide for officers in the field. These
4 are posted around all of our districts, no matter where you go,
5 headquarters. And they also have them in their FOP books, so
6 they can refer to this as quickly as possible.

7 Now just to give you a quick overview of what this is,
8 when we talk about the subject's actions and the member's
9 proportional response, we expect our officers, that when they
10 respond to resistance, when they respond to someone we have
11 categorized as an assailant, we expect those officers to use
12 the minimal amount of force necessary to take that subject into
13 custody, as long as it doesn't jeopardize lives and the officer
14 is not responding to something immediately where force is
15 necessary and it's a split-second decision that has to be made.

16 So there's a sliding scale here. Where you see
17 deescalation and escalation, where we see a subject escalate,
18 the officer can raise a level of response in order to stop a
19 threat. But as the subject 's actions change, the officer will
20 do the same. So we expect our officers to scale back when the
21 subject's actions also scale back. So we want this to be
22 professional -- proportional.

23 So if you look underneath, everything is color-coded
24 here. So when we identify a subject from someone who's
25 cooperative all the way up to an assailant and deadly force,

1 when you look beneath the member's proportional response, these
2 are all of the force options that an officer can use under
3 these circumstances.

4 Now what we have found in the field is that not all
5 officers are using the highest level of force, even though they
6 can, based on this model. They're using lower levels of force
7 and they're deescalating. So once again, deescalation does not
8 mean that we're not using force. It just means that we're not
9 using the highest level of force.

10 So next slide, please.

11 So if you look at -- once again, our use of force
12 guidelines, I kind of went over that, just to talk about how we
13 overcome a subject's actions, and just a sliding scale of the
14 use of force and the response.

15 Our force mitigation principles, now this was
16 extremely important, to stop our officers from rushing in. The
17 principles of force mitigation, obviously continual
18 communication, that means calling for additional resources if
19 they have to so that officers are not alone, you have more
20 officers on scene, planning, you take a step back because
21 that's your tactical positioning, not rushing in, keeping a
22 distance, and using that time as a tactic. And what that
23 means, using time as a tactic, is that I keep a distance,
24 that's my tactical positioning, I then call for additional
25 resources. I continually communicate with the person who I'm

1 trying to deescalate under these circumstances.

2 So when we can get deescalation tactics into place, we
3 see less force being used. So we expanded force mitigation
4 into everything that we're doing right now.

5 All of our training, and this is currently, in 2026,
6 as we see things, when we see things from the Force Review
7 Board, things that we see from TRED, we then add that to
8 training. We get the opportunity now to assess, review some
9 things that officers are doing, and we can now add that to our
10 training.

11 Next slide, please.

12 So, again, we want our officers to understand the
13 Fourth Amendment, which is what all of this is built around.
14 The force has to be reasonable and absolutely necessary, and it
15 has to be reasonable based on the totality of the
16 circumstances. And we're looking for officers to be able to
17 explain that they're using that level of force to overcome
18 resistance or someone who is fighting. We want to do that, if
19 we can avoid injury, that we want to do this in the best way
20 possible.

21 Sometimes using a lower level of force sooner will
22 stop an officer from having to use a higher level of force
23 later. We can give examples of that later, if you have
24 questions, Your Honor.

25 And then 2026, once again, we just stress to officers

1 to use the minimum amount of force necessary at the time, as
2 long as it doesn't jeopardize the safety of officers and any
3 citizens who are around or any residents that our officers are
4 sworn to protect.

5 We can move onto the next one.

6 So, again, we went over the Use of Force Model.
7 Obviously it's a guideline. It's not the entire order. It's
8 just a quick reference guide for our officers. So when we look
9 at prohibitions, this is important and this is all a part of
10 our training. Obviously the use of excessive force,
11 unprofessional conduct, use of force based on bias or protected
12 characteristics, punishment for retaliation, this is all a part
13 of our training. We want to make sure that our officers
14 understand the First Amendment.

15 Now we push that and we've pushed that like really
16 hard. You saw it pan out during the 2024 Democratic National
17 Convention, and the number of protests that we've handled
18 across this city, which is in the hundreds, and we haven't had
19 any major incidents with this.

20 So deadly force will always be a last resort and we
21 pay special attention to chokeholds, which we do not teach.
22 And it's a deadly force, use of force, and so we keep a close
23 eye on that ever since the Eric Garner incident out in New
24 York.

25 So we don't want our officers to be disrespectful, and

1 this is where we talk to them about condescending language. We
2 prohibit the use of force against someone who is a threat to no
3 one other than themselves. So someone threatening suicide, we
4 don't want our officers rushing in. This is where now we bring
5 in the SWAT teams and they do an excellent job of deescalation
6 when it comes to that.

7 So can we go to the next slide?

8 So when we talk about our detention aides who are
9 working in our lockups, they also have to complete tactical
10 response reports and the TRED unit reviews those also. So just
11 because someone is in lockup and they're not a sworn member of
12 the Department, it does not mean that they're not bound by our
13 rules when it comes to use of force.

14 So our tactical response reports, our new requirements
15 for reporting have expanded, which is why you see more tactical
16 response reports being completed. We want to make sure that
17 our officers are completing them properly. The initial
18 response from a supervisor would be a sergeant who does the
19 first level, and then from that point, it would be the watch
20 commander to complete the review, and then move that forward.

21 So, again, 2026, obviously the expansion of control
22 holds, which was not a reportable use of force before. So
23 prior to this, I believe it was 2024, it was not a reportable
24 use of force if you used nothing more than a control hold, for
25 someone was considered a resister or an active resister in this

1 way. I can say this, the TRED unit is doing an excellent job
2 of following up with this, giving us feedback as a department
3 on what they're seeing, and it's also helping us identify
4 patterns of behavior. So if we see patterns of practice,
5 patterns of behavior, this gives us the opportunity during
6 debriefings to come up with training and make recommendations.

7 Okay. Let's move onto the next.

8 So I won't spend too much time on this because we'll
9 talk a lot more about this later, but transparency is the most
10 important thing. Our annual Use of Force Report and our
11 Tactical Review and Evaluations Division Report, those are all
12 available on our website. And we'll talk about this a little
13 later.

14 Let's move to the next one.

15 So when we talk about transparency, this is extremely
16 important. Being able to go right to our website and being
17 able to see what we're doing, what we're reporting, I think
18 it's helpful in a lot of ways. It can help educate the public.
19 It allows the public to know that we're not hiding anything.
20 And what we have up there, justified, not justified, whatever
21 the outcome is, that information will be on our website. So
22 you will get the opportunity to go into our website and see
23 reportable uses of force, numbers, things of that nature. And
24 we just -- we have to be transparent if we're going to gain
25 public trust here.

1 All right. Move to the next one.

2 So when we look at the number of hours that -- since
3 we've started training, if you look, force mitigation, that was
4 a training that I designed in 2016, and during that time, this
5 was taking all of those policies into place in order to bring
6 down police-involved shootings, excessive uses of force. And
7 what this training was designed to do was to get out of the way
8 that we've always taught officers. And the way that we've
9 always responded to situations of excessive force is by
10 creating training that would tell officers what they shouldn't
11 do and what they can't do. And we realized that we needed to
12 train officers not only on what they shouldn't and what they
13 can't do, but what they should and what they can do.

14 So those are -- that was the expectation that when
15 these officers showed up here, not only would they get training
16 on prohibitions, but they would get the training on how we
17 expected them to respond. We put them through this training
18 and once the training was done, we did what was called a
19 student-centered feedback model, where we got the officers to
20 talk about what they did, what they were feeling at the time,
21 and we were able to continue to have that training evolve based
22 on that feedback.

23 So, again, the Use of Force Policy update, there was a
24 four-hour training there. I went through that myself. We put
25 a cadre of officers together. We actually brought in some

1 outside SMEs to create that training. We worked directly with
2 Legal Affairs and DOL to get that done.

3 So our Use of Force, eight hours' training. And then
4 the Use of Force in 2019, the 16-hour training, this was
5 something that helped us along with the demands of the Consent
6 Decree.

7 So in 2021, our Deescalation, Response to Resistance,
8 and Use of Force, this was an eight-hour training. So what we
9 saw here is that we continued to build on the training from
10 2016 and have that training evolve as the years continued on,
11 and obviously to build upon the Consent Decree here.

12 So our Deescalation, again, eight hours of training.
13 And then once again, the Force Mitigation Training continues.
14 This is our inservice training. For the most part, when
15 officers left the academy in the past, they didn't get this
16 kind of training. They didn't go back to the academy to get
17 this kind of training. So now this type of inservice training
18 not only gives them the training, but it's a reminder of what
19 the expectations are. And we refresh these officers because
20 sometimes when officers are in the field, the skill set can
21 deteriorate, so this kind of training keeps them fresh. Okay?
22 So once again, another 16 hours of Force Mitigation training in
23 2026.

24 So let's move to the next slide.

25 So, yeah, I'll just close it out, because I'm going to

1 turn this over to our newly promoted Commander Joe Berlage.
2 But it's important to understand where we've come with our use
3 of force. You'll see later on in the presentation the decrease
4 in police-involved shootings and major uses of force. You will
5 see regardless of what is being reported, that we're actually
6 using less force when we look at pre-pandemic numbers.

7 So our training, I believe we've done an excellent
8 job. It doesn't mean we're spiking the football. We still
9 have a ways to go. We're going to continue to do what we need
10 to do to bring certain things down. And the next step is to
11 talk about our firearm-pointing incidents and what we're doing
12 with that.

13 So with that, Your Honor, I'll just stop and ask if
14 you have any questions.

15 THE COURT: I don't. Thank you for that report. It
16 was useful to see the slides and I often ask that you get those
17 slides to me. I would love to have a set of them. I know
18 someone in your office can do that.

19 But are there others who have questions for the
20 superintendent?

21 MS. HICKEY: The IMT does not, Your Honor.

22 MR. SNELLING: Okay. All right. I'm going to turn it
23 over to, and congratulations to, our newly promoted Commander
24 James Berlage.

25 THE COURT: Congratulations, and we're happy to hear

1 from you.

2 MR. BERLAGE: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon.
3 Thank you, Superintendent. Good afternoon, everyone.

4 So I'm going to talk a little bit about
5 firearm-pointing incidents, give an update on some of the data,
6 what some of the things that we're doing. Going to turn it
7 over to deputy director of SID to talk a little bit more use of
8 force data, get into the -- a little bit more detail, and then
9 I'll close that up with information about what we're doing with
10 all this data and the sup. will do final remarks.

11 If you can go to the next slide, please.

12 So CPD adopted a firearm-pointing policy in 2019.
13 Essentially what this policy requires officers to do is
14 whenever they're involved in a firearm-pointing incident,
15 meaning they point their firearm at a person, they must make a
16 notification to the Office of Emergency Management and
17 Communication, so their dispatcher. Once their dispatcher
18 enters that notification in, a report is automatically
19 generated. That's how CPD is tracking these occurrences, where
20 they happen, when they happen.

21 So 2020 was the first full year that CPD collected
22 data, so only really six full years of data. And what we see
23 since 2020 is there has been an upward trend. That being said,
24 in 2025, it has leveled off. There was an increase of less
25 than half a percent in 2025.

1 What I'm going to talk about now, though, is the
2 launch of the Firearm-Pointing District Level Review Program,
3 which is a program in which district captains review these
4 firearm-pointing incidents. TRED has been reviewing these
5 since the beginning, but this program is a little bit
6 different.

7 If you can go to the next slide.

8 So with this program, all firearm-pointing incidents
9 do go to TRED through that report I mentioned. And TRED then
10 takes -- does the intake and assignment of those
11 firearm-pointing reports.

12 In order to be eligible for this pilot program, there
13 have to be three components. First, it must involve a district
14 level officer and it must have occurred within that officer's
15 district of assignment. That's step number one. Number two,
16 there cannot be an associated foot pursuit. If there is, then
17 TRED maintains review authority over that incident. Finally
18 there cannot be an associated use of force. Again, if there
19 is, TRED maintains review authority.

20 So if it checks all three of those, then -- and it's
21 eligible, then what TRED does is assemble all of the reports,
22 all of the video, primarily the body-worn camera video, and
23 forwards that packet of information to the district captain.

24 Next slide.

25 Once the district captain receives that packet and

1 they -- they will then conduct their review for multiple
2 purposes: Number one, to determine if the firearm-pointing
3 incident was within policy, first and foremost; second, to
4 identify any issues that require corrective action or if there
5 was anything -- any exemplary behavior that can be held up as a
6 positive example; third, they need to ensure that chain of
7 command takes corrective action with the member when
8 appropriate.

9 That said, what we're seeing in practice is the
10 captain, him or herself, is directly taking that corrective
11 action. They are the ones that watch the video. They are the
12 ones that have read the reports, are most familiar with the
13 incident, and they are the ones taking that corrective action,
14 taking ownership. And then of course that all gets documented
15 within something called the Incident Debriefing Report, because
16 once that report is completed, all the data in that report
17 feeds into our systems for synthesis, analysis, and feedback.

18 These reviews need to be done, per the Consent Decree,
19 within 30 days, and we are pleased to report that the captains
20 are doing very, very well with this 30-day. They are coming in
21 under the mark, or under the deadline.

22 Again, as I mentioned, once the reports are all done,
23 they go back to TRED and become part of the overall TRED
24 analysis.

25 Next slide.

1 So this pilot program was rolled out in three
2 different groups. First group was December of 2024, and then
3 two more groups every six months after. So what you're seeing
4 on the right is -- and I mentioned before, there was an overall
5 0.2 percent increase in 2025, but what you're seeing to the
6 right is sort of the breakdown of that increase.

7 And we broke it down by, first of all, citywide versus
8 the Group 1 captains, and the reason we analyzed the Group 1
9 captains is they were in place for the entire year. You know,
10 the first six months of course, they were still getting
11 comfortable with this new program, but by July, they were
12 really rolling. So we look at the first half, the second half,
13 and then we're looking at the entire city versus just those
14 Group 1 captains.

15 So what you see in the first half is citywide
16 firearm-pointings increase 9 percent, but within those Group 1
17 captains who had just been trained, it was fairly even, just a
18 half a percentage point increase.

19 What we saw a big difference was in the second half.
20 There was an 8 percent decrease citywide but that was really
21 led by the captain of the Group 1 districts, with, again, a
22 decrease of 16 percent, so fairly significant at the end of the
23 day.

24 Group 2 and Group 3 data is still under review, due to
25 the relative newness of those groups. And to be honest,

1 quantitative analysis is somewhat limited, just because of the
2 relative newness of the program. We -- and Deputy
3 Director Flores will talk about this, we like to look at trends
4 over longer periods of time.

5 That being said, the initial feedback has been
6 extremely positive. And we are continuing to expand and
7 enhance this program as part of our accountability systems and
8 as part of CPD's mission to be a learning, self-correcting
9 organization.

10 And with that, I will turn it over to Deputy
11 Director Flores from SID.

12 THE COURT: Well, thank you.

13 MR. FLORES: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Your
14 Honor and everybody else. Also my name is Noé Flores. I'm the
15 deputy director for the Office of Analysis and Evaluation. So
16 we are generally tasked with all the data and analytics for the
17 police department.

18 So if you go to the next slide, please, Casey.

19 So one of the things that we set out to examine and my
20 office was to try to get a picture of use of force data and
21 trends and some of the long-term effects of some of the policy
22 implementation and training explained by the superintendent
23 earlier.

24 And much to Commander Berlage --

25 (Interruption by court reporter.)

1 MR. FLORES: So we set out to examine use of force
2 data to get a picture of the trends and the long-term effects
3 of some of the policy implementations and the training that was
4 explained by the superintendent earlier. TRED analysis as a
5 whole relies on us using multiple years of data evaluation.

6 What became clear to us is that we had three distinct
7 periods of CPD history we're looking at. From 2010 to 2016 was
8 that pre-Consent Decree era, 2017 to 2019 was that transition
9 era with the investigation and the decree negotiations. We had
10 to account for the pandemic because it was such an anomalous
11 event, in not just CPD history but human history, that we had
12 to kind of account for that sort of suppression of police
13 activity and other activity. And then what we're left with is
14 now that new 2023 to current new baseline period.

15 So in our case, examined long-term data. We started
16 our analysis in 2010. By doing that, we did want to look,
17 again, at a few numbers. We're trying to look at current
18 reform cycle and we can see from the slide is that current
19 force levels are rising from the lows of the pandemic, but,
20 again, that's -- we consider it an anomalous period.

21 But you can see that there is a 25 percent decrease in
22 the average of use of force incidents when you look at the
23 pre-pandemic period from 2010 to 2019, compared to 2023 to
24 2025. So it appears from the trends that CPD is settling into
25 a lower kind of baseline for use of force incidents.

1 And then recent use of force reports also align with
2 the implementations of the new policies, new training, the new
3 reporting we have to do for use of force incidents. And the
4 Tactical Review and Evaluation Division increased focus on the
5 strength in reporting requirements and standards for our
6 department.

7 Next slide, Casey.

8 So one of the things we want to point out with our
9 analysis is that despite some perceptions, force, and I think
10 the superintendent mentioned this, is used in really a small
11 fraction of police interactions. When you look at it with
12 respect to arrests, force is typically used less than 5 percent
13 of the time. If we look at ISR data, force is typically used
14 less than 2 percent of the time; for TSSS data, less than
15 1 percent.

16 And of note there is that the most common interaction
17 for officers tends to be those traffic stops, and that also
18 corresponds with the lowest number of force incidents. The
19 higher frequency of arrests or use of force incidents with
20 arrests reflects that force is most often applied when our
21 officers do have to engage in what is required to lawfully take
22 someone into custody.

23 And the significance of what we're trying to show here
24 is that to provide some perspective into why benchmarking
25 against the actual police activities can provide a more

1 accurate measure of officer behavior, particularly with use of
2 force.

3 Next slide, Casey.

4 So this is just a breakdown of type of force commonly
5 used. CPD has a three-level classification system. The
6 prevailing category is Level 1, and that makes up approximately
7 two-thirds of all reported incidents, and they involve no
8 weapon and result in no injury, consisting primarily of
9 compliance techniques.

10 The commonality of these lower intensity interventions
11 to manage resistance, before it requires a high level of force
12 or deadly force, it shows a shift towards lower-force outcomes
13 for the Department as a whole, and also points to some of the
14 previously reviewed points by the sup. and Commander Berlage
15 that CPD's modern use of force policies and deescalation
16 training appear to be having a positive impact on use of force
17 as a whole.

18 Next slide, Casey.

19 So this kind of gives you a frequency of the different
20 types of force measured by the TRRs. And what you can see is
21 that physical force and control tactics make up the majority of
22 reportable use of force types in our TRR data.

23 One of the things that you can look at is if you drill
24 down into some of that physical force and control tactics is
25 that push and physical redirection and takedowns become some of

1 the most utilized methods for gaining compliance.

2 And I believe -- I don't recall, maybe
3 Commander Berlage can correct me, I forget what year we
4 implemented the reporting for that. That was something that
5 prior to 2021 I believe was not a reportable use of force for
6 some of the push and physical redirection.

7 Next slide, Casey.

8 So this, you kind of get into some of the more
9 significant use of force measures, and we can see we're looking
10 at data for OC spray and Taser use. So slice the information
11 in three different periods, if you look at OC spray, pre-COVID,
12 we averaged about 138 OC sprays between 2010 to 2019 period.
13 That average now from 2023 to 2025 is down to about 23.

14 You see very similar trends with Taser use. You know,
15 pre-COVID, again, during that period from 2010 to 2019, we
16 averaged about 497 Taser incidents per year. That is now down
17 to about 99 Taser incidents per year from 2023 to 2025.

18 Next slide, Casey.

19 So this is officer's firearm discharge information.
20 And once again, what you're looking at here is very similar
21 kind of downward trends when you look at the whole spectrum of
22 the timeline. And you can see overtime that we follow very
23 similar trend, metrics to a much lower baseline of incidents
24 where an officer was required to use their weapon.

25 Looking at OC -- sorry. Got a little confused here.

1 Yeah. So, again, that average is -- used to be much higher.
2 If you're looking at the first five years, kind of 2010 to
3 2015, just to get like a little deeper kind of perspective, CPD
4 was involved in a firearm discharge incident about once every
5 five days. If we look at that last five years from 2021 to
6 2025, that number stands about one firearm discharge among CPD
7 every 15 days or so, or about twice a month if you want to look
8 at it that way, so a significant kind of decrease in firearm
9 use.

10 Next slide, please, Casey.

11 And in terms of examining all the trends, one of the
12 final things we wanted to take a look at in terms of like use
13 of force and then that final perspective, but kind of just to
14 see if all the trends were kind of lining up with respect to
15 use of force, use of force types, what type of force, so we
16 took a look at the trends in complaints of excessive force.

17 And what we were seeing here is an overlay of
18 excessive force complaints measured by the total number of
19 allegations and total number of cases. Similar to the use of
20 force incidents, complaints of excessive force had seen a
21 significant decline in those periods that we discussed. So you
22 can see from the charts, prior to -- in that 2010 to 2019, we
23 averaged about 2,242 allegations per year. That's down to
24 about 842 allegations per year.

25 If you look at it with respect to cases, which cases

1 is kind of like the parents of the allegation, we used to
2 average about 826 cases per year. That is now down to about
3 490 cases per year.

4 And, again, this kind of data is I think reenforcing
5 the idea that the Department's internal training are working to
6 prevent some of the misconduct reports happening out in the
7 field.

8 Next slide, Casey.

9 So one of the things we were involved in is we were
10 part of an effort to commission some research on use of force
11 from a team of professors from University of Texas-San Antonio
12 and UPenn. The research conducted by the professors examined
13 racial, ethnic, and gender differences in CPD use of force from
14 2020 to 2023.

15 And what they found is that CPD uses force most often
16 in encounters involving black and Hispanic males predominantly,
17 and their findings align with research conducted in other
18 departments across the United States. A big differentiation in
19 what their work did and I want to mention it is that they
20 examined these differences related to different benchmarks, so
21 they didn't rely on just the basic demographic population.
22 They relied on some of those encounters we discussed earlier,
23 levels of crime within the community, and that is -- those were
24 considerations that had some effect on their outcomes.

25 Next slide, Casey.

1 So this is a very brief blurb on the results, but I
2 think we will be posting this on our website. But after
3 counting -- essentially after accounting for such factors like
4 arrests, report of suspect demographics, and even factoring
5 resistance levels, they found that while black and Hispanic
6 individuals experienced slightly higher levels of force in
7 their most complicated models, these disparities became less
8 significant when some other factors were considered, such as
9 the beat location or the individual officer information.

10 And the study suggests that systemic factors, rather
11 than individual outliers, outlier officer and potential bias
12 could be the primary drivers of these patterns.

13 The study highlights that rather than -- is that high
14 arrest volume and crime rates in certain beats were the most
15 significant predictors with respect to use of force and that's
16 something we could use internally as a department to kind of
17 gauge use of force data and trends in our department.

18 Another thing they found was that the distribution of
19 force by officers generally align across racial groups. And
20 what that means is that, you know, when you look at the
21 resistance from certain demographics, corresponding to the
22 response by the officers, that response by the officers tends
23 to be pretty aligned across all the different demographics and
24 it did show a variance across the different racial makeups.

25 And, again, there's more to this study which we could

1 get into, but I'm going to pass part of this over to
2 Commander Berlage and he's going to explain some more of this
3 and take it from there.

4 Any questions, I should add. Sorry.

5 THE COURT: None from me right now. That was very
6 comprehensive. Thank you for the information and the data you
7 gathered. Are there other questions?

8 MR. FLORES: Thank you. Commander?

9 MR. BERLAGE: Thank you, Deputy Director.

10 So what I'm going to talk about now, now that we have
11 all this research, we have all this trend analysis, what are we
12 doing with it? That's really the most important question that
13 can be asked at this point. What are we doing with it?

14 So first and foremost, I just want to acknowledge, CPD
15 wants to acknowledge that force does occur more frequently in
16 certain communities with certain demographics. That is a fact.
17 We know that. And so what we're focused on is this idea that
18 there are a lot of factors that contribute to this pattern.
19 There are officer-related factors, things like training,
20 experience. The superintendent talked a lot about training.
21 I'm going to talk about that a little bit more too. But
22 there's also characteristics of the person that an officer's
23 interacting with.

24 And then finally there are environmental conditions,
25 societal conditions. And so what we're looking at is what is

1 it that CPD has control over, what is it CPD has influence
2 over, and what are we concerned about.

3 And so our efforts are really, really focused on those
4 areas, control and influence, because that's where we can have
5 the biggest impact on what we're doing, the work that we're
6 doing.

7 Next slide, please.

8 So here are some of the areas that we're really
9 focused on. Again, big impact, we talked about policy. CPD
10 currently is reviewing as part of their two-year review process
11 for use of force policy, the sup.'s going to talk a little bit
12 more about this. We have some opportunities for the community
13 to give feedback on this coming up.

14 Training, the superintendent talked a lot about
15 training. This annual Deescalation Training, it's been -- it's
16 become a part of our culture here, part of our training
17 culture. We continue to get it year after year after year.

18 Impartial Policing Training, we know that everyone has
19 implicit bias. Research bears that out. And so the key is,
20 how do you manage that. And we continue to receive training.
21 We'll continue to receive training on managing that and
22 policing constitutionally.

23 Supervision, I talked about the District Level Review
24 Program. Again, it's early on, but so far, you know,
25 qualitatively at least, it's having an important impact on

1 supervision and accountability.

2 We're looking to launch a Leadership Training Program
3 later this year that will go into next year.

4 Fourth, and this is something that has gotten much,
5 much better in recent years, and that's the trend analysis and
6 the feedback loops. We are currently developing monthly
7 meetings with the areas that we hope to launch early next year
8 officially, which -- and with the training division, but the
9 idea is that we will have a regular cadence of meeting with all
10 the different areas and districts and training to give
11 feedback, so that they can make improvements where they're
12 needed, again, part of that self-correcting, learning
13 organization.

14 Accountability, talked about that under supervision,
15 but we've worked on both nondisciplinary things like our
16 supervisors, coaching, mentoring, training, and disciplinary,
17 COPA, BIA, all of those systems in place. They all work
18 together to make sure that policing is constitutional and
19 within policy.

20 Increased transparency, we're going to -- the
21 superintendent already put up the QR codes to our annual
22 reporting and our data dashboards. We're going to talk a
23 little bit more about that too.

24 Another big thing that's happened this year is now
25 officers must provide their information in writing after all

1 stops. So for example, investigatory stops, we now have a stop
2 receipt where the officer gives their information in writing.

3 And then finally, community feedback, already talked a
4 little bit about that, but we do have some engagements that are
5 coming up that we really want the community involved in.

6 Next slide, please.

7 So the superintendent talked a lot about this. The
8 principles of force mitigation, deescalation, the importance of
9 that. Our highest priority is the sanctity of human life, and
10 deescalation plays a big part in that. Our ultimate goal is
11 voluntary compliance. That is the ultimate goal, because when
12 there's voluntary compliance, there is little to no risk of
13 injury, little to no risk of complaints of excessive force,
14 of -- all those things tend to go away when there's voluntary
15 compliance.

16 But sometimes, despite best efforts, it doesn't work,
17 and force has to be used. It's important that we all
18 understand and not fall into the trap of thinking that use of
19 force -- a use of force is a failure of deescalation. That is
20 not the case at all. Sometimes force is necessary. But even
21 when it is necessary, that deescalation can have a very, very
22 important impact on the outcome of that effect, because it can
23 lower the level of force needed to take control in a given
24 situation or person.

25 Next slide, please. And I apologize, I'm just getting

1 over a cold.

2 THE COURT: No problem.

3 MR. BERLAGE: So one of the things that the
4 superintendent showed was the force options model that he
5 created. And what the professors did, going back to Deputy
6 Director Flores in some of the research he was talking about,
7 one of the things that they did was assigned a value to both
8 the subject or person's actions and the member's response. So
9 think of it as 1 being low resistance, 5 being high resistance,
10 assailant behavior, and then on the officer's end, 1 being
11 low-level verbal direction, and on the high end being deadly
12 force.

13 And so at the risk of oversimplifying what they did
14 was they took the averages of all of those different values, of
15 the maximum force used, the maximum resistance that was -- they
16 were met with, and then they compared those. They compared a
17 person's resistance to typically what an officer would do in
18 response. And what they found was, in fact, that officers tend
19 to use less force than what's the maximum that's allowed.

20 So the superintendent talked a lot about, you know,
21 deescalation training. We started to train officers on what
22 they should do, not just what they can't do, but what they
23 should do. And so what this research really supports is the
24 fact that this training, this deescalation being such an
25 important part of our culture, is having an effect on outcomes

1 and different use of force incidents, meaning it doesn't always
2 prevent the use of force. The vast majority of time, it does.

3 But in those cases that it doesn't, what the research
4 is showing us is that the force, the level of force required to
5 get control of a situation is lessened. And so this just
6 continues to support the efforts that the Department is
7 undertaking to focus on deescalation, both within policy,
8 within training, within our culture.

9 Next slide, please.

10 So I want to acknowledge that there has been
11 disappointment in the community with how long it took us to
12 publish the professor's report. We acknowledge that. We have
13 to do better. We will do better. We did spend significant
14 time going through the analysis and the research and this is,
15 you know, in part a result of that. But, again, we will do
16 better in the timeliness of publishing these reports.

17 So what CPD has done, and there's a QR code on the
18 screen there, is we published a Frequently Asked Questions
19 page. Those questions and answers focus on not only the
20 professor's report, but also use of force topics in general
21 that are of interest to the community that we've gotten before.

22 Also within that site is a link to the full research
23 paper. So we encourage people to check it out, you can have
24 access to the full study, all of the data, the tables, the
25 graphs, everything that was part of that study.

1 With that, I will turn it back over to the
2 superintendent, unless there are any questions.

3 THE COURT: Any questions?

4 Well, thank you and congratulations again. I think
5 we're ready to hear then again from the superintendent.

6 MR. BERLAGE: Thank you.

7 MR. SNELLING: Thank you, James and Noé, for those
8 presentations.

9 And, you know, as you can see, it's really important
10 that we get information out to the public. I think in the
11 past, one of the big problems that we've had is not having
12 communication with the parties who are concerned about this,
13 educating from our perspective, opening things up to the
14 public, and having these conversations so that we can educate
15 the members on what it is or the public on what it is that our
16 members are doing and the training around it.

17 The other thing is, it allows us to have that
18 face-to-face feedback with community members, which is
19 extremely important. Sometimes things that are just on paper,
20 those things can be interpreted in the way that the reader
21 interprets those things, and it doesn't really tell you all of
22 the factors. But when you get to sit with people, have
23 conversations, it's extremely helpful to our progress moving
24 forward.

25 Which is why, you know, if you look at the engagements

1 that we had in 2025, our community conversations, the things we
2 did with our colleges, our City Colleges, our community member
3 meetings, and just like -- just posting comments, the same
4 thing, feedback, which is really important. And that was one
5 of the things that we focused on last year. One of the
6 complaints that we got when we met with community members, you
7 know, "We would put forth information, but we never heard
8 anything back." So we were more focused on making sure that we
9 got back to people who put forth the effort to get us
10 information.

11 And, again, data transparency, making sure that we
12 have things available for the public to see on our website.
13 Okay.

14 So these are our upcoming events. So if you look, we
15 have a youth conversation at Lawrence Hall from 7 to 8. And
16 that's really important. I mean, if you think about the teen
17 trends and things that are going on, right now our officers are
18 coming in contact with youth a lot more than they have in the
19 past because of these things, because of the teen takeovers,
20 things of that nature. So these types of conversations are
21 extremely important, especially to talk about what's happening
22 now.

23 May 21st, Community Conversation, at my alma mater,
24 DePaul, and Build Chicago, the Restorative Justice Conference.
25 Once again, something that's important to those who have been

1 in the system and just having conversations and hopefully we
2 can kind of spread the message that the Chicago Police
3 Department is working in partnership with others, and their
4 concerns, we're listening to.

5 June 16th, another Community Conversation at Hyde Park
6 Art Center.

7 June 16th, another Youth Conversation, and June 17th,
8 Civic Engagement at Build Chicago.

9 So these are things that we are continuing to do. We
10 want to make sure that we're engaging the public as we do this.

11 So, Your Honor, at this point, do you have any
12 questions?

13 THE COURT: No. I want to echo your observation,
14 Superintendent Snelling, that the really -- communicating with
15 the public what is and is not going on is just vital to getting
16 their buy-in and recognition that the police officers are doing
17 everything they can to do it right. So let's continue that.
18 That's great.

19 Are there other questions for the superintendent or
20 the other people that we heard from the Department?

21 MS. HICKEY: No, Your Honor, but I did kind of want to
22 give the panelists and the public that's viewing this an
23 update. While comments have run long, it was on a very
24 important topic, use of force, that I think provided a lot of
25 information for the public.

1 But also, CPD does have additional information
2 regarding the Workforce Allocation Study and the community
3 input report also. And so we are going to run longer and I
4 expect that it will run an extra 30 minutes. I know Your Honor
5 told me earlier that you did have that extra time, but I just
6 wanted to alert the Court.

7 So then I will turn it back over to the City and CPD
8 to continue their presentations.

9 THE COURT: Yeah, and I want to confirm, I have time.
10 I don't want people to feel constrained. I'd like to, you
11 know, be as comprehensive as we can be.

12 Do we need to hear next from the AG?

13 MR. TRESNOWSKI: Yes.

14 MS. HICKEY: Yes, Your Honor, we'll hear from them on
15 this topic and we'll go to CPD. I apologize. I didn't have my
16 agenda right in front of me. I was just trying to inform the
17 public. Sorry about that.

18 THE COURT: No problem. Okay.

19 Mr. Tresnowski, did you want to hold forth on the
20 issue of use of force?

21 MR. TRESNOWSKI: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. Mike
22 Tresnowski from the Illinois Office of the Attorney General.

23 OAG is pleased once again to address the issue of the
24 CPD's use of force in today's hearing. You know, as we just
25 heard Superintendent Snelling and Commander Berlage discuss,

1 CPD has incorporated deescalation principles into its policy,
2 its training, and CPD consistently highlights the important of
3 deescalation.

4 But we do know, and as we've noted at prior hearings,
5 there are concerning trends regarding the increases in use of
6 force, and as the Coalition highlighted in their
7 September 19th, 2025, notice of enforcement, some very
8 concerning trends: A 98 percent increase in the use of force
9 against children from 2022 to 2024, a 42.9 percent increase in
10 the use of deadly force from 2023 to 2024; a 43.9 percent
11 increase in firearm-pointing incidents from 2022 to 2024.

12 And so when the Coalition says in that letter that to
13 assess compliance with the Consent Decree, we need to look
14 beyond just CPD's policies and trainings, we wholeheartedly
15 agree. The Consent Decree requires officers to put changes
16 into practice on the ground on a daily basis.

17 So to take one example, Paragraph 164 of the Consent
18 Decree says CPD officers must only use force when it is
19 objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the
20 totality of the circumstances.

21 So this is an example of a paragraph that requires
22 more than just policies and training. It describes a standard
23 CPD officers must meet each and every time force is used. When
24 an officer pulls or pushes someone in the course of
25 handcuffing, it must meet this standard. When an officer uses

1 a Taser, it must meet this standard. When an officer fires a
2 gun, it must meet this standard.

3 So we believe that now is an appropriate time given
4 the progress that CPD has made in its policies and trainings to
5 discuss among the parties, how are we going to ultimately
6 measure full compliance with paragraphs such as Paragraph 164?
7 And when the Monitoring Team assessed 164 in 2023, it said CPD
8 can get into full compliance with the review of the data and
9 the outcomes regarding the use of force.

10 We believe it's appropriate to talk about a full scale
11 review of compliance with paragraphs such as these. The review
12 could involve pulling a representative sample of use of force
13 incidents and asking about each incident. Was this use of
14 force reasonable? Was this use of force necessary? Was this
15 use of force proportional? Was the use of force in line with
16 the Department's commitment to deescalation?

17 The analysis of these questions could be made public,
18 the parties could discuss amongst each other what percentage of
19 CPD's uses of force are meeting with the Consent Decree's
20 requirement. And following such an analysis, the parties can
21 craft targeted interventions to address areas where CPD is not
22 complying with the standard.

23 This type of assessment would be the first step to
24 getting at the bottom of some of the concerning trends we've
25 seen. As the Coalition has rightly noted, the Consent Decree

1 requires more than just policies and trainings. There needs to
2 be a shift in the way force is used by police officers on a
3 daily basis. And we believe that a targeted discussion of full
4 compliance with paragraphs like Paragraph 164 are a useful next
5 step to assess whether the Department has made the required
6 shift.

7 So we look forward to having these conversations with
8 the parties at upcoming use of force meetings and site visits
9 later this month. Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Thank you. Questions for Mr. Tresnowski?

11 MR. WELLS: Your Honor, if I could, this is Chris
12 Wells from the Attorney General's Office.

13 I just wanted to also kind of take a step back and
14 reflect on the presentation that we just saw in terms of what I
15 do think we've seen in terms of a transformation in the
16 Department and how we track use of force and the transparency
17 around use of force. I think one of the reasons that we're
18 able to talk about trends and spot areas of concern and work to
19 address them is because of the increase in data collection,
20 reporting, and analysis of those trends.

21 And I think the presentations that you saw today are
22 reflective of a department that, as the superintendent noted
23 earlier, it looks a lot different in how it approaches this
24 issue than we -- than when we first started this process.
25 That's not to say that there aren't still concerning trends, as

1 my colleague just pointed out, I think we're actively working
2 to address, but we are in a very different world than when we
3 started this process.

4 And I think the presentation on use of force is a real
5 core issue, at the heart of the Consent Decree, shows the
6 extent to which things have shifted at the Department and there
7 is a different culture, there's a willingness to interrogate
8 these data trends and to try to work towards solutions, that I
9 just feel it's incumbent on us to acknowledge the progress and
10 that's based even as there remains work to be done.

11 THE COURT: Well said. Thank you.

12 All right. Anything further from the Attorney
13 General?

14 Okay. The Monitor's correct that we have further
15 progress to make here this afternoon. I think we're ready to
16 move on, though, is that right, to the Workforce Allocation
17 Study?

18 MS. HICKEY: That's correct, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: All right. Great. Well, Ms. Clark Henson
20 I think will be speaking to us first about that.

21 MS. CLARK HENSON: Thank you. Good afternoon, Your
22 Honor. Good afternoon, everyone. I know that we've had two
23 massive reports that had just recently been published and I
24 just want to provide an overview summary of the highlights of
25 both of those briefly.

1 So over the past year and a half, two rebated but
2 distinct studies were conducted by external independent
3 entities, resulting in the Workforce Allocation Study and the
4 Community Policing Assessment.

5 So this briefing is going to outline these two
6 complementary efforts, which work in concert to offer CPD a
7 clear roadmap to fighting crime and making every community,
8 Chicago community safer.

9 CPD requested these reports because we saw a clear
10 opportunity to strengthen our crime-fighting capacity and
11 improve public safety outcomes across Chicago by streamlining
12 staffing assignments and focusing on Community Policing
13 strategies, which is consistent with Consent Decree
14 requirements. Together, they're designed to ensure we're
15 making the most effective use of personnel while strengthening
16 trust in collaboration with the communities that we serve.

17 The work is grounded in extensive community
18 engagement, with over 1,100 residents and dozens of advisory
19 bodies who consistently emphasized a very shared set of
20 expectations. We had very consistent themes across all of
21 these engagements. What we've heard is communities want
22 officers who are visible or approachable and assigned
23 consistently enough to know their neighborhoods, who respond to
24 calls, and also have a followup afterwards. They also
25 emphasize fairness, accountability, and the importance of

1 timely proactive responses supported by strong communication
2 and transparency.

3 Community Policing as we know is a proven approach to
4 building relationships of trust and collaboration so that
5 working together, officers and communities can prevent violence
6 and solve crimes.

7 As reflected in both reports, this works best not as a
8 standalone program but as a department wide responsibility,
9 where essentially in effect Community Policing is simply
10 synonymous with policing. The Workforce Allocation creates the
11 conditions like proactive and geographic stability while the
12 Community Policing Assessment defines how that time should be
13 best used to strengthen public safety outcomes.

14 So, again, we see what the community consistently was
15 asking for. They want those officers who are familiar and
16 really know their neighborhoods, that visibility,
17 approachability, and followthrough, reliable response and
18 problem solving. But what is needed to create that is a stable
19 geographic assignment, enough proactive time for problem
20 solving, and clear spans of control.

21 And during the implementation, we know we need to
22 improve training and accountability, tech-enabled problem
23 solving, as well as consistent and sustainable feedback and
24 followups. The Workforce Allocation Study is the structural
25 foundation for this work --

1 You can go to the next slide now.

2 -- in how CPD allocates its personnel to meet
3 operational demand and improve public service delivery.

4 So the study is by far the most comprehensive analysis
5 CPD has ever undertaken. Different studies in the past did not
6 evaluate staffing needs across every bureau, every unit, every
7 function, like this study did, taking into consideration nearly
8 a thousand assignments.

9 Importantly as well, this study builds on earlier
10 public deliverables, including the organizational profile
11 documents and the interim framework report, reflecting an
12 iterative transparent process. The study is not designed as a
13 onetime snapshot but is a replicable model with varying
14 methodologies applied that CPD can use over time as conditions
15 change, such as calls for service volume, types of calls for
16 service, or other workload obligations as they change.

17 Again, I just want to highlight another uniqueness
18 about this particular study. It's a replicable tool that will
19 be handed off so that we can pivot and change to optimize our
20 resources as expectations or requirements change.

21 Again, the study found a structural imbalance between
22 workload and staffing. In many areas, foreign personnel are
23 performing work that does not require sworn authority or skill
24 set and while in particular patrol and supervisory functions
25 are experiencing ongoing strain. So supervisory structures in

1 particular have not been able to keep pace with organizational
2 complexity, which is limiting accountability and coaching
3 capacities. The pressures are not evenly distributed. It's
4 found they vary very significantly by geographic -- geography,
5 bureau, and function.

6 And they also identify opportunities to redeploy
7 approximately 600 sworn positions through civilianization,
8 ensuring officers are focused on the crime fighting and
9 community safety work that only they can do.

10 Next slide.

11 So I talked about the civilianization, what it is and
12 what it is not. It is a reallocation strategy, not a reduction
13 strategy. It is intended to optimize all staffing resources.
14 It's designed to align personnel with the work that best
15 matches their training and their authority. It allows sworn
16 officers to focus on core law enforcement duties while
17 strengthening technical and administrative capacity.

18 All of the staffing figures are planning level
19 estimates based off of current staffing. I just want to
20 highlight that because it did not include existing vacancies.
21 These are not accounted for in those net staffing needs.

22 604 sworn positions were identified potentially for
23 civilianization. And some existing civilian roles were --
24 require an increase in staff. Civilianization primarily serves
25 as an offset to sworn needs, which are outlined by unit

1 throughout the report. The analysis recommended adding 273
2 patrol officers in order not to have to rebalance by removing
3 officers from any district, 90 patrol sergeants and 26 TAC team
4 sergeants to meet the Span of Control requirements, and 67
5 detectives and investigative units, which does include some
6 rebalancing.

7 Additionally, there were 205 sworn roles identified in
8 various bureaus of multiple ranks, rank types, adding up to a
9 total of 661 sworn positions required across all bureaus.

10 The study -- next slide.

11 The study also found significant variation in patrol
12 workload across districts and sectors. So what that means is
13 even when staffing appeared evenly distributed on paper,
14 service levels were not found to be equal in practice. So
15 high-demand areas experiencing lower proactive time and longer
16 response.

17 This is has real implications for community trust,
18 officer fatigue, and the perceptions of fairness across service
19 delivery in neighborhoods. So using proactive time as a
20 benchmark for patrol operations is critical to improving both
21 the public safety outcomes as well as community trust.

22 The study found about 32 sectors have calls for
23 service whose totals are greater than 20 percent from the
24 average, many much higher than that.

25 This issue is amplified by each district having the

1 same number of sectors. So every district all have three
2 sectors. Matrix has recommended in 12 of those busiest
3 sectors, to be divided into two, and combining the two slowest
4 sectors.

5 The sector reconfiguration would allow for boundaries
6 to be readjusted with neighboring sectors and instances where
7 doing so would resolve neighborhood integrity issues, while
8 equalizing workload.

9 There's obviously a lot to consider with this
10 recommendation, but ultimately the goal of these changes would
11 be to ensure that team size is more consistent, there's
12 adequate supervision, leaving district boundaries the same, but
13 significantly improving workload equity and service delivery
14 across all the neighborhoods.

15 The study recommends also moving away from Community
16 Policing roles, silo Community Policing roles, towards a model
17 where all of the officers share the responsibility for
18 community-focused policing. This approach ensures that
19 Community Policing is embedded into the daily operations,
20 rather than limited to specialized assignments like we had seen
21 in programs such as the Neighborhood Policing Initiative, NPI.

22 This is also very consistent findings that they had in
23 the Community Policing Assessments, so both assessments came to
24 the same finding.

25 Within our CAPS CORE Program, Matrix recommended the

1 merge -- we merge the functionality of our CAPS office staffing
2 with the district coordination officers. They also
3 specifically recommended shifting away from having Community
4 Policing roles that are serving only dedicated populations but
5 rather shift that to dedicated geographic areas, and, again,
6 this is very consistent with the -- with what we heard from the
7 community's desire for officers who are familiar and really
8 know them and their neighborhoods.

9 And these recommendations are expanded upon in the
10 Community Policing Assessment and are complementary to one
11 another.

12 So just to transition there with the Community
13 Policing Assessment, this project complements the Workforce
14 Allocation Study, by focusing not on how many officers we have
15 or where they are assigned, but rather how these officers are
16 engaging with the communities to problem solve and prevent
17 crime.

18 The assessment was conducted over two years and
19 examines whether Community Policing is embedded department wide
20 or remain siloed. And as I stated, both studies believe this
21 needs to be embedded department wide. It was informed by over
22 1,100 community members, hundreds of CPD personnel, along with
23 national research and peer comparisons. Its purpose is to
24 operationalize Community Policing as a core responsibility
25 across the entire department.

1 The assessment found that Community Policing is often
2 viewed as a specialized function which limits consistency and
3 accountability. Both community members and officers support
4 the principles but identify barriers such as limited proactive
5 time, unclear expectation, and staffing shortages. So this
6 reenforces the need to align our staffing structures with our
7 Community Policing goals.

8 The assessment resulted in a number of
9 recommendations. It recommends embedding a customer service
10 approach to policing through training, accountability, and
11 leadership.

12 It also calls for consistent geographic assignments
13 and sufficient proactive time that supports relationship
14 building and problem solving. Technology-enabled systems and
15 clear expectations will be necessary to ensure every officer
16 contributes to the community-focused outcomes.

17 Everyday interactions --

18 You can go to the next slide, please.

19 -- are the foundation of trust and must be supported
20 by the structured engagement and clear communication, so the
21 assessment emphasizes improving community feedback systems,
22 strengthening partnerships, and providing accessible
23 public-facing information to improve both transparency and
24 understanding.

25 And lastly, the assessment highlighted the importance

1 of understanding CPD's history and its impact on community
2 perception. It calls for leadership accountability and
3 department wide training to reenforce the tenets of procedural
4 justice, both externally and internally.

5 Next slide.

6 So how do these two studies intersect? Essentially
7 they're mutually reenforced. The staffing levels directly
8 affect proactive time, geographic consistency and supervision,
9 while effective deployment of our staff enables stronger
10 community engagement and problem solving. Together, they help
11 CPD align our structure and strategy in service of public
12 safety.

13 Next slide.

14 So these expansive, highly informative, data-driven
15 studies are only as effective as a concise collaborative
16 implementation plan. So they are the beginning, they're just
17 the beginning of CPD's next phase of continuous growth. All
18 change won't happen overnight. We are excited by the chance to
19 develop an implementation plan that meets the public safety
20 needs of every Chicago community with our partners.

21 The partnership with our steering committee members,
22 implementation does need to consider many factors including
23 Consent Decree compliance, labor agreements, budget realities,
24 training and policy timelines, and technology requirements.

25 Both studies recognize that this needs a phase rollout

1 and multiyear plan, likely some piloting of certain components,
2 and that -- so basically this is going to be an iterative
3 evaluation and not simply a onetime exchange. Not every
4 implementation may be implemented, but all decisions will
5 prioritize effectiveness, sustainability, and measurable
6 improvements in public safety.

7 So just briefly, to talk a little bit about near term
8 efforts. We're going to be focusing on high impact
9 civilianization opportunities for the fiscal 2027 year budget,
10 as well as continuing expansion of our Unity of Command and
11 Span of Control Plan. Also we're going to be improving data
12 workload compilation, clarifying some department wide
13 expectations for Community Policing, and strengthening feedback
14 mechanisms with communities.

15 I just want to note once again, you know, when we talk
16 about improving workload performance data systems, again, why
17 it is so important that this particular study is an iterative
18 interactive model, a tool handed off to us. It is so CPD can
19 properly adjust its resources as requirements and expectations
20 change and we can do that in a very timely manner.

21 Next slide.

22 Essentially, in closing, the Workforce Allocation
23 Study and the Community Policing Assessment provides CPD with a
24 unified and evidence based foundation for change.
25 Implementation, as I stated, will be multiyear, transparent,

1 and collaborative. Success depends on our partners, with the
2 city council, community organizations, and CPD members all
3 working towards effective equal service delivery and
4 trustworthy public safety.

5 I'm happy, if there's any questions. There is -- I
6 just want to again note that that QR code, we do have a live
7 Workforce Allocation site. There's an opportunity there if you
8 have any questions. We are responding to those. But all the
9 information that I had mentioned with the previous reports as
10 well as this final report and our FAQs are all located there.
11 Thank you.

12 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Clark Henson.

13 Are there questions for -- about this presentation or
14 about Workforce Allocation generally? All right then.

15 Response maybe from the AG, Ms. Grieb or Mr. Lowry?

16 MS. METH: The first response is going to come from me
17 and I'll pass it onto my colleagues.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Great.

19 MS. METH: Thanks. Good afternoon, everyone. My name
20 is Elena Meth and I am speaking today as the section lead for
21 the Supervision section on behalf of the Illinois Attorney
22 General.

23 The Workforce Allocation Study falls under the
24 Supervision section of the Consent Decree. The 2017 Department
25 of Justice report emphasized that promoting additional officers

1 alone will not resolve the supervision issues that have plagued
2 CPD for years, stressing that CPD needed to deploy officers and
3 supervisors pursuant to a comprehensive staffing analysis.
4 This analysis is required under Paragraph 356 and more recently
5 was mandated under a city council ordinance.

6 Paragraph 356 requires CPD to make staffing and
7 resource allocation decisions to ensure it meets Unity of
8 Command and Span of Control requirements, ensure qualified
9 field training officers and training instructors, qualified
10 staff to conduct timely misconduct investigations, a sufficient
11 number of crisis intervention team officers, and a sufficient
12 number of officer wellness staff.

13 As Executive Director Clark Henson explained, the City
14 in collaboration with the Matrix Consulting Group has just
15 wrapped up a year-long Workforce Allocation Study, a
16 comprehensive data-driven study to evaluate the staffing needs
17 of every area of CPD.

18 The Office of the Attorney General is still reviewing
19 the near 800-page report, so today, I'm going to discuss some
20 of the key findings from the report as well as the office's
21 hopes for implementation of the recommendations of the report.

22 To provide a brief overview of the current staffing
23 structure of CPD, 61 percent of CPD staffing, including sworn
24 and civilian personnel, are within the Bureau of Patrol.
25 Excluding the office of the superintendent, the remaining

1 39 percent of staff are split across the Bureau of Detectives,
2 the Bureau of Counterterrorism, the Office of Constitutional
3 Policing and Reform, the Office of the First Deputy
4 Superintendent, and the Office of the Chief of Staff.

5 Although the report makes recommendations for each
6 bureau and office, today I'll focus on recommendations made for
7 the Bureau of Control as the largest bureau in the Department
8 and the bureau with the most recommendations for change in the
9 report.

10 The report makes three major categories of
11 recommendation for the Bureau of Patrol: First, to increase
12 department wide civilianization; second, overall staffing
13 increase, particularly for supervisors; and third, to divide
14 the busiest sectors to create a sustainable deployment
15 structure.

16 As Matrix explains in the report, Chicago is an
17 outlier among the nation's largest police departments with less
18 than 10 percent of its staff as civilian employees.
19 Civilianization or the process of transitioning roles that
20 don't require the expertise of sworn officers to non-sworn
21 staffing offers significant advantages to CPD.

22 The Office of the Attorney General recognizes the
23 challenges the City and CPD face in recruiting, hiring, and
24 training sufficient officers just to maintain its current
25 staffing numbers each year. Civilianization offers the

1 opportunity to focus sworn personnel in the roles that require
2 them and opens a broader hiring pool for other roles.

3 As the report highlights, civilians are often better
4 investments for specialized roles that require education and
5 technical expertise. Civilians may have this expertise
6 entering the Department and can be trained to stay in a
7 specific role within the Department, rather than being shifted
8 in and out, as sworn personnel often have to be.

9 In total, the report identified 604 positions for
10 civilianization across 174 different assignments. Roles that
11 are currently held by sworn personnel that could be
12 civilianized include timekeepers, 42 officers; watch
13 secretaries, 98 officers; and district and area administrative
14 support staff, 85 officers.

15 For the Bureau of Patrol in particular, the report
16 recommends civilianizing 258 positions and hiring an additional
17 386 sworn positions to meet current staffing needs.

18 To determine whether resource needs or the
19 requirements for meeting the community service needs are being
20 adequately met by the current staffing numbers within CPD,
21 Matrix focused on proactive time, which is the percentage of a
22 patrol officer's time during which they are available and on
23 duty but not actively responding to community-generated calls
24 or otherwise performing obligations like training or court time
25 so they can be in service.

1 The independent expert recommends that CPD officers
2 should generally target at least a 40 percent proactive time
3 level, meaning that officers should have 40 percent of their
4 shift time available for active patrolling and interacting with
5 the community, but not actively responding to calls for
6 service, as a benchmark for patrol coverage.

7 To hit this 40 percent mark, the report identifies
8 that 273 additional patrol officers are needed to provide
9 consistent proactive policing in each current district of the
10 City of Chicago, a total of 3,643 officer positions for the
11 whole department.

12 And to achieve Unity of Command and Span of Control
13 targets, which is a Consent Decree requirement as well, stating
14 that ten officers should be assigned for every one sergeant, 90
15 additional patrol sergeants are needed and need to be hired to
16 be -- excuse me -- to be distributed across the districts.

17 Additionally, 26 tactical team sergeants are needed to
18 address very high spans of control or supervision models where
19 one sergeant is currently supervising significantly more than
20 ten officers.

21 Matrix also recommends that the current beat
22 structure, which has too many beats to be consistently staffed
23 with current resources, be abandoned as a means of assigning
24 individual areas of responsibility.

25 Instead, Matrix explains that a sector-based

1 deployment system would work better for CPD. Still, sectors
2 also may suffer from workload inequality and uneven staffing.
3 Matrix recommends sector reconfiguration, which presents a
4 creative solution to be used in conjunction with
5 civilianization and the hiring of additional patrol officers.

6 To more effectively staff the sectors and facilitate
7 improved Unity of Command and Span of Control numbers and to
8 equalize patrol service levels, the report recommends splitting
9 the 13 busiest sectors and combining the two least busy
10 sectors, for a net change of an additional 12 sectors.

11 Reconfiguring these sectors to create a total of 78
12 would ensure that team sizes across the sectors is more
13 consistent, would leave district boundaries the same, and as
14 the report notes, would improve the ability for officers to
15 consistently have more time available to be proactive and
16 engage with the community.

17 In total, the report identifies a need for an
18 additional 661 positions across all bureaus, combined with the
19 recommendation to civilianize 604 existing positions, resulting
20 in a net staffing recommendation of an additional 57 sworn
21 positions, relative to the current filled staffing levels of
22 the Department.

23 The Office of the Attorney General recognizes that
24 implementing Matrix's recommendations is not going to be a
25 simple feat. It will require the cooperation and coordination

1 across the expire department, city agencies, and their external
2 stakeholders. Implementation will also depend on available
3 funds and collective bargaining agreements.

4 The Attorney General's Office understands that
5 immediate 100 percent adoption of every single recommendation
6 in the report isn't feasible. Instead, OAG urges the City and
7 the Department to think carefully and creatively about how to
8 use the report's recommendations to address needs, fulfill
9 Consent Decree obligations, and to make implementation a
10 priority in 2026.

11 Additionally, as CPD works through implementing the
12 report's recommendations, the Attorney General's Office expects
13 that CPD will operate transparently, as has been true for the
14 rest of the Workforce Allocation Study, by updating the public
15 at every possible juncture.

16 The study itself is an achievement. However, its
17 value comes in what CPD does with the study's recommendations
18 in the coming months and years.

19 As the study has made apparent, the Department has
20 major staffing needs that are not currently being met. The
21 independent data-driven insights provided by the Workforce
22 Allocation Study will be essential to not only accelerate
23 compliance with the Consent Decree, but to drive meaningful
24 change in how CPD officers police every day.

25 We look forward to providing updates to the Court and

1 the public about how the City and CPD are progressing towards
2 implementation of the study's recommendations. Thank you for
3 the opportunity to provide remarks.

4 And I will now turn to my colleague Assistant Attorney
5 General William Lowry to address the other recently released
6 report, the Civic Consulting Alliance report.

7 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Ms. Meth. Thank you.

8 MR. LOWRY: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Elena,
9 for that. Good afternoon, Your Honor, and to members of the
10 community.

11 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

12 MR. LOWRY: So I'm going to speak briefly. My name is
13 Bill Lowry. I'm here on behalf of the Office of the Attorney
14 General.

15 I'm going to provide some brief comments on what we've
16 already heard about regarding the Community Policing report
17 prepared by CCA, the Civic Consulting Alliance. That report
18 was commissioned by the City and recently published on CPD's
19 website. So, you know, we encourage folks to go out there and
20 look, take a look and review it.

21 Your Honor, the report prepared by CCA is a broad
22 scope, touching on the vast majority of the Community Policing
23 section, and that section in some form or fashion deals with a
24 lot of different things, as you know. But the primary things
25 we're looking at are the guidelines from Paragraphs 8 through

1 10 of the Community Policing section.

2 And that is, number one, building strong partnerships
3 and positive interactions between police and members of the
4 public, to increase public confidence in law enforcement, and
5 allow police to engage the public in problem solving
6 techniques; number two is integrating a Community Policing
7 philosophy into CPD operations; and then number three, ensuring
8 that its Community Policing philosophy is a core component of
9 CPD's provision of police services, crime reduction,
10 strategies, of training, management, resource deployment, and
11 accountability systems.

12 Now finally, the Consent Decree requires that all,
13 all, CPD members will be responsible for furthering this
14 philosophy of Community Policing and employing the principles
15 of Community Policing, including trust and legitimacy.

16 CCA report encapsulates, again, as Director Allyson
17 Clark Henson said, over two years' worth of community and
18 officer input. It analyzes the Department's operations and it
19 incorporates current best practices nationally into Community
20 Policing to help CPD then meet the goals established by the
21 Consent Decree.

22 Now through its nine recommendations, CCA has laid out
23 a template for CPD to fully exemplify a Community Policing
24 philosophy and incorporate it throughout the Department. Now
25 that report is comprehensive. Again, I encourage folks to go

1 out there and read it and take a look.

2 In the interest of time, though, I just want to
3 highlight a couple of recommendations given: Number one,
4 prioritize customer service mindset in all interactions.
5 That's why being approachable, providing mutual understanding
6 and share respect, anchored in reliability, empathy,
7 professionalism, empowerment, and communication.

8 Recommendation number three is consolidate
9 problem-solving approaches into a cohesive system with
10 distributive roles. And that's by creating a cohesive and then
11 technology-enabled problem-solving system to facilitate
12 collaboration between the community and city agencies to
13 address safety concerns and make clear how officers are
14 expected to contribute in their day-to-day routines as part of
15 that process.

16 Number six for the recommendations is to standardize
17 department wide approach for gathering community feedback on
18 policy and training, a huge part of what CPD's doing, as you
19 see with the barcodes and things of that nature, to go and give
20 feedback and have those interactions.

21 And then number nine, and that's leverage leaders to
22 model internal and external procedural justice.

23 Now, Your Honor, these recommendations provide a
24 blueprint for the City and CPD to create department wide
25 culture and structure changes based on community partnerships,

1 problem solving, principles of procedural justice, and
2 increasing safety across all Chicago communities.

3 Your Honor, our office acknowledges implementing these
4 recommendations will take time, but we know that this is a way
5 of moving forward that the City and CPD can both support and
6 advance compliance with the Consent Decree requirements and
7 paragraphs.

8 So at this time, Your Honor, the Office of the
9 Attorney General looks forward to working with the Department
10 as it reviews and implements these recommendations and provides
11 updates to the Court and to the public moving forward.

12 Your Honor, members of the public, thank you for the
13 opportunity to speak with you this afternoon and I'll turn it
14 back over.

15 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lowry. Thanks.

16 Any further comments from the -- well, from the AG?

17 MS. GRIEB: No, Your Honor, nothing further from us.

18 THE COURT: Is it time for us to hear from the
19 Coalition?

20 MS. HICKEY: Yes, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. Great. Remarks from the
22 Coalition?

23 MS. GARCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is
24 Michelle Garcia. We have remarks both from myself on behalf of
25 the Communities United plaintiffs of the Community Coalition,

1 as well as Michael Harrington, one of the leaders of our
2 Coalition.

3 Mr. Harrington, do you want to start first, or would
4 you like me to start?

5 MR. HARRINGTON: I can go. Thank you very much.

6 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Harrington.

7 MR. HARRINGTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Good to
8 see you.

9 THE COURT: You too.

10 MR. HARRINGTON: So to everybody else, good afternoon.
11 My name is Michael Harrington. I'm co-chairperson of
12 Network 49 in Chicago's 49th Ward, Rogers Park community. Our
13 membership-based organization is a member of Campbell
14 plaintiffs and the Consent Decree Coalition.

15 We, like many Chicago residents, believe that it is
16 absurd of the Chicago Police Department to want to hire more
17 police, which is a fundamental request of the Workforce
18 Allocation Study, when the Department will not commit to simple
19 demands made by the Coalition to make improvements.

20 More than six months ago, the Coalition raised the
21 alarm. Police use of forces have increased 75 percent, CPD
22 gun-pointing has increased dramatically, and racial disparities
23 have failed to improve.

24 Based on these failures, the Coalition made a simple
25 demand months ago: The City must commit to reduce uses of

1 force, reduce racial disparities, and take substantial steps
2 that actually result in those reductions.

3 The City cannot claim that it has complied with the
4 Consent Decree, no matter how many boxes it checks, if it is
5 not reducing force, gun pointing, and racial disparities.

6 Shockingly, more than six months after our demand, the
7 City has not committed to reducing use of force or racial
8 disparities. Their silence on this speaks volumes, and the
9 failure to act is damning.

10 So, no, the City does not need to hire more police
11 officers. It needs to make a real and serious commitment to
12 reducing the racially biased harm it inflicts against
13 residents.

14 Finally, my first thought after reading the Workforce
15 Allocation Study was that it addressed the wrong questions.
16 The study assumes that police officers need to continue making
17 thousands of traffic stops every day, doing mental health
18 interventions, and other community caretaking functions.

19 The fact is this: CPD cannot meaningfully evaluate
20 the proper level of staffing needed when it ignores
21 opportunities to have police community care functions
22 non-policed.

23 Similarly, the study wrongly assumes that all CPD
24 activities are valuable and should be continued. CPD should
25 end its countless pretextual traffic stops, which have resulted

1 in needless deaths and widespread harassment of people of
2 color.

3 A true Workforce Allocation Study will look more
4 skeptically at what CPD functions are actually valuable to
5 residents and where nonpolice responses could more safely and
6 effectively serve Chicagoans. To ignore these issues and
7 continue the status quo with even more officers will only
8 result in increased police violence against black and Latinx
9 people. Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Harrington. Thank you for
11 participating this afternoon.

12 Further comments from the Coalition, perhaps from
13 counsel?

14 MS. GARCIA: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.

15 Good afternoon. Michelle Garcia on behalf of the
16 Communities United plaintiffs of the Community Coalition.

17 You know, I just wanted to raise that the Community
18 Coalition and the public didn't know that today's hearing would
19 be focused on use of force. We were told it would be based on
20 Workforce Allocation hearing. And with that in mind, we hadn't
21 necessarily prepared to address use of force. And I see
22 Mr. Harrington nodding his head.

23 But I would like to raise up three points in response
24 to both what Mr. Harrington has raised, the Attorney General
25 has raised, and the Chicago Police Department, a bit on the

1 fly, so forgive me, Your Honor --

2 THE COURT: No problem.

3 MS. GARCIA: -- as I attempt to address that.

4 First, we appreciate the Attorney General
5 acknowledging that the Community Coalition first raised to the
6 Chicago Police Department in September 2025, over ten months
7 ago, that use of force was increasing and increasing at
8 alarming levels against youth, people with disabilities, and
9 black and Latino residents in Chicago.

10 We also appreciate the acknowledgment finally from CPD
11 of a report and analysis they commissioned years ago, analyzing
12 their use of force. This is long overdue. I want to highlight
13 some things in the report that are extremely alarming. The
14 house is on fire. That's how alarming it is.

15 From 2020 to 2023, 70 percent of CPD use of force was
16 against black residents, and 18 percent of use of force against
17 Latino residents, and just 6 to 7 percent was against white
18 residents. Their own experts, controlling for other factors,
19 found that black and Latino residents were more likely to have
20 use of force used against them than white residents.

21 The highest use of force disparities against black
22 residents came in 2023, indicating that the use of force
23 disparities are not improving, and in summary, the experts
24 hired by CPD reported that systemic factors, not individual
25 outliers, not rogue cops, were likely responsible for

1 differences in use of force.

2 Now that doesn't mean that CPD's experts said today
3 that there is an intentional problem. What it means is the
4 discrimination is systemic and that we need to address the
5 systemic causes for that. This is more than policy. This is
6 what is happening on the ground.

7 Now in our negotiations with CPD to resolve our
8 beginning of the enforcement process of the Consent Decree,
9 we've asked them to commit to reduce the use of force, and to
10 adopt benchmarks, as my colleague Mr. Harrington brought up, to
11 measure this. Also asked the Attorney General's Office and the
12 Monitor's office to hold them accountable. We have not
13 received this commitment.

14 So how do we course correct? One thing that we had
15 proposed is a pilot program, asking them to take action, to
16 change the amount of use of force that they've used in
17 communities, the highest communities that are most impacted by
18 use of force, black and Latino neighborhoods, and compare that
19 with use of force they've used in white neighborhoods in which
20 we know use of force is also still high against black and
21 Latino residents. That commitment has not happened as well.

22 These are also options we encourage the police
23 department to do. It is more than policy. It is more than
24 training. It has to be effective action to reduce use of force
25 against people of color, people with disabilities, and youth.

1 That is the reason why we have this Consent Decree in the first
2 place. This is the reason why we're all here today. And the
3 house is on fire. And we've got to do more than dispute the
4 statistical analysis but get down to actually fixing the
5 problem.

6 I'd like to take a moment now to address the Workforce
7 Allocation Study. We appreciate the presentations on the study
8 and the Community Engagement Study that were completed recently
9 with the police department. But we need to emphasize this
10 information is not new and the Community Coalition has been
11 advocating for changes on how CPD engages with our communities
12 for years.

13 And the Consent Decree has already mandated most of
14 these changes. The key purpose of the CPD Consent Decree is
15 not only to address use of force, but to build trust between
16 the police and the communities they serve. Right? These are
17 the communities that are the recipients of the force.

18 And for more than eight years, the Community Coalition
19 has been urging CPD to overhaul this culture of us versus them,
20 to a culture where every police officer views their job as
21 serving and protecting our shared communities.

22 This requires consistently staffing officers and
23 supervisors within the same beats so they get to know the
24 neighbors and the neighborhoods where they work. We don't want
25 a situation where the elder down the block knows who to call

1 when she sees something out the window is not going right.

2 And right now we have a situation where CPD is sending
3 new teams that don't know the communities they're policing.

4 And so we have situations, which I know, Your Honor, you have
5 heard, we've even had our community leaders, organizers, talk
6 about the harassment and discrimination that they have faced.

7 Now if we had a situation where CPD knew the
8 community, they would know that that community leader who's
9 involved with the Coalition is working to change the culture,
10 is working to make sure the policing is constitutional. There
11 would be that dialogue and that understanding and not that
12 quick action to frisk someone and not that quick action to
13 assume that a person is up to no good because they're black or
14 Latino.

15 So what are we asking, Your Honor? We are asking that
16 Community Policing means that every CPD police officer and
17 those responsible for establishing policies listen to community
18 feedback, incorporate that feedback into operations, and
19 provide substantive responses to community members.

20 These steps are already required by the Consent
21 Decree, and the problem is that more than seven years after the
22 decree was adopted, CPD hasn't made any discernible progress
23 towards adopting a community-led, customer-serving culture.

24 Now we are heartened to see the Civic Consultant
25 Alliance's recommendations align with the steps the Consent

1 Decree requires and what the Community Coalition has been
2 urging for years, but CPD already knows what to do. And the
3 real issue is that CPD historically has lacked the political
4 will and the administrative leadership to accomplish these
5 steps.

6 We urge leadership to finally work seriously to
7 transform CPD's culture to public service, problem-solving
8 mindset, training all members on customer service methods, and
9 rewarding officers who make this part of their work every day
10 are a few steps in the right direction.

11 We want to caution and I want to highlight what
12 Mr. Harrington said, that providing more, better, more
13 Community Policing does not mean more police. Our communities
14 are over-policed. That is a fact. The Coalition is not
15 encouraging more interactions between the public and the
16 police, especially those interactions are unnecessary,
17 traumatizing, discriminatory, or unproductive.

18 We encourage the expansion of the CARE Program, which
19 Your Honor has heard about, which sends clinicians, rather than
20 the police, to assist people in mental or behavioral health
21 crisis. This serves the goals of both studies, reducing the
22 workload on police officers, and providing the most appropriate
23 services to community members in crisis.

24 This must be a priority. And while the media has
25 public reported on a top line conclusion that the study

1 recommends hiring more police officers, that's not accurate.
2 We urge decisionmakers to look at the fine print. The
3 consultants recommended that we should be civilianizing more
4 sworn positions than they recommend adding. That means a net
5 reduction in total patrol officers.

6 Reading the Workforce Allocation Study together with
7 the CCA study, another key takeaway is that CPD should entirely
8 change its expectations for what officers are doing when they
9 aren't answering 911 calls. Currently CPD officers are using
10 this so-called proactive time mostly to be making traffic
11 stops.

12 We know, as Mr. Harrington raised up, that traffic
13 stops are harassing, discriminatory, and wholly ineffective
14 waste of police resources. They very rarely result in
15 arresting anyone or finding evidence of crime. Instead they
16 alienate and frustrate innocent drivers of color.

17 Instead of these traffic stops, more proactive
18 officers should be engaging with community members by meeting
19 with people on the block, just like I mentioned that elder,
20 just like mentioning these community leaders who are part of
21 the Coalition, attending community events, asking community
22 members about their needs, and listening to community advice
23 about problems that police can help solve.

24 Frankly, it shouldn't have taken an expensive
25 consulting contract and years of effort for CPD to listen to

1 this common sense advice.

2 The Community Coalition has been telling CPD for years
3 it needs to change the strategies and instill a true
4 community-serving mindset in every supervisor.

5 And with that, Your Honor, I thank you for your time.

6 THE COURT: Thank you.

7 Any comments for the Coalition or questions for them
8 before we move on?

9 All right. I think we're going to be hearing closing
10 remarks from the Superintendent, the Attorney General, and the
11 Monitor. So we can turn to those closing remarks now.

12 MR. SNELLING: Your Honor, would you like me to go or
13 would you like the Attorney General to go?

14 THE COURT: I think -- well, the list I have has you
15 going first, and then the Attorney General and then the
16 monitor, but I'm not wedded to that. Whatever works for you is
17 fine.

18 MR. SNELLING: Okay. I can start, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Great.

20 MR. SNELLING: And I'll go a little bit backwards
21 here, just to talk about some of the things. I'll start with
22 the Workforce Allocation Study. The Workforce Allocation Study
23 was something that we worked very hard to get done quickly.
24 This has been in the works for over five years. And we were
25 able to get philanthropic entities to support, to help us get

1 this done a lot quicker.

2 Now we talk about having a third party come in and the
3 claim is that CPD should have done this themselves and not
4 brought in a third party. That's a failing effort. If CPD --
5 the lack of trust within the community, no matter what we would
6 have done, it really wouldn't have mattered. It wouldn't have
7 been taken seriously. And someone would have probably called
8 for a third party to come in and do that, so we did that ahead
9 of time, to make sure that we have a third party come in so
10 that there was no bias, nothing that we did drove this study.

11 I think it's a misconception to assume that this study
12 is just about adding police officers. One of the things that I
13 heard was that we have to hire 90 new sergeants. That is not
14 correct. We have to be careful about that language. We don't
15 hire 90 new sergeants. We promote them from the ranks of
16 police officers. So as we are promoting sergeants, we're
17 reducing the number of police officers which will have to be
18 replaced in those roles. So our focus here was not about how
19 many officers we can add to CPD. It was about us following the
20 Unity of Command and Span of Control to make sure that we have
21 enough supervisors to supervise our officers in the field. And
22 I will talk about that connection and how it relates to our use
23 of force.

24 The CARES Programs. CPD has no control right now over
25 the CARES Program. As a matter of fact, CPD was removed from

1 the CARES Program. That's currently in the works by the
2 mayor's office right now. And they're working on it. Now we
3 are talking to them about it, but ultimately, the scope of
4 control when it relates to the CARES Program lies within the
5 mayor's office. So we just want to be clear with that.

6 So I just want to be clear about what it is. Now CCA
7 and the recommendations that were made, I would ask you to read
8 our -- read our strategic plan with CPD. And I said this from
9 the day I stepped into office: I want every officer to be a
10 community police officer. Now that comes with training. That
11 comes with change of mindset. These things don't and won't
12 happen overnight. This is something that we have to start from
13 the top down. This can't be from the bottom up. We can give
14 officers all of the things that we need to give them, but if we
15 don't have accountability at the top, which is where Unity of
16 Command and Span of Control comes in, then there's no control
17 over how our officers are going to perform the tasks that we
18 expect from them.

19 So all of this is connected. So when I say I want
20 every police officer to be a community police officer, that I
21 want every officer engaging with the public in the same way, so
22 that we don't have a centralized department or a centralized
23 unit within the Department that only deals with Community
24 Policing. What that tells our other officers is they may not
25 have to deal with the public the same way. The expectations of

1 how we communicate with members of the public should be the
2 same across the board when it comes to our police officers. So
3 just wanted to be clear on that particular thing.

4 Now we can go back a little bit and just to talk about
5 use of force. This was brought up, I believe it was
6 Attorney Tresnowski, about the increased incidents of use of
7 force when it comes to youth. There was some recommendations
8 that he made there and I think it's important and I'm always
9 open for recommendations and how we can do things better, but
10 that would require everyone to sit down and take a deeper dive
11 into what's within those numbers. When we're just looking at
12 numbers, it would be the same thing as police -- as police
13 officers, if we just looked at numbers and we responded to
14 calls for service and things of that nature based on statistics
15 and numbers, we would take out the human element of what it is
16 that we need to respond to.

17 And the same thing needs to happen here, when we're
18 assessing uses of force. Are there times where our officers
19 have used excessive force? Yes. And we can look historically
20 at some of those things, but is that the most common practice
21 that every time an officer uses force, that the force is
22 excessive? No. What we need to do is look at what's
23 proportional, what is reasonable under the totality of the
24 circumstances has to be applied.

25 We would actually -- if someone, a third party, came

1 to look at this, they would have to look at body cams. What we
2 do oftentimes is we measure the officer's response without
3 looking at the person's actions. So the person that they're
4 coming in contact with, we have to measure the officer's
5 response to the person's actions. That would determine if the
6 use of force is proportional. So we would have to do a much
7 deeper dive than that.

8 I would ask every one on the call to start to
9 implement some of the human element into what we're doing. One
10 of the things you have to understand, our officers are human
11 beings and they will make mistakes and they can make mistakes.
12 And we need to correct those mistakes now. We can correct
13 those mistakes through discipline, and if it rises to the level
14 of separation from the Department, we will go that length.

15 But there are also times when officers make mistakes
16 because they're not clearly trained or properly trained and we
17 need to make sure that we're training our officers and we're
18 reenforcing those things that we expect them to do.

19 Now again, going back to Unity of Command and Span of
20 Control, there was something that was mentioned earlier about
21 training. And I've said this a million times, I said this from
22 the day we started: Policy is simply policy. There are three
23 things that we need to train our officers on and what they
24 should be judged by: The law, training, and department policy.
25 Those three things have to work in lockstep with each other,

1 because we're training around the law and we're training around
2 our department policy, and we have to make sure that when our
3 officers are trained to do those things, there's a level of
4 accountability on that.

5 We need to have our officers being assessed out there
6 and that's what leadership is supposed to do. And that's why
7 Unity of Command and Span of Control is extremely important
8 here, to make sure that we get that done. So these are things
9 that we're working on.

10 And the Workforce Allocation Study, it is not CPD's
11 position to celebrate the part of that Workforce Allocation
12 that says we need additional officers. What we are looking at
13 is the entire study that talks about civilianization that we're
14 working toward. We know it's a slow progress, but -- the City
15 has a slow progress when it comes to these hiring practices.
16 So is it a struggle, is it a task, is it difficult? Yes. But
17 are we working as hard as we can to get that done? Yes.
18 Absolutely.

19 So what I will tell you about policing, it's nuanced,
20 it's tricky, and this is why we would have to do a much deeper
21 dive if we're going to get to the bottom of the expectations.

22 Lastly, I want to be clear about one thing: When
23 we're making progress -- and I can tell you, I've been on this
24 job 34 years. We have made some major progress when it comes
25 to how we use force in the public and even how we deal with

1 people. Do we still have a ways to go? Yes, we still have a
2 long ways to go. This isn't spiking the football. Right?
3 We're not declaring victory. But what we're saying is we're
4 moving in the right direction.

5 Without any acknowledgment of that, the public would
6 be led to believe that we're not even attempting to move this
7 forward. We're working closely with everyone. We're working
8 closely with the Office of the Attorney General. We're working
9 closely with oversight entities. And we're clearly working as
10 closely as we can to the communities.

11 One of the reasons that we were -- we brought in CCA,
12 CCA could reach further into the community than we could, so
13 they were able to connect with people who may not have been
14 willing to come and talk to CPD because of trust issues.

15 So these things are important to us. We want to make
16 sure that we continue the partnership with the Office of
17 Attorney General. I believe that we've been working very well
18 together. I believe we made some progress on the Consent
19 Decree. But, again, policies put in place, department orders
20 put in place, laws, none of those things mean anything if our
21 officers, number one, are not trained to deal with those
22 things, if there's not a plan for implementation, and if we
23 don't have supervision for accountability around those things.
24 So we're going to continue to push what we're pushing and
25 pushing in the right direction. And as long as we continue to

1 make progress, we will report out on that progress.

2 But I also want to say this when it comes to youth --
3 and this is important, and it's important to me as a kid who
4 grew up in the Englewood community, a poor kid who at times
5 didn't know where his next meal was going to come from.

6 We have young kids who are now taking to the streets,
7 not only in the City of Chicago, but across this country, and I
8 want people to really take a look at what's happening. And
9 they're engaging in activity that has led to violence. We just
10 had an incident, several incidents here, one in Hyde Park,
11 downtown, where I can tell you this, and I won't go too far
12 into it, but we had a young person who was a member of the
13 LGBTQ+ community who was attacked and beaten. We had residents
14 whose cars were parked, we had multiple teens jump up on top of
15 those cars, smashing in the hoods, kicking in the windshields,
16 and disabling their vehicles.

17 Now I'll be the first to tell you if I can identify
18 these kids as anything other than kids who look like me.
19 They've lost their lives. They've been shot. We've had two of
20 them murdered downtown during the tree lighting incident. We
21 had a kid shot and another juvenile murdered.

22 Right now, what we've seen across the board, we've
23 seen more CPS students shot and killed this year than we have
24 in the past ten years possibly. And we need to pay attention
25 to that and we need to make sure that we understand what it is

1 our officers are doing to try to stop this behavior, because
2 the alternative to not putting hands on a kid, to stop him, to
3 redirect him, which we have to put as a use of force, means
4 that we would stand back and do absolutely nothing and watch
5 these young people hurt each other, hurt others, and destroy
6 property.

7 So we want to make sure that we're doing everything
8 that we can to protect the community and to protect those young
9 people who are out acting in a manner that when you're that
10 young, you don't necessarily know how egregious your actions
11 are or what it can lead to. So we're going to continue to work
12 on these things. We're going to continue to do what we're
13 doing.

14 I really have to thank my team for the great work and
15 the great presentation that was done here. And I'm going to
16 continue to take everyone on this call and everyone from the
17 community seriously, your concerns, because I hear you, I'm
18 going to continue to hear, and listen to what you say, and we
19 will address those things. And when it comes time to talk
20 about these things, I will always tell you the truth.

21 So I appreciate the partnership from the Office of
22 Attorney General. You've been great partners in working with
23 us on these things. And I really have to thank my team for
24 digging down deep and making sure that we're working as hard as
25 we can to reach these goals, which we still have a long way to

1 go.

2 With that, I just want to thank everyone on the call.
3 I want to thank you, Your Honor, and I appreciate the time.

4 THE COURT: Thank you, Superintendent. I want to
5 thank you again, as I always do, but I know it's a big chunk
6 out of your day and I know that, as I've said before, you're
7 one of the busiest people in Chicago. So I really appreciate
8 your continued attention and devotion to this issue.

9 Further comments from the Attorney General?

10 MS. GRIEB: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mary Grieb
11 from the Attorney General's Office.

12 I see that we're quite over time today, so I'll be
13 very brief. I would just like to thank the Court for the
14 opportunity to provide these updates and our perspective on
15 progress with the Consent Decree. And today we've covered a
16 lot of really important topics, use of force data, trend
17 analysis, Workforce Allocation and staffing needs across the
18 City, and of course always critically important is Community
19 Policing.

20 We really appreciate and continue to work with the
21 Department to push forward in a transparent way in providing
22 these updates to the Court on the progress in those areas. So
23 thank you, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Thank you. Comments from the Monitor?

25 MS. HICKEY: Yes, Your Honor. As I mentioned at the

1 beginning of today's hearing, I will provide a more thorough
2 summary of IMR-13 during next month's public hearing on
3 May 12th at 1 p.m.

4 At that hearing, the parties will also discuss the
5 Impartial Policing section, including the Office of Equity and
6 Engagement update and the CPD's performance evaluation systems.
7 I announce at each of these monthly hearings the topics for the
8 next month, and also the topics are listed on our monitoring --
9 on our website, CPDMonitoringTeam.com.

10 On behalf of the Monitoring Team, I would like to
11 thank everyone for their participation today in these very
12 important topics to our city.

13 THE COURT: Thank you. And thank all of you for your
14 time this afternoon, your attention, and I'll be looking
15 forward to seeing you and continuing this effort, which really
16 requires everyone's involvement, when we talk again in May.

17 MS. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Anything further?

19 MS. HICKEY: No, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Reminder, please recall that the
21 transcript will be available through the Monitor's website.
22 Thank you.

23 (Concluded at 3:10 p.m.)

24

25

