1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION		
3			
4	STATE OF ILLINOIS,)		
5	Plaintiff,) Docket No. 17 C 6260		
6	VS.		
7	CITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago, Illinois		
8) November 29, 2022 Defendant.) 10:00 a.m.		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Hooping		
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Hearing BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE REBECCA R. PALLMEYER and		
11	HONORABLE ROBERT M. DOW, JR.		
12	APPEARANCES:		
13	For the Plaintiffs: HON. KWAME RAOUL		
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ILLINOIS BY: MS. MARY J. GRIEB		
15	MR. CHRISTOPHER G. WELLS MS. AMY P. MEEK		
16	MS. KARYN L. BASS EHLER MS. HANNA JUROWICZ		
17	MR. JOHN HAZINSKI MR. AARON P. WENZLOFF		
18	MS. REBEKAH I.M. NEWMAN MS. STEFANIE L. STEINES		
19	100 West Randolph Street Chicago, Illinois 60601		
20	MANDEL LEGAL AID CLINIC		
21	BY: MR. CRAIG B. FUTTERMAN UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL		
22	6020 South University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637		
23	NORTHWESTERN PRITZKER SCHOOL OF LAW		
24	BY: MS. SHEILA A. BEDI 375 East Chicago Avenue		
25	Chicago, Illinois 60611		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued:)	
2		FOUTD FOD FOUND ITS/
3		EQUIP FOR EQUALITY BY: MS. AMANDA ANTHOLT
4		20 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 300 Chicago, Illinois 60602
5		ROGER BALDWIN FOUNDATION OF ACLU, INC. BY: MS. ALEXANDRA K. BLOCK
6		MS. MICHELLE T. GARCIA 150 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 600
7		Chicago, Illinois 60601
8	For the Defendant:	CITY OF CHICAGO DEPARTMENT OF LAW
9		BY: MS. JENNIFER K. BAGBY 121 North LaSalle, 6th Floor
10		Chicago, Illinois 60602
11		TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP BY: MR. ALLAN T. SLAGEL
12		111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 2800 Chicago, Illinois 60601
13	Independent Monitor:	ARENTFOX SCHIFF
14	Thospondent Horricor.	BY: MS. MARGARET A. HICKEY MR. ANTHONY-RAY SEPÚLVEDA
15		233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 7100 Chicago, Illinois 60606
16		cirreago, irrinors occoo
17	Also Present:	MS. PATRICIA JJEMBA MR. MAX FRAZIER
18		MR. ARTHUR HAYNES MR. MATT RICHARDS
19		MS. JESSICA GALL-ADEDIRAN DR. LAURA CANARD
20		CHICAGO POLICE CHIEF ANGEL NOVALEZ LIEUTENANT MICHAEL KAPUSTIANYK
21		LIEUTENANT JOHN BENIGNO COMMANDER RALPH CRUZ
22		COHINIPLIX IVALI II CIXUZ
23	Court Reporter:	FRANCES WARD, CSR, RPR, RMR, FCRR
24		Official Court Reporter 219 S. Dearborn Street, Suite 2524A Chicago Illinois 60604
25		Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 435-5561 frances_ward@ilnd.uscourts.gov

(The following proceedings were had in open court:)

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the United States District Court.

My name is Rebecca Pallmeyer. I am the judge to whom this case is going to be assigned or is effectively assigned now.

Together with me this morning is my colleague

Judge Dow, whom, as you know, has been monitoring -- has been supervising the consent decree now for some time.

Judge Dow will be leaving our court, at least to some degree, to take a new position in Washington. That's the reason for the transfer of this case from him to another judge in the court, and that judge is me.

I want you to know that I have reviewed many of the materials that were filed in this case, but, of course, do not have the familiarity with it that Judge Dow had and, perhaps, that some of you already have in greater depth than I have. But it is my determination to supervise it effectively and actively, and I do intend to do my best to be as up to speed as I can be in the next several weeks.

I have met by video with lawyers -- many of the lawyers involved in the case, but today is the first time that I am actually presiding in a hearing. And I am anxious to hear from all of you, those of you who are scheduled to be heard this morning. I have the schedule here, and I will be

1 making every effort to keep you on time. 2 Judge Dow, did you want to make a few comments? 3 JUDGE DOW: Yes. Sure. Thank you. 4 Good morning, everybody. I do want to thank Chief Judge Pallmeyer for 5 6 inviting me to be included in today's proceeding, because 7 this case has been transferred. I am an interloper here. 8 I do want to say that you all are in great hands. 9 She is a wonderful judge and a wonderful leader of this 10 court. We have all been so fortunate to have her as our 11 chief through the pandemic and everything else. I am 12 thrilled that she will be working with you all on what is to 13 come here. 14 It has been my great privilege to have this case on 15 my docket since 2017 and to work with all of you since February 2019 on trying to implement what is a massive. 16 17 massive undertaking. 18 It has been the most challenging, the most vexing, 19 the most time-consuming, and, in many ways, the most 20 rewarding case that I have had in my 15 years on the bench. 21 This is the case that I am going to miss the most, for sure. 22 I just want to thank all of you. I'm looking at 23 all of these familiar faces. Many of you, I have spent more hours than I could ever imagine. 24 25 The thing about this case is, it is an incredibly

judge-intensive case. Many of our cases, our law clerks do a lot of the work on. In this case, it has all been judge work, and I did warn the chief that that's where this goes.

But it's been immensely rewarding. And as I look at all of you, I consider you all great colleagues to work with, and this is the case I am saddest about leaving. But you are in great hands, and I thank you all.

I am really happy today that we can be here in person. As Maggie knows, we have been planning this for a long time, and we finally felt today was -- this time period was appropriate to bring everybody in.

I'm thrilled that we have got more than 50 people on the agenda today. This is a great opportunity for us to hear from the community; and, of course, that's hugely important in this whole process.

So thank you all for working with me. I will miss you all. I will be lurking.

I have told my colleague, the Chief, and the monitor, they can always call for my recollections of what happened in the past. There are very few of us who have been here from the beginning. I'm looking at a couple of you right now, but not too many.

So I will be available, and I thank you all.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. Thank you, Judge Dow.

1 Our monitor, Maggie Hickey, is with us this morning 2 and will be making some opening remarks as well. 3 MS. HICKEY: Good morning. I will take off my 4 mask. Sorry. Good morning, Judge Dow and Judge Pallmeyer, 5 6 counsel, and members of the public. 7 My name is Maggie Hickey. I'm the independent 8 monitor. I'm also joined by two members of my team, 9 10 Anthony-Ray Sepúlveda and Dr. Laura Canard, who is graciously 11 sitting in the attorney room guarding everyone's laptops so 12 the rest of the people could be here. And she is going to be 13 dialing in by phone. 14 I want to start by thanking the community members 15 for coming today and for taking time from their schedules to 16 express their opinions and thoughts about the City's and 17 CPD's compliance with the consent decree. 18 This is the first of what we intend to be quarterly 19 public hearings, with two meetings a year, including community speakers. 20 21 One of the community listening meetings will be hosted virtually, and people will be able to keep their 22 23 laptops at their homes, and another will be in person. 24 This is the first time the community members have 25 had an opportunity to join the Court in person regarding the

consent decree since the pandemic. Today is about hearing from our communities, and for that reason, I will leave my remarks brief.

Judge Dow, when you approved the consent decree in January 2019, you acknowledged that the consent decree would not be an easy process. And, boy, you were right. It has not been an easy process. But Chicago is no longer at the starting line.

By December 31st, 2022, the end of the fifth reporting period, the City of Chicago, the CPD, and other relevant City entities reached preliminary compliance with over 70 percent of the monitorable paragraphs under the consent decree. Many of these achievements include substantial updates to policies, procedures, and other written guidance.

While this also means that the City and its entities must still achieve secondary and full compliance with the majority of the monitorable paragraphs, if properly supported, the existing compliance levels that they currently have will be the foundations for the City to ultimately achieve full and effective compliance with the consent decree.

The City of Chicago and the CPD have come a far way, but they also have a very long way to go, and we must all press on.

Thank you, Judge Dow, for your leadership and commitment to the consent decree and Chicago. It's been my privilege to learn from and work with you. The silver lining is that you are leaving this case in the very capable hands of Chief Judge Pallmeyer.

Judge Pallmeyer, as you take over this case, the independent monitoring team has filed five monitoring reports, which are posted on our website, cpdmonitoringteam.com, for everyone else's education.

Our sixth monitoring report, which covers the first six months of this year, will be publicly filed before the end of this year.

We also recently filed our monitoring plan for year four, where we identified several interrelated priorities that reflect the City's and the CPD's current challenges toward achieving compliance with the consent decree. They include staffing, resources, community, engagement, and partial policing, and effective policing.

Also included is officer wellness and efficient data collection, management, and analysis.

The consent decree requires the City and the CPD to demonstrate constitutional policing practices that respect the rights of all the people of Chicago, while building trust between officers and the communities they serve and promoting community and officer safety.

The consent decree requires the CPD and its officers to reduce crime while being community partners, building, maintaining, and rigorously protecting community trust and confidence. To do this, the CPD must ensure that the input of the community is sought, respected, and incorporated into its procedures for developing policy, training, and operations.

But reduced staffing has slowed the City's and the CPD's ability to engage with the Chicago communities, demonstrate compliance with the consent decree, and promote trust and officer wellness.

For officers to meet the high standards of the CPD, of the consent decree, and of the Chicago communities, officers must have sufficient resources and support.

Implementing reform across the consent decree, including reforms related to community policing, impartial policing, crisis intervention, use of force, training, supervision, and accountability requires healthy and effective CPD officers.

Officers require support to perform their high-stress jobs, and the consent decree requires the City and the CPD to provide increased and sustained levels of support for their officers.

Finally, to reach full and effective compliance with the consent decree, the City and the CPD must make

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

significant investments and improvements in data collection, management, and assessments. This will enable the CPD to identify new and existing challenges and implement corresponding data-driven solutions. These improvements will pay dividends in the years to come and are simply necessary for the City and CPD to consistently provide the accountability and transparency that the Chicago communities deserve.

Judge Dow, we are grateful that the consent decree started under your guidance, and we wish you the best as you head to Washington.

Judge Pallmeyer, as Judge Dow acknowledged in 2019, it has taken a long time to get to the conditions that led to the consent decree, and it will take a long time to get out of it. He has challenged us with all of -- with his poignant words back in 2019, "Let us begin." And begin we did. And we are in the middle of our work. And it's clear that change is difficult. But nevertheless, we press on. It's what the Chicago communities expect and deserve.

Judge Pallmeyer, we look forward to crossing that finish line under your guidance.

Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Hickey.

We are doing well on our time frame. I think next on our agenda is that we will hear from Jennifer Bagby of the

1 City of Chicago for some opening remarks as well, and that would be followed by Matt Richards. 2 3 MS. BAGBY: Good morning. 4 My name is Jennifer Bagby, and I am a deputy corporation counsel for public safety reform in the City of 5 6 Chicago Department of Law. I, along with Allan Slagel, Max Frazier, and Arthur 7 8 Haynes represent the City of Chicago in the consent decree 9 matter. And we are happy to be here today to update the 10 Court and the public on the City's consent decree progress. 11 I am also joined by Matt Richards, the deputy 12 commissioner for behavioral health for the Chicago Department 13 of Public Health, as well as Jessica Gall-Adediran, first 14 deputy mayor for public safety. 15 Deputy Commissioner Richards will be providing you 16 with an update on the work that is being done between the 17 Department of Public Health and the Chicago Police 18 Department. 19 Also here today to hear the comments from the 20 Court, the Attorney General's office, and the community are 21 members of the Chicago Police Department, who are involved in 22 the important work of reform. We have Chief Angel Navalez of the Office of 23 24 Constitutional Policing and Reform. We have Lieutenant Michael Kapustianyk, the 25

_

commanding officer of the Research and Development Division.

We have Commander Ralph Cruz of the training support group.

And, Lieutenant John Benigno, commanding officer of the Training Support Group, Instructional Design, and Quality Control Section.

In addition to providing an update to the Court and to the public, it is also important to note the tremendous amount of work that Judge Dow has put into this -- into facilitating both the process of police reform in the city of Chicago and the progress on the consent decree since this process began in 2017.

We are grateful for his time and attention and involvement in moving reform forward. We congratulate him on his new role, and we welcome Judge Pallmeyer to the continued work ahead.

On January 31st of 2019, when Judge Dow approved the consent decree, agreed upon by the City and the State of Illinois, he ended his written opinion with, "Let us begin." It's obviously a very popular quote today. What began then and continues today is the important and deliberative work of reform.

Reform takes hard work, and it takes time. Too often people remark that it isn't happening fast enough. But it is important to remember that the work of reform is not

about quickly complying with the paragraphs in the consent decree as if checking off items on a to-do list. Rather, the work of reform involves doing the long, hard work of building lasting change that will endure long after the consent decree is over.

As Judge Dow has frequently remarked to all involved, you can do things quickly or correctly, but rarely both. The City has been and continues to be committed to this process and to the necessary hard work of reform to ensure lasting change for the city of Chicago.

The work of reform is being carried out by hardworking women and men across many aspects of the city, dedicated employees of numerous City departments, including the Office of Emergency Management and Communication, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability, the Office of Public Safety Administration, the Department of Human Resources, the Office of the Inspector General, the police board, the mayor's office, the law department, and both civilian and sworn members of the Chicago Police Department.

Most of these City employees are doing the work of reform while carrying out their other duties and responsibilities to the citizens of Chicago.

Since this process began, approximately 300,000 pages of documents have been produced by the City.

Over 80 Chicago Police Department policies have been newly

1 written or revised, and countless trainings have been revised 2 or developed, with CPD members receiving more than 1 million 3 hours of training since the entry of the consent decree. 4 Additionally, the City estimates that in the monitor's next report, the City will have achieved some level 5 6 of compliance with approximately 78 percent of all 7 monitorable paragraphs of the consent decree. 8 This hard work is being done not only within each of these City divisions and departments but collaboratively, 9 10 between many different City agencies and departments. 11 One such area of collaboration is between the 12 Department of Public Health and the police department. And 13 here to give you an overview of that important work is Deputy 14 Commissioner for Behavioral Health Matt Richards. 15 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Mr. Richards, good morning. 16 You are with the Chicago Department of Public 17 Health. MR. RICHARDS: Yes, Judge. 18 19 Good morning, Judge Dow. Good morning, Judge Pallmeyer. 20 21 Good morning to the public. 22 My name is Matt Richards. I'm the Deputy 23 Commissioner for Behavioral Health at the Chicago Department 24 of Public Health. I'm a licensed clinical social worker. 25 I am going to be giving the Court an update on two

sets of programs that are responsive to concerns articulated in the consent decree related to crisis intervention.

I am going to be talking about alternate response programs, and I am going to be talking about diversions.

So in November of 2019, Mayor Lightfoot accepted 33 recommendations that were generated by her Mental Health Advisory Board related to the ways in which the City and our crisis response systems interface with persons who are experiencing a crisis, typically related to mental health, substance use, or homelessness.

One of those recommendations was to generate new programs that integrate new types of professionals into the 911 response system.

In September of 2021, we launched what is called CARE, Crisis Assistance Response and Engagement. This is a program that integrates mental health professionals from the Chicago Department of Public Health into the 911 call center floor and also into 911 response teams.

We have launched teams in three distinct regions of the city -- on the north side, the southwest side, and the south side -- with one team pending implementation in January of 2023 on the west side.

Approximately one year into that implementation what we have seen is, we have responded to over -- approaching 500 calls -- 911 calls -- with no arrests; very

minimal use of force, less than 1 percent. We have been able to respond and resolve calls in about two-thirds of cases, with the remaining third of cases being inability to locate the person in crisis from the 911 call.

We have shown that calls can be very safely resolved for the patient and for the responder moving toward a health-first model that does not primarily rely on police officers.

As we move into year two, the scope of that work is really focused on scale. We want to be adding a second shift to the program. It's currently operating one shift. And then we want to expand the number of community areas that are benefitting from the program, which we anticipate doing in 2023.

We are also moving toward our mental health professionals in the 911 call center being able to speak directly to callers. You will hear this referred to as clinicians being trunked into calls.

So if someone experiences, for instance, a suicide crisis, we are in the process of developing protocols by which that person could speak to a clinician on the call center floor to try to resolve the call over the phone, precluding the need for a crisis response in person.

I also want to be able to speak to you about diversions.

14

15

16

17

5

6

7

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So when we talk about diversion, we are talking about programs that try to direct a person towards community resources or treatment that is responsive to their health and social needs and away from the court system or criminal justice system.

We have one project that is already well into implementation. That's the narcotics arrest diversion program, which is one of the largest narcotics arrest diversion programs in the United States. We have diverted over 1,000 individuals since implementation in 2018.

What we have seen are both considerable benefit to patients -- over half of patients engaged in treatment at 30 days -- and over 70 percent reduction in rearrest rate for any reason over time.

So we see this as a very promising intervention that shows that you can both improve community safety, improve outcomes for patients.

And our task as we move forward is scale. We need to continue to scale this program. It is active in all police districts. We need to ensure that all of our officers understand the order related to this project and that any eligible patient is being considered for it.

In 2023, there is two additional diversion programs that we are moving towards implementation, and, Judge, I wanted you to be aware of those.

The first one is a sobering center. So this is a diversionary initiative for persons who have alcohol use disorder or are otherwise experiencing acute intoxication. We are working with Region 11, our EMS medical oversight, and the IDPH EMS division to develop this model. And we are looking to implement it in the coming year.

The last diversionary intervention is something called stabilization housing. So this is a diversionary initiative for people living with untreated serious mental illness, substance use disorders, and homelessness. This program will divert persons who are cycling across the 911 system, the homeless services system, and the emergency department system into stabilization housing with their own living unit, where they will receive primary care, substance use treatment, and psychiatric care on-site, with the intent of reducing preventible law enforcement contact and improving health outcomes for those patients over time.

So we look forward to implementing that intervention in the coming year.

And I thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One question I have, Mr. Richards.

Of the 500 calls that you were able to handle without arrests or use of force, what proportion does that

1 represent of the overall 911 calls that are made? MR. RICHARDS: Within the districts that it was 2 3 implemented? 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Yes. MR. RICHARDS: I think it's -- I want to be able to 5 6 get you the exact number. I think it's approximating 10 to 7 15 percent. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. 8 And you also mentioned your desire to expand the 9 10 program to the west side as well. 11 MR. RICHARDS: Yes, ma'am. 12 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: With respect to the 500, do 13 you have a sense that staffing shortages would have -- the 14 amelioration of shortages would have resulted in a higher 15 number than those 500? 16 MR. RICHARDS: I don't -- we have kept data on our 17 staffing levels, which we could certainly share with the 18 Court if you would like to see it in terms of the number of 19 times the teams have been down due to staffing shortages. 20 I think the big opportunity in year two is 21 expanding call eligibility criteria. That's really been -- I 22 think the limiting factor is, we chose a very conservative 23 set of criteria in year one to prove safety and feasibility. 24 And we are currently finalizing a plan to expand call 25 eligibility criteria in year two, where we would be taking on

calls that are higher risk, both from a safety perspective 1 2 and a medical perspective. 3 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Do you have other questions, Judge Dow? 4 5 JUDGE DOW: No. Thank you. 6 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. Thank you very 7 much, Mr. Richards. 8 I think the next scheduled speaker is Mary Grieb of 9 the office of the Illinois Attorney General. 10 Ms. Grieb. 11 MS. GRIEB: Good morning, Chief Judge Pallmeyer, 12 Judge Dow, Monitor Hickey, and members of the community in 13 the courtroom and listening in via phone today. 14 We thank the Court and the independent monitor for 15 hosting this public hearing, and we thank everyone who has 16 registered to speak today or submitted written comments. 17 Our team of attorneys, staff, and experts work 18 every day to push the City and CPD to implement the consent 19 decree. 20 Many of the members of our team are in court today, 21 and I would like them to introduce themselves. 22 MR. WELLS: Good morning, your Honor. 23 My name is Christopher Wells. I'm the chief of the 24 Public Interest Division. And I have the honor of leading 25 the CPD team for our office, along with Mary.

1	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good morning, Mr. Wells.	
2	MS. JJEMBA: Good morning, your Honors.	
3	Patricia Jjemba. I'm in the officer wellness	
4	section.	
5	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Say your last name again.	
6	MS. JJEMBA: Jjemba.	
7	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you.	
8	MS. MEEK: Good morning, your Honors.	
9	I'm Amy Meek. And I'm the Civil Rights Bureau	
10	chief.	
11	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good morning.	
12	MS. BASS EHLER: Good morning, your Honors.	
13	Karyn Bass Ehler. I'm the Assistant Chief Deputy	
14	Attorney General.	
15	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good morning.	
16	MS. JUROWICZ: Good morning, your Honor.	
17	Hanna Jurowicz. I'm in the supervision section.	
18	MR. HAZINSKI: Good morning, your Honors.	
19	John Hazinski, Assistant Attorney General, in the	
20	accountability section.	
21	MR. WENZLOFF: Good morning, your Honor.	
22	My name is Aaron Wenzloff. I am responsible for	
23	the community policing; use of force; and recruitment,	
24	hiring, and promotions sections.	
25	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you.	

1 MS. NEWMAN: Good morning, your Honor. 2 My name is Rebekah Newman, and I supervise the 3 crisis intervention section. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Newman. MS. STEINES: Good morning, your Honor. 5 6 My name is Stevi Steines, and I am the lead on the 7 accountability section. MS. GRIEB: Your Honor, I'm the deputy chief of the 8 9 Civil Rights Bureau. 10 In addition to the attorneys here in court, our 11 team also includes subject matter experts from around the 12 country, all of whom have been a part of this process since 13 the beginning. 14 Our team of experts include Scott Thompson, who has 15 over 27 years of law enforcement experience and is the former chief of police in Camden, New Jersey; Jonathan Smith, 16 17 current executive director of the Washington Lawyers' 18 Committee for Civil Rights and former chief of the special 19 litigation section of the Civil Rights Division of the United 20 States Department of Justice; and Greg Ridgeway, Professor of 21 Criminology and Statistics and Data Science at the University 22 of Pennsylvania. On behalf of the Attorney General's Office, I want 23 24 to begin by expressing our profound gratitude to Judge Dow 25 for the public service he has performed in this case.

When we filed this case a little over five years ago, our team knew it would need a thoughtful and conscientious judge to oversee the important work to come. We could not have ended up in more dedicated hands during these crucial years.

Judge Dow, you have often said that this is one of the most important cases you will ever have. You have certainly treated it that way.

Through late-night and weekend phone calls with the monitor, Friday night marathon settlement conferences, and over 1,000 docket entries, you have consistently demonstrated thoughtfulness; patience; humility; and, above all, humanity.

You have always recognized that the work we are doing here is far bigger than any one of us. While the people may change, the work goes on. And we will always be grateful for all you have done to get us started down this long and winding road.

Chief Judge Pallmeyer, as sad as we are to see Judge Dow leave us, we are happy that you will now join us on this path. We know that you will help us move forward with the same steady commitment and seriousness of purpose.

As you join us on this road to reform, we want to share our thoughts on where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

As oft quoted this morning -- and clearly it

resonated with the parties and the independent monitor -- when Judge Dow approved the consent decree, he concluded by saying, "Let us begin."

Now, nearly four years later, we are still far from the end, much farther than we should be. But it is fair to say that we have reached the end of the beginning.

The consent decree defines compliance as a three-step process. Step one is to create policies that establish the necessary foundation for constitutional policing. Step two is to train officers on those policies. And step three is to ensure that officers on the street are actually following those policies and engaging in constitutional policing.

Nearly four years in, we are nearing completion of step one. The department's written policies are significantly better than when we first encountered them. For example, the department's new use of force policies, while not perfect, incorporate best practices from around the country and many of the recommendations of the Community Working Group.

The department also recently issued a long-needed foot pursuit policy focused on ensuring the safety of the public and CPD officers. Throughout this time, our office has engaged with CPD on an almost daily basis to move forward collaboratively where we can, and we are committed to

continuing those efforts.

But getting to this point has been far harder than it should have been. The City and CPD have consistently resisted common sense policy changes proposed by our team, the monitor, and the community members with whom CPD must engage.

As the Use of Force Community Working Group recounts in a recent report, community recommendations were initially rejected by the City and CPD and only adopted after a tedious and excruciating process that eroded community trust. It should not have been as hard as it was.

And while we applaud the department for enacting a monitor-approved foot pursuit policy in August, it also took far too long -- more than five years since the United States Department of Justice first told CPD it needed this policy.

Even now, there are several critical and long overdue policies that the department has yet to issue, which I will return to later.

As a result, the public is understandably concerned about where we are nearly four years in. For the people of Chicago, the progress we have made on paper does not mean much until that progress is reflected in CPD's practices. That is the critical work that lies ahead of us as we look to the training and implementation phases of the consent decree. And there is much to do.

Turning to where we go from here, I want to briefly discuss the status of some key consent decree components: training, staffing, community trust, written policies, and officer wellness.

First, training.

Step two of the consent decree requires the department to train officers on the written policies that it has issued. We remain concerned that the academy does not have enough instructors to meet the consent decree's training requirements.

In recent months, the academy has had to pull in officers from other units to serve as instructors, ask overburdened instructors to work overtime, and quickly train instructors in the complex subject matter of the course they are teaching.

Even with these efforts, it is not clear whether CPD will meet the consent decree requirement to provide 40 hours of training this year.

And this brings me to staffing. Unfortunately, the academy is not the only unit where the City and CPD have not allocated sufficient staff or resources to do the reform work they need to do.

Several units in particular have been consistently understaffed. For example, the Tactical Review and Evaluation Division, or TRED, reviews incidents where an

officer uses force or points a firearm at a person. The goals of this unit are to provide feedback to officers and supervisors about their tactics; to identify concerns with department policies, training, or practices; and to analyze use of force data.

But TRED staffing has been declining, creating a backlog of reviews. At last report this month, TRED had a backlog of nearly 400 force incident reviews and nearly a thousand firearm-pointing reviews.

Making matters worse, at various times this year, and especially this summer, officers from TRED and other critical reform units have been deployed to patrol duties on a rolling basis, further slowing progress on reform.

We are particularly concerned that officers are being deployed to patrol unfamiliar beats and neighborhoods. This approach to deployment threatens to undermine the community policing and trust-building approach required by the consent decree. The philosophy of community policing requires the systemic use of community partnerships and problem-solving techniques to build community trust and improve public safety.

Unfortunately, CPD continues many of the same troubling strategies it has used for years: saturating neighborhoods -- predominately black and brown communities -- with officers, many of whom are unfamiliar with those

communities; an overreliance on traffic stops as a crime reduction strategy, despite the negative impact those stops can have on trust and police; and relegating community engagement to the Office of Community Policing rather than every officer on the department.

As noted in the status report submitted by the coalition last week, CPD has resisted community input on several critical policies over the past two years and continually struggled with effective community engagement.

These strategies impact community trust, as seen in the monitor's report this summer on focus groups with young black and Latino men. The report echoes what many Chicagoans have long known and felt: CPD's ongoing failure to change how it treats black and Latino residents has led to deep community distrust.

We hope CPD hears the focus group participants as well as the voices of the people who speak in court today. To build trust, CPD must listen to marginalized community members and approach community policing, reform, and public safety holistically.

Returning to the topic of written policies. CPD still has not issued several major policies that govern how officers interact with many of Chicago's most vulnerable populations.

When we last appeared before the Court in April, we

identified seven major policies that were long overdue. We expressed our hope that CPD would finalize these policies by the time we appeared before the Court again.

Unfortunately, for six of these policies, the department has not. These outstanding policies are policies prohibiting sexual misconduct by officers, allowing people to record officers performing their duties in public, providing meaningful access to police services for individuals with disabilities and individuals with limited English proficiency, a policy requiring officers to respond to and interact with youth and children in a developmentally appropriate way, and finally, a policy mandating officers to use body-worn cameras in compliance with the consent decree and state law.

Additionally, as noted in the recent status reports filed by the Communities United and Campbell plaintiffs of the coalition, CPD is far from completing a revised search warrant policies and practices that are consistent with the consent decree and incorporate community input. We continue to urge the City and CPD to prioritize finalizing these critical and long overdue policies.

Finally, we recognize and acknowledge the challenges the department faces in maintaining officer wellness, a key component of the consent decree.

Officers can face incredibly difficult and

1 traum2 since3 depar4 year5 on th

traumatic circumstances every day. And we express our sincerest condolences to the officer's family and the department for the police officer suicides over the past year. We never lose sight of the tragic toll suicide takes on the friends, family, and colleagues left behind.

As we begin the process of translating policies into practices, we urge the department, including its leadership, to recommit to this work. The consent decree is not optional, nor is it just a series of boxes to be checked. De-emphasizing the consent decree will not make it go away. If anything, the process will just take longer. Although the people may change, the work must and will go on.

So, Chief Judge Pallmeyer, we welcome you to this journey. We have made some progress from where we started, but we have much further to go. We are committed to working with the Court, the City, CPD, the monitoring team, and the community to keep moving forward on critically needed reforms. We know this is a long road, but our work continues every day to ensure there is constitutional policing in Chicago.

Thank you, your Honor.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Grieb.

We have representatives here of the coalition that I believe will be heard from. First on that list is Mr. Futterman, who I see is with us.

1 JUDGE DOW: Couldn't see this on the zoom calls. It looks like you're pretty good on one crutch, though. 2 3 MR. FUTTERMAN: Hopefully, in a few days, I will be hobbling no crutch. 4 Good morning, both Chief Judge Pallmeyer, 5 6 Judge Dow. 7 We -- and folks will introduce themselves in a few 8 moments, but we are honored to represent a coalition of 14 community and civil rights organizations that represent 9 10 tens of thousands of Chicagoans from all parts of the city, 11 people who have lived experience who have been most impacted 12 by police abuse. 13 We have been fighting for decades to bring an end 14 to the police department's pattern and practice of civil 15 rights violations, long before the U.S. Department of Justice 16 finally responded to our cries. 17 The U.S. DOJ had refused to come to Chicago until 18 we actually won a court order that forced the police 19 department to release the video of Officer Jason Van Dyke's execution of a 17-year-old boy. 20 21 Demonstrations that were led by young black folks 22 forced the justice department to actually have to reckon with 23 the routine machinery through which the Chicago Police 24 Department hid and justified systemic violence against black 25 people.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The justice department, as you all know, then launched the largest civil rights investigation of a police department in its history. It made detailed findings documenting what black and brown people in Chicago have viscerally, though, known for decades and entered a written agreement with then-Mayor Rahm Emanuel committing to a federal consent decree.

But after the change of the administrations following the 2016 elections, the U.S. government turned its back on the people of Chicago and the City retreated from its commitments.

So members of the community coalition then stepped up and did what the U.S. government refused to do. brought federal civil rights lawsuits to try to end violent, racist, and abusive policing in the city.

And after the Illinois Attorney General also stepped up in a truly historic fashion to fill the void left by the justice department, the coalition ultimately agreed to dismiss our lawsuits in exchange for the right to enforce the decree in court.

I mean, this is the first time --That's historic. this is the first time that community enforcement has ever been written into a government consent decree with the police in the U.S. ever. And we have taken this responsibility with the utmost seriousness.

So as Mary just said, we are nearly four years into the decree. Where do things stand? And where do things stand from the perspective of people on the ground?

In short, your Honors, the coalition is frustrated.

Rather than embrace the decree as an opportunity to do better, to be better, the City has continued to deny the reality of our clients' experiences, it's continued to resist genuine engagement with impacted folk, and it's continued to resist change.

CPD's pattern of delay, denial, resistance have left coalition members, folks who you hear from, feeling profoundly both disrespected, frustrated, and even angry. And most importantly, it's left entire communities living in continued fear of predatory behavior by the very people who are sworn to protect them.

Your Honor, coalition members are losing faith and losing faith in this process.

Throughout the entirety of this decree, the Chicago Police Department has been engaged in a pattern of illegal, violent, and dehumanizing raids, raids that continue to traumatize thousands of black and brown families in Chicago.

For the past two and a half years, we have exercised our rights under the decree to try to stop this mess, and the past two and a half years, the police department's resisted.

Police raid in Chicago about 15 homes a year.

That's more than four separate families a day. Virtually all the families are black and brown; according to the Inspector General, 96 percent.

Officers break down people's doors in their homes in the middle of the night, guns drawn -- you will hear from folks about this -- leaving people to believe that they are going to be robbed or worse.

Police point assault rifles, semiautomatic weapons directly at little kids, directly at their parents. They handcuff kids in front of their parents and parents in front of their children, and they have treated people with a basic lack of respect for their humanity, including detaining and demeaning women like Social Worker Anjanette Young, who's here today, naked or near naked in front of a band of intruding strangers. We will hear from Ms. Young.

We will hear from other survivors of CPD raids firsthand today about the harm that they suffered and about the harm that they just haven't suffered in the past but that continues.

So to conclude my comments, your Honors, if there is one thing that we have learned in this process through this, it's that CPD will change only when they are forced to do so.

Real change has occurred only when the community

5

4

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

coalition has stood up, spoken out, exercised our rights under the decree, and the court monitor have pressed the City to engage, to negotiate with us.

At this moment, your Honors, there is nothing more critical than for the Court to convene settlement negotiations with the CPD and the coalition, with people most impacted to stop these ongoing constitutional violations. can't let another kid, another child be forced to cower with a loaded CPD M-4 rifle pointed at their head.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Futterman.

MS. BEDI: Good morning, Judge Dow.

Good morning, Chief Judge Pallmeyer.

I'm Sheila Bedi, one of the other attorneys that represent the community coalition.

As you have already heard this morning, there has been some progress with CPD's compliance with the consent decree, but the consent decree that we are all here for today has failed to fulfill its truly transformative potential.

The consent decree has been failed, in large part, because those with the power to implement it view the consent decree as optional, as an inconvenience, as a political talking point, not as a federal court order, not as the minimum constitutional requirements needed in order to protect lives and to protect communities from CPD's racist violence, which has been CPD's calling card for generations.

And we know this because, while the consent decree contains many important provisions, in several crucial respects it falls short.

It's allowed CPD to hold fast to a culture that denies the reality of CPD violence and that facilitates police immunity. Recent headlines are evidence of this. Even as we appear here today, a CPD officer with ties to the white supremacist Proud Boys, one of the groups that led the January 6th Capitol insurrection, is also a proud member of the CPD.

Both the mayor and the superintendent defended the October 2022 decision to allow this officer to remain on the force, to carry a CPD badge, and reflect the overtly racist path CPD has been on for generations. This path is one that the department has continued upon, even with the consent decree in place.

The last time we were together for a listening session was in the summer of 2020. We gathered together to hear from over 60 people who protested in the streets. They were protesting police violence and white supremacy.

Over 60 people took time away from work and family to explain to Judge Dow how CPD officers brutalized them; how they used lethal force, baton strikes to the head; and indiscriminate use of OC spray; animus toward the protestors, using slurs and taunting them.

Many of the people who were harmed during the summer of 2020 are still dealing with the lingering effects of those injuries.

Hundreds of officers harmed peaceful protesters.

And the independent monitor of the Office of Inspector

General issued detailed reports confirming CPD's widespread violence and policy violations.

Despite these facts, we have identified only
12 officers who have been subject to discipline for their
role in harming protestors during the summer of 2020.

These accountability failures have real-world consequences. The IMT's recent focus group report on young black and brown men detailed that every single participant -- every single participant in that focus group either had a CPD officer point a gun at them or witnessed a CPD officer point a gun at a member of their community.

CPD's uses of force often result in flagrant police violence, and it's violence that is so common it doesn't even make headlines -- TASERs, OC spray, black eyes, backs that are bruised from being thrown against police cars.

And much of this violence happens because police have incentives to escalate encounters with our communities. This often happens when police officers are arresting people for minor and non-violent offenses, things like drinking in the public way or disorderly conduct.

Officers get paid time and a half when their shift gets extended because they are processing an arrest. What this means is that officers have financial incentives to arrest and to escalate encounters.

So how can we course correct? Well, there's two solutions that could be written into the consent decree and implemented tomorrow.

The first is that the superintendent must use his significant power to remove racist, violent officers from the streets, pending full investigations.

Until this happens, CPD officers will hear one message: that they can abuse with impunity. CPD's culture is too ingrained and too powerful for the superintendent to not use this power.

And second, the consent decree must be amended to include the creation of diversion programs and a prohibition on officer trolling, so specifically, a pre-arrest diversion program that would give services to all people, not just people who are in crisis. We heard this morning about the City's commitment to such programming. Those provisions should be written into the consent decree.

The diversion provisions would also include a community mediation program that would allow community members to resolve disputes without relying on the police.

The development of a citation program that would

allow officers to give tickets, citations for quality of life offenses.

These are provisions that exist in other consent decrees around the country and that have helped fuel real change. Chicagoans deserve no less.

Despite its flaws, the consent decree has the potential to significantly curb lawless police violence. But this potential will never be realized so long as those with the political power to implement change view the decree as optional, an optional exercise in checking boxes, and not a federal court order containing life-saving mandates, mandates that must be followed and strengthened to have their intended effect.

Thank you for hearing from us this morning.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Bedi.

MS. ANTHOLT: Good morning, your Honors.

My name is Amanda Antholt. I am an attorney with Equip for Equality. We are a disability rights organization and one of the counsel for the community coalition.

One of the areas where the consent decree has not lived up to its promise is as to the more than 520,000 people with disabilities who reside in Chicago and hundreds of thousands more who have mental illness.

People with disabilities, mental or physical, and particularly people of color with disabilities are

disproportionately impacted by police violence.

Unfortunately, when the consent decree was negotiated, the parties rejected the coalition's proposals for comprehensive disability-specific reforms to policing, use of force, and deflection and diversion.

I want to pause there to explain something that might be a little confusing, because we heard about these great programs from Mr. Richards this morning, from the Department of Public Health. And we fully support those programs and his wonderful work.

But that's not a part of the consent decree. It's something that we asked. The coalition advocated to be a part of the consent decree, and the City refused.

Those are new programs that are building up, and they are great, but they don't have the court oversight or reform, and we don't know how sustainable or how much they are going to be resourced up. And they are not a part of the consent decree, because when the consent decree was negotiated, it was limited to the police department, not the public health workers who are doing those programs.

Instead of that kind of more comprehensive program that may or may not ever come to be in Chicago outside of policing, the consent decree, what it did -- what the parties agreed to do was expand CPD's existing crisis intervention program, commonly referred to as CIT, the Crisis Intervention

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Team, to give requirements within that program for police interactions with people with disabilities more broadly, not just mental health crisis, but CIT was now supposed to be expanded to include people with disabilities, broadly speaking, and those police interactions.

But the CPD has not met even the core requirements for the CIT program. So that's why we are hearing about a program that's not actually -- this consent decree-mandated CIT program.

The monitor's report -- most recent report -- found that the CPD has reached full compliance with only 3 of 64 consent decree terms for the CIT program. They have not even reached preliminary compliance -- so that policy level compliance -- with more than a third of the CIT program.

So it certainly has not been expanded to have this broader reach for disability that we had sought.

The impact has been devastating. Despite some small new programs that answer a very small percentage of the calls, people with mental illness, whose families call to try to get help, all too often are injured, shot, or land in jail.

People with developmental disabilities and intellectual disabilities commonly are hurt and traumatized during interactions with the police, sometimes in ways that take them back, in their functioning, years.

People with physical disabilities get injured when they don't respond physically as the police expect or comply with the orders because of their physical disability.

Whether police are responding to a call for help, entering a home on search warrants, or policing on the street, making a traffic stop, people with disabilities are always present. And disability cannot be this one-off policy or an aside added on to a program that's not even fully resourced.

It must be a focus for comprehensive reform in every CPD policy. And the coalition -- the community coalition is here to keep fighting for that throughout this consent decree.

Thank you.

JUDGE DOW: Could I ask you a question before you --

MS. ANTHOLT: Yeah.

JUDGE DOW: So not too many times in this history have I heard the City say, "We have got this new program," and have heard other people say, "And it's great."

I have on occasions -- and search warrants is obviously the most noticeable thing. I have had people say, "Well, it's a policy, but it's not in the decree"; or, "it's arguably not in the decree."

I just wanted to make a point here, because I think

1 the monitor might be able to help Judge Pallmeyer understand 2 how all this works. 3 I had forgotten that things could be added to the 4 decree at certain intervals. And if there is something that 5 the City has spent 10 minutes this morning explaining how 6 great it is, and then you have said it is great, my one 7 thought is, well, the City ought to -- whether it's in the 8 decree or not, the City ought to treat it as if it's in the 9 decree. 10 And if it's not in the decree and it should be in 11 the decree, there are intervals at which the monitor can 12 suggest to the presiding judge that it ought to be in the 13 decree, and it can be added to the decree. 14 We did a fashion of that with search warrants this 15 year. 16 But I wonder -- maybe the monitor could help me 17 out -- when is the next time you can suggest that? 18 MS. HICKEY: At the end of year four. 19 JUDGE DOW: Year four. Okay. 20 MS. HICKEY: At the end of year four there will be 21 an assessment and recommendations. 22 JUDGE DOW: Perfect. So it's just a marker. 23 Really, the marker is more for my wonderful colleague here, 24 who may not have gotten through all 799 paragraphs and

25

internalized them yet.

1 The marker is, when I hear there is a great program 2 and I hear you all say it is a great program, that's the kind 3 of thing that everybody ought to work on together. It ought to be treated as if it's part of this. 4 5 And if it needs to be part of it because it's not 6 being treated that way, there is an avenue for it to be 7 formally part of the decree, if that's what's needed at the 8 time. And I wanted Chief Judge Pallmeyer to understand that. 9 I couldn't remember when the next time that's an issue that Maggie can raise. 10 11 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: When you say, the end of 12 year four, you mean the end of 2023? 13 MS. HICKEY: No. It's -- technically, because of 14 the way the consent decree came to be on March 1st and then 15 extensions because of COVID, year four officially ends 16 June 30th, 2023, for the consent decree. 17 The consent decree doesn't work on the January calendar for the ending because of delay in getting it 18 19 started and the delay because of COVID. JUDGE DOW: So it's seven months away. 20 21 MS. HICKEY: Yes. 22 JUDGE DOW: That's not too long, but it's a little wrinkle that I didn't realize until we started working on 23 24 search warrants. I had forgotten about it. 25 MS. HICKEY: So on June 30th, 2023, is when we

wouldfollo

would begin our assessment, and then offer it sometime in the following months.

JUDGE DOW: Right. But it's something you can assess for seven months. You can raise it at that time. And then it's an issue, really, for Chief Judge Pallmeyer to sort through after she has got your report and anybody else's input she wants to take.

MS. HICKEY: I promise you -- both your Honors -- I have a running list I have been assessing since day one.

MS. ANTHOLT: I don't want to get too in the weeds of this, because I know it's too much, but this issue is a little different because what they have done with the current consent decree terms is kind of siloed policing.

So things like Public Health Department crisis work in the community is different than a police response to a call, one of the hundreds of thousands of calls involving people with mental illness or other disabilities each year and the police officers responding. Those are actually two different departments, two different kind of staff people responding.

And part of why it's so important -- would be so important to have consent decree oversight is because of the need for system interaction and coordination and resource development to really make those programs as sustainable as they can be and to make them functional to decrease the

1 harmful effects that happen when police are on the scene in 2 these kinds of incidents. 3 I hope I didn't confuse that too much. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: We are still talking, 5 though, about -- whether it's the Department of Public Health 6 or the Chicago Police Department, we are still talking about 7 calls that come in to the City through a crisis -- in a 8 crisis. 9 MS. ANTHOLT: Right. 10 So the City's OEMC, the Office of Emergency 11 Management and Communications, gets calls. And many of those 12 calls -- people here probably know the numbers; I think it's 13 over several hundred thousand a year -- are coded as 14 involving mental illness or some kind of crisis. 15 And then some of those calls, under these very new 16 pilot programs, are being kind of switched over to other 17 kinds of responses or, hopefully, in some of these new 18 programs, having a social work-type call-taker respond to 19 them instead of a police dispatch. 20 But those programs are still very new and very 21 small. We are thrilled that they are happening in Chicago. 22 They are crucial. But they are not specifically under the 23 consent decree currently --24 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Correct. 25 MS. ANTHOLT: -- because they are separate than the

police response. 1 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. 2 3 MS. ANTHOLT: Thank you. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. MS. BLOCK: Good morning, your Honors. 5 6 My name is Alexandra Block. I'm an attorney with the ACLU of Illinois. And together with my colleagues here 7 8 today, I represent the coalition that enforces the consent 9 decree. 10 This morning I am going to echo some of the themes 11 that our colleagues have already emphasized, that racist and 12 violent policing, unfortunately, despite the consent decree, 13 is still the norm being experienced by people on the ground 14 in the city. 15 Our clients have not observed meaningful or 16 measurable changes in how police behave toward them, and the 17 data bear this out. 18 I'm going to talk briefly this morning about some 19 qualitative data and some quantitative data. 20 One example of the qualitative data is the report 21 that the independent monitor published in September of this 22 Ms. Bedi already mentioned it. It was a report from 23 focus groups of black and Latino men aged 18 to 35. 24 focus groups uniformly expressed profound mistrust between 25 Chicago's black and brown communities and the police.

Many black and brown communities feel both underprotected and overpoliced -- underprotected and overpoliced.

Underprotected means that the focus group participants reported feeling that the police didn't do their jobs effectively because they ignored or delayed responding to calls for service or police failed to investigate crimes. And this made the focus group participants feel that their safety and their very lives were not valued by police.

At the same time, the participants reported routinely aggressive, threatening, and racist interactions with the police on a routine basis. They reported officers routinely pointing guns at them during traffic stops, for example.

And the quantitative data also bear this out. The Chicago Police Department stops over 350,000 motorists for traffic stops every year. The data that Chicago Police Department is required to report to the Illinois Department of Transportation shows that in 2021, the Chicago Police Department stopped black drivers at five times the rate of white drivers.

The Chicago Police Department stopped Latinx drivers twice as often as white drivers in Chicago.

And these disparities are the same racial disparities that have persisted since this traffic stop data

reporting began almost 20 years ago. They have not changed since the consent decree went into effect in 2019.

Even more disturbing, the Chicago Office of the Inspector General reports that black people are subjected to over 83 percent of the uses of force during investigatory stops. And over 87 percent of the uses of force during traffic stops are against black people. And this is based on stop data from 2017 to 2020, so spanning the time that the consent decree has been in effect.

These reported racial disparities in stops and uses of force have not changed since the consent decree went into effect, despite the consent decree's requirements for impartial and unbiased policing.

This data showed that the necessary transformation has not occurred in practice under the consent decree.

And you will hear from a number of members of our community today, who are going to tell you their very personal stories about being subjected to police violence and harassment.

And thank you for giving us the opportunity to present their stories today.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Block.

MS. GARCIA: Good morning, your Honors.

Michelle Garcia with the ACLU on behalf of the coalition counsel.

You have heard from my colleagues of the coalition that we represent 14 diverse community and civil rights organizations in Chicago. And we have been fighting to stop CPD's racist, unconstitutional, and violent policing since before the decree was entered.

Our clients gave up their civil rights lawsuits to enforce this decree. And what we have found time and time again is that the City and CPD will not change to stop harming people with disabilities and black and Latino Chicagoans until the Court and the monitor forces them to do so.

My colleagues explained that, over our objections, the decree failed to comprehensively deal with disability issues and isolated it to the Crisis Intervention Team. And now CPD has cut resources to that team.

My colleagues explained that CPD is violating the consent decree as we speak with its search warrants, raiding about four families in their homes a day, but CPD won't even negotiate a search warrant policy with the coalition and counsel and community members.

My colleagues have explained to you today that there are holes in the consent decree, areas that we have raised early on and areas where we think CPD needs to step up in addressing accountability for officers that harm people at protests and officers that commit misconduct.

Even with the decree, CPD continues to use excessive force and stops black and brown men at higher rates than others in traffic stops and other investigatory stops.

While we are grateful for this hearing, because it confirms our clients' and community members' lived experiences, we ask that everyone, including the Attorney General's office and CPD, do more than listen.

We request that the Court take an active role in holding CPD accountable for its failures to engage with the coalition and our community members and live up to the consent decree's promises to stop racist, unconstitutional, and violent policing.

Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Garcia.

I have on the agenda an indication that we may be hearing from Mr. D'Alba, who's a representative of the police union.

Is Mr. D'Alba with us? He is not.

All right. Then, we will be moving to the next stage of our hearing this morning, which is an opportunity for community members to speak.

We have a list of those individuals. Although we are starting about five minutes early, I do want to adhere to the plan that we will be asking each of you to limit your comments to about three minutes. That gives us about

1 30 seconds then for the next speak speaker to step up. I 2 myself will monitor the timing. 3 But we can begin, I think, with Jalonda 4 Blassingame, if you want to step up. 5 I will just hold up my hand when you have got, 6 like, about a minute to go. 7 MS. BLASSINGAME: Okav. 8 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Go ahead. 9 MS. BLASSINGAME: Good morning, everyone. 10 My name is Jalonda Blassingame. 11 In 2015, as we do on a regular basis -- I do -- I 12 was at home with me and my three boys and my nephew. 13 making dinner. I had just got off work. I was making dinner 14 for them, my boys in the front doing homework and playing of 15 video games. 16 I just heard a loud bang at my door. I didn't know 17 what was going on. I thought somebody was trying to break in 18 the house. 19 So I ran to the front to get the kids, to see what 20 they were doing. And I heard, boom, boom, boom. And they got scared, so they got to run out of the room. We all 21 22 started running, trying to go out the front door. 23 So then I heard a loud bang at the front door. I 24 just heard, like, a big flash bomb or a smoke grenade or 25 something like that, of that sort. So we ran in the front

1 room, like in the front bedroom. 2 So I looked at my nephew. He was trying to jump 3 out the front window -- out the balcony. But he's -- they 4 were all young, like three, four, five, six, stuff like that. 5 So I'm, like, no. At that point, I'm, like, this 6 can't be somebody trying to break in the house. It has to be 7 the police. 8 So I didn't hear anybody knock. They didn't 9 acknowledge that they were the police or anything. So I 10 didn't know what it was. 11 But when I saw the grenade, I'm, like, it had to be 12 the police. So I just told them to get down behind me, and 13 we all were in the floor crouched down. 14 So I heard somebody come in the room with the guns 15 I looked up. It was guns -- a big -- like a big -pointed. 16 some type of rifle gun pointed. So I'm like, "Nobody is here. It's just me and my boys. What's going on?" 17 18 He was, like, just -- you know, they use expletive 19 words. You know, just shut the -- you know, just shut up. They still had the guns pointed. I'm, like, "These are kids." 20 21 Put your guns down. These are kids." 22 So I stood in front of them, because I was scared 23 that, you know, the guns might go off by mistake. So if 24 anybody was to get shot, it would be me instead of the boys

25

getting shot.

1 So they were screaming and crying, and the police just kept cursing. "Just shut up. Go to the front." 2 3 So they led us from the front bedroom down the 4 hall, back toward the kitchen. One in the front. One was one in back. And it was, like, the house -- at that point, 5 6 the house was full of police officers. So they still had the guns pointed the whole time. 7 8 as we walked back. I thought they would have put the guns up once they saw the kids, but they never did. 9 10 So they made us get down on the kitchen floor. So 11 we sat on the kitchen floor. At that point, one of them 12 handcuffed me. I'm not sure who it was, but I know I was 13 handcuffed. 14 The guns was still pointing at that time. 15 never took the guns off. They didn't take the guns off until 16 one of the police came back in the back and said, "Okay, 17 we're all clear." 18 It was, like, five minutes the guns were being 19 It was, like -- for the whole ordeal, it had to be, pointed. 20 like, five to seven minutes the guns were pointed. 21 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: We are just about done 22 here. 23 MS. BLASSINGAME: Okay. 24 I come to find out that they were looking for 25 someone that was already in jail serving a 40-year prison

sentence for murder that stayed in my apartment, like, years 1 2 before I stayed is there. 3 And they never apologized or anything about what 4 happened. So I had to sleep with the freezer door -- with the freezer put up to the back door. Once they broke the 5 6 door, everything was tore up in the house. 7 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Blassingame. 8 Our next speaker is Ledarrel Goss El. 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ledarrel isn't coming today. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Not able to be with us 10 11 today? All right. 12 I think we have -- next on our list, then, would be 13 Sharon Lyons. 14 Ms. Lyons, once again, I will hold up my hand when 15 you get to about one minute left. 16 MS. LYONS: Good morning, your Honors. 17 My name is Sharon Lyons. 18 February 26, 2000 -- 2020, 6:06 p.m., my son was 19 looking out the window, and he said, "Mom, it's a whole lot of polices out there." He said, "They're going downstairs." 20 21 I hear a boom. Then I hear another boom. It was 22 my downstairs door. 23 So I'm standing -- there's the front door, and my 24 cat stand, and then it's my bedroom door. I'm standing right 25 there. I hear them come up the stairs.

Next thing I know, the door bust open. The panel 1 2 on the door flew across the other room. 3 They come in, two officers, rifles with flashlights 4 on them in my face, telling me to get on the floor. 5 My son was in the living room. 6 When I proceeded to go sit at the table, the chair 7 was knocked away from me on the other side of the kitchen. I 8 was still -- they still had guns on me. Told me to get down on the floor. So I sat down. I got down on the floor, up 9 10 against my bedroom door. My grandbaby was in there. She was 11 four years old at the time. 12 They had one of my sons down by the bathroom on the 13 floor with the gun to his head, with they knee in his back. 14 I'm steady hollering asking them, "What's going on? Why is y'all done kicked in my door? What do y'all want? 15 16 What are y'all looking for? Who are y'all looking for?" 17 No answer. 18 I was disrespected. My phone was snatched out of 19 my hand. I was hollered at. I was yelled at. 20 I asked them, could I go in the room and get my 21 four-year-old granddaughter? They told me no. 22 Two officers proceeded in my room at different 23 times with they guns out on my granddaughter. 24 hollering and she's screaming. 25 I tried to get up. They helped me up. And I sat

in a chair, finally. I tried to go in there and get her. 1 They closed my bedroom door while she was still in there 2 3 hollering and screaming. I felt useless for my four-year-old 4 grandbaby. And I felt helpless. I felt scared. 5 disrespected, violated, everything. 6 These people have -- they had no morals at all of 7 coming up in my house, violating my privacy. I couldn't 8 sleep at night. I had a massive, massive headache when they 9 left. 10 They told me they had a search warrant. 11 didn't proceed to give me a search warrant for the upstairs 12 and the downstairs until they left. 13 It was two officers outside. They was making fun 14 -- cracking jokes about the paneling on my door -- stairs 15 coming into the house. 16 It was one officer standing behind me. He wouldn't 17 let me move. 18 It was just devastating. It was scary. It was --19 it was just -- it was just hopeless. I couldn't do nothing. They wouldn't let me move. They wouldn't let me do nothing. 20 21 I had -- I kept telling them that I have a 30-year-old disabled son. He has autism. He gets upset 22 23 when, you know, he sees the police and stuff go on and 24 whatever. And I told them he probably was scared, which he

25

was in the living room.

1 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Lyons. 2 MS. LYONS: You're welcome. 3 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. 4 I think our next speaker is Karl Brinson. 5 Mr. Brinson, if you want to step forward. Again, I 6 will give you a hint when you have got a minute left. 7 Go ahead, sir. 8 MR. BRINSON: Good morning. Judge Dow, we are going to miss you. We hope you 9 10 well -- wish you well in your new endeavors. 11 Judge Pallmeyer, where do we start? 12 We are humans. All the things you have heard, all 13 the things you will hear, and the things that we have 14 experienced being a black man living in the community, it's 15 been marginalized, disrespected for years and centuries. 16 The impacts of this consent decree has been going 17 on for several years. We see no resolve from it. We see no 18 impact from it. 19 We understand when you make the case -- and people 20 say that reform takes time. Our community doesn't have the 21 luxury of the time that it takes to reform when we are 22 talking about life and death. 23 In the situation that we're dealing with now and 24 will reoccur, it's all about life and death, how we are 25 policed, how we are being treated as human beings, our civil

rights being violated.

How long? We don't have that luxury to restart -- push the restart button or to say we have a resistance to be engaged in a process.

Our people hear about a consent decree. All they did was hear it. There was a consent decree just written down on paper, but it's not in practice. The procedures are not being applied.

How long? We don't have the luxury of a long time to wait for something to come to fruition, for something we have been waiting on for a lifetime in our community. This is devastating. This is painful. As you hear us testify and we give testimony, how we have been advocating for years for the organizations -- for hundreds of years for some kind of justice. How long?

Judge, we hope we get some enforcement in this consent decree. Hear the cries of the people. Listen to the community. Have full engagement. Let us have ownership in how we're being policed, how we're being treated.

How long? Hear the cry of the community. Hear our cry.

Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Brinson.

The next community member we will hear from is Cynthia Eason.

Ms. Eason, I will give you a clue when you are up 1 2 to two minutes. 3 Go ahead. 4 MS. EASON: Good morning, your Honors. 5 My name is Cynthia Eason, here to tell you about 6 the situation that happened August 2018. 7 My daughter was in the front with her baby. I was 8 in the room taking my clothes off, preparing for a bath. I I'm like, oh, my God. It sounded like a car 9 hear a boom. 10 I know my daughter was in the front with her had came in. 11 baby. 12 I run and I look. It's policemen just rushing in. 13 "Who is in here?" I'm not going to use the profanity that 14 was used toward us, but my grandchildren were in the back --15 my two grandsons. My granddaughter saw her mom going out the 16 front door. She ran behind her. 17 As my daughter is walking out the door, it was like machine guns or something -- whatever they had was pointed 18 19 directly to her back, the same as my granddaughter. 20 My grandsons ran out behind me. I didn't know it. 21 So I'm standing there. "What's going on? What's 22 going on?" They're saying to me, "Who's the F in here?" 23 24 I said, "No one but my daughter and my grandchildren and myself." 25

1 "Put your hands up." 2 A gun was pointed at me. At the time, my 3 nine-year-old grandson, in his face. My 13-year-old 4 grandson, at the temple of his head. And I'm saying, "Is this real?" 5 And they're saying, "Yes, this is real." 6 7 I'm like, "What's going on?" They kept saying, "Who's the F in here? Who's the 8 F in here?" 9 And I said, "No one." 10 11 "Okay. Get the F out." 12 And I said, "I'm not leaving without any clothes." 13 I had on -- I was preparing for a bath, so I had on a T-shirt, no bra on, and I had my underwear on. 14 15 They made me go outside with my T-shirt, no clothes 16 on, my underwear, outside. No shoes on. And I seen one cop 17 laugh at me. 18 And the way that they treated myself and my 19 daughter and my grandchildren, it was just ridiculous. Guns 20 were pointed at us the whole entire time. 21 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Eason. We will next hear from Andre Crayton. 22 23 Is Andre Crayton here? 24 (No response.) 25 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. We can move,

then, to Dajae Allen. 1 2 (No response.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Darlene Ivory. Is Darlene 3 Ivory with us? 4 5 Thank you. 6 MS. IVORY: Good afternoon, your Honor. 7 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good morning, actually. 8 Good morning, Ms. Ivory. 9 MS. IVORY: Good morning. 10 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I will let you know when 11 you have got about a minute left to go. 12 MS. IVORY: Thank you, your Honor. 13 My name is Darlene Ivory. I am a black mother of 14 two black children. We live in Roseland area. 15 I am here to speak out against the injustice and 16 the harassment for the -- that black peoples deal with in 17 Roseland every day and participate -- want to tell you how 18 CPD abuse black peoples with disability. 19 It happened to my kids just about a month ago. started as an ordinary day. I went to the beauty store on 20 21 103rd, Calumet in Roseland. 22 While I was in the store, my daughter -- my son called me, like, "Mama, get out here." 23 24 My daughter had schizophrenia, and my son has bipolar disorder. Daughter is also a rape survivor. 25

They were just waiting in the car -- in a parked car on the lot. They were driving around. They were -- they wasn't driving around. They was just sitting in a parked car. They was just waiting on me to come out.

All the sudden, while I'm in the store, here's CPD, wearing all black clothes and bulletproof vests, grabbing my daughter. I thought the officer was going to shoot my children.

I kept saying, "No one dead today. No one dead today."

They had my son-in-law handcuffed and other officers just being violent and out of control toward my daughter. My daughter can't respond well in a physical situation. That's because she has schizophrenia.

The officer grabbed my daughter and started pulling her out the car. My daughter was hollering and screaming, "Please, don't rape me." The officer did nothing to calm her down.

They showed no respect. No care. No profession.

How do you think it feel for a rape survivor with schizophrenia to have a big, male officer with a gun grab her and pull her out of the car? I was afraid for her. My daughter need to be left alone and treated like -- like not a criminal. She need to be treated with respect.

This police abuse has got to stop. The police need

to treat peoples with disability with dignity and respect. 1 2 All our life matter. 3 When I asked the officer what my kid do wrong, the officer said, "Expired tag." Give me a break. For a black 4 clothes officer was abusing passenger parked -- my kids just 5 6 was parked, sitting there in the middle of the day. Expired 7 taq? We all know Chicago police don't do this to white 8 peoples in white neighborhoods who have expired tags. We all 9 10 know those officers was really concerned about no expired 11 tags. The officers stereotyped my kids because they all 12 dark-skinned and all had dreads. 13 This officer assumed these black kids with dreads 14 was criminal and wanted to search their car, which the 15 officer did. Chicago police need to stop harassing and need to 16 17 stop doing -- and need to start doing they job in safety. They jobs is to protect us and keep us all safe. That 18 19 includes black peoples and black with disability. 20 And, Judge, we have the power to make Chicago 21 polices change how they behave. We need real change now. 22 All life matter. 23 Darlene Ivory. True story. 24 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Ivory. 25 We will next hear from Miracle Boyd.

1 (No response.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Miracle Boyd may not be 2 3 with us. 4 Maybe -- is Tree Brown here? Is it 5 Yes. Do you want to step forward. Mr. Brown? 6 7 MR. BROWN: Good morning, your Honors. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good morning. 8 9 MR. BROWN: Good morning, everyone. 10 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Mr. Brown, you could also just pull down the microphone, if you want to do that. 11 12 MR. BROWN: Thank you. 13 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: That should work. 14 MR. BROWN: Testing. Testing. Okay. 15 My name is Tree Brown. I'm a 28-year-old gun 16 violence survivor and community activist and organizer with 17 the community organization Communities United. 18 This morning I'm going to share briefly, due to the 19 short time, two incidents where I experienced the injustices 20 of the police. 21 The first instance would be in June. I was in front of my home, preparing to go to a community meeting with 22 23 my organization. I was waiting on a Lyft that they had 24 prepared to come get me. I live in the North Lawndale area, 25 community.

1 As I was waiting, a police squad car pulled up. The officer in the driver's seat asked me what was in my bag. 2 So I sarcastically responded, "What's under your hat?" 3 4 because I understood that he couldn't just, you know, ask me 5 those questions. 6 So once he asked me again, I just replied, "Just 7 some of my stuff, sir. I'm just messing with you. Just some 8 of my stuff." 9 So he said, "What's your stuff?" I said, "Stuff." 10 11 Another squad car pulled up. The two officers 12 jumped out, ran over there to me. He said, "What's in your 13 baq?" 14 I'm like, "Just some of my things." 15 So I had this exact fanny pack on me. The officer 16 reached for it, started to, like, try to grab it off me. I 17 tried to resist. When I tried to resist, the other officer 18 motioned as if he was grabbing his gun. 19 He said, "Don't touch it." So I lift my hands up. They began ransacking 20 21 through my bags, and then they just walked off. They didn't 22 tell me what it was about. They didn't say anything. 23 just walked off. 24 I began to just say things to them, like, "You 25 can't do this to people. How you expect us to respect you if

this how you act?" They ignored me and just went away.

The next incident would be from September. Me and my girlfriend were in front of my home again. This time I was in a vehicle. We were in our vehicle. The vehicle was parked. It was off. I had just transferred out of my wheelchair into the truck.

Once I got in the truck and sat down, my girlfriend was preparing to get out of the car to break my wheelchair down. Before she could get out of the car, four squad cars surrounded us, started shining lights into the vehicle, and then a lot of officers jumped out -- it was about nine officers in total -- surrounded the car.

They began asking her for her ID, driver's license, registration.

When they came to my side, though, that's when they noticed that my passenger door was open and the wheelchair was right there. And I began to notice that their demeanor and their facial expressions, just the whole energy around the whole thing changed.

To me, I perceived it as they saw a black male with dreads in his vehicle, and they perceived something was wrong. Once they saw I was disabled, they kind of felt less that I was the criminal that they thought I was.

So then that was just a stall. Now we're just sitting here. And we were like, "What's going on?" And they

were just looking crazy.

I asked one of them, "Well, since we're here now, could you put my wheelchair in for me?"

He was like, "No."

And then again they just left. After they ran her ID and things, they just left.

Moving forward after that, I no longer felt safe in my community. When I see the police, I wonder, are they gonna hop out and harass me? Are they gonna think I'm a criminal? All these different things.

I just feel like what has been echoed today. The police need a lot more training for their emotional and mental states when they go into these areas, because I understand a lot of them may have fear. That's understandable. You're a human being. But they need more training on how to deal with those feelings.

Also, we need more officers that are in communities that are familiar with those communities and not going into strange territories where all they have is reports of shootings. So now they're going off the report. Like, okay, there's a lot of shootings in this area. So nine times out of ten, the average young person in this area may have a gun.

So they just need more training and more help with their mental state and their connection to these communities.

And that would also allow us to feel safer.

And I also feel that, they made me feel that me 1 2 being disabled -- the first incident, when they ran up on me 3 and went through my bags, they made me feel like they felt 4 they could do that because I'm disabled. And they didn't have to give me no explanations or anything because, what can 5 6 I do? 7 So, yeah, I just want to also thank all the mothers 8 and women who came and spoke today about their stories as 9 well and everyone who's going to speak. I will stop there. 10 Thank you, your Honor. 11 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: We thank you as well, 12 Mr. Brown. Thanks. 13 Mr. José Almanza. Is Mr. Almanza with us? 14 (No response.) 15 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I can call the next person 16 on the list. That would be Mr. Vince Davis. 17 Mr. Davis is with us. Good. 18 Good morning, sir. I am going to give you an 19 indication when you have got a minute left. 20 MR. DAVIS: Yes, ma'am. 21 By the way, my name is Professor Vince Davis. I 22 have prior experience with law enforcement, as well as an 23 investigator with the Inspector General's office. 24 I kind of agree with Mr. Brown in terms of the use 25 of force. Most officers, you know, there's a mental state

that they go through. 1 2 And the use of force continuum is: officer 3 presence, verbal command, soft hand, impact weapon, and 4 deadly force. 5 And the body goes through physiological changes. 6 It's called parasympathetic sympathetic nervous system. And 7 I believe that that needs to be addressed more in use of 8 force training because that will make the officers aware 9 that -- you know, when they are in tunnel vision, 70 percent 10 of your vision is tunnel. It would make them aware. 11 I don't advocate people's constitutional rights 12 being violated. However, we need to come together as a team 13 and get on a collaborative team effort and try to make the 14 change in terms of the training. 15 By the way, I'm in my last year of law school, too, 16 as well, and I'm old, too. I'm going to finish. 17 Again, if there is any help that you need me in 18 terms of monitoring and help you, I can help. 19 Thank you. 20 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Mr. Davis, thank you. 21 I am going to ask whether any of the people that I 22 called earlier but who weren't here have now entered the 23 room. 24 One of those persons is Ledarrel Goss El. 25 (No response.)

1	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Andre Crayton.
2	(No response.)
3	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Dajae Allen.
4	(No response.)
5	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Miracle Boyd.
6	MS. HICKEY: Your Honor, I understand that Miracle
7	Boyd will be here this afternoon.
8	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Oh, good.
9	MS. HICKEY: That it got miscalendared for the
10	morning. So we will add her on in the afternoon session.
11	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: That's fine.
12	José Almanza.
13	(No response.)
14	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. Well, then
15	let's move on to the next person on the list. That's
16	Olatunji Oboi Reed. It looks like Mr. Reed is with us.
17	Good morning, sir. I'm going to give you an
18	indication when you have got one minute left to go.
19	MR. REED: Good morning, your Honors.
20	My name is Oboi Olatunji Oboi Reed. I am the
21	founding president and CEO of the Equiticity Racial Equity
22	Movement.
23	Black and brown communities in Chicago are
24	subjected to hundreds of thousands of brutal, racist,
25	unnecessary police encounters every year. CPD pulls over

around 350,000 drivers and stops around 70,000 pedestrians every year.

This strategy isn't working to combat crime, nor does it reduce traffic violence. But it is highly damaging to black and brown communities, and it must change immediately.

CPD officers disproportionately stop black and Latinx residents in predominantly black and Latinx neighborhoods, mostly young men.

Black drivers in Chicago are five times more likely to be stopped than white drivers. Latinx drivers are two times more likely to be stopped than white drivers.

Traffic stops all too often escalate into officers beating, tasing, or even shooting people, as many high-profile incidents have shown.

As just one recent example, an officer shot and paralyzed a 13-year-old boy who ran from a traffic stop on the west side this May. The boy was unarmed and had his hands up to surrender when an officer shot him in the back. The officer who shot the child did not activate his body-worn cameras as required.

A recent study by the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General found that among CPD traffic stops that involved an officer using force, 87.2 percent of such uses of force were against black people.

CPD issues eight times more tickets to cyclists for 1 2 riding on the sidewalk in black neighborhoods as compared to 3 white neighborhoods. Meanwhile, black and brown 4 neighborhoods are less likely to be provided with safe bike 5 infrastructure. 6 Since 2016, about two-thirds of all investigatory 7 stops were of black residents, while the city is only about 8 one-third black. 9 Almost all of the time, this horrific treatment 10 results in nothing but trauma for the people who were 11 stopped. CPD reports that 95 percent of these traffic stops 12 result in verbal warnings, not even a ticket. 13 Out of all black drivers stopped by Chicago police 14 in 2021, just half of 1 percent had contraband, including 15 guns or drugs, in their vehicle. 16 CPD's policing strategy of conducting hundreds of 17 thousands random pedestrian bike and vehicle stops must end 18 It is not making communities safer, as proven by the now. 19 fact that it yields little in the way of illegal guns or 20 drugs. 21 It is, however, irrevocably eroding trust and 22 respect between the police and the community. 23 Thank you. 24 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Oboi Reed. 25 Krystal Archie?

MS. ARCHIE: Good morning, your Honors, everyone else in the courtroom.

My name is Krystal Archie. I'm here to share my experience.

About four years ago, my home was wrongfully raided three times in four months.

The first two times that the home was raided, my children were home alone. During the first raid, police bust in the door upstairs in the two-unit building, and they chased the children from upstairs down into our apartment. And that is how they came into the apartment the first time.

Each time that the home was raided, it was left in complete shambles. To this day, nothing has been found illegally in my apartment. Nothing. We don't live that type of life.

It's very scary that we have to stay in the communities that we stay in, but it is what it is. That's our lives.

The first time and second time, my children, as I stated, were home alone. They were not allowed to call me while I was at work. Neighbors had to call and let me know what was going on in my home. By the time I arrived, the officers had left the first time -- I'm sorry -- the second time.

The first time they were there, but they would not

answer any questions for me. They could not tell me why they 1 2 were there. They were not able to tell me who they were 3 looking for. 4 The second time they had already left by the time I 5 made it there to see what was going on. The supervising 6 officer, I asked him why they had entered my home again. 7 That time they kicked my door in directly. I asked him -- he 8 told me that I needed to keep better friends. 9 I moved into that apartment less than a year before 10 I did not know the people living on the second floor. I still do not know those people. We were neighbors. We 11 12 spoke neighborlike. That was it. 13 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One minute left. 14 MS. ARCHIE: Yes, ma'am. 15 The third time, myself and my friend was there. 16 The officers came in through the front and back doors, 17 pointing rifles and guns at me and my friend. It allowed me to know what happened with my children. 18 19 We were talked to very recklessly, very carelessly. 20 And to this day, there has been no apology. There's no --21 there's no way of taking something like that back. 22 At the end of everything, I do need the Court to 23 simply understand that this was a family that did not deserve 24 something like that. Not that anyone deserves something like

it, but it is very serious. And I really hope that the

25

1 courts are listening and hearing everyone's stories and plan 2 to implement change as quickly as possible. 3 Thank you. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you very much, Ms. Archie. 5 6 Roxanne Smith? 7 I will let you know when you have about a minute 8 left. You are welcome to get started whenever you want to. 9 MS. SMITH: Okay. 10 Good morning. And thank you for having me. 11 My name is Roxanne Smith. I'm a black mother of 12 three, and I live in the Austin neighborhood. 13 I'm also the president of the board of directors of 14 Communities United. We are part of the coalition community 15 of groups that enforce the consent decree. I have been fighting for years for real change in 16 17 policing because my family has survived police violence over 18 and over, just like so many black families in Chicago. 19 In particular, I have seen how CPD brutalizes 20 people with disabilities, because it happened to my son. 0ne 21 of my sons has the developmental disability called 22 Friedreich's syndrome. 23 Several years ago -- in 2008, I believe it was --24 he suffered a panic attack while we were at church. needed medical attention. And as his mother, I wanted to get 25

him medical help as soon as possible. So I called 911 to get an ambulance or the paramedics.

Instead, more than six Chicago police officers arrive with fire trucks and everything. Just crazy. Threw my son to the ground when they got in the church and handcuffed him. One pulled a gun out.

The police did not try to deescalate the situation at all. They were unnecessarily brutal. They literally threw him down and handcuffed him for having a panic attack.

My son needed help getting to a hospital, not to be treated like a criminal.

Today my son is still terrified by police officers. I literally have to calm him down because CPD continues to use violence against people with disabilities, especially black people.

And I'm not even gonna tell you about what happened to my son in 2004. Glory to God. Violence that is totally unnecessary and avoidable.

The consent decree requires CPD to make real changes in how they treat people with disabilities, but the City is refusing to act. The monitor's most recent report found that the City has not reached any amount of compliance with 22 consent decree requirements related to crisis intervention.

The first step is, CPD needs to train all officers

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to recognize when someone might be behaving a certain way due to a disability and to deescalate incidents like the one my son was in. But deescalation training is just a start.

The CPD needs to change its culture from treating people with disabilities like threats to treating people with disabilities with human dignity.

The goal must be to prevent people with mental health issues from entering the prison system. Instead of arrest and police violence, the City needs to invest in mental health providers that can treat people who are in crisis, like my son was. We don't need crisis intervention. We need crisis -- I'm sorry. We don't just need crisis intervention. We need crisis prevention.

What's missing is leadership from the mayor. Change starts from the top. That means the mayor. The mayor is pushing these problems under the rug. We know she can get tough when she wants to. She needs to make implementing the consent decree a priority. She needs to act like it's her child whose life is on the line, because our children's lives are.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you very much, Ms. Smith.

MS. SMITH: The consent decree has been in place for almost four years, and nothing has changed on the ground. Can't wait any longer. Change is now.

1 Thank you for hearing me. 2 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Smith. 3 Raven Geary? 4 (No response.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Is Anjanette Young with us? 5 6 Ms. Young, if you want to step forward? 7 I'll try to let you know when you have about a 8 minute left, Ms. Young. 9 MS. YOUNG: Good morning, everyone. 10 To the judges on the bench and everyone in the 11 courtroom, I want to first ask that everyone look up from 12 their tablets and their books and look directly at me. 13 I'm asking for that because on February 21st, 2019, 14 when 12 male officers raided my home, they treated me as I 15 was invisible. So I want all of you guys to see me, and I 16 want you to hear me, and I want you to see that everyone who 17 has come up here to speak today have not looked like any of 18 you that are sitting on these front rows. It's because it 19 doesn't happen in your community. 20 And so all the other women who have stood up here 21 today and expressed the same situation that I am about to 22 share about myself, it's happening in black and brown 23 communities. And we need you guys that are standing here 24 saying that you are committed to making change to make real 25 change.

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I prepared something, but my passion for what I have heard everybody else say makes me want to put that down and talk directly to you, and specifically to the police officers who are in this room today.

It's one thing to put change in place with policies and consent decrees, but the training that the officers need -- if an officer doesn't come with a level of compassion for human dignity, you can train them for as many hours as you want to. It does not change the results.

So if they don't have human compassion when they come to the academy, they don't need to work in our cities, because each of us who stood up here today, we are taxpayers. We pay the officers' salary when they come to work every day. We deserve to be treated with human dignity regardless of the circumstances that lead them into our homes and our doors.

And like the other women who spoke, when they kicked in my door and they pointed guns at me and they yelled at me and they cursed at me, and they left my home in shambles, they did not fix my door that night. So how am I supposed to feel safe after what they done to me and my home?

I'm a licensed clinical social worker in my profession. And I know what it feels like to have to work and treat families who have trauma, and now I'm the person with the trauma.

I live with PTSD. I live with major depression.

And so for me to be able to get up on a daily basis and function with some level of normalcy so that I can go to work and continue to be the great social worker that I have desired to always be, we need police to do things differently.

It's a call to action for every woman that has stood up here and talked about how the City of Chicago Police Department has treated us. It's not right. And we're asking the judges and everyone in this room that we need real change right now.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Young.

I just want to point out to you, Ms. Young, and to everybody here, I know very much that I don't fall into the category of people that get abused by the police very often. I realize that life is different for people. And I'm trying my best to understand that deeply, and I really appreciate your being here.

And that's why I have looked you all in the face.

That is very important to me. I need to hear this testimony, and I take the views of all of you very seriously.

So thank you for stepping forward. I know it's never easy to talk about episodes in your past, especially when you are suffering from it still. So thank you.

MS. YOUNG: Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Tramaine Jones, I believe,

is next. 1 2 (No response.) 3 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: We had the name Christopher 4 Huff, but I think that person is off the list for right now. 5 Matt Martin, are you with us? 6 Mr. Martin, I will give you an indication when you 7 are getting close to the end here. 8 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you, Judge. Thank you both for the opportunity to speak today and for convening 9 10 this hearing. 11 My name is Matt Martin. I'm the current alderman 12 in Chicago's 47th Ward. 13 I wanted to come here to share some of my insights 14 that are informed largely by conversations that I'm 15 continuing to have with residents, as well as other experts 16 and folks who have lived experience throughout the city. 17 First, I think that it bears emphasizing that we 18 are continuing to make some amount of progress, whether you 19 look at percentages of compliance with various consent decree paragraphs -- foot pursuit policy, compliance in particular 20 21 with departments like the Inspector General's Office, COPA, 22 the police board. 23 But I think clearly what I continue to hear and 24 what we have heard today is that we are still struggling, in 25 particular with the police department, but not exclusively.

And that while my colleagues on City Council and myself will continue to do what we can in terms of improving accountability and transparency, the fact of the matter is that over the last several decades, if our elected institutions had done the job that folks have demanded and needed, we wouldn't be here today.

So while we are committed to doing a better job, we recognize that through this process, including with the two of you, that more is needed in terms of holding the City accountable.

Some of the things that I wanted to focus my testimony on are a little bit underdiscussed in the hearing thus far, but still really important. Issues around, as the monitoring team and others have noted, inadequate community engagement and input that too often is included once policies are largely or almost fully baked. That's something that obviously needs to change.

I have also heard from a number of folks and seen firsthand that the collection, the management, the analysis of data needs serious improvement, not just with the police department but also the law department. I have seen that with use-of-force issues, crisis intervention, calls, and even misconduct lawsuits.

The Inspector General's Office recently shined a spotlight on the fact that the law department, among others,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really needs to do a better job when it comes to analyzing data for purposes of understanding both for individuals and institutions and processes where we need improvement.

Also, I want to express the concern that I have and many others in my community with Bob Boik's recent firing of this head of CPD's Office of Constitutional Policing, and my hope that this court, among others, will help ensure that we don't face what I perceive to be a false choice between improved training and the resource allocation that needs to happen at a patrol level. I think that, in fact, we need the former to happen more often so that the latter happens in the ways that we need.

Finally, I want to underscore the needs around mental health, both from the officer standpoint and the community standpoint.

Crisis intervention training is improving, but it's not happening at the pace that I think we need. I think a good example of that is with these crisis intervention teams that are responding, they are only covering three or four of our police districts right now. We have 22, of course.

And also, they are happening between 9 and 5 p.m. We see a lot of these calls happening later in the evening on weekends. So that's something that will improve for officers. It also improves for the public, because, at the end of the day, we need officers to be at their best so that

1 with interactions and, ultimately, when force may need to be 2 used, that it happens in a constitutional and moral way. 3 Thank you. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Martin. JUDGE DOW: Alderman, if I could hold you for one 5 second? 6 7 MR. MARTIN: Sure. 8 JUDGE DOW: It's not often -- we have seen lots of 9 people in this process. We haven't seen aldermen. 10 So the testimony this morning is so powerful. And 11 I will say, what we have mainly focused on is policies. You 12 got to start somewhere. 13 And what we now have is policies. And I think 14 that's the one area where all of the speakers before, the 15 community members, but all the lawyers essentially agree that 16 we have better policies. 17 After policies comes training. After training 18 comes implementation. After implementation comes 19 accountability. And after all of that comes internalization. I think what all the community members are 20 21 emphasizing -- and this is something I have always felt, 22 too -- is, it's only at the end where it will be felt 23 throughout the community. And that's a shame. 24 I would like this to go faster, believe me. I have 25 spent -- of all the cases I have had, this is by far the one

that's caused me most consternation because I want it to go faster.

So much of this is about resources. And this is where I wonder if the City Council could play a role, too, because -- you referenced Bob Boik.

We all worked very closely with Bob Boik. He made a lot of great things happen. The dispute he had with the superintendent was really a function of resources. The superintendent wanted more officers on the street. Bob wanted people who were working on reform with all of us. In the ideal world, that choice would not have needed to be made.

In the ideal world, Chicago wouldn't be down 2,000 police officers from what the sworn complement is. In the ideal world, there would be a lot more people working on many of the issues that have been raised this morning and the reason that the department is in compliance with three out of 64 -- whatever the rubric is.

If there were more people to review use-of-force incidents, if there were -- if COPA moved faster, all of it's about resources.

And I am wondering if there is something -- if you would take that back to your City Counsel colleagues, because this consent decree, when it was entered into, is a contract between the Attorney General, the State of Illinois, and the

mayor of the City of Chicago, however you want to phrase that, the two contracting parties. And as soon as that contract was entered, it was a commitment to provide the resources necessary to get compliance.

If we had 30 percent more resources, we would probably be 30 percent further down the road. And many of the things that I can identify myself and many of the conversations I have had with the monitor, with all the lawyers, with the mayor, with the Attorney General have all been: they need more resources.

Now, that's -- you know, you have to raise taxes. It's complicated. But many of the problems we see, none of this -- it's all a continuum here. And what everybody in the community is saying is, we don't feel this yet. And I get that, and I'm sorry about that. I wish that I could say we had more to feel in the community.

But it's all -- people have to be trained. People have to be held accountable. And all those things require resources.

So thank you for hearing me out on that. I hope you will take that back to your colleagues, because I think if there were more resources, we would all feel better.

MR. MARTIN: May I make one quick response to that --

JUDGE DOW: Sure.

MR. MARTIN: -- if you will indulge me?

I completely agree. And I think that that continuum point is an important one, because we can look at the resources, at least from a budget, in terms of what we have allocated. And we have allocated funds to hire many new officers. We have 1,000 budgeted vacancies -- over 1,000, most of which are in patrol, some of which are detectives. We are going to struggle to fill those positions over the next year, to say nothing of retention for existing officers.

So I think that that's a point where we say, well, what can would we do with what we have right now?

Even hiring new officers, it's about 18 months to get through the academy field-training program. So when I'm thinking about what we have right now it's, can we answer the simple question of, how many officers are doing work that a civilian should do? We don't have an answer to that right now.

So as much as I think the dollars are important, just like so many other issues, as you underscore it, it's more complicated, it's nor nuanced. I will definitely take that point back to my colleagues.

Thank you.

JUDGE DOW: These are all huge points. The fact that you bothered to come today shows me that you are committed to this. So I thought it would be an opportunity

1	for me to make a pitch to you. So thank you.	
2	MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Judge. Thank you both.	
3	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Are there any of the	
4	individuals oh, Ms. Hickey?	
5	MS. HICKEY: Your Honor, I was going to ask if you	
6	would recall the names?	
7	And then, also, if there is anyone in the audience	
8	that is actually scheduled for this afternoon, perhaps if	
9	they could speak now, it would allow them to return to their	
10	jobs or their families.	
11	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I was about to make that	
12	exact suggestion.	
13	First, let me ask, are there people that were	
14	scheduled for this morning, maybe you weren't in the	
15	courtroom when your name was called?	
16	Yes?	
17	MS. JOHNSON: I haven't been called yet, but I was	
18	scheduled.	
19	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Oh, I'm sorry. What is	
20	your name?	
21	MS. JOHNSON: Carolyn Johnson.	
22	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Okay. You know what? I	
23	somehow missed that. It doesn't appear	
24	MS. HICKEY: She is No. 21.	
25	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: You are one of the	

1 afternoon speakers, but if you would like to speak now, we 2 would be happy to call you now. 3 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: That would be fine. 5 And while she was stepping up, let me ask, is there 6 anybody else who's scheduled for this afternoon that would 7 like to be heard now? 8 (No response.) 9 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Anybody who we called 10 earlier that wasn't -- or anybody who was scheduled for this 11 morning but you didn't get to speak yet? 12 (No response.) 13 MR. WILKINS: I'm No. 55. 14 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: What was your number? 15 JUDGE DOW: Mr. Wilkins. 16 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Mr. Wilkins, we will call 17 you in just a moment. 18 Right now we have Ms. Johnson, Ms. Carolyn Johnson. 19 And I am going to turn on the timer and let you 20 know when you have got about a minute to go. 21 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you, Judge Pallmeyer, and 22 Judge Dow, and everyone here. 23 JUDGE DOW: Could you pull the microphone down just 24 a bit. There you go. Thank you so much. 25 I'm here MS. JOHNSON: My name is Carolyn Johnson.

to help out with the decree for the police officers.

My son was 13 years old, and he was tortured by a group of detectives. I was standing right there when the officer got out of the car and grabbed my son off the telephone booth.

And I ran out of the restaurant and said, "This is my son. He with me. And what do you want with him?"

He said, "We taking him in for questioning of a shooting."

I say, "Well, I'm going with him because I'm his mom."

I have three kids. I adopted one, and I'm a single parent.

He took my son -- he kidnapped my son and told me I could not come with him. I didn't understand because when you're a juvenile, your parents are supposed to go with you to these offices -- police stations.

They electric shocked him, spit in his face, beat him in his chest, called him a nigger, made him sign two different statements that put him in the -- at the scene of the crime when there was a witness there that testified and that told them that my son wasn't there.

He was exonerated. The judge said that was the weakest case he ever seen in his life, to let that child go home with his parents.

These same officers, my son was 17 years old. I moved. They didn't know that I moved to Wisconsin because I got out of there, because I knew that we would still be in trouble. One of the officers was fired. But the ones that did it to my son wasn't fired. They should have been fired.

Then, come to find out, my son is disabled because of the torture. I am disabled because of the wrongful conviction and the torture that they did.

He did 30 days. He was exonerated. His case was cleared. These detectives violated their own agreement to wrongfully convict him to 46 years in prison for another case he had no -- nothing to do with, nowhere around, in retaliation because of the other officer was fired.

They tried to implicate him in another murder in '94, but they didn't know we was in Wisconsin. And by us living in Wisconsin, found out that my son was in school. Wasn't even there -- nowhere here in Chicago. Just like the other people that was wrongfully convicted and tortured was in jail when they put a case on them.

But these detectives, I feel, are above the law. I know they said people ain't above the law, but for them to be working on these many years after I found out getting involved, I was mentally -- I have PTSD. My son have it now. He did 22 and a half years.

These same detectives had an order of -- it was an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

order -- the Judge Strayhorn put an order of protection for them not to go nowhere near my son.

These officers, they was above the law. They took it upon themselves, and they just wrote up a false police report and gave my son 46 years for a crime he did not commit.

It took an attorney from New York to come here and represent my son after he did 22 and a half years. He got He didn't want disability. He relived the torture. So I had a nervous breakdown. I have been in a mental institution. I feel paranoid, looking around every time I see -- because these same detectives -- I don't even know how they get to even stay on the force.

Your Honor, I thank you all. And I thank God that we do have someone to help get this over with, because all these years from way back there -- all polices are not bad. I know they not. I wanted to be one, but now I don't. I'm afraid.

So I started trying to -- took classes of private investigating because of so much stuff I found wrong in my son's case. And when I had the nervous breakdown, everything went away. So I'm trying to -- I passed two of these exams. I'm trying to get back to it so I can, because I want to be a help to the city.

These police officers need to be held accountable

1	for what they have done. They have a pattern of what they		
2	have done.		
3	My son came home, didn't want to be in prison. Now		
4	he can't even work because a disk in his back is messed up.		
5	But I just want to thank you all for giving me the		
6	chance to speak and thank everybody here that's been fighting		
7	for us.		
8	I'm still going through the PTSD, and my son is		
9	still getting counseled. We go to the torture center. We		
10	get counseled sometimes.		
11	But ain't no way these officers supposed to still		
12	be on this force with all these patterns, proof, evidence.		
13	It's a shame. And I thank you all so much.		
14	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Johnson.		
15	I think, Mr. Wilkins, you said you are here for		
16	this you are prepared to speak.		
17	MR. WILKINS: I'll wait for the evening.		
18	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I'm sorry?		
19	MR. WILKINS: I'll still wait until the evening.		
20	We still got some more people coming, so I'll wait.		
21	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Well, I'll tell you what.		
22	You want to wait until this afternoon. Is that what you are		
23	saying?		
24	MR. WILKINS: Yes.		
25	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Okay. That's fine with me.		

1 Are there other people who are here that would like 2 to be heard on the schedule for this morning or on the schedule for this afternoon? 3 4 (Brief pause.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I think we can take -- oh, 5 6 I'm sorry, sir. 7 MR. CASTRO: My name is Jandrick (phonetic). 8 don't know if I'm on there. 9 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: What is your last name? 10 MR. CASTRO: Castro. 11 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Castro. Let me just see. 12 (Brief pause.) 13 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I don't see you on the 14 list, Mr. Castro. 15 If you will keep your comments to three minutes, I will hear from you. 16 17 I am going to get you started right now. MR. CASTRO: Thank you. 18 19 My name is Jandrick Castro (phonetic). I'm originally from Orlando, Florida. I moved here, like, five 20 21 years ago. I say that in hopes that, you know, my comments 22 23 don't necessarily get discounted but more just as a -- for 24 the sake of perspective. 25 I originally came and thought that I would, like,

speak on -- sort of ask some thought-provoking questions with the hopes that they would be maybe somewhat productive.

But I think, after listening to you guys speak and listening to the community members speak, I'm reminded of two things -- that this is sort of a manifestation of segregation in Chicago, just by the very dynamics of who is here leading this discussion on progress and also who is here in the community -- representing the community.

I think that it's also -- you have these people of the pale persuasion coming up here talking about reform, talking about how we're going to make these adjustments, and talking about the lack of accountability or lack of, you know, completion of certain aspects of the consent decree. I think it, more or less, speaks to the overexpectation we have of police officers here in Chicago, that we expect them to do way too much. We expect them to protect people.

You know, they don't really -- they don't stop crimes. I feel like that's a misconception that we are all led to believe. We are misguided in thinking that these people in uniform and everyone they represent are anything more than outdated slave patrols.

You know, we expect them to solve crimes as well, but they can't do that. I mean, the clearance rate -- the only thing worse than the clearance rate for homicide in Chicago is the clearance rate for police officers who commit

acts of violence against community members.

So I think -- I myself am not a reformist. I'm an abolitionist in every sense of the word. I think we should explore, instead of diversions, alternatives, you know, alternatives to policing. What does that look like?

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MR. CASTRO: We're building this -- you know, you're talking about -- over here you're talking about -- Judge Dow talking about how, you know, after policies comes training and after training comes implementation, but we're not talking about what comes before policies. We're not talking about infrastructure in place -- infrastructure in place. And that's why I described police officers as outdated slave patrols, because that's what they are, because that's the infrastructure we built.

So I encourage you guys to think critically about that going forward. I encourage us to expect less of the police.

And we're talking about providing resources. Resources for what? If they're not doing their job with what they have at the expectation that they have -- if we increase by 30 percent, we decreasing 30 percent of -- that, to me, is an unrealistic expectation, based off of misguided notions that the police are here to protect and serve us, and that's not the case.

1 I feel like the consent decree is a beautiful thing 2 that exists in Chicago because it doesn't exist in Florida. 3 It doesn't. 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. 5 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. 6 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. Anyone else who 7 is here scheduled for this afternoon or for this morning? 8 (No response.) 9 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I know Mr. Wilkins is 10 scheduled for this afternoon. We will see him this 11 afternoon. 12 The rest of you -- well, all of you actually, we 13 could take our lunch recess at this time. 14 We are scheduled to get started again at 2:00 15 Given the need to go through security and the like, 16 I would encourage you to get here earlier than that so you 17 are ready to go right at 2:00, when we resume. 18 I want to thank everyone for your courteous 19 attention this morning, and I look forward to seeing some of you again this afternoon. 20 21 All rise. 22 THE CLERK: Court is in recess. 23 (A luncheon recess was taken at 12:09 p.m.) 24 25

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION		
3			
4	STATE OF ILLINOIS,		
5	Plaintiff, Ocket No. 17 C 6260		
6	vs.		
7	CITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago, Illinois		
8) November 29, 2022 Defendant.) 2:00 p.m.		
9	TDANSCRIPT OF DROCEEDINGS Hooring		
10	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Hearing BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE REBECCA R. PALLMEYER and HONORABLE ROBERT M. DOW, JR.		
11	HONORABLE ROBERT II. DOW, JR.		
12	APPEARANCES:		
13	For the Plaintiffs: HON. KWAME RAOUL		
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ILLINOIS BY: MS. MARY J. GRIEB		
15	MR. CHRISTOPHER G. WELLS MS. AMY P. MEEK		
16	MS. KARYN L. BASS EHLER MS. HANNA JUROWICZ		
17	MR. JOHN HAZINSKI MR. AARON P. WENZLOFF		
18	MS. REBEKAH I.M. NEWMAN MS. STEFANIE L. STEINES		
19	100 West Randolph Street Chicago, Illinois 60601		
20	MANDEL LEGAL AID CLINIC		
21	BY: MR. CRAIG B. FUTTERMAN UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL		
22	6020 South University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637		
23	NORTHWESTERN PRITZKER SCHOOL OF LAW		
24	BY: MS. SHEILA A. BEDI 375 East Chicago Avenue		
25	Chicago, Illinois 60611		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued:)	
2		FOUTD FOD FOUND ITS/
3		EQUIP FOR EQUALITY BY: MS. AMANDA ANTHOLT
4		20 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 300 Chicago, Illinois 60602
5		ROGER BALDWIN FOUNDATION OF ACLU, INC. BY: MS. BLOCK K. BLOCK
6		MS. MICHELLE T. GARCIA 150 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 600
7		Chicago, Illinois 60601
8	For the Defendant:	CITY OF CHICAGO DEPARTMENT OF LAW
9		BY: MS. JENNIFER K. BAGBY 121 North LaSalle, 6th Floor
10		Chicago, Illinois 60602
11		TAFT STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP BY: MR. ALLAN T. SLAGEL
12		111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 2800 Chicago, Illinois 60601
13	Independent Monitor:	ARENTFOX SCHIFF
14	Thospondone nonteon.	BY: MS. MARGARET A. HICKEY MR. ANTHONY-RAY SEPÚLVEDA
15		233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 7100 Chicago, Illinois 60606
16		omoago, immora ooooo
17	Also Present:	MS. PATRICIA JJEMBA MR. MAX FRAZIER
18		MR. ARTHUR HAYNES MR. MATT RICHARDS
19		MS. JESSICA GALL-ADEDIRAN DR. LAURA CANARD
20		CHICAGO POLICE CHIEF ANGEL NOVALEZ LIEUTENANT MICHAEL KAPUSTIANYK
21		LIEUTENANT JOHN BENIGNO COMMANDER RALPH CRUZ
22		COHINIPLIX IVALI II CIXUZ
23	Court Reporter:	FRANCES WARD, CSR, RPR, RMR, FCRR
24		Official Court Reporter 219 S. Dearborn Street, Suite 2524A Chicago Illinois 60604
25		Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 435-5561 frances_ward@ilnd.uscourts.gov

(The following proceedings were had in open court)

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Good afternoon.

I want to welcome you to the hearing this afternoon. Welcome you back, in many cases. For those of you who weren't here this morning, I just want you to know that my name is Rebecca Pallmeyer. I'm the judge to whom the case is now being assigned.

We are sorry to be saying farewell very soon to my colleague Judge Dow, who has been involved in this consent decree and its enforcement since its beginning in 2019, but we know that he is going to serve the nation well in his new position in DC.

And I will do my best to fill his very large shoes and to do what I can to make sure that this consent decree is enforced appropriately and with an appropriate level of assertiveness and speed.

Judge Dow, any comments you want to make?

JUDGE DOW: I just want to thank everybody for being here.

I think this morning demonstrated the powerful testimony that we wanted to hear and some updates, also, from the lawyers. I'm just so happy we were able to get this in while I was still here. And thank you for letting me participate.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I think our next speaker --

1 the speaker that was first on the afternoon's calendar, 2 Carolyn Johnson, we heard from her earlier today. 3 But the next person on our list is Michael 4 Harrington. Mr. Harrington, if you are here, I am going to 5 6 invite you to step forward. 7 (No response.) 8 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Maybe not yet? All right. Let me just ask before I go further down the list, 9 10 are there people who were scheduled to be here this morning and did not make it and would like to be heard now -- people 11 12 that were on the list for this morning? 13 (No response.) 14 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I do know that -- I 15 understand that Miracle Boyd is with us. And we are going to 16 plug her into one of the open slots in just a few minutes 17 here. 18 Next would be Jaime Silva. All right. 19 (No response.) 20 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Nobody here for Jaime 21 Silva? All right. 22 Leticia Horton. 23 (No response.) 24 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I am going to recall these 25 people. Perhaps they will be here in a little while.

Miracle Boyd, are you here with us? 1 2 (No response.) 3 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: No. Not yet. All right. 4 Next would be James Gibson. 5 (No response.) 6 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: For those of you keeping 7 score, we are going to be done a little earlier than I 8 expected. 9 Rebecca Cook. 10 All right. Ms. Cook, I like your first name. You 11 are welcome to step up. 12 I am going to give you the same three minutes that 13 the other speakers got, and I will try to let you know after 14 two minutes that you have got one left so you will be able to 15 kind of keep track. 16 MS. COOK: Okay. Thank you. I thought I would 17 have a minute to step in, but I will just start speaking. 18 My name is Rebecca Cook. I am a member of the 19 Chicago West Side branch of the NAACP. 20 I have been a part of the Campbell coalition for 21 the past five years. I like to pride myself on saying I was the first one to say, let's just sue them. 22 0kay? 23 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: You were the first what? 24 MS. COOK: To say, let's just sue them. Let's just 25 get it done with.

We can't get any leeway by saying, let's meet.

Let's have a conversation and talk about how we can come to a place where everyone can live peaceably.

At the time that we got started, we were dealing with a lot of officers who were just kind of getting away with murder, literally. There was no repercussions for it.

And now we are looking at some five years later, and things are only really better because the newspaper puts it out now and says that these are still atrocities that are occurring and that something should be done about it.

But as far as having policies and processes and procedures that are running within the Chicago Police Department, we are not seeing them in the way that they need to be there.

I am a part of a volunteer organization with the NAACP. So I got the pleasure of spending all of my vacations and off time and time when I should have just been at home chilling trying to write the people's consent decree; trying to say, well, we don't -- we don't believe that police should just not exist. At least NAACP does not. We believe that they should exist, but we believe that they should exist with some kind of rules and regulation.

So I spent a lot of my free time trying to write what those rules and regulations would look like.

Part of my committee, I had ex-officers,

ex-detectives. We had attorneys. We had citizens. We had a conglomerate of people.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One minute left.

MS. COOK: So we are not just hearing from one side about what this looks like.

And now five years later, we still haven't gotten anywhere further. A lot of the things that were really important to us as a civil rights organization, such as diversion, have been completely dismissed.

We have been ridden over by a lot of our large institutions. They have not heard us the way that we need to be heard. And we are still getting calls day after day. "I got my gun taken." "I was shot." "Somebody arrested me in front of my daughter for having a light out of my car." Various things that are occurring in terms of the police that we don't have -- we say, oh, we put a consent decree together. We actually did sue them. And yet we have no recourse for you. Nothing that we can help you with.

So I'm here today because I want to make a plea to the Court that the Chicago Police Department, I think they are trying to wait us out. I think they think that because they are paid and we're volunteers and they have people who are paid to give their time to this, that they can just say, you know, if we wait long enough, they will just go away.

We don't intend to go away. We intend to continue

1 fighting, because we are fighting for lives, and not just the 2 people that we read about in newspapers -- our friends, our families, and it's costing us. 3 4 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. 5 MS. COOK: Thank you. 6 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Cook. 7 Benjamin Postone? 8 Sir, if you want to step forward. 9 MR. POSTONE: Good afternoon, your Honors. 10 My name is Ben Postone. I'm a law student at the 11 University of Chicago Law School. 12 I have had the immense privilege and honor to work 13 with members of the community coalition to research national 14 best practices and work with them to turn their personal 15 experiences, many of which you have heard today, into workable policy language. 16 17 I have watched community members come prepared to 18 engage the City in substantive and meaningful dialogue around 19 CPD home raid policy. And time and again I have seen CPD not 20 only fail to accept the recommendations made by the community 21 but fail to even engage in a meaningful way. 22 As you have heard, there is a clear picture that 23 CPD home raids have overwhelmingly affected black and brown 24 families and evince a pattern of discrimination. And despite 25 the clear injustices in CPD practice and recommendations from

_ _

organizations like COPA, there has been no accountability.

The community has put forward a number of common-sense demands that would protect both the people of the city and the officers who serve it.

The first of these requires that officers wait at least 30 seconds before entering a home. Giving people a meaningful opportunity to answer the door protects the safety of both families and police officers. The many powerful testimonies today indicate that the failure to do so in Chicago has been a recipe for disaster.

These are also the most dangerous raids for police officers. Between 2010 and 2016, officers were twice as likely to be killed executing a no-knock warrant than any other kind of home raid. Banning no-knock warrants is increasingly becoming the norm, including in Evanston, which just recently passed a ban on no-knock warrants with unanimous support from city council and the approval of their police chief.

The community has also asked that there be an end to dangerous nighttime raids. This is another practice that many states and cities have already restricted to only exigent circumstances and thereby prevented countless deaths and serious injures to families and police officers.

In both of these --

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

1 MR. POSTONE: -- there has been no increase in crime in those states and cities that have implemented these 2 3 policies. 4 The community demands that CPD include 5 harm-reduction principles in its search warrant policy. 6 only is this a matter of common sense, but it has already implemented these principles in its use-of-force policy. 7 8 The community insists that CPD make concrete 9 changes to its policies regarding children. The effects of 10 not doing so, you have heard time and time again today. 11 And lastly, another common sense policy that the 12 community demands is that CPD fix what it breaks. 13 policies leave homes unsecured and open to crime. Whether 14 the raid was a wrong raid or not, CPD ought to reduce harm, 15 not create situations in which crime can flourish. 16 Thank you. 17 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, sir. 18 That was Benjamin Postone. 19 Mr. Catanzara. 20 (No response.) 21 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Jasmine Vale. Is Jasmine 22 Vale with us? 23 (No response.) 24 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Keisha Dacre. 25 MS. DACRE: Good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Keisha Dacre, and I'm a black resident of West Rogers Park. I'm an immigrant. I'm a single, proud mother and grandmother.

I'm a volunteer leader for ONE Northside, a grassroots community organization. ONE Northside is part of the coalition of community groups that help to enforce the consent decree.

I have experienced many injustices, but today I am here to speak about how the Chicago police treated my son and my nephew. These are, to me, two stories, examples that show two sides of the same problem with the Chicago Police Department.

On one hand, young black men in Chicago, like my nephew George, often are victimized by violent crimes and left unprotected. This makes me feel like the police don't value those black lives.

Then, on the other hand, there are young black men in Chicago, like my son Dante, who are being overpoliced and constantly harassed.

My nephew George was riding in a car on Lake Shore
Drive in 2016 on what would be his first and last Father's
Day. He was tragically shot and killed that evening. George
was only 21 years old and a first-time father of a
ten-week-old son.

George was dropped off and left for dead on the

street in front of the Chicago police headquarters on 35th Street.

Though this shooting made -- was profiled on the news, the police did nothing. They told the newspapers that George was a documented gang member. To me, that meant they did not care, a feeling that's been validated to me because there was no investigation.

They released the person from custody and told us, the family of the victim, to investigate on our own, which led to our family being labeled as snitches and being threatened by people in the neighborhood.

How does something so blatant happen at police headquarters and there isn't even a surveillance of his nearly dead body being discarded? If this were a white person, in my opinion, they had -- I have no doubt that the outcome would be different.

By their own language, he was a documented gang member. And I guess that means, to us, that he or his family does not deserve justice, and that is wrong.

My son Dante was --

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MS. DACRE: -- harassed so badly by the Chicago police that he had to move out of state. He had to move away to save his life and his freedom.

A close friend of ours' son was shot and killed

near a corner store, and the police showed up and found a gun. They singled my son out. They arrested him and announced on the second page of the newspaper that he was a gang chief. They alleged that the gun belonged to him and that he was going to retaliate for a dead relative.

Dante was put in custody for months on months, where they then put him on trial for his life. He then beat all the charges against him.

The police were still relentless. They wouldn't let up on him. They wouldn't stop harassing him, arresting him for the simplest things every time, practically, he walked out the door. So as a mother, that is very painful to me.

I shouldn't have to stress and worry and be afraid every time my sons, who are young, black men, walk out the door, but I do.

I think the police don't see black people as people. I feel officers need to learn empathy and humility and should be punished if they don't treat all people fairly and with respect.

They continue to act rude and accusatory and be bullies. They are racist at times, demanding respect because they wear a uniform, all while being disrespectful to the people that they swore an oath to serve and protect.

I thank you for hearing me today.

1 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Dacre. 2 Aisha Oliver. 3 MS. OLIVER: Good afternoon. Thank you all. 4 I am Aisha Oliver. I am the strategy leader and 5 founder of Root2fruit Youth Foundation on the west side of 6 Chicago in the Austin community. 7 I am here as a parent, as a resident, but also as a 8 leader and voice for young people who live in my community. 9 In June of this year, we launched our second year 10 of the Austin Safety Action Plan, which is a public safety 11 action plan put together by 15 young black men between the 12 ages of 15 and 22 within my community, through their lens of 13 what safety looks like. 14 We had a successful kickoff event at our local park 15 district on that sunny Thursday in June. About 10:00 p.m. 16 that night, after everything was wrapped up, we were all 17 gone. Some of the young people were still hanging outside. 18 Unfortunately, a group of officers, who did not look like 19 those same young, black men, pulled up and pulled guns on the 20 young, black men, who were all wearing these hoodies that clearly say "ASAP" and "Protect our 'hood" on the back of 21 22 them. 23 One of our young men was chased down. The gun was 24 pointed at him. Where someone pulled out their cameras, you 25 can hear the footage that was sent to me that night.

t

unfortunately, fell asleep. You can hear the young people in the background yelling my name for someone to call me.

"Please, someone call Ms. Aisha."

And then you can hear the young people yelling in the background, "Please just look at what he's wearing. Look at his shirt. Look at his shirt." Trying to explain to them that they were not part of any riffraff. But instead, they were actually trying to create a safe place, to enhance what officers are supposed to be doing in their own neighborhoods.

So I stand here today on behalf of Dimontae Dudley, as well as Lorraine Moore, as well as Lester Bradford, four different incidents in this one summer of action that we have put together. This is our second year.

CPD gave us their own data showing that, in the past two years, we dropped violence in that particular safe zone 30 to 52 percent, which we thought was a great way for us to not only work with officers in our district and in our community, but it turned out that that same evening I lost a lot of young men who trusted what CPD was supposed to be doing. It completely went out the window, all of the work that they had done.

It really discouraged those young men. And at this point, we have had several incidents with those same officers to the point where we have had to reach out to COPA because of these incidents. It is harassment.

What I would love to see is officers to sit down with us. We are not looking for an apology. We are not looking for anyone to mend anything. We have come up in the past four months with our own strategy of what community engagement looks like within a community of color.

These young people want to leave that with CPD and all of those who will be taking place and taking up residence in our community at the joint police and fire academy on Chicago Avenue. If they are going to be in our neighborhoods, they need to know how to not only engage with us but connect with us.

They should know that not all young, black men or women are criminals. If you -- that is not something that you can actually make people see. It is something that they have to realize on their own, and that comes from the work.

These young people are very adamant about the work. This is what I need them to do. This is how I teach them. This is how I am training them. They are the say-soers of their community. This is their community. They should have stake in it.

No one should be able to come into their community and harass them and make them feel like they don't belong because of the color of their skin.

We have done a very good job with trying to make sure that these young people understand that not all officers

are bad. But when a handful of them make you feel that way, 1 2 you can look at the entire district and say, "F12," and 3 that's exactly what these young people say nowadays. 4 So in order for CPD to actually want to make the 5 change that they continuously say that they want to see by 6 protecting and serving, I need them to take the lens off and 7 understand that we are not all the same. We are not all 8 We do not deserve to be looked at that way, and criminals. 9 that young, black men in our community actually want to make 10 change. They don't want to be a part of any riffraff. 11 And in order to do that, we need CPD to take the 12 lens off, be a part of the communities in which they are 13 going to be serving actively, and sit at the table with us 14 and have us to teach them what it means to do community 15 engagement in communities of color. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you very much. 16 Thank 17 you, Ms. Oliver. 18 Nancy Rodriguez? 19 (No response.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Jacque or Jacque Stefanic? 20 21 Is it Jacque? 22 MR. STEFANIC: Jacque, yes. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: 23 Jacque. 24 Go ahead, sir. 25 MR. STEFANIC: It's Jacque, like a high school

jock.

So thank you for allowing me to speak today.

My name is Jacque Stefanic. I am a Chicago native. I was born in Chicago. And I'm also a youth community leader here. So I'm the executive director of Serving People with a Mission. It is a youth-led nonprofit here in Chicago. As well, I'm also employed at the City Colleges of Chicago.

In addition, I'm also taking citizens academy at the Chicago Police Academy so I can learn more about the internal operations of the Chicago Police Department to work to build bridges between our communities and our police force. And I'm the youngest member of the cohort. I'm 23 years old.

I want to go on by saying that Chicago is a major city in our country, and we have the second largest police force in the country. This means that Chicago and our police department, we set a significant example across the entire country when it comes to policing for other police departments.

Now, going back to 2017, when this consent decree was introduced, there has not really been any major improvements in terms of building a better relationship between the Chicago police and the Chicago community. In other words, there is still no trust between the Chicago Police Department and the Chicago community members.

In fact, many factors, such as the pandemic and the 2020 riots, made that gap bigger. And many members of the community do not see the Chicago Police Department as a resource nor do they see them as friends or any sort of acquaintance.

Neighborhoods are policed differently based off their demographics. Policing tactics are used to hurt people and create a bigger divide by essentially policing them differently based off solely south side and west side -- west side neighborhoods more specifically.

On the conversation of youth, many teenagers and young adults are scared of the Chicago police when they are present. Just a fact of an officer wearing light blue and the Ford Explorers doesn't really give a good tone to many young people, at least the ones that I'm around.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MR. STEFANIC: Youth tend to, honestly, get disrespected by a lot of police officers due to their age.

But this begs a question. Why is the Chicago police and the community still not building good relationships with each other? And that is because the Chicago Police Department is seen as an occupying force in many community members' eyes.

If this norm continues to happen, we will not have a good relationship with the Chicago Police Department and

vice versa.

Also, community members need to also understand that members of the Chicago Police Department are our friends, are our neighbors. And, honestly, a lot of them are living right next door to us. So it's a two-way street. And it's really a way that's going to enforce the community and the Chicago Police Department essentially to act together to build this divide.

And I sit here -- or I stand here, more specifically, to propose to the Court to essentially create more spaces for members of the Chicago Police Department, members of the Chicago community -- youth included -- to have down-to-earth conversations about incidents that happened. It's hard.

You know, I actually put together a tour for the youth over the summer at the Chicago police headquarters on 35th and -- is it 35th and Michigan Avenue? And we brought a total of almost 25 youth to the Chicago police headquarters, and we had a sit-down conversation about policing, about shootings, and about things that make people upset, things that make people sad, and things that make people nervous. And we had that conversation, and I believe we need to have more of those conversations so we can actually build community bridges.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Stefanic.

MR. STEFANIC: So that's all I have to say. 1 thank you for your time. 2 3 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Stefanic. 4 Anthony Tassone. 5 (No response.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: La'rie Suttle. 6 7 MS. SUTTLE: Here. 8 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Oh, good. 9 Ms. Suttle, you are welcome to step up. 10 MS. SUTTLE: Good afternoon. 11 May it please the Court? My name is La'rie Suttle. 12 Currently I am 26 years old, a 23-year-old resident of the 13 South Shore community, and graduating student in the master 14 of jurisprudence program at DePaul University College of Law, 15 where I am studying public interest law. At the last federal public community listening 16 17 session, held in August of 2020, I was a member of the 18 Use of Force Community Working Group for the Chicago Police 19 Department, where I inspected, evaluated, and recommended 20 revisions to the department directives in order to safeguard 21 civil rights, strengthen police community relations based on 22 legitimacy, public confidence, and trust in law enforcement. 23 During this time I expressed grave concerns of 24 unconstitutional policing regarding summer protests, First 25 Amendment rights of individuals, and use of force policies

and practices within the Chicago Police Department.

In addition to oral testimony, I submitted to the court internally outdated legal bulletins on the use of force in First Amendment activity from the Chicago Police Department. At this time, this was the only internal resource available to members of the public and members of the Chicago Police Department.

The outcome from the Use of Force Community Working Group was an article issued by the Chicago Sun-Times reporter Sam Charles in October of 2020 stating, "CPD announced last week that it rejected the vast majority of the 155 recommended" charges -- "changes to the use of force policy. The department added that 42 of the recommendations had already been adopted into its current policy, 30 other recommendations were deemed not operationally feasible, 50 other recommendations would directly contradict the City's consent decree or state law and cannot be legally adopted, and 28 recommendations were deemed not relevant to the use-of-force policy."

Shortly after resigning the Use of Force Community Working Group, I became a community policy review member for the Civilian Office of Police Accountability where I assessed internal data, policies, and practices of public interest by comparing, identifying, reviewing, and providing oral and written strategies to avoid or mitigate identified risks of

1 police misconduct and abuse of authority. 2 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Less than a minute left. 3 MS. SUTTLE: Because there are currently three open 4 investigations involving COPA, I will not comment on the investigative agency's mission, policies, or practices. 5 6 However, I will leave the Court with this quote by 7 Richard Henry Stoddard in hopes of engaging with 8 investigative and adjudicative agencies more effectively in 9 the near future. 10 "All that you do, do with your might. Things done by halves are never done right." 11 12 Thank you for your time. 13 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. 14 Vatsala Kumar. 15 MS. KUMAR: My name is Vatsala Kumar, and I'm a law student at the University of Chicago. 16 17 Later you will hear from Working Group co-chair 18 Arewa Winters about her experiences and takeaways from the 19 working group process, but I want to tell you a little bit 20 about my experience as a relative outsider stepping in. 21 I had the opportunity to watch as community members 22 devoted hours of unpaid time and effort toward helping make 23 Chicago a better place to live. I helped them research and 24 develop policies, and I saw them carefully consider every 25 aspect of every suggestion they made. And I also saw CPD

reject each and every of those recommendations.

After CPD and the Working Group completed their negotiations, they agreed to let the community coalition negotiate the remaining unresolved recommendations, in particular on the use of TASERs and chemical weapons.

I had the opportunity to participate in those negotiations, and I was stunned by how CPD treated community members.

CPD's participation in the process was performative. They would usually show up. They would usually listen to what we had to say, claim that they would take a look at their policies, and then come to the next meeting and do the exact same thing.

They demonstrated apathy throughout the process.

CPD leadership was condescending and dismissive of community members, instead listening only to their lawyers.

CPD strategically delayed the process by coming unprepared to meetings, not providing documents and research when promised, and not respecting the monitor's requests or deadlines.

Sometimes CPD outright refused to engage with us.

They would shut down and end a conversation when faced with a disagreement.

CPD's blatant disrespect in these meetings frustrated the community members and myself. It meant that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our hard work and efforts felt totally useless.

But sometimes CPD would feel pressure from the monitor, from the Attorney General's office, and from the court, and then they would begin to engage with us. would give us some feedback in advance, which helped us get to the core of our disagreements and helped us better address them to come to compromises we could all live with.

When CPD engaged, we were able to build better relationships and push the needle forward, leading to meaningful changes. But any time CPD felt that the pressure was off, they retreated to their earlier stances.

It was extremely disappointing to hear one week, "Yes, we will accept that recommendation," and then the next week, "We have changed our minds."

In the end, despite CPD's resistance and reluctance, the coalition accomplished meaningful policy changes, which, if implemented, will prevent real harm. despite all that we have achieved, there are still many aspects of CPD force policies that need to be immediately addressed.

CPD policy must state that pointing a firearm at another human being is a deadly use of force.

CPD policy must prohibit using pepper spray when others could be harmed, like into a group of people.

CPD policy must state that the use of chemical

1 weapons on someone who is just sitting in a car is 2 prohibited. 3 And CPD policy must prohibit the use of TASERs in schools. 4 5 The Court has the opportunity to make meaningful 6 change in the lives of every Chicagoan. The Court can do 7 this by holding CPD accountable to the decree and forcing 8 them to make these critical changes to their policy to remedy their ongoing pattern and practice of civil rights 9 10 violations. 11 History has shown that they will only do this when 12 they are forced by an outside entity like the Court. 13 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. 14 Daryle Brown. 15 (No response.) 16 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Crista Noel. 17 MS. NOEL: Good afternoon, your Honors. 18 0kav. I'm here to talk about women, the 19 Bland-Chavez Act, and the CAHOOTS program, which is now being 20 fought as Treatment not Trauma. 21 So women, if you ever see a document that doesn't 22 specifically say "women" and "gender," Women's All Points 23 Bulletin, which is a founding coalition member, has not 24 approved of it. 25 As we move forward -- I'm an elder, as the kids

call me. I was born in 1960, and I identify as a woman. So I want to see "women" and "gender" and not just "gender." I don't want women to be consumed by gender. I want us to stand until we can stand on our own and we have more control of processes.

The Bland-Chavez Act. The Bland-Chavez Act is an act that we are pushing internationally, as well as at the federal level as we stand here, and at the federal level with the U.S. government.

It is specifically to stop arbitrary arrest, and it is to provide a special police force for all the protected classes under the hate crimes.

For example, Irene Chavez was arrested because she supposedly had words in a bar -- a gay bar -- and she ended up dead. And we don't feel as if that should have happened at all.

Sandra Bland ended up dead over a turn signal.

Elijah Hudson was just arrested and shackled to a bench for four hours because his sticker on his car was expired, and he had a legal weapon.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MS. NOEL: All documentation in place, but he had a legal weapon.

So I would like you to consider the Bland-Chavez

Act and the ability to be able to call veterans who are

suffering from posttraumatic stress, to be able to call forth special forces; women, if I'm a woman; black supervisor if I'm black. Just the protected classes.

And last, CAHOOTS. CAHOOTS is a program that has

been going on in Oregon for over 20, 30 years. Your Honor, I mentioned it in August of 2020. It is an unarmed response to the majority of the cases that would be called under 911.

I want to say that the 988 number would probably be perfect for the CAHOOTS program.

But I do want to present the Court with that information. Right now, it's my understanding that three aldermanic districts have approved of the Treatment not Trauma, which is the unarmed response. And I would like for you to take that into consideration and definitely push it.

As far as the Chicago police force is concerned, right now they have what we call CAT cars. That's the crisis assessment -- I forget what the T stands for, but it's the co-responder model. And we have been told by the Chicago Police Department that they feel as if the co-responder model is a good model for training. So just in case they do need a police officer called when an unarmed response is in need, that that police officer knows how to respond. So we are okay with that, but we want to move toward that.

The last thing is supporting the Women's Working Group. We are pushing that. We are the first working group

1 that ever existed under the consent decree, and we are trying 2 to get the Chicago Police Department to agree to work with 3 women SMEs, subject matter experts, on policy surrounding 4 women. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you very much, 5 Ms. Noel. 6 7 MS. NOEL: And I thank you. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. 8 9 Paul McKinley. 10 MR. McKINLEY: Thank you very much, your 11 magistrate. 12 First of all, I would like to give a brief history 13 of the Chicago police concerning the African-American 14 I would like to start with Fred Hampton and Mark community. 15 Clark, a man that was drugged and was shot 80 times in his 16 bed and shot the woman, too, and killed Mark Clark. 17 Now I would like to lead from there, from the '60s, 18 and start in the early '80s, where there was mass rounding-up 19 of African-Americans by the Chicago police -- by the Chicago It was called "sweeps." 20 police. 21 And then I would like to leave from there and talk about Commander Burge. Commander Burge has -- was using 22 23 World War II torture techniques on African-Americans right 24 here in America, right here in Chicago. 25

I want to talk about the Chicago police who has the

largest people who have not committed a crime. This is called the capital of wrongfully convicted, where there were more people on death row that was innocent than was guilty, and they had to shut death row down.

I want to talk about Chicago police, who are right now trying to get from underneath this dissent decree. This dissent decree came into effect based on a lot of people coming together from 2000 investigating a group called SOS, which was a police group who went around the city doing contract murders, which ultimately got -- one of the police killed another police, where they had to shut it all down.

I want to talk about the Chicago police, who, in this city, were being used by the politicians to shut down the community when the community only wanted to raise up about something in their community that use Chicago -- I want to talk about the Chicago police, about the gang intelligence.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Just one more minute, Mr. McKinley.

MR. McKINLEY: I want to talk about the gang intelligence, who were taking activists' names. Some of the people you see out here (indicating), their names have been logged in to gang intelligence for merely telling on the police and the criminal stuff they was talking about doing.

The Chicago police, you cannot allow them to come

from underneath this dissent decree. If they come from under 1 2 this today are the reason why you had this in Chicago, your 3 Honor. 4 Now, I want to make this clear to the judge. 5 Chicago was seen all over the world about the Laquan 6 McDonald -- it's no accident -- about Laguan McDonald. It 7 was seen all over the world. 8 And this is the only city -- and I close with this -- where a commander, Glenn Evans, was in a police 9 10 station and put his gun in a man's mouth with DNA evidence on 11 it and walked out the courtroom and was innocent. 12 So we are asking that, your Honor, if nothing else, 13 keep the dissent decree -- it is a dissent between the public 14 and these police -- and make them honor what this courtroom 15 is about. 16 Thank you very much, your Honor. 17 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. McKinley. 18 Larry Dean. 19 Go ahead, sir. MR. DEAN: Hello, your Honor. My name is Larry 20 21 I'm a black community organizer. I work at Community Dean. 22 Renewal Society. We're part of a coalition of community 23 groups that help enforce the consent decree. 24 When it comes to the consent decree against the 25 CPD, the City is completely failing.

The City agreed to the consent decree almost four years ago, yet we have not seen any real change in policing on the ground. The consent decree has not made a major difference in people's lives.

The core problem is that the City and the CPD have been resisting the changes mandated by the consent decree over and over again. Change starts at the top. And the mayor and superintendent need to get behind the complete transformation of the culture of CPD.

The mayor and superintendent have tried to block nearly every attempt to overhaul the CPD since the consent decree was entered in 2019.

For example, despite a unanimous chorus of community voices arguing for years that CPD's practices when raiding family homes were unlawful and discriminatory, the City disputed that search warrants were even covered under the consent decree.

After losing that fight, the mayor and CPD now oppose the Anjanette Young Ordinance with similar policy changes that would end CPD's practices of violent, traumatic, and racially discriminatory home raids.

Another example is CPD's new foot pursuit policy.

CPD refused to adopt nearly all of the policy recommendations the coalition made, which were grounded in best practices from other police departments and the lived experience of

community members.

The final foot pursuit policy CPD released is so weak and watered down that it will now allow officers to continue the kind of dangerous and unnecessary foot chases that lead to the CPD killings of Adam Toledo and Anthony Alvarez last year.

The City is also failing the consent decree because the City and CPD refuse to meet with coalitions and communities impacted by police violence to negotiate necessary policy and training changes.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MR. DEAN: Community engagement is the foundation of the consent decree. And real community engagement means giving the communities most affected by harmful and discriminatory policing the power to shape CPD policies.

The City only offers useless one-way listening sessions, delivered dialogues, or focus groups. These are a waste of time, because CPD doesn't respond to our suggestions or explain why it will or won't accept our suggestions. At most, CPD offers fake sympathy head nods.

CPD must negotiate in good faith with community members, who are invested in changes, have direct experiences with police, and have expertise in best practices. This means CPD must explain to us why it agrees or disagrees with the community recommendation. And together we should come up

1 with new policies that Chicagoans can accept. 2 Anything short of this type of true community 3 engagement violates the consent decree. 4 Thank you. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, sir. 5 6 Elena Gormley. 7 MS. GORMLEY: Good afternoon. 8 My name is Elena Gormley, and I am a social worker. 9 I live in Chicago. 10 My main areas of practice are in workforce 11 development, mental health crisis response policy, and child 12 welfare policy. 13 In my work, I receive frequent inquiries from my 14 colleagues and from people directly impacted about what 15 resources are available for people and families in crisis 16 that do not involve law enforcement. Like, literally this 17 happens several times every day. 18 I also regularly receive inquiries from people 19 impacted by violence who need support. 20 People want transparent and accountable public 21 structures of care. Unfortunately, in my assessment and my 22 experience, the Chicago Police Department is not a 23 transparent and accountable public structure of care. 24 CPD is a very corrupt and poorly run jobs program

that hires sworn officers that do not possess the emotional

25

4

5

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

self-regulation or basic professionalism that we would expect and demand from a workforce that literally holds people's lives in their hands.

For comparison, if I were to do any of the things that the police do on a regular basis that you have all heard, I would be facing down a litary of ethical misconduct and professional incompetence charges from my profession.

I have had to help friends and colleagues safety-plan -- this is a term from domestic violence work -in the aftermath of being cyberstalked and harassed by CPD officers posting people's public information on their social media.

I have witnessed CPD officers use foul and disparaging remarks on their social media about people in mental health crisis that, again, if I were to do that, that would be considered ethical misconduct.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MS. GORMLEY: And I have witnessed CPD officers compare COVID-19 vaccination to the Holocaust on social media, and this is why I do not ever want to see a police officer ever supposedly guard my synagogue.

The City's main public mental health crisis response program is a police co-responder model. This means that social workers are expected to partner with CPD officers.

I would not feel safe doing any kind of crisis- or resource-linkage work side by side with a CPD officer, not only for concern out of the safety of people in crisis but for my own physical safety. And this is due to CPD's history of a severe and persistent disregard of ethical behavior. Our communities deserve better.

Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you.

Marvin Hunter.

MR. HUNTER: Thank you, your Honor, to everyone that's here.

I am Marvin Hunter, the great-uncle of Laquan McDonald, and feel like I'm primarily the reason we are in this room having this conversation.

The thing that I would like to say, above all that I could say, is that this consent decree must stay in place. It must stay in place because it has not had an opportunity to do what it was designed to do, and that is to bring about sensible policing.

We need policing in this country. It's what helps to make us a civilized society. But the truth of the matter is, it needs to be policing and not a safeguard to maintain people in poverty, not to maintain a slave system that does not work for a country, like America, which is supposed to be one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice

for all.

I was asked in an interview right after the sentencing of the police officer, what did I think that the judge should do? And how did I feel about what he would do?

My response immediately was that the American criminal justice system was on trial, not Jason Van Dyke. And I should hope that that judge would have that in mind when he make his decision.

And I want to say to you-all today, the Fourteenth Amendment rights of African-Americans, a protected class, are being violated on a daily basis by the Chicago Police Department and other police departments across this country. And this consent decree is put in place so that you could step in to supersede the state's rights, so that we could, as citizens, be treated equal in this country.

I want to say that we must realize that this is not the mayor's problem. This is not the City Council's problem. This is a policy problem that happens in Springfield, and it starts with the Uniform Disciplinary Peace Officers' Act. That act needs to be overhauled.

We need to, as a federal court, plead with you to create something within this consent decree that will cause Springfield to quit having plausible deniability and allowing us to filibuster about things that local politicians cannot change. Once the law is set in Springfield, then it is

adhered to in Chicago. 1 We are a civilized society, we are a democratic 2 society, and we have to adhere to the laws. Let's go where 3 4 the problem is: Springfield. Uniform Disciplinary Peace Officers' Act. We need 5 6 to do a forensic audit, and we need to change that act. 7 Thank you. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Hunter. 8 9 Anthony Johnson. 10 (No response.) 11 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Is Shareese Pryor with us? 12 MS. PRYOR: Yes. 13 Good afternoon, Judge Pallmeyer and Judge Dow. 14 Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. 15 My name is Shareese Pryor. I come before you from 16 a unique position, having previously worked on the consent 17 decree and now as an advocate invested in its successful 18 implementation. 19 I am the director of a criminal legal system and 20 police accountability program at a law and policy center in 21 Chicago called BPI. 22 Our policing work focuses on enacting systemic 23 changes to promote community safety, strengthening 24 accountability and transparency, and reimagine the role 25 police should play in our society.

Before BPI, I worked in the Illinois Attorney

General's office and was a member of the team that negotiated
the consent decree and helped oversee its enforcement.

There are a few things I know for certain about the consent decree: this work demands urgency, it must meaningfully involve community, and requires transparency for legitimacy.

Almost four years into implementation, serious questions remain as to the City and CPD's commitment to these priorities. I will offer an example.

After CPD released a draft foot pursuit policy for public comment in May 2021, BPI began working with a coalition of lawyers and Latinx nonprofits to advocate for improvements to that policy. This group's work was galvanized by Adam Toledo and Anthony Alvarez, both of whom were fatally shot by CPD officers following foot pursuits in the spring of 2021.

Our coalition provided draft comments in July and requested meetings with CPD, the IMT, and the OAG.

Fortunately, they obliged and allowed us to share our concerns. Following those meetings, we heard nothing.

CPD missed its September 3rd deadline to adopt the policy. For nearly seven months, there was no update. CPD's website reflected no status changes. There were no public court hearings concerning the department's failure to comply

1 with its deadline.

In February 2022, CPD issued a revised draft, and again, our coalition provided comments and requested and received separate meetings with the parties and the independent monitor.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MS. PRYOR: In June of 2022, over a year after the first draft was released and five years after DOJ's recommendation, CPD finalized its foot pursuit policy.

While the final policy made considerable improvements that incorporated some of our feedback, it is unclear whether we would have had the level of engagement influence we did without our persistence.

I understand the need for a thoughtful, considered approach, but the snail's pace at which CPD is developing policies, particularly ones that require community input, is inexcusable.

The problems this experience highlights extends well beyond policy compliance. There are a range of issues critical to successful implementation that suffer from a lack of urgency and transparency, ranging from data collection to staffing, allocation, and deployment decisions.

For those of us on the outside looking in, there is a lack of visibility about the progress being made, or the lack thereof, on the consent decree.

1 This is causing people -- even supporters -- to lose confidence in the consent decree's ability to achieve 2 3 effective and constitutional policing. 4 As you preside over this case, please keep at the 5 top of mind the need for urgency and greater transparency 6 regarding CPD's compliance with this agreement. And please exercise your authority to require meaningful community 7 8 involvement in developing policies and training. The stakes are far too high to demand anything less. 9 10 Thank you. 11 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you very much, 12 Ms. Pryor. 13 Kenneth Cook. 14 (No response.) CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Xanat Sobrevilla. 15 16 (No response.) 17 CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Arewa Karen Winters. 18 MS. WINTERS: Thank you, your Honor. 19 I'm Arewa Karen Winters. I'm a member of the 20 Campbell plaintiffs' group that filed a lawsuit against the 21 City for the consent decree. I'm also the founder of the 22 411 Movement for Pierre Loury. My great-nephew was shot and killed by the Chicago 23 24 Police Department in 2016. 25 I did want to take time to talk about the Use of

Force working group, where I served as the cochair along with the former chief, Ernest Cato III.

But La'rie Suttle as well as Vatsala have so eloquently kind of laid out a lot of things that happened. So I just want to share some personal things that I experienced in the Working Group.

So initially we had six weeks to work on nine policy suites, and that was just not enough time. And, to me, that was the City and CPD's way of instantly setting us up for a fail.

The Use of Force Working Group was a collective of community residents. It was a very diverse group. It ranged from, like, 21 years old up to 70 years old. Every demographic in the city possibly was in that Working Group. People gave of themselves, hours and hours of time of reading documents and lending to the recommendations that we made.

Every instance that CPD and the City could undermine all of our collective efforts, they took it upon themselves to do just that. So there is no genuine or no authentic engagement with CPD nor the City.

And I have to also say something about our mayor. When we orchestrated the group, we were lacking Latinx membership, so we cast our net. And while we were doing this, the mayor took it upon herself to impart four African-American religious leaders in our group. We already

_ _

had religious -- we had about five religious leaders in our group. That wasn't what we needed.

So there was also another undermining of community engagement. So it set a bad tone for the work that we were really trying to do and accomplish.

We gave it our best. It was a new experience for us. They kept saying it was new for them, but it was new for us, also. And we gave it our best effort. And whenever they could get to the media and, you know, kind of tear us apart, they took it upon themselves to do that.

So when we're constantly talking about building these relationships with them, we will not be able to do that because they lack transparency. They are very disingenuous. And it just really made it hard for us.

It was hard for us to recruit members to want to, first of all, engage with CPD and engage with the City, because all the sentiments were the same. Nothing is going to change. Nothing is going to change. Nothing is going to change. And this somewhat made that evident for us, but we still put our best face forward.

And one more thing I want to say is that there was opportunity for us, and there is still opportunity. And they don't like the Working Group, but the Working Group is really the only way that there is going to be genuine engagement under the consent decree. They try to come up with

deliberative meetings, but what they do is, they want to rely on an uneducated community to engage with them so, as we say, they can check boxes.

They don't want to engage with impacted people.

They don't want to engage with people that are aware of what should be happening or how things should be shaped and come along.

And just to humanize our relationship, while we were in the Working Group, we lost Officer Ella French. And at our very next meeting, we made it our business as community members to acknowledge -- to acknowledge their loss, acknowledge their hurt. And the reason why we did that was because we wanted to set a precedent. We wanted to say that, regardless of how we feel about the institution of policing, we are all human beings.

And this is something that the Chicago Police

Department fails to do for us as everyday citizens. They

don't care about my nephew. They don't care about how we

hurt. All they care about is how they hurt. And when they

hurt, they want everyone else to hurt along with them. Well,

I loved my nephew. Just as sure as I am anyone else loved

Ella French, I loved my nephew.

And all we are saying is, as human beings, we want an acknowledgement. And until the Chicago Police Department can acknowledge the harm that has been done and until the

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Chicago Police Department can begin to acknowledge the pain that they are causing in communities, I just don't know where we are going with any of this work that we are doing.

And I don't know how that happens. I don't know how that comes about. I don't know what needs to happen. We're doing all this work, but it just -- it feels so microscopic. You know, it's like we're putting in our best effort.

I'm not an abolitionist. Even though I lost someone I love, I'm not an abolitionist. I believe that there should be a system of law and order, but I just don't know that it's happening right now.

I don't know why they are still failing at the consent decree, but yet they are continually perpetrating like they are doing so well at the consent decree. And they are not.

So that's all I really have to say. And thank you.

Oh, lastly, there was some progress made, but ultimately, CPD still has a long way to go. They have critical shortcomings that need immediate changes, and we highlighted a lot of those deficiencies in a public report that the community representatives of the Community Working Group released earlier in the fall. And we would be glad to provide a copy of that report to the courts.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Winters.

1 MS. WINTERS: Thank you. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Akash Shah. 2 3 MR. SHAH: Thank you, your Honors. 4 My name is Akash Shah with ONE Northside. 5 I'm here because the Chicago police need a 6 transformation of their culture. People need to be able to trust the police, and trust cannot be rebuilt until the 7 8 police stop seeing community members as enemies. For a very long time now, knowing that we are 9 10 feared, hated, and stereotyped by the police, make brown 11 people feel like we're not protected. 12 Based on my past experiences with Chicago police, I 13 feel like my life is in jeopardy by the very people who swear 14 an oath to protect and serve everyone in our city. 15 Does this oath have any meaning? 16 Only when officers are really held accountable to 17 the idea that public safety means protecting everyone, 18 including brown and black people, will the mission be 19 achieved. 20 I'm proud to be an Indian-American immigrant. My 21 parents came to Chicago when I was only five years old. Ι 22 work as a victim advocate for ONE Northside. AND the reason 23 I do it is because I want to help people like myself. 24 I was the victim of a fatal drive-by shooting in 25 Chicago around 2010. The Chicago police just closed the case

and didn't investigate. They just didn't provide me with any services or resources. My family was struck. I was a full-time college student with a double major in accounting and applied mathematics, set to graduate that year.

I had a 4.0 GPA and a 1.8 million-dollar job letter awarded to me that year. So just, you know, with emotional, physical scars from that drive-by shooting not only left me unable to study and work and complete my studies, but also the rug just pulled under my feet. I was left with medical debt that destroyed my credit. I just felt like I was now a burden to my family.

I didn't want others to feel equally helpless and abandoned without the help from the police like myself, so I took this job on as a victim advocate to be here and to speak on behalf of the community.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: One more minute.

MR. SHAH: People in our community, they feel both underprotected and overpoliced. The police didn't protect and serve me.

I also felt the firsthand experience with some serious violence that police inflict on brown people like me.

The negative experiences with police harassment started when I was still in grade school, continued to high school, and through my college experiences.

Corruption is so entrenched that if we don't fix it

now, how can we work on fixing our communities?

It's been so traumatic to see that people who are supposed to keep me safe are people I don't feel safe around. And there's no accountability. Officers don't get punished. The stereotypes, the racist assumptions about gang memberships -- I have to be feeling forced to change my friendships, my hobbies, or, like, looking a different way so that police don't harass me. I have to cut my hair, keep a clean shave to look less threatening so that I don't constantly get stopped.

This is something that is internally going on at the academy, where they are trained to work off stereotyped assumptions. This needs to change, like a complete transformation from the top to bottom, inside out.

I just want to finish with a statistic we found recently that confirms that police use racist stereotypes to decide who to stop on the street.

Since 2016, about two-thirds of all investigatory stops were of black residents, while the city is only about one-third black.

Another 20 percent of the investigatory stops are brown, Hispanic and Asian people.

White people are significantly less likely to be stopped, yet they only make only up about 6 percent of the stops but over 30 percent of the city's population. Why is

1	that?
2	Thank you for your time.
3	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Shah.
4	Flora Suttle.
5	(No response.)
6	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: I know we heard from La'rie
7	Suttle before. I don't know whether that's a relation.
8	UNKNOWN SPEAKER: She is not here.
9	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Okay.
10	Daniel Wolk.
11	(No response.)
12	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Remel Terry.
13	MS. TERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Thank you
14	all.
15	My name is Remel Terry. I am a lifelong Chicagoan
16	and a very proud West Sider.
17	I serve as the second vice president and political
18	action chair for the Chicago West Side NAACP.
19	You previously heard from my colleague Ms. Cook. I
20	worked with her closely on the Campbell plaintiff consent
21	decree and a lot of the initiatives with working with our
22	criminal justice community to discuss many of the issues that
23	we have already heard throughout today.
24	So I do want to say, though I have been a part of
25	the West Side NAACP, served as a COPA advisory counsel

member, I'm also a concerned parent, as well as a concerned citizen who has also been impacted significantly by being pulled over several times simply because of where I reside in the North Lawndale community. If anyone is familiar with the North Lawndale community, you know that there is a significant number of harassments that occur in that neighborhood.

If you look at the research of the past paid-out lawsuits, even though the poverty level is significantly not high in North Lawndale, you are much better off if you just sue the police for the harassment that happens in order to get paid, because that's how common it is in that community.

I am grateful that my son this year, who is 18 years of age, was able to make it out of high school, and he is now in college. But that is a particular feat for a black mother in the city of Chicago that many others do not have to concern themselves with.

We talk a lot about all of these issues and the impacts, but when we look at things like the gang database, 75 percent of those individuals that were represented on that database were black.

If you look at the police shootings, of those who are impacted by police shootings, over 50 percent of those individuals are black.

It is unacceptable that this situation continues.

1 2 3

We should not be, as black people, reliving the history that our ancestors went through. And our children, to this day, are still learning that same history.

It is unacceptable that the highest court has implemented this consent decree, yet it has yielded no results. Yet we can see, as we hear about the sweeps that have happened in our community, those individuals are charged and given life. Sometimes it seems that that justice seems to be swift. But when we are looking at these individuals within the police department, not the entire police department, there seems to be no opportunity to hold them accountable.

And I agree about the Uniform Disciplinary
Officers' Act, that is something that we have been working
on. It does need to be addressed because it is
unacceptable -- if a teacher has to carry themselves a
certain way, it is unacceptable that uniformed officers being
paid off of taxpayer dollars are allowed to walk and do and
be unapologetically, with no accountability, committing all
kinds of heinous acts against individuals who are
undeserving.

So I'm asking this Court today to wield whatever power that you-all have to ensure that the measures that have been outlined in this consent decree are done with urgency.

It is unacceptable for us to be five years down the

1 line and all we can hear about is how they have success with 2 training. CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you. Thank you, 3 4 Ms. Terry. 5 Mr. Wilkins, I know you are still here. You were 6 here this morning. You are welcome to step up, sir. 7 I think -- if you want to pull down the microphone, 8 you are welcome to do that. MR. WILKINS: Thank you. Long day. Thank you, 9 10 Judge. My name is Eric Wilkins. I'm an organizer with 11 12 Communities United. I'm also one of the CU plaintiffs, and I 13 also worked on the Use of Force Working Group. And I'm also 14 from Roseland. 15 My brother was wrongfully incarcerated in 1992, 16 during the Jon Burge era. That's what brings me to this 17 work. He was falsely accused, and he did 25 years, which led to me getting shot and paralyzed seven years later. 18 19 While in this chair, I've been taken out of my 20 chair, pulled over by the police, sat on the curve, you know. 21 And I've been -- I've been in illegal raids where people come 22 in -- where the police come in, and they just tear your house 23 up and leave. 24 I done had friends to be shot by the police and paralyzed. I had friends to be killed by the police. 25

. .

Since the consent decree been in effect in 2019, I've seen little change.

Just this summer, I was pulled over while an officer was giving me a false sobriety test because of the way I walked. The statement told the officers that you couldn't search my car. Officers searched my car, you know. And he could have planted something for me to get caught later, you know.

And after specifically telling him that and not giving him permission, I voluntarily got information for the Independent Monitoring Team and the ACLU to show that in Roseland and in Englewood, there is no difference.

I could ride around today and get you some footage, you know. Any time -- any time that the police is behind me, I cringe. I believe there should be a -- I believe there should be law, if the police are behind you for a short period of time, you should be able to pull over and let the police go past.

In closing, I have two sons, six and ten now. And my ten-year-old, he will be 14 in four years, you know. And 14 is a scary age for a young black male in Chicago.

We spend 1,745 per household on criminalization and only 245 per household on communities of care. You know, I really want to see change. I don't want my boys to go through what I went through. I don't want them to have to

```
1
      put they hands on the cars, having to be sat on the curb,
 2
      having to be -- they're coming out of that cute age. When
      you're small, you're cute. Once you start getting bigger,
 3
 4
      you become -- you become suspect, a victim, you know.
 5
                Thank you.
 6
                CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you, sir. Thank you,
 7
      Mr. Wilkins.
 8
                There were a number of names I called where people
 9
      weren't here, and I want to review those just in case
10
      somebody has come in since this morning -- even this morning
11
      or this afternoon.
12
                So I am going to begin with the names of
13
      individuals who were here this morning -- or didn't get
14
      called this morning.
15
                There was Ledarrel Goss El.
16
            (No response.)
17
                CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Andre Crayton.
18
            (No response.)
19
                CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: If any of you are here,
20
      please do raise your hand and step up.
21
                Dajae Allen.
22
            (No response.)
                CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Miracle Boyd, are you with
23
24
      us?
25
            (No response.)
```

1	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	José Almanza.
2	(No response.)	
3	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Raven Geary.
4	(No response.)	
5	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Tramaine Jones.
6	(No response.)	
7	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	All right. And then some
8	names from this afternoon.	
9	Michael Harrington.	
10	(No response.)	
11	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Danette Bullard.
12	(No response.)	
13	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Jaime Silva.
14	(No response.)	
15	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Leticia Horton.
16	(No response.)	
17	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Natalie Cohn Arenoff.
18	(No response.)	
19	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	James Gibson.
20	(No response.)	
21	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Jennifer Edwards.
22	(No response.)	
23	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	John Catanzara.
24	(No response.)	
25	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER:	Jasmine Vale.

1	(No response.)
2	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Nancy Rodriguez.
3	(No response.)
4	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Anthony Tassone.
5	(No response.)
6	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Daryle Brown.
7	(No response.)
8	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Anthony Johnson.
9	(No response.)
10	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Kenneth Cook.
11	(No response.)
12	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Xanat Sobrevilla.
13	(No response.)
14	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Flora Suttle.
15	(No response.)
16	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Daniel Wolk.
17	(No response.)
18	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. I know that you
19	all understand this, but you're welcome to submit written
20	statements as well.
21	Judge Dow, did you want to make any closing
22	remarks?
23	JUDGE DOW: I just wanted to say thanks again for
24	the privilege of working with all of you. I wish you great
25	success in this long endeavor.

I hear what people are saying, that it's taking too long to be felt in the communities. When I look back, I will always wonder what more I could have done.

But I'm confident that we will keep moving forward. And when I said, "Let us begin," I meant for this to end, and it will.

I thank Judge Pallmeyer for allowing me to be part of today. It's a little bit of closure for me personally, but I know there is a long way to go. And I am sure you will get there. And I will be rooting for you.

CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: Thank you.

I want to say a personal thanks to Judge Dow for the great work he has done over the years and the relationships that he has built and created and his own sense of the need for strong efforts here.

Let me just say that one of the messages that came through from so many of you witnesses today is a sense of urgency and a concern that, although years have gone by, you feel that there hasn't been enough or significant change. I did hear that. I take that very seriously.

I do intend to do what I can to make sure that a year from now you are seeing some differences and some changes. It's not going to be easy. I know that.

Another comment I want to make is that a few minutes ago we heard from one of our witnesses about the fact

that when Officer French died, she reached out because she realized that this is a painful moment for the police. And the reality is that the situation in our city, the city that we all love, is very troubled.

And one of the things that's most troubling in our city is the poor relationship between the people and the police.

And not suggesting that that's the reason Ellen French died, but I do think it's important for us to remember that there are many, many victims here. There are all of you who have been hurt by episodes with the police or have family members who have. There are the police themselves who, many of them, in good faith, are attempting to investigate crime and can't get the cooperation of the public because there is no trust.

And then there are -- let's face it -- most important of all, all kinds of crime victims in Chicago. All kinds of people who have been hurt, maimed, shot at, are frightened, are scared all because of criminal activity in the city that is not -- that has not been effectively policed and for which we all are paying a dear, dear price.

I know that you are all concerned about this. I share that concern. I will take this responsibility that I now have thrust on me as seriously as I can.

I would like to see some improvements happen. I

1	would like to know that a couple of years from now, a year
2	from now you are thinking that things have gotten better.
3	They won't be perfect. No human system is perfect. They
4	won't be perfect. They won't be transformative, but I
5	certainly would hope that there will be progress and change.
6	And we are going to work toward that, all of us together, all
7	of you and all of us here, this team.
8	Best wishes to all of you. I know that the
9	holidays are coming. I hope that they are safe, happy, and
10	healthy ones for you.
11	Anything further from the monitor?
12	MS. HICKEY: No, your Honor.
13	CHIEF JUDGE PALLMEYER: All right. Thank you.
14	I think we are adjourned.
15	THE CLERK: All rise.
16	(An adjournment was taken at 3:16 p.m.)
17	* * * *
18	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
19	record or proceedings in the above-entried matter.
20	/s/ Frances Ward
21	F/j
22	
23	
24	
25	