

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

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	Case No. 17 C 6260
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
CITY OF CHICAGO,)	Chicago, Illinois
)	December 10, 2024
Defendant.)	1:04 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE REBECCA R. PALLMEYER

APPEARANCES:

Independent Monitor: ARENTFOX SCHIFF LLP
BY: MARGARET A. HICKEY
ANTHONY-RAY SEPULVEDA
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 7100
Chicago, IL 60606

For the State: OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
BY: MARY J. GRIEB
100 West Randolph Street, 11th Floor
Chicago, IL 606061

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

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

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2

3 Also Present: Chief Angel Novalez

4 Bobby Kennedy

5 Ruben Sanchez

6 Elizabeth Rochford

7 John Catanzara

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

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

24

* * * * *

25

Proceedings reported by stenotype;
Transcript produced using computer-aided transcription.

1 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

2 (Proceedings commenced via videoconference at 1:04 p.m.)

3 THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like
4 to call this afternoon's session to order. It's our monthly
5 public hearing and this is one where we will hear from members
6 of the public, several of whom who have put their names on the
7 list to be heard, and we will be calling on them.

8 I'd like to begin, though, with just a couple of
9 comments from me and then I want to hear from the independent
10 monitor and from Ms. Grieb on behalf of the OAG and from
11 Mr. Slagel. I know that we'll hear from someone from the
12 coalition as well. Ms. Garcia has -- is on the agenda.

13 Let me begin by saying first, you know, there was a
14 concern earlier this year about funding of CPD positions for
15 the consent decree and I'm very pleased to see it looks as
16 though that that concern has been addressed and that we're
17 going to be moving forward in just the pace that we hoped for
18 or wanted to.

19 With respect to our pace, I am determined that we're
20 going to be seeing some good progress this year. When I say
21 this year, I mean 2025 of course. The numbers or the
22 percentages of compliance are unsatisfying to the public. I
23 know there's a lot of hard work going on and I'd like for the
24 word about that hard work to get out, but I also want to make
25 sure that we continue to pursue active progress effectively and

1 fairly and with determination because that is what -- that's
2 what we're called on to do here.

3 Okay. I'd like to first hear from the monitor. So
4 Ms. Hickey?

5 MS. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honor. And thank you for
6 convening this monthly status hearing.

7 My name is Maggie Hickey and I'm the independent
8 monitor for the consent decree.

9 During our public hearing last month, I expressed
10 concern regarding potential budget cuts to the Chicago Police
11 Department positions related to the consent decree, including
12 positions directly responsible for community policing,
13 training, and overall reform.

14 Since then, the City of Chicago and the Chicago Police
15 Department have reported a commitment to restoring critical
16 consent decree vacancies within the CPD's budget. I believe
17 that the Chicago Police Department needs many of these
18 positions to maintain consent decree compliance that they have
19 achieved to date and that achieve the levels of compliance that
20 remain, as Judge Pallmeyer was describing in her remarks.

21 Of course, creating and implementing a budget can be a
22 long and arduous process, but today I'm cautiously optimistic
23 that the Chicago Police Department will have the resources it
24 needs to move reform forward.

25 As the City of Chicago, the CPD, and the Office of the

1 Attorney General acknowledge, the purpose of the consent decree
2 is to achieve and sustain constitutional and effective
3 policing. This must include addressing violent crime while
4 fully complying with the Constitution and the laws of the
5 United States and Illinois and respecting the rights of all
6 people in Chicago.

7 Success depends upon promoting community and officer
8 safety and building trust between officers and the communities
9 they serve. Fortunately, the Chicago Police Department has a
10 roadmap to reach these goals, the consent decree. I will
11 continue to monitor and report on the City of Chicago's and the
12 CPD's ability to fill the necessary positions and fulfill their
13 commitments.

14 Today's public hearing, however, is about hearing
15 directly from the members of Chicago's communities on the
16 topics of their choosing related to the consent decree. I look
17 forward to hearing from the public speakers today.

18 We understand that as the calendar comes to a close on
19 2024, many people may not have been available for today's
20 hearing. I hope that anyone who is unable to speak today will
21 provide written feedback, which the Court is accepting
22 through 4:30 p.m. this Friday. For those who have not yet
23 submitted comments and would like to do so, there are
24 instructions on how to submit comments in the Court's order
25 setting this hearing as well as the monitoring team's hearing

1 website CPDMonitoringTeam.com.

2 And as always, our website contains information on how
3 community members can contact the independent monitoring team
4 with any ideas, feedback, or questions at any time. And we
5 thank those community members and stakeholders who have already
6 reached out.

7 Again, I thank the parties, the Court, and the
8 community members for their time and attention to the wellbeing
9 of Chicago.

10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Hickey.

11 We'll hear next from the Attorney General. Mary Grieb
12 I understand will be making a statement.

13 MS. GRIEB: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Independent
14 Monitor Hickey, and members of the public listening in today.

15 My name is Mary Grieb and I'm the deputy chief of the
16 Civil Rights Bureau at the Attorney General's Office.

17 We thank this Court and the monitoring team for
18 providing this opportunity for community input for the fourth
19 time this year. It is an incredible chance for people impacted
20 by progress or the lack of progress on the consent decree to
21 speak to this Court, our office, the monitoring team, and the
22 city and Chicago Police Department leaders.

23 This is also the final time our office will be before
24 Your Honor this year. And although I will keep my remarks
25 brief, I'm going to recap some of the work done this year and

1 briefly address what our office hopes to see from the city and
2 CPD in 2025.

3 So to begin, I'd like to look back at three key areas
4 of reform in 2024. The first is policy development. As the
5 Court is aware, the first step towards compliance with the
6 consent decree is usually creating or revising a policy
7 incorporating particular requirements of the consent decree.
8 For the last several reporting periods, our office urged CPD to
9 prioritize putting all remaining consent decree requirements
10 into a policy.

11 During this past year, the department continued to
12 make slow but steady progress on several critical policies. As
13 just one example, this fall, our office and the monitoring team
14 sent no-objection letters on the department's policy ensuring
15 meaningful access to police services for individuals with
16 limited English proficiency. And I should say that a
17 no-objection letter means that the department was sufficiently
18 responsive to our office's comments on the draft policy and we
19 do not object to the department posting the policy for further
20 public comment. CPD is also continuing to discuss the
21 provisions of this policy with the coalition.

22 The department continued developing or revising
23 several other critical required policies this year, including
24 policies requiring officers to provide meaningful access to
25 police services for individuals with disabilities, policies

1 governing the investigations of officer-involved shootings and
2 deaths, to ensure compliance with the consent decree and state
3 law, and policies that are consistent with this Court's rulings
4 earlier this year about search warrant practices and the
5 Illinois Body Worn Camera Act. Our office met numerous times
6 with CPD this past year to ensure that these policies or
7 revisions to the policies are consistent with the law and the
8 consent decree. We encourage the department to finalize them
9 as soon as possible in the coming year.

10 Second, I want to discuss public reporting of data.
11 This past year, the city and the Chicago Police Department
12 published annual reports required by the consent decree to
13 share information with the public. Those included an annual
14 hate crimes report, an annual use of force report, the tactical
15 review and evaluation division year end report, the Bureau of
16 Internal Affairs annual report, the city's report on
17 CPD-related litigation, and then officer wellness report to the
18 superintendent.

19 These reports complement the public release of
20 investigatory stop data and use of force data on CPD's website.
21 While the city and CPD have a long way to go towards efficient,
22 accurate data collection and analysis across every aspect of
23 the consent decree, our office is encouraged by these public
24 annual reports and the transparent publication of data
25 regarding significant law enforcement activities.

1 Lastly, Your Honor, our office and the independent
2 monitor reported to the Court earlier this fall that the
3 department's efforts to prepare for the Democratic National
4 Convention in August included developing policies and trainings
5 focused on respecting individuals' First Amendment rights and
6 complying with the consent decree while simultaneously
7 maintaining public safety during a major public event.

8 The successful approach here is a prime example of one
9 of the goals of the consent decree in action. The department
10 learned from recommendations made by the independent monitor
11 and the city's Office of Inspector General after its response
12 to protests in 2020. The department worked collaboratively
13 with the monitoring team and with our office and the department
14 was responsive to community input.

15 While there were many challenges last year in 2024,
16 our office encourages CPD leadership to let these successes
17 create momentum in 2025.

18 Next, Your Honor, I would like to look ahead to 2025.
19 First, we look forward to continued public status hearings.
20 Transparency about the work being done to comply with the
21 consent decree, which includes progress and setbacks, provides
22 a window into the daily work of reform. We also look forward
23 to hearing from community members about their interactions with
24 Chicago police officers and their input on the department's
25 policies and practices.

1 I'd like to preview three areas of reform that we urge
2 the city and the police department to make sustained progress
3 on in 2025. First, the city must make progress on the
4 workforce allocation study, a requirement of Paragraph 356 of
5 the Supervision section. We understand that this study is set
6 to begin in 2025, and the end result should provide the city
7 and the department with a better understanding of how and where
8 to deploy patrol officers, supervisors, field training
9 officers, training staff, CIT or crisis intervention team
10 officers, wellness staff, personnel to conduct misconduct
11 investigations, and other crucial members of the department.
12 We also anticipate that the city will conduct community
13 engagement on the study throughout 2025 and encourage the city
14 to approach the entire process transparently.

15 Second, as required by Paragraph 320 of the consent
16 decree, the department will again provide 40 hours of
17 in-service training to its officers. The planned trainings are
18 robust and will include a course related to deescalation, use
19 of force and vehicle stops, a course related to crisis
20 intervention and officer wellness, a course related to
21 impartial and community policing topics and policies, a course
22 called Active Bystandership for Law Enforcement, also known as
23 the duty to intervene, and constitutional policing foundations,
24 among other course offerings.

25 As the department continues to provide such a

1 substantial amount of training to its officers and civilian
2 staff, in the coming year, we urge CPD to also prioritize
3 developing a system to evaluate training courses and
4 instructors to ensure that this training is high quality,
5 consistent, and effective.

6 And finally, our office is encouraged by recent news
7 reports that the city has withdrawn proposed budget cuts to
8 critical units working on the consent decree. As the Court and
9 independent monitor and our office said at the November status
10 hearing, the proposed cuts significantly threatened -- (audio
11 interruption).

12 Although the city's budget isn't yet finalized, we
13 urge the city to ensure the final budget provides the Chicago
14 Police Department with sufficient staff and resources to do the
15 everyday work of reform. The consent decree requires this and
16 Chicagoans deserve it.

17 In closing, Your Honor, on behalf of our team of
18 attorneys in court today, we thank those individuals and
19 organizations who will be speaking this afternoon and
20 submitting written comments. We understand that they take time
21 away from their lives, jobs, and family to speak in court, and
22 appreciate their dedication to providing input to the reform
23 process and sharing their experiences.

24 As we enter the seventh year of the consent decree
25 this spring, we recognize that many in our city say that

1 progress has come far too slowly. We encourage the city and
2 CPD to accelerate its progress on reform this coming year. Our
3 office remains committed to working with the city, the police
4 department, the independent monitoring team, the coalition, and
5 the community members to ensure accelerated, sustained, and
6 measurable progress towards constitutional policing in Chicago.
7 Thank you, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Grieb. I'm -- just want to
9 echo, I feel the same way you do about, let's accelerate the
10 process and let's build on the progress we made. Momentum is
11 something that slips away too easily and we want to capitalize
12 on it. So thank you for those good suggestions.

13 Okay. And I'm ready now I think to hear from
14 Mr. Slagel.

15 MR. SLAGEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Allan Slagel
16 on behalf of the City of Chicago.

17 First of all, we thank the Court and the monitor for
18 making this possible for the community to provide input and
19 appreciate both the Courts as well as the AGs working with the
20 city and CPD over the past year to make the progress that we've
21 reported on and discuss today.

22 I would note, I think as we've agreed, we will be
23 continuing these public hearings into January on the second
24 Tuesday of each month, and as Ms. Grieb highlighted, that the
25 workforce allocation is a priority item for everyone working at

1 the Consent Decree Committee and CPD. That will be the topic
2 we will be reporting on in January. I believe that meeting
3 will be on January 14th at 1 p.m. So we -- with that, we look
4 forward to the public's input from today. Thank you.

5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Slagel.

6 We have on the agenda to hear from as part of the
7 public comments some words from the coalition. And,
8 Ms. Garcia, are you with us? Are you prepared to make a
9 statement?

10 MS. HICKEY: I believe, Your Honor, that she will be
11 moved from the audience into the speakers.

12 THE COURT: Good. Thanks.

13 MS. GARCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Michelle
14 Garcia with the ACLU of Illinois on behalf of the coalition.

15 Today you will hear from me and other community
16 members about the consent decree. Let me tell you a little bit
17 about the coalition. We are a coalition of 14 civil rights
18 organizations and community justice organizations representing
19 thousands of Chicagoans from nearly every neighborhood. The
20 coalition's Community United and Campbell plaintiffs settled
21 our lawsuits against the city for its unconstitutional policing
22 to have enforcement powers over the -- under the consent
23 decree.

24 Our members and the communities we represent, many of
25 our black and brown people and people with disabilities have

1 extensive personal experience and subject matter experience
2 with CPD's unconstitutional, racist, and violent policing.
3 That's why at every public hearing, you hear from coalition
4 members about how CPD should stop its unconstitutional,
5 discriminatory, and harmful policing.

6 Today I'm going to focus on the role of the coalition.
7 Specifically I want to discuss the important opportunity
8 presented by the comprehensive assessment to better utilize the
9 coalition's expertise to improve CPD and speed up the city's
10 compliance with the consent decree.

11 Earlier this year in a status hearing, Your Honor
12 referred to the coalition as the conscience of the consent
13 decree. But a conscience is only effective if it is listened
14 to and followed. The parties right now underutilize the
15 coalition and the community's experience and expertise.

16 For over five years, coalition members have spent
17 countless of hours of unpaid time, such as in the Use of Force
18 Working Group, but also in meetings and hearings, identifying
19 how CPD mistreats black and brown people and people with
20 disabilities, and proposing real solutions, only to be ignored
21 by CPD.

22 A recent example of CPD ignoring the coalition's
23 expertise and experience is how CPD developed its policy on
24 interactions with persons with limited English proficiency.
25 You may remember, Your Honor and people and the public, at the

1 last three quarterly public hearings, coalition members told
2 stories about how CPD failed to provide meaningful language
3 access to community members with limited English proficiency.
4 The coalition provided detailed public comments on the proposed
5 policy, submitting them through the portal, recommending
6 changes based on experience, law, and best practices. We also
7 asked to meet with CPD to discuss our proposed changes.

8 CPD chose to publish the final policy, mere days
9 before meeting with the coalition, implementing only one of the
10 coalition's proposed changes. While CPD promises to continue
11 to revise that policy, there's no deadline to do so. And the
12 policy still violates the consent decree's requirement that CPD
13 use qualified interpreters in the provision of Miranda warnings
14 and custodial interrogations.

15 It's not enough to say that CPD needs to engage more
16 in the community if CPD does not listen and implement the
17 coalition and the community members' proposed changes.

18 In the last few years, one of the ways the coalition
19 got CPD to listen and implement some of the proposed changes
20 was to begin enforcement proceedings, a right the coalition has
21 under the decree. The coalition did this three times: First,
22 when CPD used excessive force and other constitutional tactics
23 against protesters responding to George Floyd's death and
24 police brutality in the summer of 2020, we served a notice of
25 intended enforcement resulting in the coalition negotiating

1 with CPD a lengthy First Amendment policy.

2 Second, the coalition served a notice of intended
3 enforcement about CPD's practice of brutal and discriminatory
4 home raids that often target black and brown Chicagoans, most
5 famously Anjanette Young. The Court ordered CPD to negotiate
6 better search warrant policies and data collection with the
7 coalition. And we did that.

8 And third, before the Democratic National Convention
9 this year, the coalition filed an enforcement motion about
10 CPD's draft mass arrest policies and negotiated with CPD
11 important improvements requiring CPD to respect the First
12 Amendment rights of protesters and document any use of force.
13 Indeed, any success about the democratic convention, a large
14 part of it belongs to the coalition. Indeed, the independent
15 monitor that recommends the coalition's accomplishments in the
16 recent comprehensive assessment and recommended that the
17 coalition have a more specified role without defining it.

18 Now the comprehensive assessment offers a critical
19 opportunity to determine whether the decree is working to
20 achieve its primary goal that all the parties identified today,
21 whether CPD is serving Chicago in a constitutional way. Are
22 they complying with federal and state law, are they building
23 trust between officers and communities, and are they promoting
24 both community and officer safety?

25 The most recent monitor reports reflects the decree as

1 it is currently structured isn't working. Currently CPD is
2 10 percent -- less than 10 percent in compliance with the
3 decree. And at almost every public hearing, coalition and
4 community members testify about the horrifying experiences with
5 CPD. Likewise, community survey results and CPD's own data
6 shows that its use of force stops, frisks, and arrests reflect
7 that CPD has not improved civil rights compliance or treatment
8 of black or brown community members.

9 As 2024 ends, now is the opportunity to change the
10 decree, to speed up CPD's compliance by specifically including
11 the coalition on the front end, not the back end, after CPD has
12 released the policy, training, or accountability measure,
13 without incorporating the feedback from the very communities
14 CPD is supposed to serve and protect.

15 Now is the opportunity to make the decree's conscience
16 effective. Over a year ago in October 2023, the coalition
17 filed specific recommendations for modifications for the
18 decree. Disappointingly, none of those recommendations were
19 adopted in the comprehensive assessment. But it's not too late
20 to modify the decree. This morning, the coalition filed a
21 response to the comprehensive assessment, requesting a status
22 hearing to establish a timeline and framework for the coalition
23 to negotiate with the parties needed changes to the decree.

24 Here are some of our recommendations that would
25 streamline the coalition's role in the decree: First, require

1 the city to provide the coalition with early policy and
2 training drafts, before they're released for public comments so
3 the coalition can provide input at the same time as the monitor
4 and Attorney General's Office. This will promote efficiency
5 because the city can incorporate feedback at one time, and the
6 coalition won't have to file enforcement motions after the
7 policy's been published.

8 Second, allow the coalition to observe and provide
9 feedback on CPD's training programs, a change the monitor
10 endorsed for community members, but not specifically for the
11 coalition.

12 Third, require the use of community working groups on
13 select topics.

14 Fourth, allow the coalition to participate in
15 negotiations and any substantive changes to the decree,
16 including adding new priorities and topics.

17 Five, provide the coalition the ability to give
18 feedback and raise objections to the monitor's methodology for
19 determining CPD's operational compliance before that
20 methodology is used.

21 And lastly, allow the coalition to obtain discovery
22 from CPD to determine if it's complying with the decree.

23 The coalition also urges the Court, the parties, and
24 the monitor to consider the substantive recommendations that we
25 made over a year ago for improving the decree as well. And

1 those are in two buckets. The first and most important one is
2 strengthening impartial policing by expanding diversion and
3 deflection of low-level offenses, restricting gun-pointing,
4 making the stop and frisk portion of the decree comply with the
5 Constitution and federal and state law, and provide protections
6 for survivors of police violence and their families.

7 And the second bucket, well, that's using actual
8 outcome metrics, numbers and percentages, so that the community
9 and the public and the coalition can determine how and when
10 CPD's operations are complying with the decree.

11 Your Honor, with almost every policy and hearing, the
12 coalition has been here and we will continue to be so, be here.
13 The coalition raises perspectives of underserved communities in
14 Chicago, constitutional statutory operational concerns that are
15 otherwise neglected by CPD. Why? Because the coalition's
16 members and the communities we represent, their lives depend on
17 CPD changing how it interacts with the people every day. But
18 we can't keep screaming into the wind and we can't keep
19 watching our people being killed.

20 We urge the parties and monitor to seize this
21 opportunity to make the decree's conscience effective. Thank
22 you.

23 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Ms. Garcia. Thanks
24 for continuing to -- to monitor this and to plug away and to
25 push your views. I think it's very valuable.

1 Okay. We're ready I believe to hear from some
2 community speakers and we're a little bit ahead of the -- this
3 timetable. So if there are people who are signed up to be
4 heard this afternoon who would like to speak up right now,
5 they'd be welcome to. First person I have on the list is Ruben
6 Sanchez. I don't know if you're with us, Mr. Sanchez, but if
7 you are, let us know. I'd love to hear from you.

8 MS. HICKEY: I'm afraid I don't believe that
9 Mr. Sanchez is with us at this time. We will keep an eye out
10 for him. But I do know that the second speaker, Bobby Kennedy,
11 is on the virtual -- is in the virtual waiting room prepared
12 to --

13 THE COURT: Great. Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kennedy, you are
14 welcome to make your statement right now, as soon as you're
15 ready, right now.

16 MR. KENNEDY: Can you see me?

17 MS. HICKEY: Yes.

18 MR. KENNEDY: Can you hear me? Okay.

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 MR. KENNEDY: I'm not too good at -- okay? All right.

21 THE COURT: Well, I'm not either, Mr. Kennedy, so --

22 MR. KENNEDY: All right. Look, I got a few questions,
23 Your Honor. I dropped them off at your assistant's office.
24 Maybe you had a chance to review them. Anyway I'm going to go
25 quick. I only got five minutes.

1 How does a group get the label "disenfranchised"? I
2 know in the consent decree, blacks and Hispanics are
3 disenfranchised, labeled by Judge Dow. So how does a group --
4 like right now, the gay community, all right, the LGBTQ
5 community -- can y'all say that? I keep saying they're
6 disenfranchised, what they tell me. But where can I find that
7 they're disenfranchised? Because I guess it's not part of the
8 federal mandate and that's why I was looking for it. Who made
9 them disenfranchised? Can a mayor do it or does it have to be
10 a judge? I'll let you answer that.

11 THE COURT: I'm not sure what you mean by
12 "disenfranchised" within the context of the consent decree.
13 What's your specific question about how they are or are not
14 being treated?

15 MR. KENNEDY: All right. They're not -- not how
16 they're being treated, but how are they labeled
17 "disenfranchised" is my question.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. KENNEDY: I'm saying, who can label somebody
20 "disenfranchised"? Can I do it, can a politician do it, or
21 does it have to be somebody in a judicial branch?

22 THE COURT: I think -- I think anyone can choose a
23 label to use for others. So if you believe that somebody is
24 disenfranchised, you could refer to people in that regard.

25 MR. KENNEDY: They got a branch for the police force

1 that's in the Affinity Program, and, I mean, that's not some --
2 like me saying they're disenfranchised. Somebody higher up had
3 to make them disenfranchised to put them into that program and
4 the Community Policing program. So that's all I'm asking.

5 THE COURT: The Affinity -- well, I'll ask whether
6 somebody on the panel would like to answer. The Affinity
7 Program, it's not specifically a part of the consent decree.

8 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. I thought it was created
9 for the consent decree. Basically -- I didn't expect the --

10 THE COURT: No, I don't think so.

11 MR. KENNEDY: I didn't expect an answer from these
12 guys because it wasn't part of the consent decree. But I just
13 wanted to ask. Okay.

14 THE COURT: Well, because it's not part of the consent
15 decree, I don't have information about it. This hearing is
16 about the consent decree. You had another question, though?
17 Go ahead.

18 MR. KENNEDY: Yeah. Okay. All right. Let me see.
19 Who in the -- it says in the paragraph -- page 204,
20 paragraph 675 in the consent decree, which I attached to your
21 stuff, the way I interpret that is no one on the -- like last
22 time we were talking about the rainbow car, and you didn't know
23 what I was talking about because it's not part of the consent
24 decree, and you said maybe somebody will get back to me from
25 the committee, which nobody did.

1 So my question is, who is accountable to answer
2 questions? Or is there anybody? Anybody I got is a Margaret
3 A. Hickey for a lawyer that I've been writing to, but that's
4 it. So is there anybody that -- based on this information I
5 got from the consent decree, there's nobody that has the answer
6 to any questions. They're not accountable to me or anybody
7 else.

8 MS. HICKEY: Sir, my name is Maggie Hickey. I am
9 Margaret A. Hickey. That's my official -- and we have
10 responded that your questions regarding rainbow cars are not
11 specified under the consent decree, and that you need to reach
12 out directly to the CPD, or if you have a complaint about that,
13 you can reach out to, you know, the inspector general or COPA.
14 But the specific questions that you have continued to ask and
15 we have responded to about rainbow cars are not specifically
16 within the consent decree or mandated that there be a rainbow
17 car by the consent decree. You seem to believe that the
18 consent decree has mandated a rainbow car and that is not
19 correct.

20 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. It's good to meet you finally
21 face to face.

22 MS. HICKEY: Yes. I've been on all the other meetings
23 and have addressed you also.

24 MR. KENNEDY: Yeah, I didn't know who you were at the
25 time. But anyway, I'm just saying is that trying to get

1 information from the CPD is pretty hard.

2 Okay. Let me see. So of course this stuff would not
3 be -- this stuff right here would not be overseen by the
4 consent decree, the publication, because they don't mention --

5 MS. HICKEY: I cannot read what you're holding. I
6 could not read what you're holding up.

7 MR. KENNEDY: Something for the -- policing community,
8 Office of Community Policing, LGBTQ+ liaisons, but it doesn't
9 mention black and Hispanics. That's what I'm trying to work
10 out, and I'm finding out it's not part of the consent decree.
11 Somebody else injected this --

12 MS. HICKEY: What we're saying is that, you know,
13 community policing and impartial policing are a part of the
14 consent decree. But you specifically ask questions about who
15 mandates rainbow cars.

16 MR. KENNEDY: Right.

17 MS. HICKEY: And the specific mandate of rainbow cars
18 is not part of the consent decree. Impartial policing and
19 community policing is, but not the specific mandate of a
20 rainbow car.

21 MR. SLAGEL: Your Honor?

22 MS. HICKEY: Does that answer your question?

23 MR. SLAGEL: Your Honor, while it's not covered by the
24 consent decree, I think Chief Novalez who is on can provide a
25 little bit of background about rainbow cars if that's okay with

1 you.

2 THE COURT: That would be great.

3 MR. KENNEDY: That would be fine. At least I can get
4 some answers.

5 MR. SLAGEL: Allow the chief to respond, Mr. Kennedy.

6 CHIEF NOVALEZ: Mr. Kennedy, I'll start trying to
7 address this the best that we can. So number one, the -- you
8 know, a specific approval, even though not named in the consent
9 decree, the Affinity officers are. The goal behind that and
10 the reason community policing was chosen is because they have
11 the most contact with communities when it is not, let's say,
12 the traditional law enforcement.

13 So what we wanted to do is, the creation of an
14 Affinity officer, which is in the consent decree, was intended
15 to try to bring folks that have not necessarily had good
16 relationship with the police into the fold. Right? Just
17 because someone has not had traditionally a good relationship
18 with the police does not mean that they do not deserve the
19 police service that they are due.

20 So what we wanted to do is create an effort to bring
21 folks into the fold, one, so we understood the unique needs in
22 that particular community; number two, figure out how to
23 address it with their input and then create the initiatives
24 that we needed to help carry that out.

25 In this case, when we talk about an Affinity group,

1 those are unique to the district. Right? We may have a
2 district that is heavily African American, one that may be
3 heavy Hispanic, one that may be LGBTQ. The groups may be
4 totally different based on the needs of that community.

5 What we wanted to do was ensure representation within
6 the police department for those groups that they don't feel
7 necessarily comfortable with reaching out to the police.

8 Now when we talk about the car here, it is for a
9 particular goal. There may be multiple initiatives that
10 attempt to achieve that goal. In that effort, what we wanted
11 to do was to create a warm environment where people felt
12 comfortable enough to reach out to us. Because ultimately what
13 we would like to do is address the crime issues, but how can we
14 address those if those communities don't feel comfortable
15 enough to bring that to us?

16 It was not intended ever to either alienate particular
17 groups and only cater to certain groups. We want to address
18 every group, but we want to concentrate on those groups who we
19 have not necessarily had traditionally good relationships with.
20 We want to be able to bring them into the fold.

21 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. I've got a question that you can
22 answer real quick. It looks like -- I mean, last time I said
23 only one police car for Chicago PD, but we have a rainbow car,
24 but yet there seems to be a cap somewhere on the black,
25 Hispanic communities putting out a car. I know Chinese applied

1 for a car. They weren't allowed or rejected. So is there an
2 artificial cap? They tell me only the rainbow car is approved
3 by the CPD. Nobody else has been approved. And I don't think
4 there should be any cars really. But my question is, is there
5 an artificial cap on -- on the groups?

6 CHIEF NOVALEZ: No.

7 MR. KENNEDY: Why isn't there others allowed?

8 CHIEF NOVALEZ: Mr. Kennedy, I'll first start with the
9 term "artificial cap," which is -- it's a bad term. Right?
10 It's to say that we've created something and put it in place
11 and not being transparent with it. So when someone -- and I'm
12 not aware of any rejection of any other group who has asked for
13 a particular car, as the chief of constitutional policing,
14 community policing is under my purview, where I have seen one
15 come across my desk.

16 Like I said, the reason, you know, one -- and it's
17 something that I also agree with, that we chose the LGBTQ car,
18 is because members of all Affinity groups, of all groups in
19 general, all the demographic in our city, may be a member of
20 that particular -- member of the LGBTQ community.

21 So what we wanted to do, that was a way of affording
22 all groups an opportunity that may be part of a traditional
23 group, but still be participating in the LGBTQ group that may
24 have some particular need that they may not feel comfortable
25 bringing to us. We wanted to make sure that there was -- so

1 they are able to bring that to us.

2 But, you know, to say an "artificial cap," that's such
3 a term that is intended to elicit just a negative response.
4 You know, what I can tell you is that there is no cap. If I
5 receive a request, I will look at the request, I will look at
6 what the needs in that community are. If there are barriers
7 that make it difficult for folks to receive that service where
8 we can create that avenue, where they can bring things to us, I
9 will look at it. I will sit down with the folks requesting it
10 and that particular district and have those discussions. But
11 no, there is no artificial ceiling, nothing that is done behind
12 closed doors. You know, we're completely transparent in that.

13 MR. KENNEDY: Okay. I got that.

14 MR. SLAGEL: As Mr. Kennedy's hit his time, Chief, is
15 there somebody at the department he could -- you could direct
16 him to follow up with?

17 THE COURT: I was just going to make that suggestion.

18 MR. KENNEDY: I'll follow up right now.

19 CHIEF NOVALEZ: That would be, within our department,
20 within our bureau, that will be Director Brooks or Deputy
21 Director Mike Milstein, who is --

22 MR. KENNEDY: Neither one will respond to me.
23 Superintendent Snelling had me meet with Glen Brooks, and Glen
24 Brooks never responded to me, anything I've said or written.

25 CHIEF NOVALEZ: I can tell you in an open forum is

1 that I will ensure that either Deputy Director Milstein or
2 Director Brooks respond to you. Now, you know, I want to make
3 sure that we -- sometimes -- all I can guarantee is that we can
4 give you the response and that we give you an accurate
5 response. Now whether or not that response is satisfactory,
6 you know, that's up to you to determine. But I can ensure that
7 you have that response.

8 MR. KENNEDY: Well, it was --

9 MS. HICKEY: Your Honor, I would like to note that
10 Speaker Number 1 is here now and we have gone well beyond the
11 time limit.

12 MR. KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

13 THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

14 And Mr. Ruben Sanchez I understand is now available.
15 And if you are available right now to speak to us, Mr. Sanchez,
16 we'd like to hear from you.

17 MS. HICKEY: And I think Mr. Sanchez may be on the
18 phone, so he may have to hit -- I think it's, you know, star 6
19 to be heard from experience with phones.

20 MR. SANCHEZ: Hello?

21 THE COURT: Yes. Hello. Mr. Sanchez?

22 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. My name is Ruben Sanchez. And I'm
23 here because -- yes?

24 THE COURT: Go ahead.

25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm here because it appears that

1 everybody is acting badly. The police, the lawyers, the
2 judges, they're all intentionally acting badly. The only way
3 you're going to correct this problem is by making the unions
4 pay. Why are the taxpayers having to pay for what they're
5 doing? The unions are the ones protecting these bad actors.
6 They're the ones that should be paying.

7 I've got a case, 21-cv-2887, and if you look at
8 Document 169, that judge is trying to seal a case that
9 shouldn't be sealed. This is a bad police officer. The guy
10 that was suing them was murdered two months after the police
11 officer was fired. A Judge Walker, eighth month, eighth day of
12 this year, finally after all of this time, he's been behaving
13 badly for 16 years, said that that guy can't get his job back.
14 So what's this police officer going to do? Go to another city
15 and get a job, simply because he's being protected by the
16 unions. The only way you're going to stop this problem is by
17 making the unions pay.

18 THE COURT: Well, thank you --

19 MR. SANCHEZ: Not much else --

20 THE COURT: Thank you for sharing those views with us,
21 Mr. Sanchez. We appreciate it.

22 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Mrs. Pallmeyer, I hope you're at
23 least going to look at Case Number 21 C 2887. There's enough
24 evidence there to show they're all bad. Kerri Kennedy, Edmond
25 Chang, Kennelly. How can these people continuously keep doing

1 this stuff and then they're getting away with it? Is because
2 the judges are allowing them. This is intentional --

3 THE COURT: I don't know the details of that case,
4 Mr. Sanchez, but I do know that the records are not under seal.
5 So you're welcome to review anything that the -- review the
6 judge's ruling and review the reason for those judge's rulings.

7 MR. SANCHEZ: On Document 170, he denied it. I asked
8 him -- Document 169, motion to produce records and unseal any
9 sealed documents, and the very next day, he denies it.

10 THE COURT: Yes. What he said in his ruling,
11 Mr. Sanchez, is that there are no sealed records. So there
12 would be nothing to unseal because there is nothing that is
13 under seal. The records are public record. We maintain public
14 records and you are welcome to review them online.

15 MR. SANCHEZ: Document 97 of Case Number 21-cv-2887,
16 they say it's still sealed. Document 97, Document 101. Every
17 bit of -- Loevy & Loevy, Loevy & Loevy is somewhere inside this
18 consent decree, and after Alfonso was murdered, they fired
19 Maria Garcia, which was giving me the information. They fired
20 her and refused to do anything. It's all in there. It's all
21 written in there. So why would Loevy & Loevy want to seal
22 documents? Why wouldn't they want to expose the bad behavior
23 of the unions? Instead they're going to say, "Oh, no, we'll
24 take the \$410,000 and let the city seal the records"?

25 In the circuit court -- let me see what date is this.

1 MS. HICKEY: Mr. Sanchez, if you could wrap it up.
2 Unfortunately, your time has expired.

3 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. That's okay. At least you've
4 been warned.

5 THE COURT: Thank you.

6 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm not Christian but I pray to the Lord
7 God. Goodbye.

8 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. The next speaker
9 on our list is Elena Gormley. I don't know whether Ms. Gormley
10 is with us, but if you are --

11 MS. HICKEY: So far, Speakers 3, 4, and 5 are not in
12 the queue yet because we're a little ahead of schedule, but
13 Speaker 6, Elizabeth Rochford is available. So we'd ask if we
14 could promote her to speak.

15 THE COURT: Sure. Ms. Rochford, you're welcome to
16 speak up. I'm happy that you're with us a little bit earlier
17 than scheduled. Go ahead.

18 MS. ROCHFORD: Hello. Thank you, Judge and group here
19 gathered.

20 My name is Elizabeth Rochford, and I am a leader with
21 ONE Northside, who is part of the coalition. And I'm also one
22 of the 17th District counselors.

23 I have lots of concerns about the consent decree, but
24 two major concerns. First is the lack of compliance with the
25 crisis intervention training that CPD is supposed to be doing.

1 A lot of the problems that the CPD has with the public is that
2 their officers are not trained to handle people who are in
3 crisis. With the talk about the cuts in this city's budget and
4 cutting the Department of Public Health and the care teams that
5 are being piloted to add people who are actually able to work
6 with people who are in crisis, I am concerned that if those
7 care teams are cut and the CPD is not training their officers
8 on how to handle people in crisis, that the problems that we've
9 seen in the past are going to escalate in the future. So I
10 urge the Court and the monitor to really make sure that CPD is
11 gaining compliance in the crisis intervention area.

12 My second area of concern is in the strategic planning
13 process that CPD goes through. It appears to me to be a
14 box-checking experience. In my district, in the 17th District,
15 they basically cut and pasted the strategic plan from last year
16 to this year. Between last Wednesday and today, they have
17 actually changed the dates, but earlier this week, it was -- it
18 had -- it was put in for 2025, but it had the last year's dates
19 still in -- in that document.

20 Part of what they talk about in their strategic plan
21 is working with youth, working with homeless, and working with
22 the migrant community, yet at their listening sessions, none of
23 those groups were available. We talk about in community
24 organizing, "Nothing about us without us," and I have met with
25 the cap sergeant and asked, "Have these groups ever been

1 present at any of your listening sessions to actually inform
2 the strategic plan that you put into place?" The cap sergeant
3 has admitted that, no, those groups are not at these listening
4 sessions. The sessions took place in the areas where people
5 who are likely to be victims of crime don't even live. It
6 doesn't appear that they -- those groups have been reached out
7 to in order to participate in these listening sessions.

8 So I hope that we in the future can make this
9 strategic planning for the districts actually be meaningful and
10 actually be something that the community, particularly the
11 people who are likely to be victims of crime, actually have
12 some ability to participate in the strategic planning process.
13 Thank you very much for your time.

14 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Ms. Rochford. Thank
15 you for contacting us and for your statement this afternoon.

16 MS. HICKEY: Your Honor, while Speaker 3 is not here
17 yet, Speaker 4 is in the queue, John Catanzara.

18 THE COURT: Great. Mr. Catanzara, we'd love to hear
19 from you.

20 CHIEF NOVALEZ: You're on mute.

21 MS. HICKEY: You're on mute, Mr. Catanzara. If you
22 could -- I think you might have to hit star 6 if you're on a
23 telephone.

24 MR. SEPULVEDA: He's no longer muted. There may be
25 some issue with the --

1 MS. HICKEY: Mr. Catanzara, if you can hear us, we
2 cannot hear you. We can see that you are talking from the
3 video, but we cannot hear you at all. And now your video --

4 MR. CATANZARA: Still no?

5 MS. HICKEY: Now we can hear you. So if you want
6 to...

7 MR. CATANZARA: Are we good?

8 MS. HICKEY: Yes.

9 THE COURT: We'd like to hear from you, Mr. Catanzara.
10 Go ahead.

11 MR. CATANZARA: All right. Good morning, Judge, or
12 good afternoon, Judge. So a few things here. Let's start with
13 a couple comments that have already been made by previous
14 speakers.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. CATANZARA: The attorney general talked about the
17 consent decree and body cams specifically. Specific to body
18 cams, I will remind you that this department has flagged every
19 single body cam for the last almost decade as a training video
20 in violation of state statute. They have refused to delete
21 those body cam videos according to the Illinois state statute
22 after 12 months or after 90 days because they have chosen to
23 flag every single video. That's -- so to expect the same
24 department now to comply with a consent decree when they can't
25 even comply with a state statute is pretty troubling to say the

1 least.

2 Onward we go. Let's talk about the attorney general's
3 comments about the police force and the men and women doing the
4 job to keep the city safe. I'll remind everybody here, it's
5 easy to nitpick one little thing here, a second little thing
6 there. But CPD answers 3 million calls for service every year,
7 and we are talking about a handful of incidents that always get
8 all the attention and concern.

9 Specific to the 2020 riots, let's just put this out
10 there. Officers were attacked with bricks, frozen water
11 bottles, fireworks shot to their face. Those are all deadly
12 use of force encounters. Officers would have been in full
13 absolute legal rights to defend themselves with deadly force
14 under those circumstances. In not a single incident did any
15 officer use deadly force in defense of even saving their own
16 lives or their coworkers. So when people want to talk about
17 the 2020 riots and the mayhem that ensued in the City of
18 Chicago specifically, the Chicago police force were acting
19 honorably.

20 There is trouble with a couple people leading the
21 charge, probably more of a problem than the police officers
22 actually being on the street. And one of those people very
23 high up in the police department right now actually cowered
24 down behind gates in downtown Chicago. Not leading the troops
25 but now she is leading the department on a very high level. So

1 I would hope they address the attempt ranks in the department
2 and actually put people in place that are going to effectively
3 push this consent decree forward.

4 Couple more quick points here. Use of force is never
5 going to change. It is what it is. We think that
6 Superintendent Snelling actually has a good grasp on the use of
7 force. But someone talked about policy releases, and policy
8 releases don't even come to the union. We haven't got a single
9 policy release ahead of time from the department as a draft
10 after the last one we got that I attended, was about the chase
11 policy. And that was well after two years ago.

12 Judge Dow at the beginning of all of this said that
13 consent decree would not violate contractual bargaining rights.
14 Well, not only had the department not been a working partner
15 with the union when it comes to the consent decree, nor has the
16 monitor to be quite honest. I have had no contact with
17 Ms. Hickey in over two-plus years, so I don't know how some of
18 these provisions within the consent decree are ever going to
19 get -- (audio interruption) -- and the PVPA also mind you --
20 I'm traveling with -- (audio interruption). So those are just
21 kind of concerns that I hope the Court would take into effect.

22 And lastly, the expenses. In consent decree after
23 consent decree, these monitoring teams just largely are just
24 paper shufflers. There is no incentive or basically urging at
25 the monitor's request or basically insistence that things get

1 done. It's just, "Oh, this is the report, let's move on, we'll
2 come back to Chicago, we'll fly another flight, buy another
3 meal, we'll add it to the tab, add it to the tab." And the
4 needle just incrementally moves. When are they held
5 accountable for the egregious expenditures that the consent
6 decree entails? When has Ms. Hickey ever had to --

7 Oh, first, you gave a guy 13 minutes to speak about an
8 incident about -- subject about a rainbow police car that had
9 nothing to do with the consent decree and gave over 13 minutes
10 of time. So, I mean, a couple minutes past five minutes I
11 don't think is that big of a deal. I'm almost done.

12 I'm just urging the Court to have a little more
13 consideration about the taxpayers' dollars being spent here. I
14 would hope the attorney general would look into it too because
15 this is not supposed to be a blank checkbook for the monitoring
16 team to just come and go and travel and eat at the taxpayers'
17 expense and just shuffle a report on without anything really
18 being done.

19 That's all I got. Thank you.

20 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Catanzara. We appreciate
21 your interest and your views.

22 Okay. We have -- I think we still have a couple of
23 people who have not yet been called on and I think we're still
24 a little ahead of game, but if either Ms. Gormley or Mr. -- or
25 Ms. Winters are available, that would be -- we would love to

1 hear from you.

2 MS. HICKEY: We do not believe that Ms. Winters is
3 going to be available and if she is, it's going to be much
4 later. And Ms. Gormley is not in the queue. There are I
5 believe two telephone numbers and we can call them up, one at a
6 time, ask them to identify themselves and ask if they'd like to
7 speak.

8 THE COURT: That would be great. That would be great.
9 And we can wait until the time that Ms. -- that Ms. Gormley was
10 scheduled. I certainly am not -- have no problem with that. I
11 want to make sure that if she did want to speak, she has that
12 opportunity. If you could call those numbers, that would be
13 great.

14 MS. HICKEY: Yes, we did alert -- while we gave
15 projected times, we did ask people to be here at the start of
16 the hearing, and saying that time can go faster or slower.

17 THE COURT: Excellent. Good.

18 MS. HICKEY: So we will call up one of the cell
19 numbers.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MS. HICKEY: I'll ask one of my teammates to call out
22 the number when it is and ask them to identify themselves, if
23 they want to unmute and identify themselves, and if they'd like
24 to speak.

25 MR. SEPULVEDA: Maggie, this is Anthony-Ray. The

1 phone numbers are no longer in the waiting room. They must
2 have signed off. However, we do have various attendees under
3 either nicknames or some nonidentifying names. So it's perhaps
4 possible that some of the speakers are just unidentifiable, but
5 if they raise their hand, we can certainly call on them.

6 MS. HICKEY: So I believe if you're on a cell phone,
7 you can raise your hand by star nine, I think.

8 MR. SEPULVEDA: That's correct.

9 MS. HICKEY: And so if you're on a phone and you would
10 like to speak, please raise your hand with star nine. If
11 you're not on a cell phone but just have dialed in through your
12 computer, please raise your hand. You can -- at the bottom of
13 the Zoom button, there is a "raise your hand" icon. And please
14 raise your hand and we would welcome you to speak at this time
15 if you would like to address the Court. Perhaps you're just an
16 active listener and you do not wish to address the Court, we
17 understand.

18 I do not see anyone raising their hand. Anthony-Ray,
19 do you see anyone that has --

20 MR. SEPULVEDA: No hands have been raised.

21 MS. HICKEY: Okay.

22 THE COURT: Tell you what. Let's wait another couple
23 of minutes just to make sure there's nobody who's struggling to
24 get -- to make contact, and if not, I will ask whether we want
25 to make any brief closing statements or simply adjourn until

1 our next public hearing.

2 Just so those of you who are -- who are new to the
3 issue, are unaware, our next public hearing will take place on
4 January 14th, which is a Tuesday.

5 MS. HICKEY: And I would just note too, Your Honor, as
6 Mr. Slagle addressed earlier, that we will continue to have the
7 monthly hearings. They will be the second Tuesday of the
8 month, unless there has been some scheduling change. We will
9 post on CPDMonitoringTeam.com a list of all of the hearings for
10 2025 in the next couple weeks. So if you want to check back on
11 our website, we will have listed all of the dates so that you
12 can put them in your calendar. I say that to the public.

13 THE COURT: One thing I did catch, it's not -- you
14 don't have to address this immediately, but the second Tuesday
15 in November I think may be Veteran's Day, so that could be a
16 public holiday. We'll make sure that with the calendar that we
17 get out is one that is accurate, or as accurate as it can be.

18 MS. HICKEY: Yes, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: All right. If there's nothing further, I
20 think we could adjourn, unless you believe that we should wait
21 a little bit longer.

22 MS. HICKEY: No, Your Honor. I believe that it's
23 2:05, and, you know, we had asked everyone to be on at the
24 1 o'clock timeframe. And so I think -- and we did get
25 notification from Arewa Winters that, you know, she was not

1 available until later.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Well, we do -- then I'll just ask
3 for any closing remarks that anyone wants to make, beginning,
4 again, with the OAG, Office of the Attorney General.

5 MS. GRIEB: Good afternoon again, Your Honor.

6 Very briefly, we appreciate all of the comments made
7 in court today and Ms. Garcia's comments on behalf of the
8 coalition and we are taking careful notes, and we appreciate
9 everyone's time as we bring 2024 to a close. So thank you.

10 THE COURT: Thank you very much.

11 Okay. And then any further comments from the city,
12 Mr. Slagel?

13 MR. SLAGEL: Only to thank those people who
14 participated today and we appreciate their time and cooperation
15 and comments that were made.

16 THE COURT: And, Ms. Hickey, anything that you'd like
17 to say to wrap things up this afternoon?

18 MS. HICKEY: Just want to again echo and say thank you
19 to everyone that spoke and, again, I'm available through CPD
20 Monitoring Team, and I am -- have attended multiple community
21 meetings throughout the year and host community meetings and
22 I'm happy to meet with anyone that wants to meet with me.

23 THE COURT: Good to hear. And I want to thank all of
24 you for your continued interest in this, for participating in
25 the hearing this afternoon. I just want you to know that I --

1 those of you who were concerned about the length of time and
2 the expense of the monitor, I share your concerns. I do want
3 to move this forward. I think the city and its residents and
4 the people of the state benefit from aggressive pursuit of
5 reforms in the consent decree and I'm confident that that's the
6 direction we're going to be going in. I'm hoping for
7 significant progress in 2025, just as all of you are.

8 All right. Anything further this afternoon?

9 MS. HICKEY: No, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Thank you.

11 (Adjournment at 2:06 p.m.)

12

13

14

15

o o o o o o o o o o o o o o

16

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

17

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
18 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

18

19

Dated this 16th day of December, 2024

20

/s/ Hannah Jagler

21

22

Hannah Jagler, RMR, CRR, FCRR
23 Official Court Reporter

23

24

25