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**MS. SCRUGGS:** Welcome, everybody, today. I'm only going to do a quick intro -- or kick us off so that the Engaged Stakeholders Committee can introduce themselves, and then you guys can do your presentation and then they will have questions for you. We'll go from there.

We will try to let you know when you have like 5 minutes left, 15 minutes left. Why don't you guys introduce yourselves.

Do you want me to introduce you or do you want to introduce yourselves?

PASTOR BIEKMAN: So we'll introduce ourselves.

I still remember who I am this morning even though I haven't had coffee yet.

My name is Robert Biekman. I'm with an organization here in Chicago called Community Renewal Society.

MR. WILKINS: My name is Eric Wilkins. I'm with actually two organizations, Communities United and Broken Wings.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Hi. My name is Maria Hernandez. I'm with Black Lives Matter Chicago and the Campbell Plaintiffs Group.

MS. NUQUES: Good morning. I am Katya Nuques.

I'm with Enlace Chicago.

SERGEANT PETTIS: Good morning. My name is Sergeant Christopher Pettis. I'm with the Chicago Police Sergeants Association.

SERGEANT CALVINO: Good morning. I'm Sergeant James Calvino. I'm also with the Chicago Sergeants Association.

MS. SAMUELS: Good morning. I'm Jeanette Samuels.

MS. SCRUGGS: And just so everyone is aware, the folks sitting behind there you guys have all been introduced to before, but this is the AG's office representatives, and the City representatives are on that side.

JUDGE COAR: Good morning. My name is David Coar of the Coar Monitoring Team, and we will introduce our principal team members as we go along, but let me start with myself.

The other folks here are experienced police reform people, I am a retired former judge, and so you might ask: So why are you involved in this? Well, let me give me a little bit about my personal background, things you wouldn't see on a resume.
I was born and raised in Birmingham, Alabama. I attended public high school there. At one time the high school I attended was the largest African-American high school in the country. When I was there, it was 3500 students. To say it was an inner-city school would be a gross understatement. Directly across the street was the largest African-American housing project. At one time or another most of the people that I knew lived in the projects, including my own family. My house in Birmingham was on Center Street in an area called Dynamite Hill, Dynamite Hill because it was the dividing line between historically black and historically white neighborhoods. The early blacks who moved into the area had their homes bombed or torched. One of my earliest memories was watching my father and some of the men in neighborhood walk armed patrols around the house of a lawyer -- an African-American lawyer who was the local counsel for a civil rights organization that was coming in handling civil rights cases.

Those patrols were necessary because his house had been bombed several times, and the police and the FBI showed no interest in investigating crimes or protecting his family from the violence. After graduation from high school and college and active duty in the U.S. Marine Corps, I came to Chicago to attend law school at Loyola. I was here as a student during the riots following Dr. King's assassination during the 1968 Democratic Convention. During that time I lived a couple blocks from Cabrini Green and personally witnessed the interactions between the police and the public that marked that period. After law school I got -- after Loyola, I got a master's degree in law at Harvard. My first job out of law school was as a Carnegie Foundation intern at the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. That involved a year in New York doing appeals in civil rights cases followed by three years in Alabama actually trying civil rights cases -- civil rights and civil liberty cases. I've tried all types of cases including excessive force, school desegregation, criminal defense, employment discrimination and cases involving the maldistribution of municipal resources.

After my commitment with the Legal Defense Fund was over, I received an offer to return to Chicago to teach law at DePaul where I taught courses in constitutional law, employment discrimination, ethics for corporations and corporate finance. During that time my children were born, and I raised my two boys in South Shore and later Hyde Park. I gave each of them the talk when they were about 11 years old, helped them navigate the -- several incidents in which they were stopped by the Chicago Police from the time they were teens through their mid-20s. I now have a grandson who's 8 years old, and I assume that my son will give him the talk before very long. I went on the bankruptcy court in 1986 and the U.S. District Court in 1994. In that latter capacity, I presided over dozens of excessive force cases and oversaw consent decrees including the redevelopment of Cabrini Green and some housing cases.

More importantly, while I was on the court, I believe I established a reputation for independence, integrity and fairness, and if we are awarded the monitorship, we will provide all parties with confidence in our efforts. Since I retired from the court at the end of 2010, I've served as a private arbitrator and mediator. In 2011 I was appointed special independent counsel for the Teamsters/Central States Pension and Welfare Funds. You may recall that that consent decree arose because of the funding with the mob of purchase of casinos in Las Vegas. About five years ago, the Illinois Supreme Court asked retired Supreme Court Justice Ben Miller and I to co-chair the Cook County Stakeholders, the President of the County Board, the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court, the Sheriff and the State's Attorney, the Public Defender and County Clerk, to find ways to improve the pretrial process in Cook County. The impetus for that effort was overcrowding at the jail. The principal concern...
was that there were people being held pretrial in
the county jail simply because they couldn't afford
bond.

We made a big dent in the number of
people who are resident at the jail. We still have
a long way to go. One of the issues is the people
who have mental disability. The sheriff estimates
that 25 percent of the inmates in the jail have
mental problems, and I'll give you a quick example.
The issue there is that once someone
with mental illness goes into the system, it's
difficult to get them out. A recurring pattern is
that the sheriff monitors people who are there who
are held for a long period of time. They'll pick
up the phone and call the prosecutor and say, you
know, "Why is this person here so long? We need to
move them out." The prosecutor will say, "Okay.
We will agree to a guilty plea for time served."
He'll then call the public defender, and the public
defender says, "I can't plead that person because
they are mentally incompetent."
Because of the lack of mental health
resources, the person just stays. They're stuck in
the system. So there's an urgent need to come up
with some type of diversion program in addition to
additional -- finding additional resources for
mental health people.

I met -- or I knew Jeff Cramer for a
long time when he was a prosecutor in the U.S.
Attorney's Office. Jeff and I started talking
about the need for police reform well before there
was a -- the Justice Department report came out and
before there was a draft consent decree.
We've talked about it several times. We
met with Ken Bouche and the folks over at Hillard
Heintze to talk about some of these issues. They
introduced us to more people, some of whom we'll
talk about today, who are subject matter experts in
the area.
So that's how we came to eventually come
up with our proposal to be the monitor in this
case. They will give you some background about
their background and experience as we go along.
What do we bring to the table as a
monitoring team? The monitor's going to have to
establish a degree of credibility, trust and
independence and transparency in the system. We
need to build -- one of the most important roles of
the monitor is to build trust between the community
and the Chicago Police Department.
We have an intimate knowledge and
understanding of Chicago. Most of us live in
Chicago. We've lived in Chicago before there was a
consent decree; we will be here afterwards.
Ken, Jeff, Marcia and I are all Chicago
natives. The core of our team will be based in
Chicago. We will -- we have some firsthand
knowledge of the problems that exist, we're aware
of the community concerns, we will become more
aware of community concerns as we go along.
Members of our team have been deeply
involved in monitorships in other places and, more
broadly, we've been deeply involved in police
reform, so I think you'll see more of that as we go
along.

MR. BOUCHE: My name is Ken Bouche, and before
I start, I just want to tell you about my fashion
statement. We all met for coffee, and I left my
glasses there. Fortunately Marcia has an extra
glasses there. Fortunately Marcia has an extra
pair, and that's why they look good on me. So I
apologize for that.
A little bit about me. For the most
part I have been doing police reform most of my
professional career. I grew up through the
ranks of the State Police here in
Chicago. I started as a trooper in the early '80s,
went through the ranks through lieutenant colonel
to be the regional commander in my first 18 years.
As a young sergeant, I was very
fortunate to get sent to the Long Course, which is
a school that no longer exists in Northwestern
University, and it really changed my mindset on
policing. I started looking at ways to implement
more community policing practices through the State
Police and do other things and then moved into
investigations where really reform started to
happen for me as a matter of my job.
And I can tell you, you know, during
those days, the State Police handled all of the
police shootings in Cook County with the exception
of the City of Chicago, and after about my fifth
one in six weeks, we realized that it was a very
difficult thing to continue and it was difficult to
do it correctly, so we looked at best practices and
architected along with the Sheriff and the State's
Attorney's Office the Cook County Public Integrity
Unit, which is really a unit that looks at shootings without bias that the home agency normally has.

In addition to that, early in my career I was one of the architects of two bills that I'm really proud of. The first was the Videotaping of Confessions and Interrogations Bill in Illinois which started to set the standards. What we really started to see was the problem that was coming so much to light with false confessions, and videotaping was important.

We helped people in the General Assembly draft a bill, and I worked with a committee for the Criminal Justice Authority which I chaired to drive the standards and implement the grants that pay for all the committees.

The second reform that I think is probably my best brush with fame was the creation of the Racial Profiling and Traffic Data Collection Act in Illinois.

For three years, this was -- I was at this point a lieutenant colonel and the area commander and was responsible for legislation. For three years the director of the State Police kept telling me, "This is a bill we want to fight." A new governor comes in, a new director comes in, and my conversation with them was, "We have to pass this bill. It's the right thing to do. It's needed," and so then we set out an a quest.

There were four bills pending. We got a coalition from the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, the Chicago Police and some of the county police -- not the Illinois but some of the associations, and we looked at the four bills and we picked the best one, which was from a young member of the General Assembly that no one had really heard of, and we all know him as President Obama.

So we went to meet with him and said, "We'll support your bill if you'll work with us to make it a good bill," and he was amazing, and a good bill came out, and that bill has been in place now for I think 14 or 15 years, relatively unchanged, and has been a model for the nation. So that was really important to me.

When I left the State Police, after joining Hillard Heintze -- the reason I went to Hillard Heintze was at that point they were a corporate security company looking to start in law enforcement reform, and I joined to help lead that practice.

We did some things early on here in Chicago. When Metra had an embezzlement problem, that was our first big assignment. We became their inspector general and then we assessed their police department.

Then we went to Schaumburg when they had a real scandal out there where their detectives were selling narcotics that they were seizing and found that they had some significant problems and ultimately stayed there for a year as their chief when the city said -- the village said, "Put your money where your mouth is. Implement all the reforms you say you need," and I think that they're a model for suburb policing on how reforms can truly be implemented.

From that, Hillard Heintze really grew. We started doing work all over the country. We did a lot of the internal affairs reform in Seattle, particularly with King County, and then we were -- we were ultimately brought to the Department of Justice to be one of five groups that started a new project called Collaborative Reform.

We had two cities, Baltimore and Calexico, California. That grew. The program proved itself. They decided to put it out for bid.

We won that bid, and we were the sole provider of that for seven more cities, some major, some minor, including San Francisco, Milwaukee, some as small as Commerce City, Colorado or St. Anthony Village.

All of them had one thing in common. They had tremendous internal strife in their city following a really bad use of force action and were in need of reform.

It's really a program that we have committed to. It's a program that stays in line with our company's -- really our core focus is protecting what matters, and we're thrilled to be a part of this project.

MR. CRAMER: Good morning. My name is Jeff Cramer. I'm the managing director of Berkeley Research Group, which is an independent consulting firm that does internal investigations.

More importantly, for purposes of today, I was an Assistant U.S. Attorney here in Chicago. I started my career as a prosecutor in New York,
was then a criminal defense/civil defense attorney  

in Boston and then came to Chicago about 20 years  

ago to work at the U.S. Attorney's where I was for  

about ten years or so.  

The last thing I did at DOJ was I led  

the team that indicted Jon Burge and worked on that  

with another member of our team, Sergio Acosta, who  

couldn't be here this morning because he's  

attending a family wedding.  

Another program I did while at the U.S.  

Attorney's Office, I co-led Project Safe  

Neighborhood, and for those of you who aren't sure  

what Project Safe Neighborhood is, PSN, just  

briefly, it's a Department of Justice program in  

conjunction with local authorities. We would work  

with CPD, with federal law enforcement, with  

community groups, and we would invite individuals  

who have a prior felony conviction for guns and sit  

them down and explain to them the next time they're  

caught with a gun, the case could be brought  

federal.  

But more importantly at those meetings,  

which took place in the 7th, the 11th, the 10th and  

the 14th districts, for the most part, was there  

would be GED representatives there, there would be  

drug counseling representatives there, there would  

be people offering jobs there.  

So while our part was more or less to  

bring everyone together and tell them what could  
happen if they possess a gun, the out-take of that  

fortunately was a lot of people got their GED,  

seven gentlemen got off drugs and there were a  

lot of jobs that were given as a result of those  

forums, which happened pretty consistently  

throughout the city.  

Since I left the DOJ, I've been retained  

by two special prosecutors. The first was Dan Webb  

and Winston law firm. They worked on the Vanecko  
case. If you remember, Mr. Vanecko was -- pled  
guilty to hitting and killing Mr. Koschman.  

Mr. Vanecko was then Mayor Daley's nephew, so it  

was an investigation of not only what happened at  

that scene but also if there were improprieties  

with respect to the investigation itself.  

The second special prosecutor case I  

worked on, which is ongoing now, I'm working with  

Judge Patricia Holmes. Judge Holmes has the three  

individuals on the McDonald shooting in the  

conspiracy case that's set to go to trial. We  

worked interviews, witnesses and data for Judge  

Holmes on that.  

At BRG, my team and I, we do really  

multi-million-dollar engagements, they're all over  

the world, but the focus at least for me is here in  

Chicago. With the work with the special  

prosecutors, I'm able to still stay involved, which  

is how the Judge and I got to talk, as he  
discussed, and got to know the people over at  

Hillard Heintze.  

And just quickly, BRG is about a  
thousand people worldwide. I think the most  

important for the purposes of this is we do a lot  
of data analysis. There will be a lot of data  
presumably with this engagement. We have a  
computer forensic lab here in Chicago and I have a  
team here in Chicago to work that, some of whom are  
working with me or did work with me on the special  
prosecutor cases.  

JUDGE COAR: All right. For better or worse,  
it bears repeating that communities need the  
Chicago Police Department and the Chicago Police  
Department needs to help those communities.  

Crime exists, there's no two ways about  
it, and the CPD is necessary to serve and protect  
us all from crime and criminals. There's an old  
saying who are you going to call at 1:00 a.m. when  
somebody is breaking in your house? You call the  
police. They are -- they are necessary.  
Having said that, there are two related  
narratives that arise out of the historical  
experiences with the police that persist in  
minority communities.  
The first is the need to have the talk  
with your sons and daughters warning them that any  
encounter with the police is potentially dangerous,  
and you try to impart to them certain rules for  
(navigating those encounters.  
The second, which reinforces the first,  
is the relaying of incidences in which someone  
calls to report a crime, and when the police  
arrive, they get into an altercation with the  
police and wind up being arrested themselves, the  
caller is arrested.  
There are also incidences of  
disrespectful conduct, excessive force and other  
unconstitutional behaviors. If it doesn't happen
to you, when it happens to somebody you know, a relative or friend, there's a ripple effect, and that -- that ripples through the community. Even one such act undermines the relationship between the department and the community. Our goal is to reduce the incidence of bad behavior in a way that's demonstrably evidenced by the metrics in community feedback. Community policing, community engagement and transparency have been shown to create a level of trust between the police and the people they serve. So as a judge, most of the cases of police misconduct I saw involved a lack of discipline, so we'll also be looking at the disciplinary process within the department.

The next slide shows the members of our team. Peter Harvey is the monitor in Newark and an attorney in New Jersey. He's the former Attorney General of New Jersey. Newark was identified as one of the more successful monitorships, and so we've talked to Peter at some length and we have made Peter a part of the team with not a lot of hours involved but as a consultant to work with us to figure out how he did it and how we could duplicate some of his efforts.

Jeff Cramer you met; Ken Bouche you met. Sergio Acosta, as Jeff said, he's not able to be here today. He's another former Assistant U.S. Attorney and a civil rights coordinator for the Department of Justice. Marcia Thompson, to Jeff's right, led the Hillard Heintze team in Baltimore on use of force and community policing issues. She also worked on engagements with the Denver Sheriff's Office on use of force management staffing and training. Marcia has a special expertise in the area of community policing.

Theron Bowman on the end is a Ph.D. He's a former policeman and a former chief of police in Texas. He was appointed one of the monitors for the New Orleans Police Department consent decree and has served as a police practices expert for the Department of Justice in Newark; Maricopa County, Arizona; Seattle; Cleveland; Albuquerque and New Orleans.

MR. BOUCHE: So to make up for some lost time, I'm going to buzz through this because you have the resumes for all of our team, but we really believe that we're putting forward a team of really national experts of diverse lives, diverse experiences and diverse expertise from Rick Tanksley, who was the former chief of police for Oak Park, now Occidental College. In between those two jobs, he led several reform projects for Hillard Heintze. Rick led one of the most notable community policing projects of the '90s that really started to shape community policing not only in Illinois but nationally.

Meghan Maury is the general counsel and policy director for the National LGBTQI Task Force. Grande Lum is the former director of CRS for the DOJ and is really an expert in bringing together communities, especially in discussions. Rob Davis is a senior vice president for the Department of Justice.

Hillard Heintze and led our practice with the Department of Justice and our law enforcement practice, former chief of San Jose, former educator on internal affairs for the Department of State globally and for the Department of Justice nationally.

Marcia Thompson, to Jeff's right, led the Hillard Heintze team in Baltimore on use of force and community policing issues. She also worked on engagements with the Denver Sheriff's Office on use of force management staffing and training. Marcia has a special expertise in the area of community policing.

Theron Bowman on the end is a Ph.D. He's a former policeman and a former chief of police in Texas. He was appointed one of the monitors for the New Orleans Police Department consent decree and has served as a police practices expert for the Department of Justice in Newark; Maricopa County, Arizona; Seattle; Cleveland; Albuquerque and New Orleans.

MR. BOUCHE: So to make up for some lost time, I'm going to buzz through this because you have the resumes for all of our team, but we really believe that we're putting forward a team of really national experts of diverse lives, diverse experiences and diverse expertise from Rick Tanksley, who was the former chief of police for Oak Park, now Occidental College. In between those two jobs, he led several reform projects for Hillard Heintze. Rick led one of the most notable community policing projects of the '90s that really started to shape community policing not only in Illinois but nationally.
internal affairs, ultimately then progressed up to being the assistant chief.

John Maskaly is a professor at the University of Texas. He's really a data guy. He's worked on five of our projects in other cities helping us to bring data together.

And Will Johnson is the protege of Theron. He's the current police chief of Arlington, and Arlington was just placed as one of the best community policing programs in the country. Will is a national trainer on impartial policing and really one of the country's leading police chiefs.

JUDGE COAR: Let me just say -- and we'll get to questions -- why us? We're the most experienced team ever assembled for monitoring a consent decree, and as you'll see as we go along and we'll talk about as you ask your questions, we've identified momentum as one of the most important things in a successful monitorship.

We have a large team and we will deliver our role in the consent decree in a timely fashion.

MR. BOUCHE: And that really sums up what this slide is about. If you look at -- we've studied consent decrees, we've studied police reform, and what we really believe we're best -- and we could find successes in all of these, but the most successful really in my mind started to come out of Seattle. They recently were found fully compliant. They did it in five years. They did it by really building a program that collaborated between the police department, the city, the communities and the monitor and helped implement reforms. That same model, Newark, now in its second year of its consent decree, is already showing some really significant advancements.

San Francisco was a Department of Justice Collaborative Reform site that Hillard Heintze led. When the current administration ended Collaborative Reform, they've hired us, and we are the monitor for them in a program between the San Francisco Police and the California Department of Justice similar to what you're doing here but really based on the progress that we made in Collaborative Reform, and their exact quote to us is, "We can't lose our momentum. We're making progress. We want to keep moving forward." So they spoke to the police department, and the city self-imposed that on them, not the Department of Justice coming to them.

So we think that when departments get into this, they see the benefit and continue to move forward.

MR. CRAMER: We've got to tie things up and there are a few other slides, but hopefully we can incorporate these as we're answering the questions.

MS. SCRUGGS: Start with your questions and we'll start the clock.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you for a great presentation and staying within the time constraints. We have a series of questions that we speak of in your proposal. Particularly you talk a lot about sustainable reform and then you talk about the Chicago Monitor Community Advisory Board. Hopefully you can share a little bit about that.

But I want to turn it over to -- for the first question, I want to turn it over to my friend and colleague here, Eric Wilkins.

Okay. My first question would be: In your experience, how have your concerns regarding disabilities -- I forgot my glasses, too -- regarding disabilities figure into the shaping of police -- shaping of the policy? Wait. Let me just go to this question here.

What experience do you have with working with people with disabilities?

MR. WILKINS: Okay. My first question would be: In your experience, how have your concerns regarding disabilities -- I forgot my glasses, too -- regarding disabilities figure into the shaping of police -- shaping of the policy? Wait. Let me just go to this question here.

What experience do you have with working with people with disabilities?
And when we start looking at our impartial policing programs, an impartial policing program can't be based solely on race. It has to be based not only on race but on lifestyle, on disability and it has to encompass a respect for all people, and that's got to start to be the basis of how we approach impartial policing.

Our experience in this in cities particularly like San Francisco and, oddly enough, Commerce City, Colorado, which is also a Collaborative Reform site, had some significant issues in the way that police treated the disabled, and there was distinct focus on the training and really how to incorporate the CIT program into working with the disabled, which is something that's starting to become a large national model.

MR. WILKINS: Okay. How much experience have you had with being a monitor?

JUDGE COAR: Well, if you'd look across the team, we have -- we were trying to figure out how many hours we had, and depending on how you look at it, hundreds of hours of working in monitorships are reflected in our team.

MR. BOWMAN: I would add to that. You know, thank you for the opportunity. My name is Theron Bowman, and I didn't have a chance to introduce myself, but I've had the privilege of serving on two different monitoring teams, a team in New Orleans that started a little over five years ago, and I also served as a monitor on the team in Baltimore.

So I have myself many years of police monitoring experience. I believe that the people on our team collectively have served on 25 different police monitoring teams, so there's considerable experience amongst the entire team.

MR. BOUCHE: If I could add to that, too, I threw out the term "Collaborative Reform" without explaining what it was, and Collaborative Reform were those cities who were experiencing significant strife and were really on the cusp of receiving a consent decree and went to the Department of Justice and asked for a reform program, and that program started with our teams going in and doing a complete assessment and then spending a period of time working under technical assistance and then --

and then going to monitoring. So Collaborative Reform is a monitorship without the court's overseeing it. Really it's an agreement with the Department of Justice, and between monitoring and Collaborative Reform, all of our team has experience in police reform.

JUDGE COAR: There's a slide that we didn't get to that addresses that. Consent decrees, police misconduct investigations, COPS, community-oriented policing initiatives, all of that experience is reflected within this team.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you. So we want to make sure that everybody gets an opportunity to ask questions, but I just wanted to do a little follow-up on the question regarding disability.

I think, Mr. Bouche, you were involved with a -- with an investigation of a young black man that was shot back in the '90s, I believe he was deaf, on I-55?

MR. BOUCHE: Yes, sir.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: How has that helped to kind of inform the work you're doing and how police interact with the public, particularly with people with disabilities?

MR. BOUCHE: This is a long story that was a life change for me. Interestingly enough, I was pursuing a graduate degree. The person I was pursuing it with was deaf. We became friends. I would take notes for her. Then I was the director of the public integrity unit that handled that investigation.

The investigation -- it was a sad death. It was a young man who because of use of PCP and anger issues led to his own demise, but what it really -- what made me recognize and made the State Police recognize was that there was a disabled community that we never saw as a disabled community, that was the deaf community.

Ultimately for me, I ended up doing my master's project, a co-project with the woman, on policing the deaf community. The State Police won a national award for it because we came up with tools for the deaf community to use on traffic stops, but it really -- it really helped demonstrate the different needs of different communities in dealing with the police that sometimes aren't so obvious to most of the police.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you.

Jeanette?

MS. SAMUELS: Very briefly, could each of you
just tell me something about the consent decree that you would change or improve?

MR. BOUCHE: I think for me, looking at the CIT programs. I think nationally the CIT programs are lacking a little bit. They've gone to maturity and now need to start looking into other areas of disabled, of mental health illnesses that we don't normally recognize, particularly in teenage and young African-American men, which the tools that police need to deal with that mental illness or that person in crisis is significantly different than what's been taught over the years in CIT.

So I think continued advancement in those programs are the most important pieces.

MS. SAMUELS: Thank you.

MR. CRAMER: Two areas. One aspect we always go through, especially when we're doing our response, is which areas to focus on.

The officer wellness, it's important it's there, and Sergio Acosta, who's on our team who is on the police accountability task force, really derived some of these. I think that's an area that offers a lot of opportunity.

The other one, not surprisingly, use of force is a large focus of the consent decree. I think there are some areas there where that can be built on, as well.

MS. THOMPSON: I think for me, you'd have to include community engagement and accountability.

MR. BOWMAN: I think I see opportunities to have even more improvement in the area of fair and impartial policing. I think there are some opportunities to really hone in on the populations who are negatively impacted who are most negatively impacted by adverse police actions.

And so I think that we have a chance to make sure that the limited English proficiencies are properly addressed as well as the disabled populations. There is some attention paid to the population of mental disabilities, but I think there is just an opportunity to really make sure that every single possibility of that -- or every single population that's impacted by policing is included in this area.

I mean, we all know the Title VII categories, national origin, race, ethnicity and so on are all touched on, but from what I've seen in Baltimore and what I've seen in New Orleans, I think perhaps there is a chance to be more inclusive than what's already specified in the draft document.

JUDGE COAR: Let me affirmatively not answer your question. I understood your question to be what's not in the consent decree to the extent it should be in the consent decree.

The monitor is a creature of the consent decree, and so from -- just from reading the newspapers, I take it that this consent decree was negotiated aggressively by the parties, including some of the people in this room, and we're going to stay within the four corners of the consent decree.

If you ask all of us if there are things that we would like to be in there, the answer is probably yes, but we didn't negotiate the consent decree. That's between the parties and the court, and we're going to be staying within the corners of the consent decree.

MS. NUQUES: Talking about in particular, you know, populations or groups of people, can you describe your methodology for identifying, preventing and redressing gender bias and gender-based violence in policing?

MR. BOUCHE: Well, I can tell you that none of the team here really are experts on that, but we have dealt with that.

So when we were in San Francisco, I can tell you that Meghan led the team along with another expert who's not on our team but also did some of the similar work, and really the approach first is awareness. It's education. It again goes back to some of the main points of the consent decree. It's focusing on CIT training, impartial policing training and building in programs that make sure that we address all populations, and that's where the main source of the education and the accountability to our officers should come from.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: So we're going to move into the area of community engagement and we're going to receive a question from Jim.

SERGEANT CALVINO: All right. The first one: How would you plan on having boots on the ground, actual monitors, you know, like on the street?

MS. THOMPSON: One of the ways is as we engage...
the community to make sure that they have a
meaningful voice is setting up listening sessions.
I know early on in this process, as well, there
were listening sessions where people were in the
community.
So we plan to be out in the community on
a regular -- on touch points to make sure that we
have listening sessions when we start this process,
throughout the process and in implementation of the
monitoring process.
We also want to have focus groups. We
also want to use the Community Advisory Board as a
voice of the community to make sure that that's a
reciprocal conversation that's going on so that
they could share with us what community voices want
to be heard and have that heard and then also be
shared with the Advisory Board things that we're
hearing in our work as monitors.
We'll also use other ways of touching
the community through surveys, through
observations, also involving the community when
policies are coming out, specific groups having say
on policy implementation.
However we can meaningfully involve the
community, we will do that within our work
monitors. We plan to be active in community
groups, community programs as well as attending
other forums that are going on in the City that
have impact on the consent decree, as well.
So we plan to be out, we plan to be
visible and we plan to hear the community's voice
and in as many creative ways as we can involve the
community within the bounds of our authority given
by the court, we will do so, and we will be
creative in creating those opportunities.
JUDGE COAR: If you’d look at the org chart up
there, you'll see up to the right the blue box, the
Community Advisory Board.
We had long and hard discussions about
whether to propose membership of the Community
Advisory Committee, and our judgment was no, we
would not, for a very simple reason.
In talking about the other monitorships,
the other proposals, the feedback was that they
proposed specific groups and individuals, and it
turns out sometimes they pick the wrong people.
So we think the community should also
have input on who's on the Community Advisory
Committee, and so we didn't want to populate that
committee until we had feedback from the City, the
AG and the community groups themselves.
You've been actively involved. You know
better than we do who should or who should not be
on the committee. If we had agreed among
ourselves, we could probably come up with 20 names
of people and organizations to put there, but we
just weren't sure that they were the right people
to put there, so that's why that box is empty.
PASTOR BIEKMAN: Judge, can you talk a little
bit more about, since we're there, the Community
Advisory Board? Specifically how did you see --
what did you see as the role of that? And then if
you could profile perhaps the types of
organizations, people that you'd like to see that
you think would make it effective.
JUDGE COAR: Well, I can't think of an
organization just by their focus that shouldn't be
on there. The Community Advisory Committee will
advise us on everything, how we should interact
with the community, how often we should meet with
the community groups, what the vehicles should be,
whether we should go out and meet with them
individually, whether we should meet with
individuals on the community groups, but the
Community Advisory Committee will tell us and give
us feedback on what's happening in the community.
You know, there's a system -- a pretty
straightforward system for getting feedback from
the police department, but the community is sort of
a large group, as you know. You know, we talked
about the disabled community, we talked about
racial and ethnic and gender groups, but there are
other groups out there, too, and we can't lump
everybody in the same basket.
What's a matter of urgent concern for my
group may not be a matter of urgent concern for
other groups, and so we need to have a broad-based
way to reach out to the community. The Community
Advisory Committee tells us how to do that and who
to talk to.
PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you.
MR. CRAMER: One thing I might add on that, as
well, is -- and you can tell just from talking
about our backgrounds, we're in Chicago, and that
just doesn't mean we work here or whatnot, but
we've worked on police issues, we've worked on
community issues, whether it's from the bench, whether it's working Project Safe Neighborhood or working with the selection committee for the new person to head COPA or police reform here or elsewhere. We've been in the community, we've worked with police and these groups, so we know -- we have a pretty good idea because we've worked on these issues with them who we might want, but as the Judge indicated, I think it would be folly, for lack of a better term, to do it this early without guessing the necessary input.

MS. THOMPSON: I just want to add to that, as well. I think that, you know, working and living reform every day as practitioners, you meet different community partners that have wonderful ideas and wonderful outreach that can be creative to help in reform. I mean, I'm working on a citywide initiative on true racial healing and transformation right now which crosses over policy, justice reform as well as mental health and truth narrative. For me, I mean, that type of policy council has 30 different groups from the City that are involved in it from the healing field, from the law field, from the juvenile justice field, from housing. I mean, that group in itself has people that have a valid voice that will bring something creative to the table. So I think there are many opportunities for us to develop who would be on that advisory board, but we really want to hear the voices of the community so that we don't select people that don't really have their pulse in the city.

MR. BOUCHE: I think we went around and answered some questions, but I don't think we specifically answered the sergeant's question in a way that I heard, and I think it's important to say that our proposal is built on the fact that we believe that reform takes momentum. You can't come in one quarter, do a couple things, leave some directions, come back, check on it. It requires a constant monitoring partnership. Of all the proposals that came in, ours was by far the most hours -- you know, over 1400 hours -- and we really took some hits for that, but we believe that that's what it takes, and we were over the City's cap for the budget, and instead of lowering our hours, we just made those hours pro bono because we did some real analysis and thinking of what it's going to take to have people here. So between our subject matter experts that will drive our initiatives and our team on the ground that will constantly be present, we think we'll have boots on the ground probably more than you would imagine.

MS. THOMPSON: Again, Marcia Thompson. I worked with police reform for almost 20 years. I'm also an attorney, and I've worked on Title VII workplace issues internal to the government and external to the community, as well. So two things. Eric, as to our experience working with persons with disabilities, I taught ADA accommodations and disability law for almost 20 years. I've also represented juveniles as a guardian who suffered from mental illness, also disabilities, and also in the foster care system and suffered from trauma.

For your answer, Katya, I worked on the Domestic Violence Task Force, reviewed domestic violence policy for the police department, how they were not enforcing the laws for domestic violence.

I've also been a keynote speaker for victims in trauma for domestic violence and I've also coordinated teaching domestic violence policies in the City of Birmingham for the entire police department. So I just wanted to add that to the questions.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you. I think you addressed this partially earlier, but I'll just ask you: How will you ensure that youth, LGBTQ, undocumented and people with disabilities' voices are heard and considered in the monitoring process?

MR. BOUCHE: Well, Marcia hit on it, I think T hit on it and the Judge hit on it, but we are really committed to community engagement. If you look at our work in Milwaukee, if you look at our work in San Francisco, there was a lot of community engagement. We met with youth groups. We spent significant time in San Francisco with the LGTQ groups because it was just -- there were so many issues. But we believe that in order to hear the voices between us and our Community Engagement Committee that we have to be able to have a voice.
to all the populations and have them be represented, so you'll see us in the community a lot listening and giving updates on what we're doing.

Sergeant Pettis: So I think that --

Judge Coar: One of the ways that -- if you think about what the monitor does in a general sense, we're going to be out there trying to figure out what the police department's doing, why they're doing it and how they're doing it.

Now, we also want to check to see whether or not it's effective, so we'll be establishing metrics to see whether or not it's effective, and we'll be getting feedback from the community as to whether what we're hearing from the police department is accurate and what the perceptions in the community are of what the police department is doing.

So all those pieces are essential.

Absolutely all of it. So we need to hear from all of these various constituencies in the City as to how the police are doing and whether or not there are problems out there.

Mr. Bowman: And I would add, Sergeant, that I'm actually working directly with the New Orleans Police Department in this area, bias from the police, and I know just from experience that there is not one tool that you can use that will capture what you need for every different population out there, and the LGBTQ community in particular, sometimes it is difficult to identify the right stakeholders who can speak for the group without the police alienating that population in particular.

So it's really important to use a diverse set of tools from surveys to community meetings to stakeholder meetings to organization head meetings. Sometimes it requires actually going out on the ground and talking to people face to face.

But we also have to look at police discipline records, police complaints. We have to look at lawsuits that may have been filed against the police and leave no stone unturned in this area, make sure that we're understanding what's actually happening out there on the street.

Just like the dark figure of crime, not every crime is reported, not every piece of misconduct is reported, not every time a person is offended by an act of impartial policing is reported, so we have to make sure that we actually go out working with the CPD to make -- to try and uncover those sources of information that will inform this particular category.

MS. Nuques: I'm going to keep on kind of like, you know, going deeper into something similar.

As you probably know, there's so many issues that go unreported in the relationship between the police and undocumented immigrants because of, you know, the consequences that they -- that may have for themselves.

So we have seen this issue even in the task force report for police accountability when it was first published, right? It really was, you know, very explanatory in issues of particular communities, but the undocumented community was left out of that report.

So what strategies would you use so that the voices of undocumented immigrants are really heard? In this climate, it's very unlikely that undocumented immigrants -- and I'm saying that from experience. When I put even the word "police" on a flyer and invite them to a community meeting, no one shows up that may have been in this category, right? Because there's a lot of fear for the consequences.

So what are those strategies?

Judge Coar: You know, in the Cook County stakeholders group that I've been involved with, one of the issues that came up there with the current administration's position with respect to immigration is that it leaves the undocumented unprotected.

If you are a victim of crime and you -- you won't report the crime to the police because you're afraid that you'll be prosecuted. If you are a witness to a crime, it's unlikely that you're going to show up in court and testify if you're undocumented and ICE is in there prepared to arrest you.

So one of the things that we've talked about is keeping ICE completely out of the courtroom. We don't want them in the jail, we don't want them in the -- in the courthouses, because as far as the legal system is concerned,
In the criminal justice system concerned, they are members of the community. Whether they're here legally or illegally is not a factor. They're members of the community. And so as we go out and try to address the community, we're going to address the entire community. We want to find out what's happening with respect to the undocumented as well as the people who have papers.

MS. THOMPSON: I think one of the options is to determine who the champions are for these organizations, for these individuals, because your point is very valid that the individuals may not come forward for fear -- perceived fear, real fear -- of outcome.

So I think we would again poll the community, find out who are the champions for these groups, who are those voices that they trust and invite those people to the table and share our information, ask them to get the information to us and make sure that we have anonymous ways to provide input, be it through a website, through things that they can post on bulletin boards, any way that we can get that information out.

MR. CRAMER: I prosecuted domestic violence cases, and in that community, those go 90 percent unreported for obvious reasons. So in working with those victims, you deal with the groups, and that helps bring in or give some comfort level for the victims, which are always the witnesses in those cases, to come forward without fear that anything is going to happen to them that day other than telling their story, and I think that is not only an option, that has been done in other places, and I think it can be implemented here, as well.

MR. BOWMAN: And one more point that I'd like to add to that, as well, because I spent 14 years as a chief of police and another 5 years as a city administrator, and what I know is for disenfranchised groups in the community, you cannot expect them to access traditional means of communication. You just can't put a sign up in a different language and say, "You're welcome. Come, please report," but the department really has to be proactive and reach out and go to those populations, embrace those populations and to make sure that the message that we're sending hits home that we're authentic, that we're humble and that we're touching those stakeholders who do have credibility with those populations.

So the methodology has to be completely different in that the approach is reaching out, going to where those populations are, embracing them versus saying, "Okay. Here's the information. Come get it if you're interested in seeing what it is."

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you. So we're going to invite Maria to share.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. So my first question is -- and you've spoken a lot to your extensive experience with monitorships.

How would you say that the Chicago consent decree is similar to others and also how would you manage the unique elements of it? In particular, what will you do as a monitor to ensure that the coalition has access to timely information when police officers use excessive force -- or use force, period, receive complaints of misconduct, et cetera, so that the coalition can play a meaningful role in monitoring and enforcing the decree?

JUDGE COAR: We had a long discussion yesterday about the use of social media. One of the ways is social media.

We will be filing reports periodically, and it's -- I mean, that's -- we'll talk about that some more later, but the consent decree has a schedule for reporting, and we have some questions as to whether or not it should be that schedule or a more frequent schedule for reporting, but we will -- transparency is essential.

MR. BOUCHE: I think that that is for our information that's going to go to the community, and I think one of the pieces you're seeking is access to the information held by the Chicago Police Department, and, you know, the monitor has a role, and the role is to see that -- you know, to
look at the pieces of the consent decree -- which
clearly would fall into -- and to ensure that
the Chicago Police Department is following its own
rules and making information available in a timely
manner.

But short of that, we would not be a
conduit for that information. That would really be
outside of the role of the monitor. The role of
the monitor would be to make sure that it's
happening and, when it's not, to report that it's
not happening to hopefully facilitate that the
rules are followed.

But we wouldn't be a conduit for that
information. That would still be a connection
through the Chicago Police Department.

MR. CRAMER: Two things I would add. One,
with respect to information, there's a tremendous
amount of data that's already out there. The crime
lab in East Chicago has it, the Invisible Institute
has it, there is a lot of data out there, and we're
cognizant of that, and hopefully the consent
decree, which it does speak to -- there's a
component, as you know, of data -- bringing that
together and being able to get that out in the best
possibility way.

To your first point -- and certainly T
and Ken can speak to this, as well -- what's
different about Chicago with respect to the other
consent decrees -- we all know that Chicago is
unique for many reasons, but the most important
one, which drills down into the consent decree
which is I think not present in a lot of other
cities, is the historical decades, generations of
distrust that exists, and we've seen it from our
different areas. The Judge has certainly see it
from the bench, everyone else here has seen it in
police reform. I've certainly seen it in the U.S.
Attorney's Office in dealing with these cases and
other matters, as well.

This team was put together with that in
mind. This team was constructed, and it was
constructed very thoughtfully with an eye towards
doing the work but gaining the trust, because if
you do not gain of the trust of the stakeholders,
both police and the community, this fails on day
one.

So as the community looks to the person
at the helm, I think that's tremendously important,
discussed about community participation and oversight, and we've gone into like specific communities. What methods do you plan to utilize in your monitoring of the consent decree so that the community is respected, in particular that the CPD know that they are as accountable to the community as they are to their employer, to their union, et cetera?

MR. BOUCHE: I think it really goes back to so much of what we've talked about about our role in managing the community engagement of the consent decree. If the monitor and the monitor's team are listening to the community on a consistent, regular basis and acting on that information, you become an equal partner in the consent decree because you have a voice, and that voice comes through your ability to bring your concerns to the monitor and have them heard by the court, and I think that's a really important piece. It's really -- it's the key piece to making this work. Both sides, as the Judge said, have to have trust in the process. So if we can facilitate that trusted voice for the community, then we can help make that work.

JUDGE COAR: You know, we're going to find out what the police department is doing. We're going to establish a baseline of performance. We're going to look at the complaint registers, look at the lawsuits, we're going to look at all the objective things. Then we have to measure progress. We have to establish metrics of progress. One of the metrics is have the number of complaints declined? Have the number of lawsuits declined? But also there's a subjective element. We're going to hear from the community. What are you seeing out there? Do you see it's getting better? If not, in what areas is it not getting better? So all of that goes into the evaluation of the reform act.

MR. BOWMAN: And to what's already been said, I would add just one or two more points. One is that this is a collaborative process, and through the way -- throughout this process, the monitoring team will be interacting with the City, the AG's team, with the police department team, so there are no surprises, there are no gotchas, and so as we experience input and feedback from the community, that information is going to be shared with our team. At the end of the day, reform doesn't occur if CPD is not on board, so they are a key critical player in this whole equation. And so we as a monitor sometimes will be responsible for just serving with the CPD and the AG's office and the City and the community as part of this work group to move towards full and effective compliance with the consent decree.

But sometimes we'll also serve a convening role, and to the extent we're needed to convene, then we'll make sure that we provide input to make sure the right people are around the table, to hear the right kinds of issues and voices and that the CPD, as a critical member of this team, has an ongoing communication link and is always informed on process and progress. So I think that's how we know that the community won't get left out when it comes to interactions and issues concerning CPD.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Those are all my questions.

Thank you.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: So thank you, guys. I do have one more question I wanted to ask, and that is that -- and then we can -- we have a few more minutes. We can open it up for others, because I believe we can go until 11:51, is that right?

MS. PRYOR: You have 21 minutes.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: 21 minutes. Very good. But we don't have to take all that time.

MS. PRYOR: You do not.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you.

But my question -- so specifically in your proposal, you talk a lot about this concept of sustainable reform. What is sustainable reform? When you're not here, what does that look like for the citizens and the people of Chicago? What is sustainable reform?

MR. BOUCHE: As the Judge talked about, we spent a lot of time looking as a group before we decided to make this proposal at what works and what doesn't, and we believe that our role -- our most important role as the monitoring team is to be the vehicle that helps not only the department.
reach compliance but have its own internal
mechanisms to monitor compliance, to have
communications with the community, to make sure
that we have the ability to recognize when the
reforms put in place are starting to slip.
Now, that may mean that there's the
establishment of other agencies, that there is a
community engagement, but whatever it is has to be
right for the City, it has to be right for the
department, but what we want to take this to is
to really where community policing is going, and
it's not the role of what can the police department
do for the community; it's what does the community
need and how does it solve its problems with the
assistance of the police department?
And the difference is that there's now
an equal voice in that, that it's not community
policing by the police; it's a community policing
program that the communities run.
And I know Chicago is even trying this
in a couple of their districts in a program out of
New York called Co-Produced Policing. Those are
the types of mechanisms where there is a voice
developed in committees, whether they're at the
district level, whether they're at the headquarters
level, where the community's voice is not only
heard, it's embedded in the process, and that's how
reforms will be sustained.

MR. BOWMAN: May I add again here that I was
told while I was probably in school or somewhere
but it stuck with me that a system produces exactly
what it's designed to produce, and so in that we're
around the table today having this discussion about
police reform in Chicago means that there are
elements and aspects of the system that are broken
and that have been broken for some years, and in
order to produce reform that's sustainable, we have
to change the system.

And so what you have sitting at this
table here is the core team with a group of
experienced professionals who understand what best
practices are in policing around the country, folks
who have participated on other monitoring teams,
and again in my case in New Orleans, when we went
into New Orleans, there were four police officers
on trial for murder, and in Baltimore, the gun --
the GTTF task force corruption case was just
adjudicated this year.
So we've seen some of the worst
conditions in police departments, but we've been
able to walk alongside of these police agencies,
and under the auspices and the parameters
established by the consent decree, we've been able
to work some effective resolutions.
And so it involves from day one looking
at the system, providing feedback and input and
training, to some extent technical assistance as
allowed under the consent decree, and helping the
CPD to understand what systems we are aware of can
be effectively replaced or changed in order to
instill that permanence, that sustainability that
will continue 20, 30, 40 years after this team is
no longer officially monitoring the City of
Chicago.
PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you.
JUDGE COAR: Let me give you an example as I'm
listening to the conversation.
The police have a tough role. They're
where the rubber meets the road on a lot of
society's ills. You can't expect a police officer
walking -- I remember Mike Royko wrote a column
about a friend of his who was Irish. His friend's
uncle got off the boat in New York, took the
overnight train to Chicago, before he went home he
went by the police station, picked up his uniform,
and by 2:00 that afternoon, he was on a corner
directing traffic.
You can't expect somebody to come in and
not have the biases and the straightjacketed way of
thinking that they had as a civilian. Training
makes up the difference. The policies and the
training make the difference, and so we're going to
look at that. We're going to look at the policies
and we're going to look at the training.
We're going to look at the system of
accountability in place. If somebody's not
following the policy, what does the police
department do about it? And to the extent -- when
we talk about police reform, all of that is part of
reform. We're not brainwashing the officer; we're
making sure that there's a system in place so that
we get proper policing.
And there will be metrics in place long
after the monitoring ends so that anybody can come
in and take a look at those metrics and see whether
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| 1 or not there is sustained reform. If there’s not 2 sustained reform, then I suspect that you’ll be 3 sitting in this same room 25 years from now talking 4 about the same issues. 5 PASTOR BIEKMAN: Not me. 6 JUDGE COAR: But you’ll have more information. 7 PASTOR BIEKMAN: Yeah, exactly. So thank you all. I just wanted to make sure -- because that is 8 our last -- kind of the last question there, but 9 there may be things that came up amongst the 10 committee that you might want to ask questions. 11 Anything? 12 MS. SAMUELS: Can you just -- have you all 13 worked together before as a team, or how did this 14 team come together? 15 MR. CRAMER: It started years ago, literally. 16 Judge Coar and I had coffee discussing this years. 17 This is years before the Police Accountability Task 18 Force, this is years before the DOJ report and 19 obviously long before the RFP that brings us here 20 today. So we’ve been talking about this for a 21 while. 22 The Judge and I knew each other in the federal building. As I indicated, I indicted Jon 23 Burge. The Judge worked on the reparations board 24 for Jon Burge, so we had that in common. 25 Then I knew Arnette Heintze from Hillard 26 Heintze, and we started talking with his 27 professionals and Ken and then Marcia and T, and if 28 you’ll remember that one slide with the 12 faces, 29 they have all worked together in some way, shape or 30 form. 31 So we’re not disparate people. We have 32 all worked together in different capacities 33 together, though, on different police reform issues 34 and community issues. 35 MS. THOMPSON: And I’ll add that I’ve worked 36 with Ken in the past as part of the executive team 37 for Hillard Heintze in reform in Baltimore. I’ve 38 worked with T for, I don’t know, over 10, 15 years. 39 What did you say? 20? 40 MR. BOWMAN: 20. 41 MS. THOMPSON: Okay. 20. We’ve trained 20 police on sexual harassment, diversity, ethics and 21 we also served on a panel together for many years, 22 and I’ve also been general counsel for the National 23 Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, 24 so I know many other leaders in the country in that 1 role, as well. 2 I’ve also worked with many of these 3 other people on our team. Aside from the table 4 here, also I’ve worked with Grande Lum, I worked 5 closely with the Department of Justice, so many of 6 us have had touch points over the last 20 or 25 7 years. 8 MR. BOUCHE: The team that you see up on the 9 board, of the 10, 8 of them have worked previously 10 on reform projects through Hillard Heintze. Grand 11 Lum did not. Marcia and Tom O’Reilly recommended 12 we talk to him for this project because of his 13 roles at CRS. 14 And Amy Watson many of us have worked 15 with because of her work in Chicago and in some of 16 the things we have done here, but she’s never been 17 part of our reform effort. Everyone else has been 18 part of our system. 19 JUDGE COAR: The first time I met Ken, we sat 20 down and talked about if there was to be a team, 21 who would the subject matter expert be, and we 22 kicked around a lot of names, a lot more names than 23 you see in this group, and we sort of narrowed it 24 down and expanded the list over time, some of whom
together people that are the best for Chicago since
they know the issues -- not just issues, policing
and community issues in Chicago coupled with
national experts to bring a fresh perspective. You
need both. That's what we tried to do here.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: So thank you all very much
for your time.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Actually, I had another
question.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: One more question, please.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you so much.

I mean, you guys have -- yes, thank you
so much for answering all these question so
thoroughly. I was wondering -- we did speak on --
and this was encompassed really by Katya's question
on how to involve folks who don't typically report,
such as undocumented, and so do you plan on
outreach to other communities that don't
traditionally report such as people engaged in sex
work or homeless populations, stuff like that?

MR. BOUCHE: I think that we do. I think a
lot of what we touched on can be used across a
board range of communities, but I think the one
thing in our conversation that we didn't really
touch on is these the ongoing engagements with
our Community Engagement Board that will help drive
that.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. BOUCHE: It's going to be those voices
from the community that are saying, "What are you
doing here?" And our questions back will be
saying, "You're right. How do we get there?"

Because in many of these communities of
these disenfranchised people, we will need your
help -- the community's help to figure out what are
the best methods to get to these people and to
include them in the process.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

JUDGE COAR: And when we set the board up, the
board won't represent every community concern out
there. It can't be. It would be a 150-member
board.

What we want is a broad cross-section,
and when you have a broad cross-section, you get
the least common denominator, the things that they
agree on.

But there are other communities out
there that we're going to be reaching out to, and

it won't necessarily the same communities at the
same time. As problems are identified, we're going
to go out and reach out to those communities.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Okay. I think we're going to
turn it back over to Lisa.

MS. SCRUGGS: All right. Well, thank you all.
We will see this same team tomorrow. You guys are
on at 9:40 tomorrow. So certainly we look forward
to hearing from you again. Thank you for being in
attendance, and we'll be in touch.

JUDGE COAR: Thank you.

(TIME NOTED: 11:37 A.M.)
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