

PUBLIC FORUM FOR THE CHICAGO POLICE CONSENT DECREE  
INDEPENDENT MONITOR FINALISTS

VOLUME 2

PAGES 192 - 333

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the  
above-entitled cause on the 3rd day of November, A.D.  
2018, at 3:00 p.m.

REPORTED BY:

MS. CATHERINE ARMBRUST RAJCAN,

CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC

CAROL ADAMS: Good afternoon. Good afternoon. Good afternoon.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. I needed somebody to respond to me.

Good afternoon, and welcome to the Public Forum for the Chicago Police Consent Decree, Independent Monitor finalists. My name is Carol Adams, and I will be the moderator for today's event.

On behalf of the Illinois Attorney General's office, and the City of Chicago, who are hosting this forum, thank you all for being here.

First, we have sign language and Spanish language interpreters in the auditorium today. The sign language interpreters are at the front of the auditorium near the stage.

If you would like to listen to a live translation of the program in Spanish, there are headphones at a table in the back of the auditorium.

During this afternoon's session, we will hear and learn from each of the four finalists being considered for the job of Independent Monitor

The Consent Decree is court-ordered, that if approved, will be enforced by federal Judge. The consent -- the objectives of the Consent Decree are to ensure that CPD delivers services in a manner that fully complies with the Constitution and federal and state law; respect the rights of the people of Chicago; builds trust between officers and the communities they serve; and promotes community and officer safety.

It will require broad reforms to ten substantive areas of policing: Community policing; impartial policing; crisis intervention; use of force; recruitment, hiring and promotion; training; supervision; Officer wellness; accountability and transparency; and data collection, analysis and management.

The proposed Consent Decree requires an outside Independent Monitor to assess the City's compliance with the requirements of the Decree and report on the City's progress to the Court and the public.

The Independent Monitor will review

of the Chicago Police Consent Decree. Before we bring out the first finalist team, I will provide a little bit of background on the Consent Decree and the role of the Independent Monitor, the selection process for the Independent Monitor, and what we can expect during this afternoon's session.

First, some background on the Consent Decree. The proposed Consent Decree was filed in federal court on October 13th, 2018, by the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago. It is meant to settle a 2017 lawsuit filed by the Illinois Attorney General's office against the City of Chicago, alleging that the Chicago Police Department engaged in a pattern or practice of unconstitutional uses of force that disproportionately impacted black and Latino communities in Chicago.

The lawsuit included findings stemming from the United States Department of Justice's investigation of the Chicago Police Department in 2016 as well as findings from the City's Police Accountability Task Force.

new and revised policies, procedures, and training materials required by the Consent Decree. It will comment on those materials and, if necessary, it will object if it has an issue.

The Monitor will hold public meetings and meet with various community and other stakeholders to provide information regarding the implementation of the agreement and to obtain feedback.

The Monitor will also conduct community surveys of a broad cross-section of the city every two years.

Each year the Monitor will prepare annual monitoring plans that will describe how and when the Monitor and his or her team will conduct compliance reviews and audits. The Monitor will also publish some annual reports on compliance with the Consent Decree and a copy of its assessment three years after implementation.

Finally, the Consent Decree requires that the Independent Monitor teams budget stay within \$2.85 million each year.

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

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

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

Members of the public, including those of you in attendance today, can provide feedback to the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City, as I will describe a little later.

In the coming week, the Illinois Attorney General's office and the City will evaluate the finalists based on their written submissions, interviews, performance at today's forum, and community feedback; and will work to jointly make a recommendation to the Court.

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

So what are we looking for in an Independent Monitor?

Well, the Consent Decree, as well as the Request for Proposals, provides some detail on this. The Independent Monitor must have expertise in policing and law enforcement practices; monitoring and oversight; preparation of reports or other

applications as well as Requests for Proposals can be found online at [chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org](http://chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org).

On November 1st, the representatives from the Attorney General's office and the City of Chicago interviewed each of the four finalist teams. And yesterday, each of the teams participated in the second set of interviews conducted by a group of engaged community stakeholders. The engaged stakeholder committee is a nine-member group made up of individuals and organizations who have been involved in the Consent Decree process, police reform litigation, or are engaged in policing matters in Chicago.

The group, which includes members of the Communities United and Campbell plaintiffs' groups, as well as members of the CPD sergeant's union will provide input to the Attorney General's office and the City on the four finalists.

The public forum today is another part of the selection process. Each of the teams will make a short presentation and respond to written questions submitted by audience members.

written materials to diverse audiences, law and civil rights, project management, data analysis and information technology, communication, and budgeting.

It will also have a demonstrated ability to collaborate with government entities, and members of the monitoring team should have knowledge of Chicago communities and experience working in Chicago with various constituencies.

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

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

If you would like your questions to be

asked to all of the teams, please indicate that on your question card so that we know to reread your question when the next team comes on.

Once you filled out a question card, please raise it in the air or signal to a staff member. Someone will come by to collect the cards from you and hand them to me.

Please raise your hand or signal to a staff member if you need additional cards or need assistance completing a card. Someone will come by to help.

I will read out your questions to the finalist team, I will read as many questions as I can in the 30-minute period. If there are multiple questions on the same topic, I may choose one as an example so that we can hear answers to a variety of questions.

Because it is important that we stay on topic, I will only read questions that are relevant to the role of the Independent Monitor and the finalist's ability to perform their role.

So that we can assure that each

your input and leadership. We seek your expertise; we promise to bring our very best to every aspect of this process, because everyone deserves to feel safe in Chicago.

My name is Maggie Hickey, and I'm the team Monitor. I've been an attorney for 27 years; I've practiced mainly in the city of Chicago and in Washington, D.C. I'm currently a partner at Schiff Hardin, and I have been for six months; and I head up their government investigations group. And during that time frame I have done an investigation of the Chicago Public Schools regarding sexual misconduct in the schools, and completed a preliminary report that consisted of 39 recommendations to improve at the school.

Prior to that I was the Inspector General for the State of Illinois; and prior to that I worked as a federal prosecutor here in Chicago, where not only did I work on prosecuting cases, but at one point headed up our Project Safe Neighborhood and the Community Engagement Team.

I spent the last five years at the

finalist has an opportunity to answer as many of your questions as possible, please refrain from clapping or speaking out while they are on stage.

Following today's session, the Attorney General's office and the City encourage you to share your thoughts with them about the finalists by filling out the feedback form that was provided to you when you checked in at the desk. Please turn in completed feedback forms at the same table outside the auditorium before you leave.

The [chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org](http://chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org) website provides other methods for submitting comments regarding the finalists.

The Illinois Attorney General's office and the City will consider all feedback received by this Monday, November 5th.

Okay. Let's get started. Our first finalist presentation this afternoon comes from Schiff Hardin-CNA. You may begin your presentation.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Thank you, Dr. Adams. Good afternoon. This team understands that much of the healing and the transformation we seek depends on

U.S. Attorney's office as the Executive Assistant U.S. Attorney, essentially running different parts of the office. So I have a great amount of project management, and I also have experience in running large organizations that have multiple purposes, but one end mission.

Chicago has been used as an example of a city besieged by violence. We, the whole team -- not just myself -- are here out of a deep love and respect for Chicago and out of the dedication to do what we can do to be excellent Monitors for this important opportunity this Consent Decree presents for our city.

Police officers account for approximately 12,000 residents of Chicago. Having a deep divide between these officers and their fellow residents serves no one. We see the damage this divide causes with stress to the police officers; we see it in the reluctance of the community members who refuse to call the police out of fear of improper use of force; and we see it in the low clearance rates that are often blamed on the lack of trust between

the officers and the community.

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

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

Our team, with deputy monitor Chief Rodney Monroe and deputy chief monitor Dr. Chip Coldren, have experience in all aspects of independent police agency monitoring. We offer a proven monitoring and assessment approach based on successful methodologies that incorporate best practices, evidence-based research, and through lessons that each of us have learned that will lend

directly and that CPD reforms build community trust and police legitimacy.

And last but not least, here with us is Dan Giaquinto, our associate monitor for accountability and transparency deputy. He is the former director of the New York -- New Jersey Office of State Police Affairs and currently the deputy monitor for the Albuquerque P.D. court-approved settlement agreement.

Legitimacy of the Chicago Police Department is so important, but we are only going to be able to achieve that if CPD gains the community's trust through a transparent monitoring process.

And I now want to turn it over to Chief Rodney Monroe, who is a national leader in urban crime-fighting, to describe the depth of the experience our team has.

RODNEY MONROE: Thank you, Maggie. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Rodney Monroe. I've spent nearly 40 years in law enforcement. I've had the opportunity to be the chief of police in three urban cities, very vibrant cities; each of

for technical assistance to the CPD.

We will conduct the analysis required by the Consent Decree through collaboration with the Chicago Police Department and through partnerships with the members of the Chicago community working with our Community Engagement Team.

I have four of the five members of our Community Engagement Team here with me today. I have Sodiqa Williams, who is the vice president of external affairs and general counsel at the Safer Foundation; Elena -- Elena Quintana, executive director of the Institute on Public Safety and Social Justice at Adler University; Joe Hoereth, who is the director of the Institute for Policy and Civic Engagement at the University of Illinois Chicago -- and those of us who are hometown people, UIC -- and Steve Rickman, currently the associate monitor for Community Policing under the Albuquerque Police Department Court-Approved Settlement Agreement.

Together we will actively engage community stakeholders in the monitoring process to ensure that monitoring benefits the community

those opportunities came about based on loc -- those cities looking for opportunities for change, looking for opportunities to better unite the police department and their community together in order to address some very significant issues within those communities.

My journey with community policing started long before I became a chief of police. I recognized very early on in my career the true value of police and communities and other partners working together to address issues and concerns within our community.

There's great value to be placed in those relationships. And not just partnerships, but true relationships. Relationships that you can call upon not just next month at a meeting, but later in the year, next year, when things really need the attention of both the police and the community.

Just to give you a couple snippets of how I've actually seen the development of community policing and how effective it has become, whether we're talking about Macon, Georgia, where we

developed sectors within our precincts, we assigned the same officers to those sectors, we reported out on a -- on a biweekly basis, not only crime, but actual citizen engagements, actual problems that citizens and police were encountering in those particular communities; and the solutions that we developed together jointly between police and communities in addressing those problems.

And not only when you start to work together with citizens do you have the ability to develop those relationships, but you bring about other wholesome outcomes, such as crime reductions, greater accountability between both the police and the citizens.

In Richmond, Virginia, whether it was organizing of a litany of partners to help address some of the social issues within our communities -- health, education, social services, bringing those services within the police department, exposing those services to the community at a more rapid pace for delivery of services.

To Charlotte, North Carolina, whether

it would be developing a diversion program within the police department whereby diverting youth out of the criminal justice system; working with private organizations to develop programs for youth that we could divert youth to, versus bringing them into the juvenile justice system.

But each one of those opportunities allowed us to foster greater relationships with our communities.

And when you talk about accountability, which is -- it's primarily what this Consent Decree is about -- how do we develop and create greater accountability, not only amongst the police department, but also the community. You have a greater opportunity to bring yourselves together and develop outcomes that will significantly affect.

I've had the opportunity to serve as the Independent Monitor for Consent Decree settlement agreement with Meridian, Mississippi Police Department and the public school system whereby police were engaged in practices of arresting students for disciplinary type of issues within the

schools. We're now 18 months into that; that no longer occurs. We provided outside training; we developed policies within the police department.

And inside of 18 months they are in full compliance and have been able to reform themselves as relates to their engagement with young people.

So I think -- given the opportunity, I think we bring a lot of experience that will afford us the opportunity to create some of those relationships.

We come with a very strong team, especially on the community-engagement side. And with that, I believe that we can serve not only the Department and the citizens, but the City of Chicago very well in this endeavor.

And with that, I'd like to turn it over to Chip Coldren.

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

I have been a Chicago, Chicago-area resident on and off for the past 33 years, and I have

had several fairly intense and successful engagements in community policing and criminal justice system reform in Chicago and in Cook County over the years.

I was involved in Redeploy Illinois, which is a statewide program that reduced youth incarceration; I was involved in the onset of the introduction of community policing in Chicago under the CAPS program; and I served as president of the John Howard Association for five years when I was the federal court Monitor for conditions of confinement and use of force at the Cook County Department of Corrections.

I would like to just make a couple points of emphasis about our team's experience, not only in monitoring Consent Decrees, but in other formal efforts to transform police organizations into constitutional and effective agencies.

So we have -- as I noted, we've had experience with Cook County Jail; we have several members of our team are involved, as you heard, in the Albuquerque initiative. Dan Giaquinto was involved in constitutional policing reform in New

Jersey. We're involved in Puerto Rico; Rodney spoke of his experience in Meridian; and currently we are engaged with Maricopa County, Arizona, in a multi-year analysis and assessment of their stop and biased policing practices.

We have also been involved with well over 60 or 70 police departments around the country in assessing and reducing problems such as use of force, police shootings, and violence reduction. I can just tell you with confidence, and it's documented in many places, that we have had success, double-digit reductions, double-digit percentage reductions of these problems in the communities and agencies that we have worked with.

Thank you.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Our team brings knowledge, commitment, and experience. You've met our leadership team, and now I really want to turn it over to the most important and driving force of our team, which is our Community Engagement Team.

JOE HOERETH: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Joe Hoereth, director of the Institute

more informational. And what's important for us at this point is to commit ourselves to a set of principles around how we engage. And I'm going to just go through those real quickly.

The first is clarity of purpose. At every engagement we will be reading some sort of statement or communicating in some way the purpose of that meeting, what's going to happen with that information, the context of how that information's being gathered and used in our role as Independent Monitor, and then the context of what the Consent Decree is about, and how we got to this point.

It's very important for us to recognize that, while there may be some people who are fully informed about what the Consent Decree is or where it came from, at some point in our meetings there may be people who are not. There may be people two years down the line who that's the first time they're participating in something. And it's just as important for their -- for them to understand the context within which -- and the purpose for which they're participating. So purpose is important.

for Policy and Civic Engagement. And I'm part of this team because I know this team believes in values of community voice and community input as much as it values the raw data and the technical aspects of this report.

And so for me and for my commitment to this -- to this Independent Monitor role, that's very important to me; certainly bringing that from my recent experience, designing and leading for the Attorney General's office, a series of community meetings where we collected input on the Consent Decree prior to the Decree being filed -- the draft Decree being filed to the Court.

So I'm coming off of that experience. We gathered over 6,000 comments; and I have a good sense of going into that process, what we heard from the community.

Now, the Decree itself calls for a wide range different types of engagements. And so at times we'll be reporting out, at times we'll be listening, at times we'll be reporting out and listening. There will be other meetings that are

Inclusion. It's -- it's very important for us to make sure that all voices are heard. All voices that have something to offer to this process contribute their input, their information, their feedback.

Just as I said a moment ago, the value from -- that we hear from you all is just as -- of information is just as important as the numbers that we -- we gather in other places.

And so we'll be paying attention to who participates, strategies for ensuring all those folks participate, and how we outreach to communities.

The third principle is safe space. We recognize this issue is emotional for a lot of folks. There's a history of harm in many communities, that's very prevalent. And so it's important that we create that safe space where people are comfortable in sharing those thoughts and opinions. And we'll establish a practice and standards for that as well.

The fourth is trust. And that's really about how consistent we are. We're not going

to walk out of the gate, if we get this role, having trust from the community and having trust from all the parties involved. But there's certain things that -- principles that we will adhere to: honesty about our role and the limitations of our role, the limitations of the Decree.

And then following through. Making sure we're reporting back to people what happened with the information they submitted last time. What happened with the information that we have been collecting along the way.

So I'm going to turn it over to Sodiqa Williams, who's going to talk more about our strategy.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: Sure. Thank you, Joe. Hello, everyone. My name is Sodiqa Williams, and I'm the vice president of external affairs for the Safer Foundation.

I am honored and humbled to be in the room with all of you here today. And I am extremely appreciative of all the hard work that has been done to get us here today.

I am an attorney, but I'm also a systems reformer. In my current capacity of Safer Foundation, I work to provide opportunities for people with arrest and conviction records; and I work systematically to remove barriers to successful reentry.

I am committed and very passionate about working with this team, who I have great faith in, to truly make a difference here. I believe in this team, and I believe in our principles, in our approach to include all voices.

And so some of the ideas that we have -- and to expand our Community Engagement Team, I'm going to share with you today; but I just want to put out there that we are well aware that those who are on the ground and in the community, who are directly impacted, know best. So we're going to be reaching out, we're going to be talking to everybody to get their opinions about how they view their role in terms of participating with us in the community engagement group.

Some ideas that we have in terms of

different ways the community can be involved include researchers, facilitators, liaisons, subject-matter experts, and translators.

I also wanted to share -- just to wrap up -- that this -- I'm also directly impacted myself, as being a resident in the City of Chicago, and some of the experiences that I've shared. And I really believe that we have a significant opportunity here to make a difference.

I'm going to pass it on to Elena.

Thank you.

ELENA QUINTANA: Hi, I'm Elena Quintana of the Institute on Public Safety and Social Justice.

The last slide just lists some of the ways that we aim to dialogue with community. And we are -- have -- I hope it's the right one -- yeah. We have up here just that we aim to be relentlessly inclusive, not just because we'll have a website and published office hours and time when all of the monitors and monitoring staff will be available; but we are also going to go very much beyond the expected

quarterly meetings to be able to hear from people who are most affected by the -- the need for this Consent Decree.

We really think that it's important for people who have felt very silenced or very marginalized to feel that they have a safe place to bring this. Because if we do not hear from them, if they do not understand how important they are to the solution, then we will have failed. We are not going to fail. We are going to find them, we are going to be inclusive. And that's our pledge as monitors.

MAGGIE HICKEY: We welcome hearing from all voices; so at this point we're happy to take questions.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you very much. The first question is: Are there any parts of the proposed Consent Decree that concern you or give you pause in some way?

And if so, why?

JAMES COLDREN: Okay. So we have taken, as you can imagine, a very careful and deep look at this Consent Decree. And before I launch

into a couple areas of concerns that we have, I do want to say that, in our experience -- and we have looked at a number of Consent Decrees around the country -- this is a very comprehensive Consent Decree. And we applaud the fact that it includes so many paragraphs, so much information about community policing. That we think is unusual compared to other Consent Decrees that we're familiar with.

I'm going to just pick two little points that I want to raise about some reactions that we had to the Consent Decree and then make a point about how we can manage those things.

We think that the language in the Consent Decree around citizen oversight and civilian oversight could be stronger. And we -- we know that there's a strong interest in community sectors about that very issue.

We also think that the language around -- or rather, the research that needs to be done is almost slightly overstated and overambitious given what is required to get that work done.

I think the thing to point out is

and how do we create safe spaces, whether they be very small spaces or larger forums, in order to help people feel as open as possible to share with us.

And then recruiting community ambassadors is another thing that we'll have to do right away. There is a lot of learning that has been done on the front end with Joe's institute that will really help guide us as well.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: I would like to add really quick. We need to talk to everybody. We won't be talking so much that you're going to be like, okay, we've had enough of you.

But no, seriously, this is about building trust from the very beginning, and building those relationships, and being accessible so that we can talk to everyone and learn as much as we can at the front end, as well as with the principles that you heard Joe talk about, really making sure we lay the foundation for how these meetings will take place in terms of the purpose statement, inclusiveness, and being consistent as we -- as we move in the process.

Thank you.

there are several paragraphs in the Consent Decree that provide for the fact that, if the monitoring team feels that there are areas that need to be shored up, if we observe things that we think are not well addressed or are not addressed by the Consent Decree, we have the invitation from the Court and from the judge to make recommendations about the Consent Decree itself.

So that is possible.

CAROL ADAMS: Could you please describe the concrete steps, programs that you will put in place, to ensure that the voices that most need this Consent Decree are heard by your team?

MAGGIE HICKEY: Our Community Engagement Team will field that question.

ELENA QUINTANA: So the very first step is that we want to make sure that we are understanding the places and that we will map the places where most arrests take place. These are likely to be the people most affected. And we want to not only hold forums, but really try to figure out who are the people that we really need to speak to,

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Please describe how your monitoring plan will control for CPD's long history of coverups and the documented code of silence. Specifically, how will your team look beyond CPD-generated and reported data and double and triple check compliance?

How will you ensure that the CPD doesn't just get good at reporting so that it only appears that there's compliance but nothing changes on the street?

MAGGIE HICKEY: I would like both Chief Monroe and Dan to assist in answering that question. They both have very important information to share.

RODNEY MONROE: One of the things that we clearly recognize is there will be a host of data sets that we will be looking at, measuring, number of reports, looking at citizen complaints, disposition in those particular cases. But one of the things that we recognize clearly is that data alone will not tell us the story; that you must have the ability to match data with voice. And when I say "voice," I

mean the understanding and the responses from community.

Data can tell us one thing, that uses of forces are going down, or citizen complaints are going down; but at the same token, that we have to be -- we have to have the ability to interview individuals that have been subject to uses of force, that we need to interview individuals that have filed citizen complaints. And not only look at the complaint process, but look at those other attributes that may be wrapped in to policy and training, whether or not the timeliness of that investigation, whether or not you were contacted within a reasonable time, whether or not there was follow-up to that particular investigation.

So not only will we be looking at the data, we'll be -- also be looking and listening to individuals as relates to how they respond.

Part of our other responsibility is not just to sit in our office, or sit somewhere and read a report, but physically be out there on the ground, in the various 22 police districts, during a

with and is responsible for.

And when I say relationship, I don't mean just having a conversation together, I mean going out to where they are, offering your assistance, offering them opportunities to work with you to solve the problems that they confront; and the most important thing is going back. Because if trust doesn't exist, and an officer goes out once and never comes back, trust will not be established.

You have to go back again and again and again. And if you do that, with the consistent message, with a notion of the shared responsibility that community policing entails, then you will start to break down those barriers and build the trust that you need that you work on.

RODNEY MONROE: I just want to add to that, you talk about police officers, how do they develop an understanding and belief that community policing works. Is that when you develop those strategies, police have to -- to be able to see and understand that what the public and what the community has to offer can assist them.

variety of times and days and shifts, so that we can better understand and observe. And again, you want to always be able to not only match policy and training, you need to also match it also with the actual actions that officers are engaged in each and every day.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How do you create real buy-in to community policing among Chicago Police Department officers, who don't believe that community policing is real policing?

JAMES COLDREN: You know, I have a -- done a number of workshops around the country around citizen engagement and policing. And I can just tell you that everywhere I've gone and every community organization that I've talked to, and every person of color that I talked to that has had a difficult association with the police has told me one thing, and it boils down to one thing: It's the creation of a relationship. Not just a relationship between the police organization and the community, but the relationship that each officer in that department creates with the community members he or she works

Whether it's additional information, whether it's vital information, whether it's they're volunteering to -- for neighborhood watches, whether it's -- it's them willing to come forward and -- and partake in opportunities to help train the police department, whether it's citizens bringing insight into training opportunities, all of those things add value to our departments. And we have to recognize the value that communities can bring to police departments and recognize that it is of some value.

And most importantly is citizens and communities help keep police officers safe. When you have communities that are looking out not only for the welfare of their communities but the welfare of the officers that are policing their communities, they become safer. And we have to understand that that exists with those relationships.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. I have a follow-up that's directed to you, Chip. Say for you, why didn't the Chicago CPD CAPS program work?

JAMES COLDREN: Couple things. I think that there was a change in leadership, and the

new leadership that came in did not value it as much as the leadership that brought it up in the first place; and I think that the department started to kind of partition responsibility for community policing to just certain individuals and certain officers within the department, and it lost its conceptualization of community policing being infused in the work that all officers do. They started to create special units that were community policing units. So that kind of eroded the very strong foundation that the department had under CAPS.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. People with disabilities are disproportionately impacted by police misconduct, especially people of color with disabilities.

How will your community-engagement process be open to or include people with disabilities?

What is your team's experience or expertise in best practices for policing and disability, including but not limited to crisis intervention?

important for the Chicago Public School students to understand the history and how we got to where we are, and how we're going to be moving forward to change their communities. Because they too are affected on a daily basis by the violence that faces our city.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: Hello. We do have a member of our Community Engagement Team who will be focusing on the marketing and social media aspect.

But I can tell you, while I'm a lawyer, I also specialize in communications; and I understand the importance of not making language so complicated that no one, you know, can grasp it.

So it's really important -- and especially technology; right? Everybody wants stuff just like this (snapping fingers).

So we must convey in a way, whether infographics or otherwise, where we can concisely spell out the meeting and provide it in a format so that it's not just, you know, a thick pile of papers, but really kind of broken out.

And what I think we're concerned with

JAMES COLDREN: Yeah, so in the past several years the Department of Justice has revitalized and revamped its Crisis Intervention Team training for law enforcement and for corrections. And when they did that, they actually turned to CNA to do that work. It was CNA that worked with the Department of Justice and the National Institute of Corrections to assess and reassemble and pilot test the new Crisis Intervention Team training.

So we actually have on our team, members who have been working with troubled communities, communities of...people with mental health problems for many years. And we are the people that they turn to, to -- to produce the best that can be done in that area.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Thank you. How will you be able to break down this Consent Decree in the manner which students in Chicago Public Schools could understand how important the Monitor's job is?

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'll let our Community Engagement Team answer that. But also, it is very

really, as we're talking about the different pieces of the Consent Decree, is how can you get involved? What are your thoughts regarding this?

So that's what --

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'd like to add one thing, as a personal point. In my personal life I'm the chair of the Constitutional Rights Foundation for the City of Chicago, which is a civic education for youth. They have the Equal Justice Under Law program at CPS, the Lawyers in the Classroom program, and many other youth summit projects. And we worked with CPS on doing the John Burge training in CPS schools.

And so we have a lot of access and abilities to be able to distill the information and the importance of the Consent Decree to make sure that that is delivered in the Chicago Public Schools, and not only in the public schools, all schools should learn.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: I'm sorry, one more thing.

CAROL ADAMS: Go ahead, please.

SODIQA WILLIAMS: The most important

part of the question that you ask is explaining why should they care in the first place.

I think a lot of times that very simple notion gets missed. And you know, this is truly about making our communities safer, and improving the quality of not only their lives, but the whole community.

And when we're talking about needs, we're talking about the community needs, and we are talking about the police officers as well. Because the better we address the police officers, the better they are equipped to protect these communities and build up the trust that's needed.

The fear in the communities is so high right now, when you see a police officer pull up behind your car, or et cetera. So we really need the youth to be really involved in anything that we do, because they are our future. And if we're going to have sustainable impact, we need everyone involved.

MAGGIE HICKEY: And as you can tell, Sodiqa and I are very passionate because we're both mothers of school-age children.

And this Consent Decree is written in a way that tasks that it contains, the reforms that it contains, by the monitoring process, judging those reforms and judging those tasks, once we sit down, develop the metrics and the methodology in collaboration with the parties, it will enable us to assess whether constitutional policing is actually taking place.

I understand individuals would feel that they don't get the presumption of innocence on the street. But we would be looking at the appropriate constitutional standards for engaging -- okay -- Chicago residents. And -- and the appropriate constitutional standard for carrying out law enforcement police functions.

That's one half of the answer. The other half of the answer, I believe, lies with the chief or our Community Engagement Team.

MAGGIE HICKEY: I'd like Elena to add a few comments on...

ELENA QUINTANA: I want to say, you know, the Consent Decree really aims to put police

CAROL ADAMS: All right. This is a first-person question. I'm going to try to -- statement that I'm going to try to read as a question, and maybe you can comment on.

But, if arrested, this individual says they would be -- should be considered innocent until proven guilty; but police have always functioned in a way that seem to indicate the opposite when they've somehow done something socially inappropriate in Chicago and suburban communities.

They believe that we're in a police state. And there are citizens who feel this way in our city. How do you respond; how do you create some atmosphere of -- in the community that will engage people who feel they've been inappropriately treated by the police?

DAN GIAQUINTO: I'll try to answer the first half of that question, if I can.

I firmly believe that constitutional policing and effective policing are not mutually exclusive. If I didn't believe that, I wouldn't be here.

and communities in right relationship with each other. And when that occurs, public safety improves; right?

And a lot of the questions that you're asking are really about like are people going to be excluded from the process, and will we continue to do that same thing of like, you know, favoring an establishment over citizens that have a long legacy of being marginalized.

And the answer is, we aim to do our level best to be as accurate as possible and to be relentlessly inclusive. We need to do that in order to do a good job.

And you know, like when you asked will we do what's needed to engage disabled people: Yes. To -- to engage women: Yes. To engage youth: Yes. Sex workers: Yes. LGBT people: Yes.

I mean -- and to create safe space. So I think that there's just -- there's a lot of fear -- and I understand why: Because there's a deep legacy of people feeling excluded from the process. And we feel that it is just a -- just to do a

satisfactory job, the minimum of what we need to do, is to be incredibly inclusive.

RODNEY MONROE: The point that you made about arrests -- and I think that, you know, part of our responsibilities is not just looking at arrests from a generic perspective, but looking at arrests based on the type of arrest. And not only the type of arrest, but what precipitated the arrest.

What is a robbery, a burglary, those type of things, they're going to have their own explanation. But when you start looking at arrests for disorderly conduct, you start looking at some of the other minor-type offenses, we have to really take a close look at those to determine the circumstances in which those type of arrests are being made.

And is there additional policy, procedures, and training that we can wrap around those type of arrests so that we don't create an environment where citizens believe that they're just being arbitrarily picked on for some other reason?

So that will be a part of our process, to dig down into -- see about the circumstances.

Because I've been in law enforcement over 40 years, I know about pissing off the police and how sometime that can result in an arrest.

But we have to be mindful of those types of things and really take a close look and measure those things as well.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I asked --

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Thank you. We are not entertaining any questions from the audience, only questions that are written on cards. If you have another card for me, then I can use that question. Otherwise -- and we will take a few moments for you to write that.

But exclusive of that, we have entertained all questions from the audience for your part of this presentation.

And we thank you very much.

MAGGIE HICKEY: Like to thank you very much for having us today.

JAMES COLDREN: Thank you, everyone.

RODNEY MONROE: Thank you.

ELENA QUINTANA: Thank you.

CAROL ADAMS: We'll take a brief ten-minute break as we transition to the next group of presenters, which will be StoneTurn.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: Good afternoon; we're going to continue with our presentation.

Good afternoon. All right. Good afternoon, we're going to continue with our presentations from the finalists to be the Independent Monitor for the Chicago Police Consent Decree.

And this afternoon we have before us StoneTurn. We're going to ask them to give us a 20-minute presentation, after which we will open up for questions from the cards that will come to me from the audience.

If you would like the question that you are asking to be answered subsequently by the other finalists, please indicate it on the card, and we will proceed.

Thank you so much, StoneTurn.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Thank you. Can you

hear me? Yes. Good afternoon. My name is Katie Lemire; and I want to start by thanking those of you who are here today, and thank you for coming. And thanks for listening to us.

I want to start by briefly introducing my team members, then I'm going to talk a little more about each one of them, and then I want to talk a bit about our methodology and what -- what makes our team particularly unique.

So first of all, to my right is Dr. Monte Long. To my left, two people down, is Dr. Carol Rasor-Cordero. And David Burroughs is to my immediate left. And to my far left is Michael Costa.

There is one member of our core team, who we have named to the core team, who is not with us today, and that's Brent Larrabee. Brent I will speak of and describe to you some of his background. Unfortunately, he had an unmovable conflict such that he could not be here today with us.

So going onwards, I want to talk just generally a little bit about our team. We have a lot of different experience up here at the tables, and

with Mr. Larrabee, who's not present; we're a lot of different things. We are former federal and local prosecutors, former law enforcement. We are data analytical specialists, we are compliance professionals who have run monitorships in the past.

We are well versed in policing practices, best practices. We are well versed in how you get the many, many facets of a Consent Decree done. We are well acquainted with federal and local laws; we know how to get change management done; and we understand data analytics.

And in short, we know how to get virtually everything done that needs to get done in the course of this monitorship. And we will make sure that the objectives of the Consent Decree are followed and the mandates are met.

So just first about myself for a moment -- that's me up there. I'm a career prosecutor. I was a federal prosecutor in New York City in Manhattan, and before that I was an assistant D.A., also in Manhattan. I spent a bit of time after working as a prosecutor as counsel to the police

years at the New York City Police Department. While he was there, he oversaw significant swaths of the police department in areas that are particularly relevant to the Consent Decree.

He was the commanding officer of the police academy, and in that role he oversaw the training of recruits, in-service training, as well as managerial and executive training. He also oversaw -- he was the commanding officer of the office of community affairs, as well as the school safety division, which handles many ways in which the police department interacts with youth, the youth of New York City.

He also had a supervisory position in the internal affairs bureau of the NYPD, that is the office that oversees discipline and -- within the police department.

He is now a professor at Pace University; and he is currently working on the outside of the NYPD. He left the NYPD, he left for many years, and he was asked to come back by the current monitor of the New York City Police

commissioner at the NYPD. While I was there, I had a very, very broad portfolio which ranged from reviews and reforms of broken pieces of the police department, to working with different community groups, to overhauling training in connection with constitutional policing, and spearheading a very large reengineering project that touched many, many facets of that 53,000-person police department.

I'm also experienced in running monitorships. I know how to meet deadlines, meet budgets, get things done.

This is a big Consent Decree. It is 225 pages. Those of you who have not read it would find out if you looked at it, 225 pages. And it is full of deadlines and things to get done, and a budget to meet within that.

And I can get that done; I'm well equipped to get that done; I have the experience to get it done.

I want to speak now for a moment about Dr. Monte Long, who is here to my right. Dr. Long also has a past experience from the NYPD; he spent 20

Department. This is the Monitor charged with overseeing the stop-and-frisk-related monitorship. And now Dr. Long is working on the outside looking in at the NYPD, making sure that the department gets in compliance with that monitorship.

I want to move on to Dr. Carol Rasor-Cordero, who is to my left. She also has a lengthy career in law enforcement. She spent 25 years at the Pinellas County Sheriff's office. She served at the -- at that agency as its training advisor. She also -- there are many, many highlights to her career, but to point out a couple of things, she established the Citizens Community Policing Institute while she was there, she also established that agency's first domestic violence unit and sex offender unit.

Since leaving law enforcement some time ago, she has started a second career, what I'll call as a law enforcement change agent. In that role she has provided technical assistance to police departments, large and small, all over the United States of America. She has served as a trainer,

she's advised on executive development, and she's overseen various project -- various management projects, change projects, so to speak, within those police departments.

Moving on to David Burroughs, immediately to my left. Mr. Burroughs is a 25-year veteran of the FBI. He served on multiple squads while he was there, including the primary squad charged with addressing street violence in New York City. He spent the last years of his career at the FBI as a supervisor, working with some of the most sensitive investigations in the United States.

He now works with me at StoneTurn; we are both partners at StoneTurn. And he has extensive experience, since leaving the FBI, in overseeing pieces of monitorships on very wide-ranging subjects. He would be invaluable in assisting me in making sure that all the mandates of the Consent Decree are met and done on time.

Moving on to Michael Costa, who is at the far end there, Michael would spearhead our data analytics work. He's our quant guy, so to speak. He

smaller police departments, he was very, very involved in any changes, policy, procedures, training, any overhauling that had to happen. He is a boots-on-the-ground guy, not a 30,000-foot view, former law enforcement agent.

As a police chief, one of his posts was overseeing the East Haven, Connecticut Police Department. Some of you may know that that police department was under a federal Consent Decree for many years. And while the U.S. Department of Justice investigation was going on, Brent was brought in to work with federal authorities, with the Department of Justice, on that investigation.

And then when the Consent Decree was handed down -- it was a federal Consent Decree -- he was -- he continued on as chief. It was agreed that he would be particularly effective in making sure everything happened that needed to happen within that Consent Decree.

And he got it done, and he got it done on time and without bankrupting the police department.

has expertise doing this in the -- in the context of monitorships.

He does work at StoneTurn with me as well. He also has experience in some areas particularly relevant to the Chicago Police Department monitorship, specifically he's dealt on the ground with issues relating to system upgrades and updating legacy systems, which I understand could be at issue here over the course of the next several years.

And he also has experience, he has a background in gathering data such as the kind of data that would need to be gathered in the course of surveys in the course of this monitorship.

And lastly, I want to speak to Brent Larrabee, who is not with us, unfortunately. He is a former police chief. He ran multiple departments. And I will tell you these were departments much, much smaller than Chicago, than the Chicago Police Department.

But what is particularly relevant and important about that is that, as the chief overseeing

And that is particularly valuable experience: You have someone who was inside a police department, making sure the changes happened that needed to happen. And he would be particularly of value on this monitorship to us.

So I want to speak, lastly -- there's one member of our team who is not here. And I'm going to refer to that person as our community liaison. And we have not yet filled that role.

If you looked at our proposal, you know that we have left that role unnamed. And that is for a very distinct reason. We believe that we should not choose -- officially name that community liaison until and unless we are named as the Monitor. And there's a reason for that.

It is so -- it is such a very, very important role, in our view; and it would be -- it would be -- to call it problematic is to put it too lightly. If we chose someone now, and there was somewhere in this room, someone among the parties, someone among the stakeholders who we met with yesterday, people within communities in Chicago who

don't have a positive view of that person, that's a failure. That would be a failure. And that cannot happen.

So we made the deliberate decision to hold off on nominate -- naming that person until we were appointed, until I was appointed as the Monitor.

And we have -- we have an action plan as to how we would find that person. And I say person, but it could be persons. I want to underscore for everyone in this room that the budget that we included with our proposal in some years is less than half of the \$2.85 million cap that is -- that is to be proposed on the monitorship.

We left a lot of financial wiggle room. And we left it for several things. There are many things that could happen in the course of this monitorship, such that we realize we need some more specific subject matter expertise. We also may realize that we need to really beef up on the community liaison role. We may not need a role filled, but roles and more people.

This Consent Decree is not, not just

If we get the monitorship, one of the first things we have to do is take a hard look, come up with a road map, a monitoring plan within 75 days to -- to mark out exactly what's got to get done and how we're going to do it.

And in that we've got to gather data, we've got to look at what changes have already happened within the police department -- I know that some reforms have been rolled out already; we have to validate those to the extent we can within 75 days -- and create a road map of what's got to get done.

Secondly, we've got to create a gap analysis. We have to look at what has to get done and what's been done already, again, so that we have a plan to address the gap.

We have to in the course of the monitorship make sure that policies and procedures are implemented. And lastly, all along the way we're measuring compliance, and we're reporting; we're reporting back not only to the judge, not only to the community through posting on that website, but in many, many other ways. So there's a sense that the

about getting things done within the police department, but it's about creating a sense of transparency, transparency to the community; not only so the community has faith that they can see what we're up to, but also they have a sense of what the Chicago Police Department is up to, and that we have a sense of knowing what the community is thinking, what the feedback is, what the sense is out there of what's happening, or just as important, what is not happening.

So --

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: I want to move on, then, a speak to our proposed methodology.

We have four pillars to our methodology. And you have this lovely graphic up there. I will tell you that this graphic makes it look as if there's a straight line from here to the end of the monitorship. That is just not the case; this is a very much a simplification. But I want to speak to the four boxes on here; the first being review and assess.

community knows what we are doing and that they have faith in us.

So it is not a straight line from one to the end; there's a lot of overlap there, there may be some doubling back. But those are really what I'll call the four primary building blocks of what we've got to set out to do.

I want to speak a bit about what is -- what is unique to us compared to at least some of the other groups that you're considering, and that's our independence.

And we -- we are primarily not from Chicago. We have some Chicago roots. I went to law school in Chicago, I have family in Chicago. Mr. Costa lives in Chicago, he grew up in Chicago. StoneTurn has a Chicago office. And we have people in the Chicago office who would be working on this monitorship.

We would also, of course, as I said, have a community liaison or liaisons here full time. We're not bringing, of course, someone in from New York or anyone else to be that person. It's someone

from here, who lives here, who is here, who would be here all the time.

So we do have Chicago ties, but at the same time we are independent. And -- and there -- what is so very difficult about -- there are many difficult aspects of this monitorship. And a part of what is particularly difficult about it is that there has got to be a perception of independence on multiple levels.

There's got to be a sense among the community that we are independent, that we are not particularly tied to the city, to the state, to the police department; that we are coming in there independently to get the job done.

And to be quite frank, there's got to be a sense among the Chicago Police Department as well that we are independent.

There's a lot, a lot of change that's got to get done within that 20 -- 225 Page Consent Decree.

Many of us have worked within police departments. I spent years within the guts of a

happen and reforms to happen.

So we are independent coming in. And that is why we are the best choice for this monitorship. In addition to the fact that we'll get the job done, we'll get the job done, we'll get it done on time, we'll get it done within budget. And we will make the community feel that this has been a transparent process, that things are changing and they'll continue to change, even well beyond the time -- the time that the Consent Decree is over.

So I thank you very much for listening to us. I know there may be some questions for us. And I will stop there.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Thank you very much. The first question does in fact address what you just were commenting about in terms of relationship with Chicago. Says, how will you address your lack of knowledge and experience with Chicago communities?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Yes. So very briefly I'll say that we do have some ties to Chicago, but I am not going to say it's at much --

police department; others spent their careers in police departments. And I think many of you out there as well know -- and this is not at all a means of apologizing or anything like that, it's reality -- it is hard work changing police departments.

And if the people at the helm are perceived as coming in not independent, as being beholden to one party or another, and not here for the right reasons, then change -- change isn't going to happen.

Those five years, those three years, though five years will go by, and we'll have a clean bill of health, and the judge will stamp it, and we'll leave, and everything will revert back to the way it was.

There's got to be real buy-in that happens within the police department, in the course of this monitorship.

In addition to all the many, many, many reforms that are included in that Consent Decree, with strict deadlines and data-gathering requirements, and all sorts of -- of activity to

there's at least two other teams who just have loads of Chicago people on their staffs, and I recognize that.

So there are many things that we will do. Our community liaison team will be doing many things; they'll be having town hall meetings. And I shouldn't just be saying "they." I, Katie Lemire, if I'm named as the Monitor, I'm not going to be sitting behind my computer screen in New York City, looking at policies and looking at Excel spreadsheets and tracking budgets if I'm named as the Monitor. I will be spending loads and loads of time here, as will all of us.

And I will have to be out there as well. This is not to imply we shove things on to a community liaison. They would be a core team member, they would be a part of all of our biweekly and monthly meetings -- and more meetings than that, I'm sure, certainly in the early years of the monitorship.

But that community liaison would be making sure that we're going to the right places,

we're going to the right communities, we're doing stakeholder meetings, we're meeting with leaders of political organizations, nonprofit organizations, faith-based groups; that we're getting out there.

We had a question this morning -- we had a question this morning in connection with immigrants, and might immigrants be nervous about coming to any meetings that relate to the police.

And that would be something in addition we would have to be very sensitive to, in making sure that we're creating a forum -- even if it's perhaps even going door to door in some neighborhoods -- making sure that people are being heard, especially those people who might be afraid to come to those meetings.

CAROL ADAMS: Along the lines of the community-engagement approach, this question says, community engagement is critical. Did you not propose someone because you don't know anyone from Chicago, around the country, who is qualified?

Please tell us what your process will be to find a Community Engagement Team.

going back to my original -- my original point I made during the presentation. We would want to make sure that none of those people would be perceived as being biased. I'm sure in reality none of them are. Those are fine groups putting in other proposals. But we would want to make sure there are no issues whatsoever with perceptions.

In going to the second part of the question, the second question, in terms of what qualities that person must possess, obviously they must be from the community. They would have to be from one of the -- what I will call, as put in the DOJ findings report, one of the especially affected communities, the West Side, the South Side of Chicago. They'd have to be someone who is viewed as having impeccable ethics, they'd have to be really good at talking to people, very, very good at talking to people. And making -- someone who could give people the feeling that they're actually being heard. They'd have to be very well organized, because there would be a lot to get done as well.

CAROL ADAMS: To that end, what

And another related question is: What will the qualifications be for the community liaison?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: Yes. So I think I spoke partly to that question already. And we will -- we have mapped out already a process that we'll be pursuing to find that person. It's going to happen very quickly.

There are two top priorities if we're to be named as the Monitor. Within the first 75 days the monitoring plan has got to get done, but we also have to find that community liaison very, very quickly in advance of 75 days.

And what we would be doing is the following. We would be speaking to the parties, we would be speaking to stakeholders -- we met some of them yesterday. I know that there are many, many other community leaders who would want to be heard from. I went to Northwestern law school; there are professors there who are active in the community.

And quite frankly, we've looked at the other proposals, and there are some great people on those proposals. But we would want to vet them --

experience does your team have with working directly with the people who are most affected by police misconduct?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: So I'm going to give a chance for some of my other team members to speak.

Dr. Long, do you want to speak to that?

DOMESTHENES LONG: In my capacity as the commanding officer of community affairs in the NYPD, my job was to engage various communities, business leaders, faith-based institutions, and youth groups. So we -- we did a lot of outreach, a lot of programming, particularly for youths during the summer. We would have the youth police academy where we would engage them for the vast majority of the summer, for majority of the day to keep them engaged, to keep them...fulfilled.

So we -- there was a lot of opportunities in that capacity to do -- to interact with the community in a positive way.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Is there a

culture of corruption in the Chicago Police Department?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: That's a very, very big question. And "culture" is a big word; and it's an 11,000-person police department. And I don't think any of us at this table believe that there are 11,000 corrupt people in the Chicago Police Department.

I know I'm not precisely -- precisely answering that question, because that question is about culture, and not about 11,000 people.

I have inhaled enormous amounts of reading before coming here today. I have read those -- all of us have -- the DOJ findings, the Consent Decree; we followed what's happened. There is a lot of change that needs to happen.

There is some good there as well, quite frankly. And the Consent Decree does a masterful job, in my view -- in our view, of laying out all the different things, all the reforms that need to be changed.

And can I say, reading all of this,

microphone. And repairing the damage that has been done -- I sat down yesterday morning and read for three hours cover to cover that DOJ findings report again. And you walk away from that report, and you just think it's --the damage is staggering, the lack of community trust. And that question encapsulates it.

And -- does anyone want to help me out on this?

That's a big question. Go ahead, Carol.

CAROL RASOR-CORDERO: What that statement leads me to believe is that there's clear feeling that there is no real community policing going on; that there's a stark separation between the police and the community. And that's one of the things that has to change in order for this Consent Decree to be effective, is for there to be enhanced trust and buy-in, both from the community and from the police department. And that's going to take a lot of effort.

Reading through the Consent Decree, I

that there is a culture of corruption? I cannot -- that is -- I cannot say that definitively. And I'm not here -- but I think that the action plan, as it is laid out in the Consent Decree, certainly addresses -- appears to address what needs to happen. It's a masterful road plan.

CAROL ADAMS: Would you respond to this statement, please?

If arrested, I would be innocent until proven guilty. But police were always against me when I have accidentally been somehow socially inappropriate in Chicago, Skokie, Winnetka, and Highland Park. I am not making this up. I believe we are in a police state like Russia or China.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: I'm going to speak to that a moment, and I'm going to ask others to chime in as well. That is -- that is a stark example of some of what I spoke to when I spoke earlier. Transparency, reaching out to the community.

And it feels -- I'll be very frank. It feels -- it feels almost minimizing to talk about these things sitting up here on this stage behind a

think that there's been some really formidable steps to improve community policing, which will roll into the community engagement, and hopefully increase the trust and understanding.

I would also be curious to the age of that person and -- because of their perspective as well.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: 68 years old. 68.

CAROL ADAMS: No comments from the audience, please.

One of the main reasons Chicago needs this Consent Decree is because the traditional policing model isn't working here, and that the problems are so deep that they cannot be reformed from the inside.

Given the deep ties your team has to law enforcement, how can we be sure that you will work on behalf of those who need this Consent Decree most, and not on behalf of the Chicago Police Department?

CAROL RASOR-CORDERO: I'd like to speak for Dr. Long and myself. We both work for the

center for public safety management. And we do police assessments throughout the United States.

Sometimes we're called in by the police chiefs who want to enhance their police departments, other times we're called in by the city managers and mayors because they're unhappy with the police department.

So I think we're pretty skilled at looking at assessments; and the type of assessments we do are top to bottom, looking at every unit, looking at policies, procedures, internal affairs. It mirrors a lot -- and training. It mirrors a lot what's done in your Consent Decree.

And with that too is every community is unique, and you have to look at it that way, and when you carry out your strategies.

And Dr. Long wants to add to that.

DOMESTHENES LONG: And part of it in terms of, you know, community policing or problem-solving policing is actually involvement in the community and police operations. You know, the community supports and helps the police in

talk to every resident in the City of Chicago before we -- before we choose that person, but there is a lot of vetting that could happen.

And we're not starting from the ground up. We have ideas already. And we have an action plan for how we would go about doing that. But I recognize why that question was asked, because -- I understand that. And that's exactly why we think it's such an important role.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. I want to thank you all. There are no further questions. Thank you for your attendance and participation. We're going to take a 10-minute break to transition to the next group.

KATHERINE LEMIRE: And thank you all as well for coming.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: Good afternoon. We're continuing in our presentations, and we will hear from the Coar Monitoring Team. We will ask them to present it to us in 20 minutes, and then allow 30 minutes from the audience for any questions from this

establishing procedures.

So the -- if the -- there's no one size fits all. And so what works in one place doesn't necessarily work in another.

And so having the community input, having the community as an equal partner in terms of police policy development and operational issues is -- it's very, very important.

CAROL ADAMS: How can we be sure that you will listen to the community when you haven't even hired a community liaison?

Do you really expect us to hire you and your team when you haven't told us whom you will hire?

KATHERINE LEMIRE: That's a good question. And that's some of what I spoke to before. I think that question is the flipside of the answer I gave, which is it is so critically important that role, that we made the affirmative decision not to choose that person until we could vet whomever that would be with so many of the constituencies here.

I know that we can't go around and

team.

Thank you. You may begin.

DAVID COAR: Good afternoon. My name is David Coar, and we will be introducing some of the members of our team and myself.

Let me start with myself. I am a retired federal judge. And you might reasonably ask, why are you part of this application?

Well, let me tell you a little bit about my history. I was born and raised in Birmingham, Alabama. I attended local public high school there, as you can probably tell by some of my wrinkles, I was there during a period of segregation.

I attended the largest -- then the largest all-African American high school in the country, it was 3500 students. It was an inner city school, to say the least. There were -- directly across the street in the school was the largest housing project in the city. At one time or another, everybody I knew had lived in the projects, including my own family.

I grew up on a street called Center

Street, which was in the middle of town, and it was dividing line between a historically black neighborhood and a historically white neighborhood. It was called Dynamite Hill because there had been so many bombings along that street.

Some of the bombings had to do with a local lawyer who was local counsel for civil rights organizations coming in to bring the segregation cases.

Following high school I went to college and active duty in U.S. Marine Corps. I came to Chicago to study law at Loyola. I was here during the '68 King riots, and later the '68 Democratic Convention. I lived in an apartment about two blocks from Cabrini Green, and witnessed the interactions between the police and public that marked that period.

My first job after law school was as a Carnegie Foundation intern with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. That role included a year in New York handling appeals in civil rights cases, followed by three years in Alabama handling

Consent Decrees, including the one involving the redevelopment of Cabrini Green projects. More importantly, hopefully, I established a reputation for independence, integrity, and fairness.

After I retired from the court in 2010, I served as a private arbitrator and mediator. In 2011 I was appointed special independent counsel under the Consent Decree involving the Teamsters Central State Pension and Welfare Funds. As special counsel I attend all board meetings of the funds, review financial transactions, and file quarterly reports with the Court.

About five years ago the Illinois Supreme Court asked retired Supreme Court Justice Ben Miller and I to co-chair meetings of the Cook County stakeholders, that's the president of the County board, the chief judge of the circuit court, the sheriff, the state's attorney, the public defender, and the county clerk. The impetus of that was to try to eliminate the chronic overcrowding at the County jail.

Since that time we've made great

civil rights and civil liberties cases. I tried all types of cases, including excessive-force cases, school desegregation, Title VII, criminal defense in cases involving the maldistribution of municipal assets.

After my four-year commitment with the Carnegie Foundation 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, corporations, and corporate finance.

My children were born while I -- when I came back to Chicago, including my two sons. We lived in South Shore and later Hyde Park. During that period I gave each of my sons the talk. That proved to be great foresight because, as they grew up, they had numerous encounters with the police from time to time.

I was appointed to 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 against the police, several

progress in reducing overcrowding, but there's still discrete areas of concern that remain. The goal was to make sure that there's nobody in jail, awaiting trial, presumed to be innocent, who's sitting in jail simply because they can't pay the bail.

About three years ago I was asked to arbitrate cases under the city -- or the Chicago Reparations Ordinance, which sought to provide a degree of compensation to victims of torture imposed by Jon Burge and his confederates.

Why do I tell you all this? My interest in criminal justice and police reform preceded the Justice Department Police Report and the Consent Decree by many, many years.

A couple of years ago Jeff Cramer, who's sitting to my right, and I were discussing the problems of the police-community relations in Chicago, over coffee. I know Jeff from his days in the U.S. Attorney's office, including his involvement in the Burge prosecution. Jeff was aware of the disconnect between the CPD and Chicago community, because he had seen firsthand some of the

excesses of some officers and the resulting distrust and fear that victims and witnesses had of both the criminals and the police.

We talked about the need for police culture to respect the basic dignity of all, and work with the community to combat crime. We shared our firsthand knowledge of the history, culture, and the people involved in the system. We talked about what type of interaction there needed to be, what -- to change the culture.

Over a period of time we continued to talk. Jeff knew some of the people who had been involved across the country in those types of efforts. He introduced me to Ken Bouche and the folks at Hilliard and Heintze. And we continued our discussion. They were intimately involved with the experts in the field. And we talked about who would be the best people to get involved.

We -- I met at Hilliard Heintze, Peter Harvey, who we'll talk about in a second. Peter, as you know, is a former attorney general in New Jersey and currently serves as the Monitor in Newark. Over

KEN BOUCHE: My name is Ken Bouche. Little bit about myself. I spent a career here in the Illinois State Police. Vast majority of my career was in northern Illinois in what we call now District Chicago, or Region 1, from trooper through lieutenant colonel. I spent a significant amount of time here.

My reform -- if you're not familiar with the state police, it's an agency that does a lot more than patrol, and there's a lot of reform work. We were the agency and I was one of the people that started the Public Integrity Task Force here in Cook County, Homicide Task Force to look at medically complex deaths, led to videotaping and confession and interrogation program here when it first came to Illinois, helped participate in the legislation as well as worked with criminal justice authority, where I chaired the committee that wrote the standards and helped distribute grants that helped the police department to put cameras in.

I joined Hilliard Heintze in 2009 after I left the -- retired from the State Police

a period of months we had further discussions about what an ideal team would look like, culminating in this proposal.

What do we bring to the monitoring team? All members of the community must have confidence as well as the Court have confidence that the collection, analysis, and reporting of information be honest, accurate, and complete.

This team has no agenda other than achieving the goals outlined in the Consent Decree and in the manner spelled out in the Consent Decree.

We're based in Chicago; all four of us that you see here this afternoon are Chicago people. We live here, we will continue to live here during the period of monitorship, and afterwards. We have a vested interest in making sure that this works.

Members of our team have deeply -- been deeply involved in monitorships and other reform activities, including guiding troubled police agencies and investigating and prosecuting corrupt police officers.

Why don't you proceed.

with the purpose of starting a reform program.

After sitting down with the folks at Hilliard Heintze and really having a conversation, the desire was very appealing to me, was to look at how do we do police reform, how do we help police agencies?

Because in 2009 there was really a couple of routes. There was a lot of money available from the Department of Justice through cops, and they'd give it to police departments so they could fix themselves; which really didn't work for -- they would go to a Consent Decree, which there was a lot of questions about whether that was the best way to reform police departments.

And 2010 we were part of a round table discussion with the Department of Justice and when the idea of collaborative reform was first born.

We were one of the original five agencies, the only private company that was brought in to do collaborative reform, and then ultimately won the contract to do seven more cities. Cities from -- ranging from Milwaukee and San Francisco;

Baltimore, where we started, which ultimately went to Consent Decree; to six other cities.

What these cities all had in common was they were in crisis. They were in crisis, eight of the nine, largely because of the poor use-of-force decisions that enraged community. Something that we're pretty familiar with here.

And collaborative reform taught us that we could go into a police department without the Court's authority and really work with the department to -- to effect change after an assessment, and really make this work. And we think that, when we look at our model of our approach here, when you combine the collaboration along with the Court's authority, we think it gives us the best opportunity to move forward with change.

Like to ask Jeff --

JEFF CRAMER: One more person.

MARCIA THOMPSON: I'm Marcia Thompson. Came up here in the Midwest, attended undergrad in Michigan, and then went off to Washington D.C. and worked in federal intelligence, law enforcement

intelligence for a while, while I was attending law school.

While I was there doing that work, I got interested in discrimination work because I became an EEO counselor for my own agency; and I started working with people who felt they were being treated inequitably. I ended up running a diversity initiative and recruitment process while I was there with the federal government, also while I attended law school.

Once I graduated, I start practicing law as both a defense attorney as well as I worked on the government side. I worked for the county attorney in Fairfax County, where I handled abuse and neglect cases; I also worked for the State's Attorney general's office where I handled child abuse as well as child -- child support, child support matters for the Attorney General's office.

I've also served as the ombuds for federal agency. Also worked as a professor of criminal justice, social justice and peace studies. I've also worked in reform since 2001. I started

working with ethics and integrities for the cop's office during earlier riots in other police departments in the Midwest.

So I've been working reform efforts, training, technical assistance, and then moved to Chicago in 2014. Started working with Hilliard Heintze, ran their law enforcement advisory practice. Was primary in Baltimore in those reform efforts, and also worked in about four other police departments during my tenure there.

Left Hilliard Heintze in 2016 to go back to work as vice president of the internal organizational ADR practice where I worked with organizations to make cultural change and help with cultural movement and shift in their organizations.

And I also worked in police administrator as well.

JEFF CRAMER: Good afternoon. My name is Jeff Cramer, former federal prosecutor here in Chicago. I started my career as a prosecutor in New York and worked for a while as a criminal defense and civil defense attorney in Boston. Came here under

Scott Lazar and worked for about nine years under Pat Fitzgerald, ending up as a senior litigation counsel in charge of all criminal trials at the office.

The last thing I did at the office, which I think was relevant to this, is I led the team that indicted Jon Burge. So personally interviewed hundreds of witnesses, victims of Commander Burge, as well as police officers; working closely with Sergio Acosta, who's on our team -- at a family wedding right now, but -- Sergio will talk a little bit about him later. Was head of the civil rights prosecutions at the U.S. Attorney's office there.

Since leaving the U.S. Attorney's office, worked with two special prosecutors. I worked with Dan Webb and the team at Winston on the Koschman case; and am currently working with Judge Patricia Holmes on the conspiracy case, three individuals related to the McDonald shooting, working on witnesses, witness preparation and data for Judge Holmes.

Right now I'm at Berkeley Research Group. BRG is about 1,000 people dealing with

internal investigations, corporate fraud, cyber, data collection, computer forensics, and the like.

DAVID COAR: This is organizationally what we look like. This is the Monitor and the deputy monitors.

I've already told you about myself. I mentioned Peter Harvey.

We especially wanted to bring Peter in to this -- this project because Newark -- like I said, he's the Monitor in Newark. Newark was identified as one of the monitorships that has worked very well from -- from beginning to the present.

And we wanted to have access to Peter for advice on what, in his experience, had worked well and what didn't work well. So he will be a special advisor to me.

You see that blue box, the community advisory board.

We have not populated that box, intentionally. We had a number of conversations about that. And -- and between us we certainly could have come up with about 20 names to put on the

the Department of Justice in Newark; Maricopa County, Arizona; Seattle; Cleveland; Albuquerque; Los Angeles; and New Orleans.

Then we have the subject-matter expert. Ken, will you go --

KEN BOUCHE: Sure. And I'll go pretty quickly through this and not talk about each one of them individually. Every one of these individuals has both been practitioners and engaged in police reform and policing, and have been police reform experts. Eight of the ten listed here have worked together on projects over the past four years, largely around collaborative reform.

They are former police chiefs, civil rights attorneys, Department of Justice professionals. I always like to point out Carol Archbold, who's a professor at University of North Dakota, who wrote the book on police accountability with Sam Walker, *The New World of Police Accountability*, which is on every progressive police chief's desk. And Amy Watson, who's doing significant work here in Chicago.

advisory board. But before we did that, there was an experience -- some experiences that had happened before that we wanted to take into account.

We learned that sometimes when the advisory board was identified before the monitorship started, and without consultation with other members of the community, they picked the wrong people.

They -- the Attorney General's office, the City, and the -- and the coalition have had a lot of experience in discussing the Justice Department report and the Consent Decree, and who are the important people within the community we need to bring on.

And so we decided not to populate that board until we've had a chance to talk to them.

Jeff Cramer you've already met. Ken Bouche. Jeff mentioned Sergio Acosta. You've met Marcia.

Theron Bowman is a former policeman, served 14 years as a policeman and later as chief of police. He is a court-appointed Monitor from New Orleans, has served as police practices expert for

But it's a team that brings a lot of interest and a lot of energy to reform; and we look forward to bringing them to Chicago.

DAVID COAR: All right. Just to sum up with respect to the team, this team has had a great deal of experience with federal Consent Decrees. They've conducted hundreds of police misconduct investigations. We've heard about the involvement with COPS, helped a number of police agencies.

It's a team -- it's a large team made up of experienced practitioners and experienced recruitment. There are a lot of lessons learned that we have already discussed and we want to take into account with respect to this monitorship.

KEN BOUCHE: Sure. This is another slide that, if we had more time, I could go into detail on what worked well and what didn't work with these Consent Decrees. But they all bring us to the point where we are now; where we believe that, in order for a Consent Decree to work well, the best thing it needs is momentum. It needs people

constantly focusing on reform.

When we look at some of the early Consent Decrees, they took somewhere between 10, 11, 13 years, hundreds of millions of dollars. And we don't believe that that needs to be the case.

These ones that are listed here can show a pattern of how that's consistently decreased, until you hit Seattle, and find a Consent Decree that really worked well, came to full and final compliance within the time frame that it set forward.

Newark is modeled after the same program. When we sat down with Peter and Tom O'Reilly, who's one of our subject-matter experts, and looked at what they were doing there, it was the same collaborative approach that they brought to where the Monitor, the City, and the Police Department and the Department of Justice were focused on having pieces of work done and moving forward. And they've really done a great job there.

San Francisco is a unique place because it started with collaborative reform, and then when the current administration ended, it came

Decree are really the key areas to building the police department that Chicago needs. And so none of them concern us in why they're there. Some of them will be more difficult than others.

But no, there's no areas of concern.

CAROL ADAMS: Would you please describe how your monitoring plan will control for CPD's long history of coverups and documented -- the documented code of silence; specifically how will your team look beyond CPD-generated and reported data, and double and triple check compliance?

How will you ensure that the CPD doesn't just get good at reporting so that it only appears that there's compliance, but nothing changes on the streets?

JEFF CRAMER: I'll take that. A few things, you mentioned data. There's a tremendous amount of original data here in Chicago. The crime lab has it, Visible Institute has it, and several other areas.

I worked with the crime lab when I was Project Safe Neighborhood coordinator, so I'm very

to us and said, please continue, and started a -- a statewide Consent Decree similar to what you're doing here, only under different circumstances. So now we're the Monitor working with San Francisco and the California Department of Justice, keeping that momentum.

And it was that that really brought it home for us, and said, we don't want to stop. You've put us on a path that we want to continue. So they developed the same structure.

We think that that's really going to be our approach here.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Thank you so much. We'll now proceed with the questions, some of which we have because they're continuing through all the panels.

Are there any parts of the proposed Consent Decree that concern you or give you pause in some way; and if so, why?

KEN BOUCHE: We've talked about the aspects of the Consent Decree, and on the contrary we think that the areas that are laid out in Consent

familiar with that. So you have to go to primary source for data, not just take what's coming out necessarily of any one group to ensure it's accurate.

The broader question is how do you change culture. And all of us, whether from the bench or whether it's dealing with police corruption matter, or dealing with police reform here in Chicago or elsewhere, have dealt with change in culture and the code of silence.

It's not going to happen in a week, it's not going to happen in a month, it's not going to happen in six months. But at some point the culture does change when trust is established.

As Judge Coar indicated when he and I first started this conversation, this is a large part of what we were talking about, is there needs to be trust between the community and the police. And that helps change the culture.

And as we put together this team, that was an overriding concern of ours is making sure that we had experts in Chicago -- not just experts who knew the city, but experts of policing and community,

as well as outside experts. And I think all that combined helps breed trust, and ultimately that changes the culture.

MARCIA THOMPSON: I want to add a little bit to that answer.

One of the ways, aside from the actual raw data that my colleague mentioned, we're also going to have touch points with the community to get their perceptions as this progresses. We've got a lot of feedback from the community to get to the Consent Decree process.

We want to make sure that they have a meaningful voice throughout the process; and those touch points will also give us their perceptions as to whether the data is reflective of how their behaviors are being translated into the street.

So as you mentioned, the boots on the street, we will be talking with the community on a regular basis to get their perceptions and feedback.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. People with disabilities are disproportionately impacted by police misconduct, especially people of color with

the program themselves sometimes haven't advanced to meet the needs of the city and areas where they're at.

An example that we're working with University of Illinois with -- Amy Watson is working on is really looking at do the tools match the needs of young African American men in crisis, that we deal with in normal CIT programs. And the training isn't necessarily the same, and the tools aren't the same. So that would be one area that we'd have to examine.

Earlier in some of our interviews we talked about a variety of areas we worked with -- with people with disabilities. I myself have some pretty deep experience in working with the deaf community, which was -- was an unusual experience. And that one really seemed with the police -- until it was an issue, and then we realized how important it was.

But across our teams we have a variety of experts in working with disabilities as well.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How do you create real buy-in to community policing among CPD

disabilities.

How will your community engagement processes be open to or include people with disabilities?

What is your team's experience or expertise in best practices for policing in disability, including but not limited to crisis intervention?

KEN BOUCHE: Sure. I think that first when we talked about the important areas of the Consent Decree, there's some that are critical. Partial policing, crisis intervention, community policing are the areas where trust is really going to be built.

From our team's perspective, Crisis Intervention Training is really how to teach the officers how to act, and then how to hold them accountable for what they've been taught. But as it stands now, we also believe that it needs to be taken to the next level; that there's -- what we're seeing is that the resources to support officers to do this sometimes don't necessarily give them the tools; and

officers who don't believe that community policing is real policing?

DAVID COAR: If you -- the easy answer is you either get with the program, or get out. The -- community policing is a goal. It's been demonstrated to work. We need effective policing. Abusive policing is not effective.

The police need to -- need the community, and the community needs the police. And it won't work if the community is -- is turned off and is distrustful of the police.

So that's our goal. That's our goal. We have to get there, or it's not going to work.

MARCIA THOMPSON: If that's -- I think one of the -- one of the key factors to getting buy-in with the Department is giving them examples of what works.

One of the things that our team has been really good at is establishing best practices across the country, and identifying best practice that work in other police departments.

When police see practical application

that work in other departments, particularly other departments that have been in reform, oftentimes we can do peer exchanges or peer modeling, and they'll say, you know, that worked there, you showed that it reduces crime, it increases trust, and also the police officers can do their jobs better.

So I think when you actually show that there are other departments that have been in similar situations as the City, and they've been able to come through it, and community benefits and have been a huge part of it, Consent Decree or otherwise, I think by modeling those best practices you can get some buy-in from the Department.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you.

KEN BOUCHE: And I think one quick thing that's important on that is, when we look at the not having the buy-in to the programs, one of the things we've seen in successful places -- Seattle is a good example -- is when community policing works and trust starts to improve, good police officers see the real value.

Community policing programs that are

boastful, this is a great team. And this team was picked not because we think they could be good police reformers, it's because they've proven to be good police reformers.

When you go back to -- if you go back to our team -- I can give you examples of what they've done to -- from our -- our chiefs from Arlington, a former and current, who built what is now seen as the best community policing program in the country; to Tom O'Reilly, who worked from -- in New Jersey, who worked the first Consent Decree with the New Jersey State Police and did more than four decades, and now is -- he's a senior advisor, but built the Center for Public Safety at Rutgers University to deliver these types of reforms.

Our team is built on reformers. And that's why we -- it's not their law enforcement experience that will be an impediment, that's a tool for them. Their drive for reform is what really works.

JEFF CRAMER: One thing if I can add and straddle both sides, most of the witnesses I put

designed to be a panacea for problems in neighborhoods don't necessarily build that trust. But when you start to create the environment where the community and the police are working together to solve problems, instead of the police giving a service of community policing, trust starts to evolve, crimes start to get solved, and everyone's job starts to get easier.

And that's how you bring the Chicago Police Department forward.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. One of the reasons that Chicago needs this

Consent Decree is because the traditional policing model isn't working here. The problems are so deep that they cannot be reformed from the inside.

Given the deep ties your team has to law enforcement, how can we be sure that you will work on behalf of those who need this Consent Decree most and not on behalf of the Chicago Police Department?

KEN BOUCHE: Well, at risk of sounding

out in my career invariably were police officers, NYPD and Chicago police. I have also worked on investigating police corruption.

Those aren't necessarily two different things. Lot of times they went hand in hand. And we need to be able to see both sides.

So I think -- I would flip it. I think what our team does bring is exactly what -- being able to see both sides. Both the police and the community can look at us, whether it's the prosecutor who prosecuted public corruption, or our police corruption, as well as put officers on the stand just in the normal course of business, four people who have been in law enforcement but now work on police reform. I think we bring both those things.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How will you be able to break the Consent Decree down to where students in Chicago Public Schools can understand how important this Monitor job is?

DAVID COAR: Well, one of the goals of the Consent Decree is transparency. We want

everybody in the community to understand the basis.

What are the police doing; why are they doing it; and how are they doing it?

And there he's a feedback loop. What they're doing from the point of view of the police may not be the perception of the community. So we want the community to also tell us what the police are doing.

If there's a disconnect, we need to get at that disconnect. Maybe it's communication, maybe it's understanding. There may be lots of reasons for that.

But we have to make sure that there is a great deal of communication and transparency in the process.

KEN BOUCHE: Additionally, when we first start, there will be a tremendous amount of community engagement. And what we've learned from our past work, particularly we learned this early in Milwaukee, was engaging youth groups in conversations was really beneficial. And they stayed with us through the process.

So we're not in a police state; we got this -- this distrust going on, and we need to solve that, and we need to solve that right away. I am -- Russia and China I don't think the state cares whether or not people are treated fairly.

JEFF CRAMER: And also add the how off that as well. Here in the continuum, the how -- and we talked about trust when we were at the hearings for Judge Dow -- and we talked about this before the last meeting. The two words we heard most were "Jon Burge" and "trust." And it's understandable why those would be predominant words.

But trust, the how, isn't necessarily an end into itself. It's a means. When there's trust between the community and the police, that's when tips start coming into police. If you ask any police officer, certainly some folks that work murders, that's how these cases get solved.

So the how, instilling the trust, helps facilitate good police work. They really are -- go hand in hand.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Are you

And we replicated that in San Francisco. And we absolutely would replicate it in Chicago.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Let me read to you out of a first-person statement in answer to -- react to it, please. If arrested, I would be innocent until proven guilty, but police were always against me when I've accidentally been somehow socially inappropriate in Chicago, Skokie, Winnetka, and Highland Park.

I'm not making this up. I believe we are in a police state like Russia or China.

DAVID COAR: I've been to Russia and China. It's not quite like that.

If -- if the measure of a successful police department is simply the body count, how many people we lock up, then that's short-sighted. Because how they go -- how the police go about doing their job is important.

If the -- if the how of policing turns the community off and the community turns against the police, that's not successful policing.

still employed by the University of Chicago Police Department? How will your successes or failures of working for that department inform your role as deputy monitor?

MARCIA THOMPSON: Assuming it's directed at me, since I work at the University of Chicago Police Department.

I think -- in my role there I am over training, accreditation, compliance, recruitment, as well as community engagement. And so the answer is, yes, I am still employed there.

I believe that my experience here in Chicago, in that administrative role with the police department, has also given me insight to the communities that we're serving in a law enforcement capacity. And I think everything that I've learned from the community engagement and strategy and outreach, as well as internal compliance to the State, as well as other regulatory issues as a police department, I take all of that into my monitoring role.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How do you

expect the community to hire you when you have not yet hired a community liaison or engagement team?

Do you expect us to just trust you first without any additional information?

DAVID COAR: Well, if you go back to that chart, there's a direct line between the Community Advisory Board and the Monitor. How you get in touch with me would be easy.

And I would expect that if we don't do exactly that, then my -- my phone is going to blow up, and I'll take care of that.

KEN BOUCHE: I think there's also a really important differentiation, is we did not create a community board because we didn't have people to put on it. We're a Chicago-based team, we all had a lot of people we could bring. And what we thought was this was a Consent Decree that had a tremendous amount of people already engaged, and if we were to pick people and they were the wrong people, it wouldn't be helpful.

What we stated in our proposal and what we really believe is we should be working with

Foundation, you can begin.

BLAKE NORTON: Thank you very much. Hi, my name is Blake Norton; I'm the senior vice president of the National Police Foundation located in Washington, D.C. I'm first going to introduce myself, and then I'll talk a little bit about the foundation and give you some context about the work that we do.

At the National Police Foundation I oversee our police reform and technical assistance work. And our organization is -- was founded in 1970.

CAROL ADAMS: Would you pull the mic to you a little bit more?

BLAKE NORTON: Sure. Can you hear me now?

CAROL ADAMS: Yes.

BLAKE NORTON: Okay. Great. Where did I leave off? 1970. Sorry. I should know this. Our organization was founded in 1970 through an endowment through the Ford Foundation, and we were tasked with doing technical assistance and providing

the parties, if selected, to put the right people on the board, to represent the City in a way it needs to be represented. And that would be a collaborative approach.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you so much. And on that note, that is the last of our questions. And we want to thank you so much for your participation and your responsiveness to the questions asked.

MARCIA THOMPSON: Thank you.

DAVID COAR: Thank you.

CAROL ADAMS: And we'll have a short break before we hear from our final presenters.

(A short interruption was had.)

CAROL ADAMS: Good afternoon. We are ready to proceed with our final presentation of the afternoon, coming from the Police Foundation. We will begin by them doing an introductory presentation about their firm, and then proceed to entertain questions from the audience.

Again, reminding you to submit them on question card.

Thank you very much. And Police

research to local law enforcement. The work started as a result of the civil unrest in the '60s and '70s, and so we have spent the last 47, 48 years doing work focused on evidence-based practices, doing collaborative reform work, doing research and technical assistance for local law enforcement.

Our work has done -- has led to some ground-breaking studies on the role of women in policing, the efficacy of community policing, and as well as looking at the role of foot patrols.

The work that we do is national in perspective. We work with state and local entities. We focus a fair amount of work on community engagement and understanding the role of community, and co-producing public safety.

Our staff is located nationally. We have both researchers and practitioners and policy analysts on our staff, and we focus very much on making change in policing, focusing on science and innovation and in technology to do that.

RICK BRAZIEL: Good evening. I'm Rick Braziel; I'm an executive fellow at the Police

Foundation. I have 33 years law enforcement experience in Sacramento, California, the last five as chief. With respect to -- so in 2002, the civil rights project and Harvard went to identify the most diverse city in the United States. And the most diverse city is Sacramento, California. So used to living and working in a very diverse culture.

After retiring I spent the last five years with the Police Foundation doing research, critical reviews, and collaborative reform. What that means is we started with looking at how law enforcement, policing do a better job in responding to large-scale events, whether they're terrorism or riots. That work led to the Department of Justice requesting a review of the Ferguson riots and also collaborative reform in Ferguson, Missouri.

So there were four U.S. DOJ teams in Ferguson. I was on two of those teams. I was the ground lead in the collaborative reform. Collaborative reform is very -- it's a Consent Decree in nature, so to speak. It's basically DOJ going in and working with an agency in a collaborative way to

the mid 1990s, where I'm from. And from 1999 I authored a book called COP Talk: Essential Communication Skills for Community Policing; and basically a -- kind of a primer that instructs line employees all the way up through executive staff and law enforcement how to better interact with the community.

BRIAN MAXEY: Good evening. My name is Brian Maxey; and I'm the former chief operating officer of the Seattle Police Department, which was under a -- still is under a federal Consent Decree. In 19 -- excuse me -- in 2012 when DOJ came out -- this is the United States Department of Justice -- came out to investigate Seattle, I was the lead attorney at the Seattle City's attorney's office handling the discovery and providing the documents and following the investigation.

In 2014 I went in to the Seattle Police Department as general counsel to drive the reforms that were requested as part of the Consent Decree.

And in 2015 I was promoted to chief

prevent you from having to go down the path of a Consent Decree.

So it starts out collaborative. It's a very similar process: Reviewing use of force, recruitment, hiring, policies, everything you see in the Consent Decree in Chicago was done in a collaborative way in St. Louis County; and then instead of reporting to a federal magistrate, we report to the COPS office and main justice. So instead of the -- more of a stick approach -- or carrot approach versus a stick.

I'm also -- spent the last three years as inspector general overseeing the 8th largest sheriff's department in the country on their civilian oversight, accept citizen complaints; I review internal affairs investigations, I review all their death-in-custodies and officer-involved shootings, and any other special projects the community asks for on the board of supervisors, their equivalent of a city council, or the sheriff's task force.

Additionally, I've been passionate about community policing; and we implemented it in

operating officer; which was an important change in title and authority at the department, because it was a civilian deputy chief level overseeing the administrative sides of the department, including training, force review, force investigations, 911, and budget and finance. And this allowed me to really advance the reforms, because I was able to push the City to give more resources to the Seattle Police Department in order to increase the training, in order to build the systems within the department to measure officer activity so that we could actually see in a quantitative way what was happening at the department.

I also work very -- I hired the first director of transparency and privacy at the Seattle Police Department to really focus on that balance. When a department has some information that it does not want to release, but in most circumstances should be transparent and open, this person's full-time job was to figure out when there was a valid reason to withhold information; and the answer in Seattle was almost never.

And to promote transparency within the department, I wrote the policy that said that Seattle Police Department would provide information on critical events within 72 hours, and typically we did it within 24 hours. Because what we found is, when we provided the community with information on critical events, rapidly and efficiently, the community does not fill in misinformation or make assumptions about what happened. And the facts allow people to have rational discussions and come together to better understand how to improve practice.

So what I bring to this team is the hands-on experience within a department and within a city, driving reform. And I hope to do the same here in Chicago.

GANESHA MARTIN: Good afternoon. My name is Ganesha Martin. I am the former Department of Justice Compliance, Accountability, and External Affairs chief for the -- for the Baltimore Police Department. In that role -- I came to that role after being the chief of community engagement and working with both the community and the police

in actually carrying out the metrics that were in the Consent Decree. And then auditing, so that the police department was auditing itself to self correct when we found patterns and trends of things that were -- should not have been happening.

I helped negotiate the Consent Decree in Baltimore. We had to do that in a record amount of time because we had a new presidential administration coming in. I think it's the only Consent Decree where the police and the community stood together and said we wanted a Consent Decree against other federal agencies.

We implemented that Consent Decree. It was my job to set up the -- help set up the -- the monitoring plan. So by the time we finished this process that I put together in Baltimore, we had 581 paragraphs and subparagraphs that we had already touched. And so we put together the monitoring plan, and at that point assigned different folks from the police department with the monitoring team to start working on compliance with the Consent Decree.

Since then, since I resigned from that

department to implement a strategy around community engagement.

In that role as the chief of the Department of Justice Compliance and Accountability it was my role to interact exclusively with the Department of Justice as they investigated the police department and carry out the directive from the commissioner at the time to give them every -- access to everything -- every document, every database, every person they wanted to talk to -- so that they could thoroughly investigate the department.

At the same time I went across the country to various jurisdictions that had Consent Decrees and studied what they had done right and what they had done wrong; brought those practices back to Baltimore; and set up a compliance unit that had three different functions.

One was community engagement so that there was a feedback loop around the reforms, and making sure to give that information to and from the community. I also implemented civilian compliance managers that were there to aid the police department

position, I've joined the Cleveland monitoring team, in helping them to push forward on their compliance with technical assistance and auditing.

Thank you for having us tonight.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. And thank you. We'll proceed right to the questions, the first of which is, are there any parts of the proposed Consent Decree that concern you or give you pause in some way?

And if so, why?

GANESHA MARTIN: There are some things that give me concern and pause, and I think that we could probably figure that out by talking to a couple people. But it seems like some of the mechanisms for accountability around discipline don't communicate and could get in the way of actually holding police -- police accountable. And so many that -- that's something that gives me pause.

I think the Consent Decree, you know, allows for some of those -- those -- those accountability mechanisms to be worked on. But I -- but I am concerned whether they will actually be able

to have the result that I think the community and the -- the folks that negotiated it might have been thinking about.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How will you incorporate the voices of women, people engaged in sex work, people who are undocumented, and other people who are hesitant to report police abuse or misconduct, despite the efforts of COPA and community advocates, into compliance filings?

Part two of that is: Please describe your -- well, I'll ask that first one, and I'll come back with the second question.

GANESHA MARTIN: Well, I think it's incumbent upon us to go to those communities, go to folks who have been victimized in that way.

I actually did quite a bit of work as the deputy mayor of public safety in Baltimore around human trafficking. And -- and there's a lot of distrust there for a variety of reasons between those folks who are engaged in that work and law enforcement.

And so I think that it's really

community policing basically, at its basic level, is law enforcement agencies going to the community, getting into the neighborhoods, and asking the community what are a list of your issues that you have, and then how do you prioritize those?

We've done that in jurisdictions where we held community forums that allowed the community to identify all of their issues, and then the community prioritized it, and then the law enforcement working with the community can start going through those priorities.

Too often policing agencies assume they know what the problems are in a neighborhood, when in fact the best people to inform the police are the neighbors, the people living there.

There are some folks that say that community policing is soft on crime; it's actually not; it's smarter. It actually uses interactive techniques where the community is actually engaged in the problem-solving, so that you end up with a more fulfilled community. And basics, if you think about it in a -- in a -- I'll use a retail way. The

important to go talk to those communities, talk about the environment in which they feel comfortable speaking, talk about the people that they would welcome into their space to have those conversations. But you -- you really go and -- and meet them where they are. Start to build that trust, start to build that understanding, and start to build that bridge so that those concerns make it into the policies and the programs, and all of the things that you're looking to reform the police department.

And then at the end, I think you're successful if those bridges then build into the police department and the police department infrastructures, that those conversations continue beyond the ones that we actually started.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Please describe your understanding of community policing. What recommendations will you make to ensure that community policing initiatives do not harm or disproportionately harm black or brown communities?

RICK BRAZIEL: A lot of people misunderstand community policing. And should be --

community's the customer. And the police department provides a service.

In government, the community has very little choice of which government entity they get to choose to solve that problem. In Chicago what we want to do is make it so the community wants to engage with the police department, and the police department wants to engage with the community, because they both want to address similar problems, but the only way to identify if you know what the problem is, is to get out in the neighborhood and talk, if you know what those issues are.

GANESHA MARTIN: If I may add to that, I think community policing, quite frankly, is a term that's been bastardized, and some folks, particularly police, has a negative connotation.

So the first thing that I would do is ask the police department and the community to come together and define what community policing actually means for Chicago; and not have a policy or training or anything ever begin to be written until that definition is agreed upon by the community and the

police.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. Please describe how your monitoring plan will control for CPD's long history of coverups and the documented code of silence. Specifically, how will your team look beyond CPD-generated and reported data and double and triple check compliance?

How will you ensure that the CPD doesn't just get good at reporting so that it only appears that there's compliance but nothing has changed on the streets?

BRIAN MAXEY: So there's several responses to that. First of all, what's different about this process is we as a monitoring team report to the federal judge. The end of the day, we bring the authority of the federal court directly into the police department. And that gives us unfettered access to all of the documents, to talk to whomever we need to talk to, to get at the truth, to run our own investigations as necessary, to dig into incidents if we need to.

Again, we're here more on a systemic

do not speak to each other, and it's very difficult to bring the information out of those systems.

Once the systems are up and running and they are integrated and we can start doing analysis on it, you will see patterns within the information.

It is virtually impossible to effect systemic analysis at the individual level. If there are -- if there are officers that are providing misinformation or altering information in such a way that you make their activities seem better than they were, or to hide the truth, those patterns are discoverable within data systems.

But that's all in the quantitative side of the analysis. That's not sufficient.

Along with the quantitative there has to be a qualitative aspect. And that's where our unfettered access to the information, the ability to talk with people, officers, witnesses if necessary, but dig into these files, read them, look for patterns of language, the pat language that often appears in police reports -- you know, "I guided the

level than we are to reopen or examine any individual incident. But that does not mean that we will not dig into incidents to ensure that the systems that get put in place are effective at accurately portraying officer activity.

In Seattle we had to do -- there are many levels of analysis that occur. Within the police department, it's important to develop the critical systems of self-analysis. And as to go through this, you'll hear me talk about this a lot.

These are the systems where, at the very beginning, every officer activity is recorded, whether it's a Terry stop, whether it is an arrest, a crisis intervention, a use of force. Anything an officer does is recorded on paper.

That data has to be connected within these data analytic systems. You cannot have a silo; you cannot keep information on stops over here, information on arrests there. You have to see the whole ecosystem of events.

Those systems are not easy to develop. I'm sure we have many legacy systems in Chicago that

person to the ground," things like that. Those become red flags, because those are boiler-plate descriptions that cannot be true over multiple -- multitudes of cases. And those will stand out.

So the answer is, is hard work. You've got the technical systems, and then you have the systems of qualitative review that dig into those.

Finally, all the external systems of review and accountability, such as COPA, and the police board and other such systems will need to be examined as well to make sure that they are also serving as the proper backstop to ensure credibility to all of these systems.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. People with disabilities are disproportionately impacted by police misconduct, especially people of color with disabilities.

How will your community engagement processes be open to include people with disabilities?

And what is your team's experience or

expertise in best practices for policing in disability, including but not limited to crisis intervention?

BRIAN MAXEY: So the crisis-intervention model that we put in in Seattle is relatively standard nationally, really has multiple layers of engagement.

The first thing is that all officers need to have a basic understanding of symptoms and behaviors that are associated with mental health issues. And I'm going to start by talking about mental health disabilities; physical disabilities have a slightly different answer.

With mental -- with the crisis engagement, once you understand the symptomology and you understand the behavior at a very basic level, officers can be trained to modify their behavior.

In addition, we instituted a 40-hour crisis certification, a longer training that gives much more in-depth analysis -- I'm sorry -- analytic capabilities to officers, and a better understanding of proper approaches than they should engage in,

familiar with that neighborhood, works that shift, they might react differently when they encounter people that exhibit alarming behaviors that they're not familiar with.

So what we did is we had crisis-intervention plans whereby when a contact was made, Officers had an understanding of what this individual's triggerpoints were, how the best approach, what's worked in the past. Just information that, first of all, allows the officer to know that this person has a certain set of behavioral issues, and secondly, the best approach to resolve it.

Our dispatchers were also cross-trained in crisis intervention to be able to flag this for officers, so it was not incumbent on the officers to look up this information. They were already being provided that information.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. I'm going to make a statement in the first-person that we have from a presenter, and just ask for your reaction to it, if you will.

time, distance, shielding, communication when engaging, to understand that people with mental disabilities have a very hard time being yelled at and being given direct commands, and giving alternate pathways to better resolve whatever the given situation is.

In addition, we have crisis-response team that served two purposes. One includes mental health advocates that would roll out with officers. We found that the staffing levels that we had in Seattle only allowed a 9:00 to 5:00 response, which didn't help that much after hours. But it was something that we were continuing to develop. Getting the mental health providers to work alongside the officers gave much greater capacity, much greater than the sum of the parts.

The second part of the crisis-response team was to do the investigative work, to -- to look at the people that officers are contacting frequently. It's all well and good if an officer works in a certain neighborhood and knows the people that they engage with, but when an officer is not

If arrested, I would be innocent until proven guilty. But police were always against me when I've accidentally been somehow socially inappropriate in Chicago, Skokie, Winnetka, or Highland Park. I am not making this up.

I believe we are in a police state like Russia or China.

GANESHA MARTIN: I -- I believe that many communities feel that way. And I think that they feel that way for legitimate purpose, because they had -- have had to suffer at the hands of what could be described as...demented individuals who should have never been able to ever wear a badge.

And -- and so I think that, you know, we have to listen to those people, we have to hear their story, we have to find out who -- I know, you know, even in Baltimore, the young woman that I mentor, when she saw that a police officer was arrested, she was like, that's her school. I know her school.

So I mean, you know, these stories -- if you listen to them, they will lead you to a place

that maybe somebody the police department has not acknowledged and/or done something about. And -- and I think that that plays into the community policing definition we spoke about, the accountability mechanisms.

We have to make sure that citizen complaints that are made, are taken seriously, that there are systems that track them. And that there are some mechanisms that can be implemented when there are particular officers -- and this is not every officer -- I will tell you that, if you talk to officers that have to work with those type of officers, they feel like they are trapped as well.

And so for the benefit of the community and the police department, those type of folks that make people feel that way need to be looked at.

And in addition, I think there's also communication and education to be done to the community, capacity-building, so that when those types of things happen, they have an avenue through which they can discuss and that can make it to the

them, you know, what is community policing, you come to find out that they really don't understand it, much like the community doesn't.

And then you bring in examples from across the country where community policing actually has reduced serious crime, has reduced community complaints against police, has improved morale in organizations; and you show them examples from other agencies across the country.

One of the benefits from the Police Foundation, we have access to all of that, because we've been doing this work across the country. And demonstrate to them, you know, this does work, it's safer for you, it's better for the community; and everyone walks away with a much better understanding of each other.

GANESHA MARTIN: I think the other thing you have to do, much the same way in the community, there are people that they trust and that they listen to and that they share their stories with. And police departments -- and I've seen it work often, but it's not used often -- is there are

monitoring team, and that can be taken into consideration as we move through the Consent Decree process.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. How do you create real buy-in to community policing among CPD officers who don't believe that community policing is real policing?

RICK BRAZIEL: The first thing you do is sit down with them and have them try to explain what community policing is. Because 90 percent of the time when you go into law enforcement agency and you ask them for the definition, they don't really know what the definition is. They don't understand what their role is in that.

You know, throughout the Consent Decree, when you look at this, it requires training. It mandates different equipment, it mandates interaction with the community. All things that actually make them safer. The officers safer. Allow them to do their jobs better, and allow them to serve the community.

So when you sit down with them and ask

police officers with street cred. There are police officers that get guns, they get bad guys, and they do it in a constitutional way.

And so I think that those police officers have to be utilized more in helping to redefine what community policing -- it's not just picnics and parties and -- that's part of it. But it's much more than that.

And so I think you have to utilize police officers in the department, if they're not already converts, convert them, and let them be the messengers about what community policing is.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Why did your initial proposal not discuss community involvement, especially in light of the important and specific terms that the City and the Attorney General have included in this Decree?

And companion to that, how do you see community involvement being different in Chicago than what it has been in other cities?

BLAKE NORTON: Thank you. So our proposal actually does contemplate community

involvement and community engagement. We are wholly committed to hiring two staff people from Chicago, understanding that we are not Chicagoans, and that we have an opportunity to learn a lot.

We've done a fair amount of work in getting to this space; we've talked to many, many people; we've read lots of reports and the Consent Decree, we've looked at media. But the thing that we don't have is the Chicago experience in terms of the staff.

We are wholly committed to bringing on a community engagement manager who will be working in the community, who will be working closely with the leadership team of the monitoring team. They will be leading meetings, they will be engaging with the community all over the city of Chicago.

The sole purpose for this person is to really help us engage with the community, get us into focus groups, help us work through the surveys that we're going to be administering, having one-on-one meetings to understand what are their concerns for the community, and how they engage in the police

in Chicago and the way it is experienced in Chicago is definitely unique, and it is deeply personal to those people that are experiencing policing in Chicago. That is what we are here to tap into, to listen, to translate. And when we listen, we will listen both to the police experiences about what resources they don't have, what training they don't have, what do they need to do their job more successfully; and then we're looking to the community to help us figure out what does success look like.

Police draw all of their legitimacy from the community. And if they don't have it, they're not effective. And that is the real work here to do.

And I know others want to talk, so I'll...pass it off.

Ganesha Martin, go ahead.

CAROL ADAMS: All right. Well, we want to thank you for your responses.

Questions -- that concludes our questions for you this afternoon.

And we appreciate you coming back this

department.

Our focus will be very surgical; we are very committed to this; and we are really looking forward to bringing on Chicago staff as part of this project.

CAROL ADAMS: Thank you. And finally, again, how do you see community involvement being different in Chicago than it has been in other cities where you've worked?

BRIAN MAXEY: So --

RICK BRAZIEL: We're all ready to jump in.

BRIAN MAXEY: Obviously this is a very important process, so we're champing at the bit here.

So the policing issues, the challenges that policing face, these are not unique to Chicago. These are issues that have been grappled with in many, many jurisdictions across the country.

In fact, there's really an evolution in policing itself that is occurring right now in 2018 in the United States.

However, the way that manifests here

afternoon to respond to a different audience.

GANESHA MARTIN: Thank you.

BLAKE NORTON: Thank you.

BRIAN MAXEY: Thank you. And always happy to answer more questions.

WHICH WERE ALL OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD AT THE PUBLIC COMMENT FORUM ON THIS DATE.

I, CATHERINE A. RAJCAN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported stenographically by means of machine shorthand the proceedings had at the hearing aforesaid, thereafter reduced to typewriting via computer-aided transcription under my personal direction, and that the foregoing is a true, complete and correct transcript of the proceedings of said hearing as appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed under my personal direction. I further certify that my certificate attached hereto applies to the original transcript and copies thereof, signed and certified under my hand only. I assume no responsibility for the accuracy of any reproduced copies not made under my control or direction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my hand on this 9th day of November, 2018.

/s/ CATHERINE ARMBRUST RAJCAN,  
CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC  
Certificate No. 084-002503

<b>A</b>				
<b>A.D</b> 192:8	<b>achieve</b> 207:12	289:4 295:21	309:19	<b>aims</b> 235:22
<b>abilities</b> 232:14	<b>achieving</b> 274:10	299:6 316:13	<b>affect</b> 210:16	<b>air</b> 201:5
<b>ability</b> 200:5	<b>acknowledged</b>	<b>addition</b> 254:19	<b>affirmative</b> 266:19	<b>Alabama</b> 268:11
201:21 209:10	325:2	255:4 257:10	<b>afford</b> 211:9	269:22
224:21 225:6	<b>Acosta</b> 280:9	321:18 322:7	<b>aforsaid</b> 333:5	<b>alarming</b> 323:3
319:18	282:17	325:18	<b>afraid</b> 257:14	<b>Albuquerque</b>
<b>able</b> 207:12 211:5	<b>acquainted</b> 241:9	<b>additional</b> 201:9	<b>African</b> 291:7	206:18 207:8
220:1 226:3	<b>act</b> 200:10 290:17	228:1 237:16	<b>afternoon</b> 193:1,2	212:21 283:2
227:20 230:17	<b>action</b> 249:7 262:3	301:4	193:2,3,6 202:18	<b>all-African</b> 268:15
232:14 293:9	267:5	<b>Additionally</b>	202:21 207:19	<b>alleging</b> 194:13
296:6,9,18 308:7	<b>actions</b> 226:5	297:16 306:21	211:20 213:21	<b>allow</b> 267:21 309:9
312:22 323:15	<b>active</b> 258:19	<b>address</b> 208:5,11	239:5,7,8,12	326:19,20
324:13	269:11	209:16 233:11	240:1 267:18	<b>allowed</b> 210:8
<b>above-entitled</b>	<b>actively</b> 206:20	251:15 255:15,18	268:3 274:13	308:6 315:7
192:8	<b>activities</b> 274:19	262:5 316:9	279:18 302:14,16	322:11
<b>absolutely</b> 298:2	319:11	<b>addressed</b> 222:5,5	309:16 331:21	<b>allows</b> 312:20
<b>abuse</b> 278:14,16	<b>activity</b> 254:22	<b>addresses</b> 262:5	332:1	323:10
313:7	308:11 318:5,12	<b>addressing</b> 209:8	<b>afternoon's</b> 193:20	<b>alongside</b> 322:14
<b>Abusive</b> 292:7	<b>actual</b> 209:4,4	245:9	194:6	<b>altering</b> 319:10
<b>academy</b> 243:6	226:5 289:6	<b>adhere</b> 217:4	<b>age</b> 264:5	<b>alternate</b> 322:4
260:15	<b>Adams</b> 193:1,4,9	<b>Adler</b> 206:13	<b>agencies</b> 212:17	<b>ambassadors</b> 223:5
<b>accept</b> 306:15	202:20 220:15	<b>administering</b>	213:14 274:20	<b>America</b> 244:22
<b>access</b> 232:13	222:10 224:1	329:20	276:6,19 284:10	<b>American</b> 268:15
281:13 310:8	226:7 228:18	<b>administration</b>	311:12 315:2,12	291:7
317:18 319:18	229:12 230:16	285:22 311:9	327:9	<b>amount</b> 204:3
327:11	232:21 234:1	<b>administrative</b>	<b>agency</b> 205:18	275:6 287:18
<b>accessible</b> 223:15	238:8 239:1,5	300:13 308:4	244:10 275:9,11	297:17 301:18
<b>accidentally</b> 262:11	250:12 255:14	<b>administrator</b>	278:5,20 305:22	304:13 311:7
298:8 324:3	257:16 259:22	279:17	326:11	329:5
<b>account</b> 204:14	260:22 262:7	<b>ADR</b> 279:13	<b>agency's</b> 244:15	<b>amounts</b> 261:12
282:3 284:15	264:9 266:9	<b>advance</b> 258:12	<b>agenda</b> 274:9	<b>Amy</b> 283:21 291:5
<b>accountability</b>	267:10,18 286:13	308:7	<b>agent</b> 197:2 244:19	<b>analysis</b> 195:15
194:22 195:14	287:6 289:20	<b>advanced</b> 291:1	247:5	200:2 206:2 213:4
207:5 209:13	291:21 293:14	<b>advice</b> 281:14	<b>ago</b> 216:6 244:18	251:13 274:7
210:11,13 283:18	294:11 296:17	<b>advised</b> 245:1	271:13 272:6,15	318:7 319:5,8,15
283:20 309:18	298:4 299:22	<b>advisor</b> 244:11	<b>agree</b> 199:13	321:20
310:4 312:15,21	300:22 302:5,11	281:16 295:13	<b>agreed</b> 247:16	<b>analysts</b> 304:18
320:10 325:4	302:14 303:13,17	<b>advisory</b> 279:7	316:22	<b>analytic</b> 318:17
<b>accountable</b> 290:18	312:5 313:4	281:18 282:1,5	<b>agreement</b> 196:8	321:20
312:17	314:16 317:2	301:7	199:12 206:19	<b>analytical</b> 241:4
<b>accreditation</b> 300:9	320:15 323:19	<b>advocates</b> 313:9	207:9 210:19	<b>analytics</b> 241:11
<b>accuracy</b> 333:14	326:4 328:13	322:9	<b>ahead</b> 232:21	245:22
<b>accurate</b> 236:11	330:6 331:18	<b>affairs</b> 206:10	263:10 331:17	<b>and/or</b> 325:2
274:8 288:3	<b>add</b> 223:9 227:16	207:7 217:17	<b>aid</b> 310:22	<b>Angeles</b> 283:3
<b>accurately</b> 318:4	228:7 232:5	243:10,15 260:10	<b>aim</b> 219:16,18	<b>announced</b> 197:21
	235:19 265:17	265:11 306:16	236:10	<b>annual</b> 196:14,17

<b>answer</b> 200:17 202:1 230:22 234:17 235:16,17 236:10 266:17 289:5 292:3 298:5 300:10 308:21 320:5 321:13 332:5	<b>Archbold</b> 283:17 <b>area</b> 230:15 291:10 <b>areas</b> 195:11 221:1 222:3 243:3 246:4 272:2 286:22 287:1,5,20 290:10 290:13 291:2,12 <b>Arizona</b> 213:3 283:2 <b>Arlington</b> 295:8 <b>ARMBRUST</b> 192:15 333:21 <b>arrest</b> 218:4 237:7 237:8,8 238:3 318:13 <b>arrested</b> 234:5 262:9 298:6 324:1 324:19 <b>arresting</b> 210:21 <b>arrests</b> 222:19 237:4,6,7,11,15 237:18 318:19 <b>aside</b> 289:6 <b>asked</b> 201:1 236:14 238:7 243:21 267:7 271:14 272:6 302:8 <b>asking</b> 236:5 239:18 315:3 <b>asks</b> 306:18 <b>aspect</b> 203:2 231:9 319:17 <b>aspects</b> 205:11,17 214:4 253:6 286:21 <b>assess</b> 195:18 230:8 235:7 250:22 <b>assessing</b> 213:8 <b>assessment</b> 196:18 205:19 213:4 277:11 <b>assessments</b> 265:2 265:9,9 <b>assets</b> 270:5 <b>assigned</b> 209:1 311:19	<b>assist</b> 224:12 227:22 <b>assistance</b> 201:10 206:1 227:5 244:20 279:5 303:10,22 304:6 312:3 <b>assistant</b> 204:1 241:20 <b>assisting</b> 245:17 <b>associate</b> 206:17 207:4 <b>associated</b> 321:10 <b>association</b> 212:9 226:17 <b>assume</b> 315:12 333:14 <b>Assuming</b> 300:5 <b>assumptions</b> 309:9 <b>assure</b> 201:22 <b>atmosphere</b> 234:14 <b>attached</b> 333:11 <b>attend</b> 271:10 <b>attendance</b> 197:8 199:2 267:12 <b>attended</b> 268:11,14 277:20 278:9 <b>attending</b> 278:1 <b>attention</b> 208:18 216:10 <b>attorney</b> 193:10 194:10,12 197:5 197:17 198:4,17 199:3,6 202:5,14 203:6 204:2 214:10 218:1 271:18 273:21 278:12,14,15,18 279:22 282:8 307:15 328:16 <b>attorney's</b> 204:1 272:19 280:12,13 307:15 <b>attorneys</b> 283:15 <b>attributes</b> 225:10 <b>audience</b> 193:3 198:22 200:17 238:7,10,15 239:16 264:8,10 267:22 302:19 332:1 <b>audiences</b> 200:1 <b>auditing</b> 311:2,3 312:3 <b>auditorium</b> 193:14 193:16,19 202:10 <b>audits</b> 196:16 <b>authored</b> 307:2 <b>authorities</b> 247:12 <b>authority</b> 275:17 277:10,15 308:2 317:16 <b>available</b> 219:21 276:8 <b>avenue</b> 325:21 <b>awaiting</b> 272:3 <b>aware</b> 218:15 272:20	247:21 <b>barriers</b> 218:5 227:14 <b>based</b> 197:22 199:7 205:19 208:1 237:7 274:12 <b>basic</b> 273:5 315:1 321:9,16 <b>basically</b> 305:21 307:4 315:1 <b>basics</b> 315:21 <b>basis</b> 209:3 231:5 289:19 297:1 <b>bastardized</b> 316:15 <b>beef</b> 249:19 <b>beginning</b> 223:14 281:12 318:12 <b>behalf</b> 193:10 264:18,19 294:19 294:20 <b>behavior</b> 321:16,17 <b>behavioral</b> 323:11 <b>behaviors</b> 289:16 321:10 323:3 <b>beholden</b> 254:8 <b>belief</b> 227:18 <b>believe</b> 211:14 218:9,10 219:8 226:9 234:11,19 234:21 235:17 237:19 248:12 261:6 262:13 263:13 284:20 285:5 290:19 292:1 298:11 300:12 301:22 324:6,8 326:6 <b>believes</b> 214:2 <b>Ben</b> 271:14 <b>bench</b> 288:6 <b>beneficial</b> 297:21 <b>benefit</b> 325:14 <b>benefits</b> 206:22 293:10 327:10 <b>Berkeley</b> 280:21 <b>besieged</b> 204:8
			<b>B</b>
			<b>back</b> 193:19 217:8 227:7,9,10 243:21 251:20 252:5 254:14 259:1 270:13 279:12 295:5,5 301:5 310:15 313:12 331:22 <b>background</b> 194:3 194:7 240:17 246:12 <b>backstop</b> 320:13 <b>bad</b> 328:2 <b>badge</b> 324:13 <b>bail</b> 272:5 <b>balance</b> 308:16 <b>Baltimore</b> 277:1 279:8 309:19 310:16 311:7,16 313:17 324:17 <b>bankruptcy</b> 270:19 <b>bankrupting</b>

<b>best</b> 203:2 205:20 218:17 229:20 230:14 236:11 241:7 255:3 273:18 276:13 277:15 284:21 290:6 292:19,20 293:12 295:9 315:14 321:1 323:8,12	301:7,14 302:2 306:19 320:11 <b>boastful</b> 295:1 <b>body</b> 298:16 <b>boiler-plate</b> 320:2 <b>boils</b> 226:18 <b>bombings</b> 269:5,6 <b>book</b> 283:18 307:2 <b>boots</b> 289:17 <b>boots-on-the-gro...</b> 247:4 <b>born</b> 268:10 270:12 276:17 <b>Boston</b> 279:22 <b>bottom</b> 265:10 <b>Bouche</b> 273:14 275:1,1 282:17 283:6 284:16 286:20 290:9 293:15 294:22 297:16 301:12 <b>Bowman</b> 282:19 <b>box</b> 281:17,19 <b>boxes</b> 250:21 <b>Braziel</b> 304:21,22 314:21 326:8 330:11 <b>break</b> 227:14 230:17 239:2 267:13 296:18 302:12 <b>breed</b> 289:2 <b>Brent</b> 240:16,16 246:15 247:11 <b>BRG</b> 280:22 <b>Brian</b> 307:8,9 317:12 321:4 330:10,13 332:4 <b>bridge</b> 314:7 <b>bridges</b> 314:12 <b>brief</b> 239:1 <b>briefly</b> 197:13 240:5 255:21 <b>bring</b> 194:2 203:2 209:11 210:15 211:9 220:7 228:9	269:8 274:4 281:8 282:13 284:19 294:9 296:8,15 301:16 309:12 317:15 319:2 327:4 <b>bringing</b> 209:18 210:5 214:8 228:6 252:21 284:3 329:11 330:4 <b>brings</b> 213:16 284:1 <b>broad</b> 195:10 196:11 242:2 <b>broader</b> 288:4 <b>broken</b> 231:21 242:3 <b>brought</b> 229:2 247:11 276:19 285:15 286:7 310:15 <b>brown</b> 314:20 <b>budget</b> 196:21 242:16 249:10 255:6 308:6 <b>budgeting</b> 200:3 <b>budgets</b> 242:11 256:11 <b>build</b> 207:1 227:14 233:13 294:2 308:10 314:6,6,7 314:12 <b>building</b> 223:14,14 252:6 287:1 <b>builds</b> 195:7 <b>built</b> 290:14 295:8 295:14,16 <b>bureau</b> 243:15 <b>Burge</b> 232:12 272:10,20 280:6,7 299:11 <b>burglary</b> 237:9 <b>Burroughs</b> 240:12 245:5,6 <b>business</b> 260:12 296:13	<b>buy-in</b> 226:8 254:16 263:19 291:22 292:16 293:13,17 326:5 <hr/> <b>C</b> <hr/> <b>Cabrini</b> 269:15 271:2 <b>California</b> 286:5 305:2,6 <b>call</b> 204:20 208:15 244:19 248:18 252:6 259:12 275:4 <b>called</b> 265:3,5 268:22 269:4 307:2 <b>calls</b> 214:18 <b>cameras</b> 275:20 <b>Campbell</b> 198:15 <b>candidate</b> 197:7 <b>candidates</b> 197:19 <b>cap</b> 249:12 <b>capabilities</b> 321:21 <b>capacity</b> 218:2 260:9,20 270:21 300:16 322:15 <b>capacity-building</b> 325:20 <b>CAPS</b> 212:8 228:20 229:11 <b>car</b> 233:16 <b>card</b> 201:2,4,10 238:11 239:19 302:21 <b>cards</b> 200:19 201:6 201:9 238:10 239:15 <b>care</b> 233:2 301:11 <b>career</b> 208:9 241:18 244:8,12 244:18 245:10 275:2,4 279:20 296:1 <b>careers</b> 254:1 <b>careful</b> 220:21	<b>cares</b> 299:4 <b>Carnegie</b> 269:19 270:7 <b>Carol</b> 193:1,4,8 220:15 222:10 224:1 226:7 228:18 229:12 230:16 232:21 234:1 238:8 239:1 239:5 240:12 244:6 250:12 255:14 257:16 259:22 260:22 262:7 263:11,12 264:9,21 266:9 267:10,18 283:16 286:13 287:6 289:20 291:21 293:14 294:11 296:17 298:4 299:22 300:22 302:5,11,14 303:13,17 312:5 313:4 314:16 317:2 320:15 323:19 326:4 328:13 330:6 331:18 <b>Carolina</b> 209:22 <b>carrot</b> 306:11 <b>carry</b> 265:16 310:7 <b>carrying</b> 235:14 311:1 <b>case</b> 250:19 280:16 280:17 285:5 <b>cases</b> 203:19 224:19 269:9,22 270:1,2,2,4,22 272:7 278:15 299:18 320:4 <b>CATHERINE</b> 192:15 333:1,21 <b>cause</b> 192:8 <b>causes</b> 204:18 <b>center</b> 265:1 268:22 295:14
--	---	--	--	--

<b>Central</b> 271:9	<b>Chicago</b> 192:1	207:15,21 208:8	194:12 196:12	<b>coalition</b> 282:9
<b>certain</b> 217:3 229:5	193:7,11 194:1,10	211:19 224:12	197:6,17 198:4,18	<b>Coar</b> 267:20 268:3
229:5 322:21	194:13,13,17,20	235:18 246:17,22	199:3,6 202:5,15	268:4 281:3 284:4
323:11	195:7 197:6,18	247:6,16 271:17	203:7 204:8,13	288:14 292:3
<b>certainly</b> 214:8	198:5,13 200:7,8	282:20 305:3	211:15 219:6	296:21 298:13
256:19 262:4	203:4,7,12,18	307:9,22 308:3	231:6 232:8	301:5 302:10
281:21 299:17	204:7,10,15 205:3	309:19,21 310:3	234:13 241:20	<b>code</b> 224:4 287:9
<b>certificate</b> 333:11	205:5,7,11 206:4	<b>chief's</b> 283:21	243:1,13,22	288:9 317:5
333:22	206:5,15 207:10	<b>chiefs</b> 265:4 283:14	245:10 253:12	<b>coffee</b> 272:18
<b>certification</b>	211:15,21 212:3,7	295:7	256:9 265:5 267:1	<b>Coldren</b> 205:17
321:19	219:6 226:9	<b>child</b> 278:16,17,17	268:16,19 272:7	211:18,19 220:20
<b>certified</b> 333:1,13	228:20 230:18	278:17	282:9 285:16	226:11 228:21
<b>certify</b> 333:3,11	231:1 232:8,16	<b>children</b> 233:22	288:22 291:2	230:1 238:20
<b>cetera</b> 233:16	234:10 235:13	270:12	293:9 302:2 305:5	<b>collaborate</b> 200:5
<b>chair</b> 232:7	239:10 246:5,19	<b>chime</b> 262:17	305:6 306:20	<b>collaboration</b>
<b>chaired</b> 275:18	246:19 248:22	<b>China</b> 262:14	308:8 309:14	206:3 235:6
<b>challenges</b> 205:10	250:6 252:13,13	298:12,14 299:4	328:16 329:16	277:14
330:15	252:14,14,15,15	324:7	<b>City's</b> 194:21	<b>collaborative</b>
<b>champing</b> 330:14	252:16,17 253:3	<b>Chip</b> 205:16 211:18	195:18,20 307:15	276:17,20 277:8
<b>chance</b> 199:13	253:16 255:17,19	228:19	<b>civic</b> 206:14 214:1	283:13 285:15,21
260:5 282:15	255:22 256:2	<b>choice</b> 255:3 316:4	232:8	302:3 304:5
<b>change</b> 205:14	257:20 259:15	<b>choose</b> 201:15	<b>civil</b> 200:1 269:7,21	305:10,16,19,20
208:2 228:22	261:1,7 262:12	248:13 266:20	270:1,1 279:22	305:22 306:3,7
231:4 241:10	264:11,19 267:1	267:2 316:5	280:11 283:14	<b>colleague</b> 289:7
244:19 245:3	269:12 270:8,13	<b>chose</b> 248:19	304:2 305:3	<b>collect</b> 201:6
253:18 254:9,9	272:7,18,21	<b>chosen</b> 197:3	<b>civilian</b> 221:14	<b>collected</b> 214:11
255:9 261:16	274:12,13 275:5	<b>chronic</b> 271:20	306:14 308:3	<b>collecting</b> 217:11
263:17 273:10	279:6,20 283:22	<b>circuit</b> 271:17	310:21	<b>collection</b> 195:15
277:11,16 279:14	284:3 287:2,18	<b>circumstances</b>	<b>clapping</b> 202:2	274:7 281:2
288:5,8,13,18	288:7,21 294:9,12	237:14,22 286:3	<b>clarity</b> 215:5	<b>college</b> 269:11
304:19 308:1	294:20 296:2,19	308:18	<b>Classroom</b> 232:10	<b>colonel</b> 275:6
<b>changed</b> 261:21	298:3,9 300:1,7	<b>CIT</b> 291:8	<b>clean</b> 254:12	<b>color</b> 226:16
317:11	300:13 306:6	<b>cities</b> 207:22,22	<b>clear</b> 263:13	229:14 289:22
<b>changes</b> 224:9	309:15 316:5,20	208:2 276:21,21	<b>clearance</b> 204:21	320:17
247:2 248:3 251:7	318:22 324:4	277:2,3 328:20	<b>clearly</b> 200:21	<b>combat</b> 273:6
287:14 289:3	328:19 329:2,9,16	330:8	224:16,20	<b>combine</b> 277:14
<b>changing</b> 254:5	330:4,8,16 331:1	<b>citizen</b> 209:4	<b>clerk</b> 271:19	<b>combined</b> 289:2
255:8	331:1,4	221:14 224:18	<b>Cleveland</b> 283:2	<b>come</b> 201:6,10
<b>charge</b> 280:3	<b>Chicago-area</b>	225:4,9 226:13	312:1	211:12 228:4
<b>charged</b> 244:1	211:21	306:15 325:6	<b>close</b> 237:14 238:5	239:15 243:21
245:9	<b>Chicago-based</b>	<b>citizens</b> 209:5,10	<b>closely</b> 280:8	251:2 257:15
<b>Charlotte</b> 209:22	301:15	209:14 211:15	329:13	281:22 293:9
<b>chart</b> 301:6	<b>Chicagoans</b> 329:3	228:6,11 234:12	<b>CNA</b> 230:5,6	309:10 313:11
<b>check</b> 224:6 287:11	<b>chicagopolicecon...</b>	236:8 237:19	<b>co-chair</b> 271:15	316:18 327:1
317:7	198:2 202:11	244:13	<b>co-producing</b>	<b>comes</b> 201:3 202:18
<b>checked</b> 202:8	<b>chief</b> 205:15,16	<b>city</b> 193:11 194:10	304:15	227:9

<b>comfortable</b> 216:18 314:2	209:6,8,17 210:9 213:13 216:13,16 228:9,12,13,14,15 230:12,12 231:4 233:5,12,14 234:10 236:1 248:22 255:19 257:1 259:14 260:11 300:15 313:14 314:1,20 324:9	281:17 282:7,12 288:17,22 289:8 289:10,18 290:2 290:12 291:15,22 292:1,5,9,9,10 293:10,19,22 294:4,6 295:9 296:10 297:1,6,7 297:18 298:21,21 299:15 300:10,17 301:1,2,7,14 304:9,13,14 306:18,22 307:3,7 309:6,8,21,22 310:1,18,21 311:10 313:1,8 314:17,19,22 315:1,2,4,7,7,9,10 315:17,19,21 316:3,6,8,14,18 316:19,22 320:19 325:3,15,20 326:5 326:6,10,18,21 327:1,3,5,6,14,19 328:6,12,14,19,22 329:1,12,13,16,18 329:22 330:7 331:9,12	203:13 <b>completing</b> 201:10 <b>completion</b> 205:6 <b>complex</b> 275:14 <b>complexity</b> 205:10 <b>compliance</b> 195:19 196:16,17 211:5 224:6,9 241:4 244:5 251:19 285:9 287:11,14 300:9,18 309:18 310:4,16,21 311:21 312:2 313:9 317:7,10 <b>complicated</b> 231:13 <b>complies</b> 195:5 <b>comprehensive</b> 221:4 <b>computer</b> 256:9 281:2 <b>computer-aided</b> 333:6 <b>conceptualization</b> 229:7 <b>concern</b> 220:17 272:2 286:18 287:3,5 288:20 312:8,12 <b>concerned</b> 231:22 312:22 <b>concerns</b> 208:11 221:1 314:8 329:21 <b>concisely</b> 231:18 <b>concludes</b> 331:20 <b>concrete</b> 222:11 <b>conditions</b> 212:10 <b>conduct</b> 196:10,15 206:2 237:12 <b>conducted</b> 198:7 284:7 <b>confederates</b> 272:10 <b>confession</b> 275:14 <b>confidence</b> 213:10 274:6,6	<b>confinement</b> 212:10 <b>conflict</b> 240:18 <b>confront</b> 227:6 <b>connected</b> 318:16 <b>Connecticut</b> 247:7 <b>connection</b> 242:5 257:6 <b>connotation</b> 316:16 <b>consent</b> 192:1 193:7 194:1,3,7,8 195:1,3,3,17 196:2,18,20 197:4 197:9 198:11 199:18 204:12 205:2 206:3 210:12,18 212:15 214:11 215:11,15 220:2,17,22 221:3 221:4,8,11,14 222:1,5,8,13 230:17 232:2,15 235:1,22 239:10 241:8,15 242:12 243:4 245:18 247:9,14,15,19 249:22 253:19 254:20 255:10 261:14,18 262:4 263:17,22 264:12 264:18 265:13 271:1,8 272:14 274:10,11 276:12 277:2 282:11 284:6,19,21 285:3 285:8 286:2,18,21 286:22 289:11 290:11 293:11 294:13,19 295:11 296:18,22 301:17 305:20 306:2,6 307:11,20 310:13 311:2,6,10,11,13 311:21 312:8,19 326:2,15 329:7 <b>consider</b> 202:15
<b>Commander</b> 280:7 <b>commanding</b> 243:5 243:9 260:10 <b>commands</b> 322:4 <b>comment</b> 196:3 234:4 332:7 <b>commenting</b> 255:16 <b>comments</b> 202:13 214:15 235:20 264:9 <b>commissioner</b> 242:1 310:8 <b>commit</b> 215:2 <b>commitment</b> 213:17 214:6 270:6 <b>committed</b> 218:7 329:2,11 330:3 <b>committee</b> 198:9 275:18 <b>common</b> 277:3 <b>communicate</b> 312:15 <b>communicating</b> 215:7 <b>communication</b> 200:3 297:10,14 307:3 322:1 325:19 <b>communications</b> 231:11 <b>communities</b> 194:17 195:8 198:15 200:7 205:5 208:6,10	<b>community</b> 195:8 195:11 196:6,11 198:8 199:9 200:12 203:21 204:19 205:1 206:5,6,8,18,21 206:22 207:1 208:4,7,12,18,20 209:20 210:14 212:2,7 213:20 214:3,3,10,17 217:2 218:13,16 218:20 219:1,16 221:6,16 222:14 223:4 225:2 226:8 226:10,14,20,22 227:13,18,22 229:4,7,9 230:21 231:8 233:7,9 234:14 235:18 242:4 243:10 244:13 248:8,13 249:20 250:3,4,7 251:21 252:1,20 253:11 255:7 256:5,16,21 257:18,22 258:2 258:11,17,19 259:11 260:10,21 262:19 263:6,14 263:16,19 264:2,3 265:14,19,21,22 266:5,6,10,11 272:22 273:6 274:5 277:6	<b>community's</b> 207:12 316:1 <b>community-enga...</b> 211:13 229:16 257:17 <b>companion</b> 328:18 <b>company</b> 276:19 <b>compared</b> 221:7 252:9 <b>compensation</b> 272:9 <b>complaint</b> 225:10 <b>complaints</b> 224:18 225:4,9 306:15 325:7 327:7 <b>complete</b> 274:8 333:7 <b>completed</b> 202:9	<b>completed</b> 202:9	

<b>consideration</b> 326:2	276:3 288:15	273:13 292:20	317:6	305:10 309:4,7
<b>considered</b> 193:22 234:6	<b>conversations</b> 281:20 297:20 314:4,14	295:10 306:14 310:13 327:5,9,12 330:18	<b>CPS</b> 232:10,12,12	318:9
<b>considering</b> 252:10	<b>convert</b> 328:11	<b>county</b> 212:3,11,19	<b>Cramer</b> 272:15 277:18 279:18,19	<b>critically</b> 266:18
<b>consisted</b> 203:14	<b>converts</b> 328:11	213:3 244:9	282:16 287:16	<b>cross-section</b> 196:11
<b>consistent</b> 216:22 223:21 227:11	<b>convey</b> 231:17	271:15,16,19,20	295:21 299:6	<b>cross-trained</b> 323:15
<b>consistently</b> 200:10 285:7	<b>conviction</b> 218:4	275:13 278:13,14	<b>CRC</b> 192:16 333:21	<b>CRR</b> 192:16 333:21
<b>conspiracy</b> 280:17	<b>Cook</b> 212:3,11,19 271:15 275:12	283:1 306:7	<b>create</b> 210:13 211:10 216:17	<b>CSR</b> 192:16 333:21
<b>constantly</b> 285:1	<b>coordinator</b> 287:22	<b>couple</b> 208:19 212:13 221:1	223:1 226:8 229:9	<b>culminating</b> 274:2
<b>constituencies</b> 200:8 266:21	<b>COP</b> 307:2	228:21 244:12	234:13 236:18	<b>cultural</b> 279:14,15
<b>Constitution</b> 195:5	<b>cop's</b> 279:1	272:15 276:8	237:18 251:11,12	<b>culture</b> 261:1,4,11 262:1 273:5,7,10 288:5,8,13,18 289:3 305:7
<b>constitutional</b> 205:8,13 212:17 212:22 232:7 234:19 235:7,12 235:14 242:6 270:9 328:3	<b>COPA</b> 313:8 320:10	312:13	291:22 294:3 301:14 326:5	<b>curious</b> 264:5
<b>consultation</b> 282:6	<b>copies</b> 333:12,15	<b>course</b> 200:13 241:14 246:9,13 246:14 249:16 251:16 252:19,21 254:17 296:13	<b>creates</b> 226:22	<b>current</b> 205:10 218:2 243:22 285:22 295:8
<b>contact</b> 323:6	<b>cops</b> 276:9 284:9 306:9	<b>courses</b> 270:9	<b>creating</b> 250:2 257:11	<b>currently</b> 203:8 206:17 207:7 213:2 243:19 273:22 280:16
<b>contacted</b> 225:13	<b>copy</b> 196:18	<b>court</b> 194:9 195:20 197:2,10 199:10 212:10 214:13 222:6 270:20,20 271:5,12,14,14,17 274:6 317:16	<b>creation</b> 226:18	<b>customer</b> 316:1
<b>contacting</b> 322:19	<b>core</b> 240:14,15 256:16	<b>court's</b> 277:10,14	<b>cred</b> 328:1	<b>cyber</b> 281:1
<b>contains</b> 235:2,3	<b>corporate</b> 270:10 281:1	<b>court-appointed</b> 282:21	<b>credibility</b> 320:13	
<b>contemplate</b> 328:22	<b>corporations</b> 270:10	<b>court-approved</b> 206:19 207:8	<b>crime</b> 209:3,12 273:6 287:18,21 293:5 315:17 327:6	<hr/> <b>D</b> <hr/>
<b>context</b> 215:9,11,21 246:1 303:7	<b>Corps</b> 269:11	<b>court-ordered</b> 195:1	<b>crime-fighting</b> 207:16	<b>D.A</b> 241:21
<b>continue</b> 236:6 239:6,8 255:9 274:14 286:1,9 314:14	<b>correct</b> 311:3 333:8	<b>cover</b> 263:3,3	<b>crimes</b> 294:7	<b>D.C</b> 203:8 277:21 303:5
<b>continued</b> 247:16 273:11,15	<b>corrections</b> 212:12 230:4,8	<b>coverups</b> 224:3 287:8 317:4	<b>criminal</b> 210:3 212:2 270:3 272:12 275:17 278:21 279:21 280:3	<b>daily</b> 231:5
<b>continuing</b> 267:19 286:15 322:13	<b>corrupt</b> 261:7 274:20	<b>CPD</b> 195:4 198:16 200:12 206:1 207:1,12 224:7 228:20 272:21 287:12 291:22 317:8 326:5	<b>criminals</b> 273:3	<b>Dakota</b> 283:18
<b>continuum</b> 299:7	<b>Costa</b> 240:13 245:20 252:15	<b>court-order</b> 195:1	<b>crisis</b> 195:12 229:21 230:3,9 277:4,4 290:7,12 290:15 291:7 318:14 321:2,14 321:19 323:15	<b>damage</b> 204:17 263:1,5
<b>contract</b> 276:21	<b>council</b> 306:20	<b>cover</b> 263:3,3	<b>crisis-intervention</b> 321:5 323:6	<b>Dan</b> 207:4 212:21 224:12 234:17 280:15
<b>contrary</b> 286:21	<b>counsel</b> 206:10 241:22 269:7 271:7,10 280:2 307:19	<b>coverups</b> 224:3	<b>crisis-response</b> 322:7,17	<b>data</b> 195:15 200:2 214:4 224:5,16,20 224:22 225:3,17 241:3,11 245:21 246:12,12 251:6 280:19 281:1 287:11,17,18 288:2 289:7,15
<b>contribute</b> 216:4	<b>counselor</b> 278:5	<b>CPD's</b> 224:3 287:8 317:4	<b>critical</b> 205:2 257:18 290:11	
<b>control</b> 224:2 287:7 317:3 333:15	<b>count</b> 298:16	<b>CPD-generated</b> 224:5 287:10		
<b>Convention</b> 269:14	<b>country</b> 213:7 221:4 226:12 257:20 268:16			
<b>conversation</b> 227:3				

317:6 318:16,17 319:13 <b>data-gathering</b> 254:21 <b>database</b> 310:9 <b>DATE</b> 332:8 <b>David</b> 240:12 245:5 268:3,4 281:3 284:4 292:3 296:21 298:13 301:5 302:10 <b>day</b> 192:8 226:6 260:17 317:15 333:18 <b>days</b> 226:1 251:3 251:10 258:9,12 272:18 <b>deadlines</b> 242:10 242:15 254:21 <b>deaf</b> 291:14 <b>deal</b> 284:6 291:7 297:14 <b>dealing</b> 280:22 288:6,7 <b>dealt</b> 246:6 288:8 <b>death-in-custodies</b> 306:17 <b>deaths</b> 275:14 <b>decades</b> 295:13 <b>decided</b> 282:14 <b>decision</b> 249:4 266:19 <b>decisions</b> 277:6 <b>decreased</b> 285:7 <b>Decree</b> 192:1 193:7 194:1,3,8,8 195:1 195:3,17,19 196:2 196:18,20 197:4,9 198:11 199:18 204:12 205:2 206:3 210:12,18 214:12,12,13,18 215:12,15 217:6 220:3,17,22 221:5 221:11,14 222:1,6 222:8,13 230:18	232:2,15 235:1,22 239:11 241:8,15 242:12 243:4 245:18 247:9,14 247:15,19 249:22 253:20 254:21 255:10 261:15,18 262:4 263:18,22 264:12,18 265:13 271:8 272:14 274:10,11 276:12 277:2 282:11 284:21 285:8 286:2,18,21 287:1 289:11 290:11 293:11 294:13,19 295:11 296:18,22 301:17 305:20 306:2,6 307:11,21 311:2,6,10,11,13 311:21 312:8,19 326:2,16 328:17 329:8 <b>Decrees</b> 212:15 221:3,8 271:1 284:7,19 285:3 310:14 <b>dedication</b> 204:10 <b>deep</b> 204:9,16 220:21 236:20 264:14,16 291:14 294:15,17 <b>deeply</b> 274:17,18 331:2 <b>defender</b> 271:18 <b>defense</b> 269:20 270:3 278:12 279:21,22 <b>define</b> 316:19 <b>definitely</b> 331:2 <b>definition</b> 316:22 325:4 326:12,13 <b>definitively</b> 262:2 <b>degree</b> 272:9 <b>deliberate</b> 249:4 <b>deliver</b> 295:15	<b>delivered</b> 232:16 <b>delivers</b> 195:4 <b>delivery</b> 209:21 <b>demented</b> 324:12 <b>Democratic</b> 269:13 <b>demonstrate</b> 200:11 327:13 <b>demonstrated</b> 200:4 292:6 <b>department</b> 194:14 194:19,20 205:7 206:4,19 207:11 208:4 209:19 210:2,14,20 211:3 211:15 212:11 226:9,21 228:6 229:3,6,11 230:2 230:7 242:4,8 243:1,3,12,17 244:1,4 246:6,20 247:8,9,10,12,22 248:3 250:2,6 251:8 253:13,16 254:1,17 261:2,5 261:8 263:20 264:20 265:7 272:13 275:20 276:9,16 277:9,10 282:10 283:1,15 285:17,17 286:5 287:2 292:16 293:13 294:10,21 298:16 300:2,3,7 300:14,20 305:14 306:14 307:10,13 307:19 308:2,4,9 308:10,13,16,17 309:2,3,13,17,20 310:1,4,6,7,11,22 311:3,20 314:10 314:13,13 316:1,7 316:8,18 317:17 318:8 325:1,15 328:10 330:1 <b>departments</b> 213:7 228:8,10 244:21	245:4 246:17,18 247:1 253:22 254:2,5 265:5 276:10,14 279:3,9 292:21 293:1,2,8 327:21 <b>DePaul</b> 270:8 <b>depends</b> 202:22 <b>depth</b> 207:16 <b>deputy</b> 205:15,16 207:5,7 281:5 300:4 308:3 313:17 <b>describe</b> 196:14 199:4 207:16 222:11 224:2 240:17 287:7 313:10 314:17 317:3 <b>described</b> 324:12 <b>descriptions</b> 320:3 <b>desegregation</b> 270:3 <b>deserves</b> 203:3 <b>designed</b> 294:1 <b>designing</b> 214:9 <b>desire</b> 276:4 <b>desk</b> 202:8 283:21 <b>despite</b> 313:8 <b>detail</b> 199:19 284:18 <b>determine</b> 237:14 <b>develop</b> 209:11 210:4,12,16 227:18,19 235:5 318:8,21 322:13 <b>developed</b> 209:1,7 211:3 286:10 <b>developing</b> 210:1 <b>development</b> 208:20 245:1 266:7 <b>dialogue</b> 219:16 <b>difference</b> 218:9 219:9 <b>different</b> 204:2	214:19 219:1 232:1 240:22 241:2 242:4 261:20 286:3 296:4 310:17 311:19 317:13 321:13 326:17 328:19 330:8 332:1 <b>differentiation</b> 301:13 <b>differently</b> 323:2 <b>difficult</b> 226:16 253:5,6,7 287:4 319:1 <b>dig</b> 237:22 317:20 318:3 319:20 320:7 <b>dignity</b> 273:5 <b>direct</b> 301:6 322:4 <b>directed</b> 228:19 300:6 <b>direction</b> 333:7,10 333:16 <b>directive</b> 310:7 <b>directly</b> 207:1 218:16 219:5 260:1 268:17 317:16 <b>director</b> 206:12,14 207:6 213:22 308:15 <b>disabilities</b> 229:13 229:15,18 289:21 290:1,4 291:13,20 320:16,18,21 321:12,12 322:3 <b>disability</b> 229:21 290:7 321:2 <b>disabled</b> 236:15 <b>disciplinary</b> 210:22 <b>discipline</b> 243:16 312:15 <b>disconnect</b> 272:21 297:9,10 <b>discoverable</b>
---	--	---	--	---

319:13	<b>doing</b> 232:12 246:1	<b>East</b> 247:7	238:1 241:3 244:8	288:3 314:18
<b>discovery</b> 307:16	252:1 256:5 257:1	<b>easy</b> 292:3 301:8	244:17,19 247:5	317:8 318:3
<b>discrete</b> 272:2	258:13 267:6	318:21	264:17 277:22	320:13
<b>discrimination</b>	278:3 283:21	<b>ecosystem</b> 318:20	279:7 294:18	<b>ensuring</b> 216:11
270:10 278:4	285:14 286:2	<b>education</b> 209:18	295:17 296:14	<b>entails</b> 227:13
<b>discuss</b> 325:22	297:2,3,3,5,8	232:8 269:20	300:15 304:1,6	<b>entertain</b> 302:18
328:14	298:18 302:17	325:19	305:1,12 307:6	<b>entertained</b> 238:15
<b>discussed</b> 284:14	303:22 304:3,4,5	<b>EEO</b> 278:5	313:21 315:2,10	<b>entertaining</b> 238:9
<b>discussing</b> 272:16	305:9 319:4	<b>effect</b> 277:11 319:7	326:11	<b>entities</b> 200:5
282:10	327:12	<b>effective</b> 208:21	<b>engage</b> 206:20	304:12
<b>discussion</b> 273:16	<b>DOJ</b> 259:13 261:14	212:17 234:20	215:3 234:14	<b>entity</b> 316:4
276:16	263:3 305:17,21	247:17 263:18	236:15,16,16	<b>environment</b>
<b>discussions</b> 274:1	307:12	292:6,7 318:4	260:11,16 316:7,8	237:19 294:3
309:10	<b>dollars</b> 285:4	331:13	321:22 322:22	314:2
<b>disorderly</b> 237:12	<b>DOMESTHENES</b>	<b>efficacy</b> 304:9	329:18,22	<b>equal</b> 232:9 266:6
<b>dispatchers</b> 323:14	260:9 265:18	<b>efficiently</b> 309:7	<b>engaged</b> 194:14	<b>equipment</b> 326:17
<b>disposition</b> 224:18	<b>domestic</b> 244:15	<b>effort</b> 263:21	198:8,8,12 210:21	<b>equipped</b> 233:12
<b>disproportionately</b>	<b>door</b> 257:12,12	<b>efforts</b> 212:16	213:3 226:5	242:18
194:16 229:13	<b>double</b> 224:6	273:14 279:4,8	260:17 283:9	<b>equivalent</b> 306:19
289:21 314:20	287:11 317:7	313:8	301:18 313:5,20	<b>eroded</b> 229:10
320:16	<b>double-digit</b>	<b>eight</b> 277:4 283:11	315:19	<b>especially</b> 211:13
<b>distance</b> 322:1	213:12,12	<b>either</b> 292:4	<b>engagement</b> 203:21	229:14 231:15
<b>distill</b> 232:14	<b>doubling</b> 252:5	<b>Elena</b> 206:11,11	206:6,8,15 211:6	257:14 259:13
<b>distinct</b> 248:12	<b>Dow</b> 197:5,7 299:9	219:10,12,12	213:20 214:1	281:8 289:22
<b>distribute</b> 275:19	<b>dozens</b> 270:21	222:16 235:19,21	215:6 218:13,21	320:17 328:15
<b>District</b> 270:20	<b>Dr</b> 202:20 205:16	238:22	222:15 226:13	<b>Essential</b> 307:2
275:5	240:10,11 242:21	<b>eliminate</b> 271:20	230:22 231:8	<b>essentially</b> 204:2
<b>districts</b> 225:22	242:21 244:3,6	<b>emotional</b> 216:15	235:18 257:18,22	<b>establish</b> 216:20
<b>distrust</b> 273:1	260:7 264:22	<b>emphasis</b> 212:14	264:3 290:2	<b>established</b> 227:9
299:2 313:19	265:17	<b>employed</b> 300:1,11	297:18 300:10,17	244:13,14 271:3
<b>distrustful</b> 292:11	<b>draft</b> 214:12	<b>employees</b> 307:5	301:2 304:14	288:13
<b>diverse</b> 200:1 305:5	<b>draw</b> 331:11	<b>employment</b> 270:9	309:21 310:2,18	<b>establishing</b> 266:1
305:6,7	<b>drive</b> 295:19	<b>enable</b> 235:6	320:19 321:7,15	292:19
<b>diversion</b> 210:1	307:19	<b>encapsulates</b> 263:6	329:1,12	<b>establishment</b>
<b>diversity</b> 278:7	<b>driving</b> 213:19	<b>encounter</b> 323:2	<b>engagements</b> 209:4	236:8
<b>divert</b> 210:5	309:14	<b>encountering</b> 209:5	212:1 214:19	<b>et</b> 233:16
<b>diverting</b> 210:2	<b>duties</b> 200:14	<b>encounters</b> 270:17	<b>engaging</b> 235:12	<b>ethics</b> 259:16
<b>divide</b> 204:16,18	<b>duty</b> 269:11	<b>encourage</b> 202:5	297:20 322:2	270:10 279:1
<b>dividing</b> 269:2	<b>Dynamite</b> 269:4	<b>endeavor</b> 211:16	329:15	<b>evaluate</b> 199:6
<b>division</b> 243:11		<b>ended</b> 278:7 285:22	<b>enhance</b> 265:4	<b>evening</b> 304:21
<b>document</b> 310:9	<b>E</b>	<b>endowment</b> 303:21	<b>enhanced</b> 263:18	307:8
<b>documented</b>	<b>earlier</b> 262:18	<b>energy</b> 284:2	<b>enormous</b> 261:12	<b>event</b> 193:9
213:11 224:3	279:2 291:11	<b>enforced</b> 195:2	<b>enraged</b> 277:6	<b>events</b> 305:13
287:8,9 317:4	<b>early</b> 208:9 256:19	<b>enforcement</b>	<b>ensure</b> 195:4	309:4,7 318:20
<b>documents</b> 307:16	285:2 297:19	199:21 207:20	206:22 222:12	<b>everybody</b> 218:18
317:18	<b>easier</b> 294:8	230:4 235:15	224:7 287:12	223:10 231:15

268:20 297:1 <b>everyone's</b> 294:7 <b>evidence-based</b> 205:21 304:4 <b>evolution</b> 330:19 <b>evolve</b> 294:7 <b>exactly</b> 251:4 267:8 296:8 301:10 <b>examine</b> 291:10 318:1 <b>examined</b> 320:12 <b>example</b> 201:16 204:7 262:17 291:4 293:19 <b>examples</b> 292:16 295:6 327:4,8 <b>Excel</b> 256:10 <b>excellent</b> 204:11 <b>excesses</b> 273:1 <b>excessive-force</b> 270:2,22 <b>exchanges</b> 293:3 <b>excluded</b> 236:6,21 <b>exclusive</b> 234:21 238:14 <b>exclusively</b> 310:5 <b>excuse</b> 307:12 <b>executive</b> 204:1 206:11 243:8 245:1 304:22 307:5 <b>exhibit</b> 323:3 <b>exist</b> 227:8 <b>exists</b> 228:17 <b>expand</b> 218:13 <b>expect</b> 194:6 266:12 301:1,3,9 <b>expectation</b> 199:11 <b>expected</b> 219:22 <b>experience</b> 200:7 204:4 205:17 207:17 211:9 212:14,19 213:2 213:17 214:9,14 221:2 229:19 240:22 242:18,22	245:15 246:4,11 248:2 255:18 260:1 281:14 282:2,10 284:6 290:5 291:14,15 295:18 300:12 305:2 309:13 320:22 329:9 <b>experienced</b> 242:9 284:12,12 331:1 <b>experiences</b> 219:7 282:2 331:6 <b>experiencing</b> 331:3 <b>expert</b> 282:22 283:5 <b>expertise</b> 199:20 203:1 229:20 246:1 249:18 290:6 321:1 <b>experts</b> 205:9,12 219:3 273:17 283:11 285:13 288:21,21,22 289:1 291:20 <b>explain</b> 326:9 <b>explaining</b> 233:1 <b>explanation</b> 237:11 <b>exposing</b> 209:19 <b>extensive</b> 245:14 <b>extent</b> 251:10 <b>external</b> 206:10 217:17 309:18 320:9 <b>extremely</b> 217:20 <hr/> <b>F</b> <hr/> <b>face</b> 330:16 <b>faces</b> 231:5 <b>facets</b> 241:8 242:8 <b>facilitate</b> 299:20 <b>facilitators</b> 219:2 <b>fact</b> 221:5 222:2 255:4,15 315:14 330:19 <b>factors</b> 292:15 <b>facts</b> 309:9	<b>fail</b> 220:10 <b>failed</b> 220:9 <b>failure</b> 249:2,2 <b>failures</b> 300:2 <b>fair</b> 304:13 329:5 <b>Fairfax</b> 278:14 <b>fairly</b> 212:1 299:5 <b>fairness</b> 271:4 <b>faith</b> 218:8 250:4 252:2 <b>faith-based</b> 257:4 260:12 <b>familiar</b> 221:8 275:8 277:7 288:1 323:1,4 <b>family</b> 252:14 268:21 280:9 <b>far</b> 240:13 245:21 <b>favoring</b> 236:7 <b>FBI</b> 245:7,11,15 <b>fear</b> 204:20 233:14 236:19 273:2 <b>federal</b> 194:9 195:2 195:5 197:3 203:18 212:10 241:2,9,19 247:9 247:12,15 268:7 277:22 278:9,20 279:19 284:6 306:8 307:11 311:12 317:15,16 <b>feedback</b> 196:9 199:2,9 202:7,9 202:15 216:5 250:8 289:10,19 297:4 310:19 <b>feel</b> 203:3 220:6 223:3 234:12,15 235:9 236:22 255:7 314:2 324:9 324:10 325:13,16 <b>feeling</b> 236:21 259:19 263:14 <b>feels</b> 222:3 262:20 262:21,21 <b>fellow</b> 204:16	304:22 <b>felt</b> 220:5 278:6 <b>Ferguson</b> 305:15 305:16,18 <b>field</b> 222:15 273:17 <b>figure</b> 222:21 308:20 312:13 331:10 <b>file</b> 271:11 <b>filed</b> 194:8,11 197:10 214:12,13 225:8 <b>files</b> 319:20 <b>filings</b> 313:9 <b>fill</b> 309:8 <b>filled</b> 201:4 248:9 249:21 <b>filling</b> 202:7 <b>final</b> 285:9 302:12 302:15 <b>finalist</b> 194:2 198:5 200:15 201:13 202:1,18 <b>finalist's</b> 201:21 <b>finalists</b> 192:1 193:8,21 197:8,21 198:18 199:7 202:6,13 239:9,19 <b>finally</b> 196:20 200:9 320:9 330:6 <b>finance</b> 270:11 308:6 <b>financial</b> 249:14 271:11 <b>find</b> 220:10 242:14 249:8 257:22 258:6,11 285:8 324:16 327:2 <b>findings</b> 194:18,21 259:13 261:14 263:3 <b>fine</b> 259:5 <b>fingers</b> 231:16 <b>finished</b> 311:15 <b>firm</b> 302:18 <b>firmly</b> 234:19	<b>first</b> 193:13 194:2,7 202:17 215:5,18 220:16 222:16 229:2 233:2 234:18 240:10 241:17 244:15 250:21 251:2 255:15 258:9 269:18 275:15 276:17 288:15 290:9 295:11 297:17 301:4 303:5 308:14 312:6 313:11 316:17 317:13 321:8 323:10 326:8 <b>first-person</b> 234:2 298:5 323:20 <b>firsthand</b> 272:22 273:7 <b>fits</b> 266:3 <b>Fitzgerald</b> 280:2 <b>five</b> 203:22 206:7 212:9 254:11,12 271:13 276:18 305:2,8 <b>fix</b> 276:11 <b>flag</b> 323:16 <b>flags</b> 320:2 <b>flip</b> 296:7 <b>flipside</b> 266:17 <b>focus</b> 304:13,18 308:16 329:19 330:2 <b>focused</b> 285:17 304:4 <b>focusing</b> 231:9 285:1 304:19 <b>folks</b> 216:12,15 273:15 276:2 299:17 311:19 313:2,15,20 315:16 316:15 325:16 <b>follow-up</b> 225:14
--	---	---	--	---

228:19	232:7 269:19	312:11 313:13	276:12 277:9	279:18 287:13
<b>followed</b> 241:16	270:7 302:16	316:13 324:8	279:11 283:5,6	292:19 293:19,20
261:15 269:22	303:1,4,7,9,21	327:17 331:17	284:17 288:1	295:2,3 299:20
<b>following</b> 202:4	305:1,9 327:11	332:2	295:5,5 298:18,18	302:14 304:21
217:7 258:14	<b>founded</b> 303:11,20	<b>gap</b> 251:12,15	299:21 301:5	307:8 309:16
269:10 307:17	<b>four</b> 193:21 197:8	<b>gate</b> 217:1	306:1 313:14,14	317:9 322:20
<b>foot</b> 304:10	197:21 198:5,18	<b>gather</b> 216:9 251:6	314:1,5 318:9	<b>government</b> 200:5
<b>force</b> 194:15,22	200:15 206:7	<b>gathered</b> 214:15	326:11 331:17	203:10 278:9,13
195:13 204:21	250:15,21 252:6	215:10 246:13	<b>goal</b> 205:4 272:2	316:3,4
212:11 213:9,19	274:12 279:9	<b>gathering</b> 246:12	292:5,12,12	<b>graduated</b> 278:11
225:7 275:12,13	283:12 295:12	<b>general</b> 203:17	<b>goals</b> 274:10	<b>grants</b> 275:19
306:4,20 308:5,5	296:13 305:17	206:10 273:21	296:21	<b>graphic</b> 250:16,17
318:14	<b>four-year</b> 270:6	306:13 307:19	<b>goes</b> 197:16 227:8	<b>grappled</b> 330:17
<b>forces</b> 225:4	<b>fourth</b> 216:21	328:16	<b>going</b> 207:11	<b>grasp</b> 231:13
<b>Ford</b> 303:21	<b>frame</b> 203:11	<b>general's</b> 193:11	214:16 215:3,8	<b>great</b> 204:3 208:13
<b>foregoing</b> 333:7	285:10	194:10,12 197:5	216:22 217:12,13	218:8 258:21
<b>forensics</b> 281:2	<b>Francisco</b> 276:22	197:17 198:4,17	218:14,17,18	270:16 271:22
<b>foresight</b> 270:16	285:20 286:4	199:3,6 202:5,14	219:10,22 220:9	284:6 285:19
<b>form</b> 202:7	298:2	214:10 278:16,18	220:10,10 221:9	295:1 297:14
<b>formal</b> 212:16	<b>frank</b> 253:15	282:8	223:11 225:4,5	303:18
<b>format</b> 231:19	262:20	<b>generally</b> 240:21	227:4,7 231:3	<b>greater</b> 209:13
<b>former</b> 207:6 241:2	<b>frankly</b> 258:20	<b>generic</b> 237:6	233:18 234:2,3	210:8,13,15
241:3 246:17	261:18 316:14	<b>Georgia</b> 208:22	236:5 237:10	322:15,15
247:5 273:21	<b>fraud</b> 281:1	<b>getting</b> 250:1 257:4	239:6,8,13 240:6	<b>Green</b> 269:15
279:19 282:19	<b>frequently</b> 322:20	292:15 315:3	240:20 247:11	271:2
283:14 295:8	<b>front</b> 193:16 223:7	322:14 329:6	248:8 251:5 254:9	<b>grew</b> 252:15 268:22
307:9 309:17	223:17	<b>Giaquinto</b> 207:4	255:22 256:8,22	270:16
<b>formidable</b> 264:1	<b>fulfilled</b> 260:18	212:21 234:17	257:1,12 258:6	<b>ground</b> 218:16
<b>forms</b> 202:9	315:21	<b>give</b> 208:19 220:17	259:1,8 260:4	225:22 246:7
<b>forum</b> 192:1 193:7	<b>full</b> 211:5 242:15	239:13 259:18	262:15,16 263:15	267:4 305:19
193:12 198:19	252:20 285:9	260:5 276:10	263:20 267:13	320:1
199:8 257:11	<b>full-time</b> 308:19	286:18 289:14	286:11 288:10,11	<b>ground-breaking</b>
332:7	<b>fully</b> 195:5 215:15	290:22 295:6	288:11 289:8	304:8
<b>forums</b> 222:21	<b>functioned</b> 234:7	303:7 308:8 310:8	290:13 292:13	<b>group</b> 198:7,9,14
223:2 315:7	<b>functions</b> 235:15	310:20 312:8,12	299:2 301:10	203:10 218:21
<b>forward</b> 228:4	310:17	<b>given</b> 211:8 221:20	303:5 305:21	239:2 267:14
231:3 277:16	<b>Fund</b> 269:20	264:16 294:17	315:2,11 321:11	280:22 288:3
284:3 285:10,18	<b>funds</b> 271:9,10	300:14 322:4,5	323:19 329:20	<b>groups</b> 198:16
294:10 312:2	<b>further</b> 267:11	<b>gives</b> 277:15 312:18	<b>good</b> 193:1,1,2,3,6	242:5 252:10
330:4	274:1 333:11	317:17 321:19	202:21 207:19	257:4 259:5
<b>foster</b> 210:8	<b>future</b> 205:3	<b>giving</b> 292:16 294:5	211:20 213:21	260:13 297:20
<b>found</b> 198:2 309:5	233:18	322:4	214:15 224:8	329:19
311:4 322:10		<b>go</b> 215:4 219:22	236:13 239:5,7,7	<b>guide</b> 223:8
<b>foundation</b> 206:11	<b>G</b>	227:10 232:21	240:1 259:17,17	<b>guided</b> 319:22
217:18 218:3	<b>gains</b> 207:12	254:12 263:10	261:17 266:15	<b>guiding</b> 274:19
223:19 229:11	<b>Ganesha</b> 309:16,17	266:22 267:6	267:18 268:3	<b>guilty</b> 234:7 262:10

298:7 324:2	281:7	<b>hereunto</b> 333:17	<b>host</b> 224:16	196:8,19
<b>guns</b> 328:2	<b>Haven</b> 247:7	<b>hesitant</b> 313:7	<b>hosting</b> 193:12	<b>implemented</b>
<b>guts</b> 253:22	<b>head</b> 203:9 280:11	<b>Hi</b> 219:12 303:3	<b>hours</b> 219:20 263:3	251:18 306:22
<b>guy</b> 245:22 247:4	<b>headed</b> 203:20	<b>Hickey</b> 202:20	309:4,5 322:12	310:21 311:13
<b>guys</b> 328:2	<b>headphones</b> 193:19	203:5 213:16	<b>housing</b> 268:19	325:9
	<b>healing</b> 202:22	220:12 222:14	<b>Howard</b> 212:9	<b>imply</b> 256:15
<hr/> <b>H</b> <hr/>	<b>health</b> 209:18	224:11 230:21	<b>huge</b> 293:11	<b>importance</b> 231:12
<b>half</b> 234:18 235:16	230:13 254:13	232:5 233:20	<b>human</b> 313:18	232:15
235:17 249:12	321:10,12 322:9	235:19 238:18	<b>humbled</b> 217:19	<b>important</b> 201:18
<b>hall</b> 256:6	322:14	<b>hide</b> 319:12	<b>hundreds</b> 280:7	204:12 207:11
<b>hand</b> 201:7,8 296:5	<b>hear</b> 193:21 201:16	<b>high</b> 233:14 268:11	284:7 285:4	213:19 214:8
296:5 299:21,21	216:7 220:1,7	268:15 269:10	<b>Hyde</b> 270:14	215:1,13,20,22
333:13,18	240:1 267:19	<b>Highland</b> 262:13		216:2,8,17 220:4
<b>handed</b> 247:15	302:12 303:15	298:10 324:5	<hr/> <b>I</b> <hr/>	220:8 224:13
<b>handled</b> 278:14,16	318:10 324:15	<b>highlights</b> 244:11	<b>idea</b> 276:17	227:7 230:19
<b>handles</b> 243:11	<b>heard</b> 212:20	<b>Hill</b> 269:4	<b>ideal</b> 274:2	231:1,14 232:22
<b>handling</b> 269:21,22	214:16 216:3	<b>Hilliard</b> 273:15,19	<b>ideas</b> 218:12,22	246:22 248:17
307:16	222:13 223:18	275:21 276:3	267:5	250:9 266:8,18
<b>hands</b> 324:11	257:14 258:17	279:6,11	<b>identified</b> 281:11	267:9 282:12
<b>hands-on</b> 309:13	259:19 284:8	<b>hire</b> 266:12,14	282:5	290:10 291:17
<b>happen</b> 215:8	299:10	301:1	<b>identify</b> 305:4	293:16 296:20
247:3,18 248:4	<b>hearing</b> 220:12	<b>hired</b> 266:11 301:2	315:8 316:10	298:19 301:13
249:3,16 254:10	333:5,9	308:14	<b>identifying</b> 292:20	308:1 314:1 318:8
255:1,1 258:6	<b>hearings</b> 299:8	<b>hiring</b> 195:13 306:5	<b>Illinois</b> 193:10	328:15 330:14
261:16 262:5	<b>Heintze</b> 273:15,19	329:2	194:9,12 197:5,17	<b>importantly</b> 228:11
267:3 288:10,11	275:21 276:3	<b>historically</b> 269:2,3	199:3,5 202:14	271:3
288:12 325:21	279:7,11	<b>history</b> 216:16	203:17 206:15	<b>imposed</b> 272:9
<b>happened</b> 217:8,10	<b>held</b> 315:7	224:3 231:2	212:4 271:13	<b>impossible</b> 319:7
247:18 248:3	<b>Hello</b> 217:16 231:7	268:10 273:7	275:3,4,16 291:5	<b>improper</b> 204:20
251:8 261:15	<b>helm</b> 254:6	287:8 317:4	333:2	<b>improve</b> 203:14
282:2 309:9	<b>help</b> 201:11 209:16	<b>hit</b> 285:8	<b>imagine</b> 220:21	264:2 293:20
<b>happening</b> 250:9	223:2,8 228:5,12	<b>Hoereth</b> 206:13	<b>immediate</b> 240:13	309:11
250:10 308:12	263:8 276:5	213:21,22	<b>immediately</b> 245:6	<b>improved</b> 327:7
311:5	279:14 311:14	<b>hold</b> 196:5 222:21	<b>immigrants</b> 257:7	<b>improves</b> 236:2
<b>happens</b> 254:17	322:12 329:18,19	249:5 290:17	257:7	<b>improving</b> 233:6
<b>happy</b> 220:13	331:10	<b>holding</b> 312:16	<b>impact</b> 233:19	<b>in-depth</b> 321:20
332:5	<b>helped</b> 275:16,19	<b>Holmes</b> 280:17,20	<b>impacted</b> 194:16	<b>in-service</b> 243:7
<b>hard</b> 217:21 251:2	275:19 284:9	<b>home</b> 286:8	218:17 219:5	<b>inappropriate</b>
254:5 320:5 322:3	311:6	<b>hometown</b> 206:16	229:13 289:21	234:9 262:12
<b>Hardin</b> 203:9	<b>helpful</b> 301:20	<b>Homicide</b> 275:13	320:16	298:9 324:4
<b>Hardin-CNA</b>	<b>helping</b> 312:2	<b>honest</b> 274:8	<b>impartial</b> 195:12	<b>inappropriately</b>
202:19	328:5	<b>honesty</b> 217:4	<b>impeccable</b> 259:16	234:15
<b>harm</b> 216:16	<b>helps</b> 265:22	<b>honored</b> 217:19	<b>impediment</b> 295:18	<b>incarceration</b>
314:19,20	288:18 289:2	<b>hope</b> 219:17 309:14	<b>impetus</b> 271:19	212:6
<b>Harvard</b> 305:4	299:20	<b>hopefully</b> 264:3	<b>implement</b> 310:1	<b>incident</b> 318:2
<b>Harvey</b> 273:20	<b>hereto</b> 333:11	271:3	<b>implementation</b>	<b>incidents</b> 317:21

318:3	<b>indicated</b> 288:14	266:5	<b>interruption</b> 239:4	<b>involvement</b>
<b>include</b> 218:11	<b>indicted</b> 280:6	<b>inside</b> 211:4 248:2	267:17 302:13	265:20 272:20
219:1 229:17	<b>individual</b> 234:5	264:15 294:16	<b>intervention</b>	284:9 328:14,19
290:3 320:20	318:1 319:8	<b>insight</b> 228:6	195:12 229:22	329:1 330:7
<b>included</b> 194:18	<b>individual's</b> 323:8	300:14	230:3,9 290:8,12	<b>involving</b> 270:4
249:11 254:20	<b>individually</b> 283:8	<b>inspector</b> 203:16	290:16 318:14	271:1,8
269:20 328:17	<b>individuals</b> 198:10	306:13	321:3 323:15	<b>issue</b> 196:4 216:15
<b>includes</b> 198:14	225:7,8,18 229:5	<b>instilling</b> 299:19	<b>interview</b> 225:6,8	221:17 246:9
205:9 221:5 322:8	235:9 280:18	<b>institute</b> 206:12,14	<b>interviewed</b> 198:5	291:17
<b>including</b> 197:20	283:8 324:12	213:22 219:13	280:6	<b>issues</b> 208:5,11
199:1 229:21	<b>inequitably</b> 278:7	223:7 230:7	<b>interviews</b> 198:7	209:17 210:22
245:8 268:20	<b>infographics</b>	244:14 287:19	199:8 291:11	246:7 259:6 266:7
270:2,13 271:1	231:18	<b>instituted</b> 321:18	<b>intimately</b> 273:16	300:19 315:4,8
272:19 274:19	<b>inform</b> 300:3	<b>institutions</b> 260:12	<b>introduce</b> 303:5	316:12 321:11
290:7 308:4 321:2	315:14	<b>instructs</b> 307:4	<b>introduced</b> 273:14	323:12 330:15,17
<b>Inclusion</b> 216:1	<b>information</b> 196:7	<b>integrated</b> 319:4	<b>introducing</b> 240:6	
<b>inclusive</b> 219:19	200:3 215:9 216:5	<b>integrities</b> 279:1	268:4	<b>J</b>
220:11 236:12	216:8 217:9,10	<b>integrity</b> 200:10	<b>introduction</b> 212:7	<b>jail</b> 212:19 271:21
237:2	221:6 224:13	271:4 275:12	<b>introductory</b>	272:3,4
<b>inclusiveness</b>	228:1,2 232:14	<b>intelligence</b> 277:22	302:17	<b>JAMES</b> 211:19
223:20	274:8 301:4	278:1	<b>invaluable</b> 245:17	220:20 226:11
<b>incorporate</b> 205:20	308:17,21 309:3,6	<b>intense</b> 212:1	<b>invariably</b> 296:1	228:21 230:1
313:5	310:20 318:18,19	<b>intentionally</b>	<b>investigate</b> 307:14	238:20
<b>increase</b> 264:3	319:2,6,10,18	281:20	310:11	<b>Jeff</b> 272:15,18,20
308:9	323:10,17,18	<b>interact</b> 200:13	<b>investigated</b> 310:6	273:12 277:17,18
<b>increases</b> 293:5	<b>information's</b>	260:20 307:6	<b>investigating</b>	279:18,19 282:16
<b>incredibly</b> 237:2	215:9	310:5	274:20 296:3	282:17 287:16
<b>incumbent</b> 313:14	<b>informational</b>	<b>interaction</b> 273:9	<b>investigation</b>	295:21 299:6
323:16	215:1	326:18	194:20 203:11	<b>Jersey</b> 207:6 213:1
<b>independence</b>	<b>informed</b> 215:15	<b>interactions</b> 200:12	225:12,15 247:11	273:21 295:11,12
252:11 253:8	<b>infrastructures</b>	269:15	247:13 307:17	<b>job</b> 193:22 230:20
271:4	314:14	<b>interactive</b> 315:18	<b>investigations</b>	236:13 237:1
<b>independent</b> 192:1	<b>infused</b> 229:7	<b>interacts</b> 243:12	203:10 245:12	253:14 255:5,5
193:8,22 194:4,5	<b>inhaled</b> 261:12	<b>interest</b> 221:16	281:1 284:8	260:11 261:19
195:18,22 196:21	<b>initial</b> 328:14	272:12 274:16	306:16 308:5	269:18 285:19
197:1,11,12,16,19	<b>initiative</b> 212:21	284:2	317:20	294:8 296:20
199:17,20 200:9	278:8	<b>interested</b> 278:4	<b>investigative</b>	298:19 305:12
201:20 205:18	<b>initiatives</b> 314:19	<b>intern</b> 269:19	322:18	308:19 311:14
210:18 214:7	<b>inner</b> 268:16	<b>internal</b> 243:15	<b>invitation</b> 222:6	331:8
215:10 239:10	<b>innocence</b> 235:10	265:11 279:12	<b>involved</b> 198:11	<b>jobs</b> 293:6 326:20
253:4,11,17 254:7	<b>innocent</b> 234:6	281:1 300:18	212:4,6,20,22	<b>Joe</b> 206:13 213:21
255:2 271:7	262:9 272:4 298:7	306:16	213:1,6 217:3	213:22 217:16
<b>independently</b>	324:1	<b>interpreters</b> 193:14	219:1 232:2	223:18
253:14	<b>innovation</b> 304:20	193:15	233:17,19 247:2	<b>Joe's</b> 223:7
<b>indicate</b> 201:1	<b>input</b> 198:17 203:1	<b>interrogation</b>	273:8,13,16,18	<b>John</b> 212:9 232:12
234:8 239:19	214:3,11 216:4	275:15	274:18	<b>joined</b> 275:21



<b>loc-</b> 208:1	240:21 241:1	<b>management</b>	317:12 321:4	<b>men</b> 291:7
<b>local</b> 205:9 241:2,9	249:14 252:4	195:16 200:2	330:10,13 332:4	<b>mental</b> 230:12
268:11 269:7,7	253:18,18 259:21	204:4 241:10	<b>mayor</b> 313:17	321:10,12,14
304:1,6,12	260:13,13,19	245:2 265:1	<b>mayors</b> 265:6	322:2,8,14
<b>located</b> 303:4	261:15 263:21	<b>manager</b> 329:12	<b>McDonald</b> 280:18	<b>mentioned</b> 281:7
304:16	265:12,12 267:3	<b>managerial</b> 243:8	<b>mean</b> 225:1 227:3,3	282:17 287:17
<b>lock</b> 298:17	275:9,10 276:8,12	<b>managers</b> 265:6	236:18 318:2	289:7,17
<b>long</b> 208:8 224:3	282:9 284:1,2,13	310:22	324:21	<b>mentor</b> 324:18
236:8 240:11	289:10 296:5	<b>mandates</b> 241:16	<b>meaningful</b> 289:13	<b>Meridian</b> 210:19
242:21,21 244:3	301:16 313:18	245:18 326:17,17	<b>means</b> 254:3	213:2
260:7,9 264:22	314:21 318:10	<b>Manhattan</b> 241:20	299:14 305:11	<b>message</b> 227:12
265:17,18 287:8	329:4	241:21	316:20 333:4	<b>messengers</b> 328:12
317:4	<b>lots</b> 297:11 329:7	<b>manifests</b> 330:22	<b>meant</b> 194:11	<b>met</b> 213:17 241:16
<b>longer</b> 211:2	<b>Louis</b> 306:7	<b>manner</b> 195:4	<b>measure</b> 238:6	245:18 248:21
321:19	<b>love</b> 204:9	230:18 274:11	298:15 308:11	258:15 273:19
<b>look</b> 220:22 224:5	<b>lovely</b> 250:16	<b>map</b> 222:18 251:3	<b>measuring</b> 224:17	282:16,17
225:9,10 237:14	<b>low</b> 204:21	251:11	251:19	<b>methodologies</b>
238:5 250:18	<b>Loyola</b> 269:12	<b>mapped</b> 258:5	<b>mechanisms</b>	205:20
251:2,7,13 265:15		<b>Marcia</b> 277:19,19	312:14,21 325:5,9	<b>methodology</b> 235:5
274:2 275:13	<b>M</b>	282:18 289:4	<b>media</b> 231:9 329:8	240:8 250:14,16
276:4 277:13	<b>machine</b> 333:4	292:14 300:5	<b>mediator</b> 271:6	<b>methods</b> 202:12
281:4 284:2 285:2	<b>Macon</b> 208:22	302:9	<b>medically</b> 275:13	<b>metrics</b> 235:5
287:10 293:16	<b>Maggie</b> 202:20	<b>marginalized</b> 220:6	<b>meet</b> 196:6 242:10	311:1
296:10 317:6	203:5 207:18	236:9	242:10,16 291:2	<b>mic</b> 303:13
319:20 322:18	213:16 220:12	<b>Maricopa</b> 213:3	314:5	<b>Michael</b> 240:13
323:17 326:16	222:14 224:11	283:1	<b>meeting</b> 208:16	245:20,21
331:10	230:21 232:5	<b>Marine</b> 269:11	215:8 231:19	<b>Michigan</b> 277:21
<b>looked</b> 221:3	233:20 235:19	<b>mark</b> 251:4	257:2 299:10	<b>microphone</b> 263:1
242:14 248:10	238:18	<b>marked</b> 269:16	<b>meetings</b> 196:5	<b>mid</b> 307:1
258:20 285:14	<b>magistrate</b> 306:8	<b>marketing</b> 231:9	214:11,22 215:16	<b>middle</b> 269:1
325:17 329:8	<b>main</b> 264:11 306:9	<b>Martin</b> 309:16,17	220:1 223:19	<b>Midwest</b> 277:20
<b>looking</b> 199:16	<b>majority</b> 260:16,17	312:11 313:13	256:6,18,18 257:2	279:3
208:2,2 224:17,18	275:3	316:13 324:8	257:8,15 271:10	<b>Miller</b> 271:15
225:16,17 228:13	<b>making</b> 217:7	327:17 331:17	271:15 329:15,21	<b>million</b> 196:22
235:11 237:5,6,11	223:18 231:12	332:2	<b>member</b> 193:3	249:12
237:12 244:3	233:5 244:4	<b>masterful</b> 261:19	201:6,9 231:8	<b>millions</b> 285:4
256:9,10 265:9,10	245:17 247:17	262:6	238:7 240:14	<b>Milwaukee</b> 276:22
265:11 291:6	248:3 256:22	<b>match</b> 224:22	248:7 256:16	297:20
304:10 305:11	257:11,13 259:18	226:3,4 291:6	264:8	<b>mindful</b> 238:4
314:9 330:3 331:9	262:13 274:16	<b>materials</b> 196:2,3	<b>members</b> 198:14	<b>minimizing</b> 262:21
<b>loop</b> 297:4 310:19	288:20 298:11	200:1	198:16,22 199:1	<b>minimum</b> 197:12
<b>Los</b> 283:2	304:19 310:20	<b>matter</b> 249:18	200:6,12 204:19	237:1
<b>lost</b> 229:6	324:5	288:7	206:5,7 212:20	<b>minor-type</b> 237:13
<b>lot</b> 211:9 216:15	<b>maldistribution</b>	<b>matters</b> 198:12	226:22 230:11	<b>minutes</b> 200:16,16
223:6 232:13	270:4	278:17	240:6 260:5 268:5	200:17 267:21,22
233:3 236:4,19	<b>manage</b> 221:12	<b>Maxey</b> 307:8,9	274:5,17 282:6	<b>mirrors</b> 265:12,12



241:15	293:6,20 296:1,12	226:15,20 303:11	<b>oversight</b> 199:22	293:1 297:19
<b>observe</b> 222:4	319:9,19 321:8,17	303:20	221:14,15 306:15	316:15
226:2	321:21 322:9,15	<b>organizational</b>	<b>overstated</b> 221:20	<b>parties</b> 199:11
<b>obtain</b> 196:8	322:19 323:7,16	205:14 279:13		217:3 235:6
<b>obviously</b> 259:10	323:17 325:10,12	<b>organizationally</b>	<b>P</b>	248:20 258:14
330:13	325:13 326:6,19	281:3	<b>P.D</b> 207:8	302:1 328:7
<b>occur</b> 318:7	328:1,2,5,10	<b>organizations</b>	<b>p.m</b> 192:9	<b>partition</b> 229:4
<b>occurring</b> 330:20	<b>officially</b> 248:13	198:10 204:5	<b>pace</b> 209:20 243:18	<b>partly</b> 258:4
<b>occurs</b> 211:2 236:2	<b>oftentimes</b> 293:2	210:4 212:16	<b>Page</b> 253:19	<b>partner</b> 203:8
<b>October</b> 194:9	<b>okay</b> 202:17 220:20	257:3,3 269:8	<b>pages</b> 192:6 242:13	266:6
197:21	223:12 235:13	279:14,15 327:8	242:14	<b>partners</b> 208:10
<b>offender</b> 244:16	303:18	<b>organized</b> 259:20	<b>panacea</b> 294:1	209:16 245:14
<b>offenses</b> 237:13	<b>old</b> 264:8	<b>organizing</b> 209:16	<b>panels</b> 286:16	<b>partnerships</b> 206:4
<b>offer</b> 205:18 216:3	<b>ombuds</b> 278:19	<b>original</b> 259:1,1	<b>paper</b> 318:15	208:14
227:22 270:7	<b>once</b> 201:4 227:8	276:18 287:18	<b>papers</b> 231:20	<b>parts</b> 204:2 220:16
<b>offering</b> 227:4,5	235:4 278:11	333:12	<b>paragraphs</b> 221:6	286:17 312:7
<b>office</b> 193:11	319:3 321:15	<b>Orleans</b> 282:22	222:1 311:17	322:16
194:10,12 197:6	<b>one-on-one</b> 329:20	283:3	<b>Park</b> 262:13 270:14	<b>party</b> 254:8
197:17 198:4,18	<b>ones</b> 285:6 314:15	<b>outcomes</b> 209:12	298:10 324:5	<b>pass</b> 219:10 331:16
199:3,6 202:5,14	<b>online</b> 198:2	210:16	<b>part</b> 198:19 214:1	<b>passionate</b> 218:7
204:1,3 207:6	<b>onset</b> 212:6	<b>outlined</b> 274:10	225:19 233:1	233:21 306:21
214:10 219:20	<b>onwards</b> 240:20	<b>outreach</b> 216:12	237:5,21 238:16	<b>pat</b> 280:1 319:21
225:20 243:9,16	<b>open</b> 223:3 229:17	260:13 300:18	253:6 256:17	<b>path</b> 286:9 306:1
244:9 252:16,17	239:14 290:3	<b>outside</b> 195:18	259:8 265:18	<b>pathways</b> 322:5
272:19 278:16,18	308:19 320:20	202:9 211:2	268:8 276:15	<b>Patricia</b> 280:17
279:2 280:3,4,12	<b>operating</b> 307:9	243:20 244:3	288:15 293:11	<b>patrol</b> 275:10
280:14 282:8	308:1	289:1	307:20 313:10	<b>patrols</b> 304:10
306:9 307:15	<b>operational</b> 266:7	<b>overall</b> 197:10	322:17 328:7	<b>pattern</b> 194:14
<b>officer</b> 195:9,14	<b>operations</b> 265:21	<b>overambitious</b>	330:4	285:7
226:21 227:8	<b>opinions</b> 216:19	221:20	<b>partake</b> 228:5	<b>patterns</b> 311:4
233:15 243:5,9	218:19	<b>overarching</b> 205:4	<b>Partial</b> 290:12	319:5,12,21
260:10 299:17	<b>opportunities</b>	205:4	<b>participate</b> 216:12	<b>pause</b> 220:18
307:10 308:1,11	208:1,2,3 210:7	<b>overcrowding</b>	275:16	286:18 312:8,12
318:5,12,15	218:3 227:5 228:5	271:20 272:1	<b>participated</b> 198:6	312:18
322:20,22 323:10	228:7 260:20	<b>overhauling</b> 242:5	<b>participates</b> 216:11	<b>pay</b> 272:5
324:18 325:11	<b>opportunity</b> 202:1	247:3	<b>participating</b>	<b>paying</b> 216:10
<b>officer-involved</b>	204:12 207:21	<b>overlap</b> 252:4	215:19,22 218:20	<b>peace</b> 278:21
306:17	210:15,17 211:8	<b>overriding</b> 288:20	<b>participation</b>	<b>peer</b> 293:3,3
<b>officers</b> 195:7	211:10 219:8	<b>oversaw</b> 243:2,6,8	267:12 302:7	<b>Pension</b> 271:9
204:14,16,18	277:15 329:4	<b>oversee</b> 303:10	<b>particular</b> 209:6	<b>people</b> 195:6
205:1 209:2 226:5	<b>opposite</b> 234:8	<b>overseeing</b> 197:4	224:19 225:15	206:16 211:7
226:9 227:17	<b>order</b> 208:4 223:2	244:2 245:15	325:10	215:14,17,17
228:12,15 229:6,8	236:12 263:17	246:22 247:7	<b>particularly</b> 240:9	216:18 217:8
233:10,11 273:1	284:21 308:9,10	306:13 308:3	243:3 246:5,21	218:4 220:1,5
274:21 280:8	<b>Ordinance</b> 272:8	<b>overseen</b> 245:2	247:17 248:1,4	222:20,22 223:3
290:17,21 292:1	<b>organization</b>	<b>oversees</b> 243:16	253:7,12 260:14	229:12,14,17

230:12,14 234:15	266:20 267:2	201:5,8 202:2,8	261:7 262:10,14	211:3 251:17
236:5,15,17,21	277:18 310:10	222:10 224:1	263:16,20 264:19	256:10 265:11
240:11 248:22	320:1 323:11	232:21 239:19	265:2,4,4,7,21,22	306:5 314:8
249:21 252:16	329:17	257:21 262:8	266:7 269:16	<b>policing</b> 195:11,11
254:6 256:2	<b>person's</b> 308:19	264:10 286:1	270:17,22 272:12	195:12 198:12
257:13,14 258:21	<b>personal</b> 232:6,6	287:6 298:6	272:13 273:3,4	199:21 205:8,11
259:3,17,18,19	331:2 333:6,10	313:10 314:16	274:19,21 275:3,9	205:13,14 206:18
260:2 261:7,11	<b>personally</b> 280:6	317:2	275:19,22 276:5,5	208:7,21 212:2,7
273:8,12,18	<b>persons</b> 249:9	<b>pledge</b> 220:11	276:10,14 277:9	212:22 213:5
274:13 275:11	<b>perspective</b> 237:6	<b>point</b> 203:20 215:2	279:2,9,16 280:8	221:7 226:8,10,10
278:6 280:22	264:6 290:15	215:12,16 220:13	282:21,22 283:9	226:13 227:13,19
282:7,12 284:22	304:12	221:11,22 232:6	283:10,14,18,19	228:15 229:5,7,9
289:20,22 290:3	<b>Peter</b> 273:19,20	237:3 244:12	283:20 284:7,9	229:20 234:20,20
291:13 296:14	281:7,8,13 285:12	259:1 283:16	285:16 287:2	235:7 241:6 242:6
298:17 299:5	<b>phone</b> 301:10	284:20 288:12	288:6,7,17 289:22	244:13 263:14
301:15,16,18,19	<b>physical</b> 321:12	297:5 311:19	291:16 292:8,9,11	264:2,13 265:19
301:20 302:1	<b>physically</b> 225:21	<b>points</b> 212:14	292:21,22 293:6	265:20 283:10
309:10 312:14	<b>pick</b> 221:9 301:19	221:10 289:8,14	293:20 294:4,5,10	288:22 290:6,12
313:5,6,7 314:3	<b>picked</b> 237:20	<b>police</b> 192:1 193:7	294:20 295:2,4,12	290:13 291:22
314:21 315:14,15	282:7 295:2	194:1,13,20,21	296:1,2,3,9,12,15	292:1,2,5,6,7
319:19 320:15,17	<b>picnics</b> 328:7	198:11 204:14,18	297:2,5,7 298:7	293:19,22 294:6
320:20 322:2,19	<b>pieces</b> 232:1 242:3	204:20 205:7,18	298:12,16,18,22	294:14 295:9
322:21 323:3	245:16 285:18	206:4,18 207:2,7	299:1,15,16,17,20	298:20,22 304:9,9
324:15 325:16	<b>pile</b> 231:20	207:10,21 208:3,8	300:1,7,13,19	304:19 305:12
327:19 329:2,7	<b>pillars</b> 250:15	208:10,18 209:5,7	302:16,22 303:4,9	306:22 307:3
331:3	<b>pilot</b> 230:8	209:13,19 210:2	303:10 304:22	314:17,19,22
<b>perceived</b> 254:7	<b>Pinellas</b> 244:9	210:14,19,21	305:9 307:10,19	315:1,12,17
259:3	<b>pissing</b> 238:2	211:3 212:16	308:9,16 309:3,19	316:14,19 321:1
<b>percent</b> 326:10	<b>place</b> 220:6 222:12	213:7,9 225:22	309:22 310:6,22	325:3 326:5,6,7
<b>percentage</b> 213:12	222:19 223:19	226:9,17,20	311:3,10,20	326:10 327:1,5
<b>perception</b> 253:8	229:3 233:2 235:8	227:17,20 228:5,9	312:16,17 313:7	328:6,12 330:15
297:6	266:3 285:20	228:12 229:14	314:10,13,13	330:16,20 331:3
<b>perceptions</b> 259:7	318:4 324:22	233:10,11,15	315:14 316:1,7,7	<b>policy</b> 206:14 214:1
289:9,14,19	<b>placed</b> 208:13	234:7,11,16	316:16,18 317:1	225:11 226:3
<b>perform</b> 201:21	<b>places</b> 213:11 216:9	235:15,22 238:2	317:17 318:8	237:16 247:2
<b>performance</b> 199:8	222:18,19 256:22	239:10 241:22	319:22 320:11,17	266:7 304:17
<b>performing</b> 200:14	293:18	242:3,8 243:1,3,6	324:2,6,18 325:1	309:2 316:20
<b>period</b> 201:14	<b>plaintiffs'</b> 198:15	243:11,17,22	325:15 327:7,10	<b>political</b> 257:3
268:13 269:17	<b>plan</b> 224:2 249:7	244:20 245:4	327:21 328:1,1,4	<b>poor</b> 277:5
270:15 273:11	251:3,15 258:10	246:5,17,19 247:1	328:10 329:22	<b>populate</b> 282:14
274:1,15	262:3,6 267:6	247:6,7,8,21	331:6,11	<b>populated</b> 281:19
<b>person</b> 197:4	287:7 311:15,18	248:2 250:1,6	<b>police-community</b>	<b>portfolio</b> 242:2
226:15 248:8	317:3	251:8 253:13,16	272:17	<b>portraying</b> 318:5
249:1,5,8,9	<b>plans</b> 196:14 323:6	253:21 254:1,2,5	<b>policeman</b> 282:19	<b>position</b> 243:14
252:22 258:6	<b>plays</b> 325:3	254:17 257:8	282:20	312:1
259:10 264:6	<b>please</b> 200:18 201:1	260:2,15 261:1,5	<b>policies</b> 196:1	<b>positive</b> 249:1

260:21	<b>presided</b> 270:21	266:1	203:20 204:3	196:7 198:17
<b>possess</b> 259:10	<b>president</b> 206:9	<b>proceed</b> 239:20	205:5 242:7 245:2	199:2 218:3 222:2
<b>possible</b> 202:2	212:8 217:17	274:22 286:14	268:19 281:9	231:19 272:8
222:9 223:3	271:16 279:12	302:15,18 312:6	287:22 305:4	309:3
236:11	303:4	<b>proceedings</b> 192:7	330:5	<b>provided</b> 200:20
<b>posting</b> 251:21	<b>presidential</b> 311:8	332:6 333:4,8	<b>projects</b> 232:11	202:7 211:2
<b>posts</b> 247:6	<b>presumed</b> 272:4	<b>process</b> 194:5	245:3,3 268:20	244:20 309:6
<b>practical</b> 292:22	<b>presumption</b>	197:11,15 198:11	271:2 283:12	323:18
<b>practice</b> 194:14	235:10	198:20 203:3	306:18	<b>providers</b> 322:14
216:20 279:7,13	<b>pretty</b> 265:8 277:7	205:6 206:21	<b>promise</b> 203:2	<b>provides</b> 199:19
292:20 309:11	283:6 291:14	207:13 214:16	<b>promote</b> 309:1	202:12 316:2
<b>practiced</b> 203:7	<b>prevalent</b> 216:17	216:4 223:21	<b>promoted</b> 307:22	<b>providing</b> 303:22
<b>practices</b> 199:21	<b>prevent</b> 306:1	225:10 229:17	<b>promotes</b> 195:8	307:16 319:9
205:21 210:21	<b>primarily</b> 210:11	235:3 236:6,21	<b>promotion</b> 195:13	<b>public</b> 192:1 193:7
213:5 229:20	252:12	237:21 255:8	<b>proper</b> 320:13	195:21 196:5
241:7,7 282:22	<b>primary</b> 245:8	257:21 258:5	321:22	198:19 199:1
290:6 292:19	252:6 279:8 288:1	278:8 289:11,13	<b>proposal</b> 248:10	203:12 206:12
293:12 304:4	<b>primer</b> 307:4	297:15,22 306:4	249:11 274:3	210:20 219:13
310:15 321:1	<b>principle</b> 216:14	311:16 317:14	301:21 328:14,22	227:21 230:18
<b>practicing</b> 278:11	<b>principles</b> 215:3	326:3 330:14	<b>proposals</b> 197:18	231:1 232:16,17
<b>practitioners</b> 283:9	217:4 218:10	<b>processes</b> 290:3	197:20 198:1	236:2 265:1
284:12 304:17	223:17	320:20	199:19 258:21,22	268:11 269:16
<b>preceded</b> 272:13	<b>prior</b> 203:16,17	<b>produce</b> 230:14	259:5	271:18 275:12
<b>precincts</b> 209:1	214:12	<b>professionalism</b>	<b>propose</b> 257:19	295:14 296:11,19
<b>precipitated</b> 237:8	<b>priorities</b> 258:8	200:11	<b>proposed</b> 194:8	304:15 313:17
<b>precisely</b> 261:9,9	315:11	<b>professionals</b> 241:5	195:17 197:9	332:7
<b>predominant</b>	<b>prioritize</b> 315:5	283:16	220:17 249:13	<b>publish</b> 196:17
299:12	<b>prioritized</b> 315:9	<b>professor</b> 243:18	250:14 286:17	<b>published</b> 219:20
<b>preliminary</b> 203:13	<b>privacy</b> 308:15	278:20 283:17	312:7	<b>Puerto</b> 213:1
<b>preparation</b> 199:22	<b>private</b> 210:3 271:6	<b>professors</b> 258:19	<b>prosecuted</b> 296:11	<b>pull</b> 233:15 303:13
280:19	276:19	<b>program</b> 193:18	<b>prosecuting</b> 203:19	<b>purpose</b> 215:5,7,21
<b>prepare</b> 196:13	<b>probably</b> 268:12	210:1 212:5,8	274:20	215:22 223:20
<b>present</b> 241:1	312:13	228:20 232:9,10	<b>prosecution</b> 272:20	276:1 324:10
267:21 281:12	<b>problem</b> 316:5,11	275:15 276:1	<b>prosecutions</b>	329:17
<b>presentation</b>	<b>problem-solving</b>	285:12 291:1	280:11	<b>purposes</b> 204:5
198:21 200:18	265:20 315:20	292:4 295:9	<b>prosecutor</b> 203:18	322:8
202:18,19 238:16	<b>problematic</b> 248:18	<b>programming</b>	241:19,19,22	<b>pursuing</b> 258:6
239:6,14 259:2	<b>problems</b> 205:13	260:14	279:19,20 296:11	<b>push</b> 308:8 312:2
302:15,17	209:4,8 213:8,13	<b>programs</b> 210:4	<b>prosecutors</b> 241:3	<b>put</b> 218:14 222:12
<b>presentations</b>	227:6 230:13	222:11 291:8	280:14	235:22 248:18
200:17 239:9	264:14 272:17	293:17,22 314:9	<b>protect</b> 233:12	259:12 275:20
267:19	294:1,5,15 315:13	<b>progress</b> 195:20	<b>proved</b> 270:16	281:22 286:9
<b>presenter</b> 323:21	316:9	272:1	<b>proven</b> 205:19	288:19 295:22
<b>presenters</b> 239:3	<b>procedures</b> 196:1	<b>progresses</b> 289:9	234:7 262:10	296:12 301:15
302:12	237:17 247:2	<b>progressive</b> 283:20	295:3 298:7 324:2	302:1 311:16,18
<b>presents</b> 204:12	251:17 265:11	<b>project</b> 200:2	<b>provide</b> 194:2	318:4 321:5

<b>putting</b> 259:5	298:14 313:16 316:14	<b>realized</b> 291:17	<b>recorded</b> 318:12,15	242:3 251:9
<b>Q</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>really</b> 208:17	<b>records</b> 218:4	254:20 255:1
<b>qualifications</b> 197:12 258:2	<b>raise</b> 201:5,8 221:10	213:18 216:22	<b>recruiting</b> 223:4	261:20 295:15
<b>qualified</b> 257:20	<b>raised</b> 268:10	219:7 220:4	<b>recruitment</b> 195:13 278:8 284:13	307:20 308:7 310:19
<b>qualitative</b> 319:17 320:7	<b>RAJCAN</b> 192:15 333:1,21	222:21,22 223:8	300:9 306:5	<b>refrain</b> 202:2
<b>qualities</b> 259:10	<b>ran</b> 246:17 279:7	223:10,18 231:14	<b>recruits</b> 243:7	<b>refuse</b> 204:20
<b>quality</b> 233:6	<b>range</b> 214:19	231:21 232:1	<b>red</b> 320:2	<b>regarding</b> 196:7 202:13 203:12
<b>quant</b> 245:22	<b>ranged</b> 242:2	233:16,17 235:22	<b>redefine</b> 328:6	232:3
<b>quantitative</b> 308:12 319:14,16	<b>ranging</b> 276:22	236:5 237:13	<b>Redeploy</b> 212:4	<b>Region</b> 275:5
<b>quarterly</b> 220:1 271:11	<b>rapid</b> 209:20	238:5 249:19	<b>redevelopment</b> 271:2	<b>regular</b> 289:19
<b>question</b> 200:19	<b>rapidly</b> 309:7	252:5 259:16	<b>reduced</b> 212:5 327:6,6 333:5	<b>regulatory</b> 300:19
201:2,3,4 220:16	<b>Rasor-Cordero</b> 240:12 244:7	264:1 266:12	<b>reduces</b> 293:5	<b>relate</b> 257:8
222:15 224:13	263:12 264:21	276:3,7,11 277:10	<b>reducing</b> 213:8 272:1	<b>related</b> 258:1 280:18
233:1 234:2,4,18	<b>rates</b> 204:21	277:12 285:9,19	<b>reduction</b> 213:9	<b>relates</b> 211:6 225:18
238:12 239:17	<b>rational</b> 309:10	286:7,11 287:1	<b>reductions</b> 209:12 213:12,13	<b>relating</b> 246:7
255:15 257:5,6,17	<b>raw</b> 214:4 289:7	290:13,16 291:6	<b>reengineering</b> 242:7	<b>relations</b> 272:17
258:1,4 259:9,9	<b>RDR</b> 192:16 333:21	291:16 292:19	<b>reentry</b> 218:6	<b>relationship</b> 226:19 226:19,21 227:2
261:4,10,10 263:6	<b>reach</b> 199:12	295:19 297:21	<b>refer</b> 248:8	236:1 255:17
263:10 266:16,17	<b>reaching</b> 218:17 262:19	299:20 301:13,22	<b>reflective</b> 289:15	<b>relationships</b> 208:14,15,15
267:7 288:4	<b>react</b> 298:6 323:2	308:7,16 313:22	<b>reform</b> 198:11 211:5 212:3,22	209:11 210:8
302:21 313:12	<b>reaction</b> 323:21	314:5 321:6	272:12 274:18	211:11 223:15
<b>questions</b> 198:22	<b>reactions</b> 221:10	326:12 327:2	275:8,10 276:1,5	228:17
200:18,19,21,22	<b>read</b> 200:21 201:12	329:18 330:3,19	276:14,17,20	<b>relatively</b> 321:6
201:12,13,15,17	201:13,19 225:21	<b>reason</b> 237:20 248:12,15 308:20	277:8 278:22	<b>release</b> 308:18
201:19 202:2	234:3 242:13	<b>reasonable</b> 225:13	279:4,8 283:10,10	<b>released</b> 197:18
220:14 236:4	261:13 263:2	<b>reasonably</b> 268:7	283:13 284:2	<b>relentlessly</b> 219:18 236:12
238:9,10,15	298:4 319:20	<b>reasons</b> 254:9 264:11 294:12	285:1,21 288:7	<b>relevant</b> 201:20 243:4 246:5,21
239:15 255:12	329:7	297:12 313:19	293:2 295:19	280:5
267:11,22 276:13	<b>reading</b> 215:6 261:13,22 263:22	<b>reassemble</b> 230:8	296:15 303:10	<b>reluctance</b> 204:19
286:14 302:6,8,19	<b>ready</b> 302:15 330:11	<b>received</b> 202:15 270:7	304:5 305:10,16	<b>remain</b> 272:2
312:6 331:20,21	<b>real</b> 215:4 226:8,10	<b>recognize</b> 215:14 216:15 224:16,20	305:19,20 309:14	<b>reminding</b> 302:20
332:5	254:16 263:14	228:8,10 256:2	314:10	<b>remove</b> 218:5
<b>quick</b> 223:10 293:15	291:22 292:2	267:7	<b>reformed</b> 264:14 294:15	<b>reopen</b> 318:1
<b>quickly</b> 215:4 258:7,12 283:7	293:21 326:5,7	<b>recognized</b> 208:9	<b>reformer</b> 218:2	<b>repairing</b> 263:1
<b>Quintana</b> 206:11	331:13	<b>recommend</b> 197:7 199:12	<b>reformers</b> 295:3,4 295:16	<b>Reparations</b> 272:8
219:12,13 222:16	<b>reality</b> 254:4 259:4	<b>recommendation</b> 199:10,14,15	<b>reforms</b> 195:10 207:1 235:2,4	<b>replicate</b> 298:2
235:21 238:22	<b>realize</b> 249:17,19	<b>recommendations</b> 203:14 222:7		<b>replicated</b> 298:1
<b>quite</b> 253:15 258:20 261:18		314:18		<b>report</b> 195:20
		<b>record</b> 311:7		

203:13 214:5	235:13	<b>Richmond</b> 209:15	300:21 304:8,10	<b>school</b> 203:15
225:21 259:13	<b>resigned</b> 311:22	<b>Rick</b> 304:21,21	304:14 309:20,20	210:20 231:1
263:3,4 272:13	<b>resolve</b> 322:5	314:21 326:8	310:3,5 326:14	243:10 252:14
282:11 306:9	323:12	330:11	<b>roles</b> 249:21	258:18 268:12,15
313:7 317:14	<b>resources</b> 290:21	<b>Rickman</b> 206:17	<b>roll</b> 264:2 322:9	268:17,18 269:10
<b>reported</b> 192:14	308:8 331:7	<b>Rico</b> 213:1	<b>rolled</b> 251:9	269:18 270:3
209:2 224:5	<b>respect</b> 195:6	<b>right</b> 219:17 223:6	<b>room</b> 217:20	278:2,10 324:19
287:10 317:6	200:11 204:10	230:16 231:15	248:20 249:10,15	324:20
333:3	273:5 284:5,15	233:15 234:1	<b>roots</b> 252:13	<b>school-age</b> 233:22
<b>Reporter</b> 333:2	305:3	236:1,3 239:7	<b>round</b> 276:15	<b>schools</b> 203:12,13
<b>reporting</b> 214:20	<b>respond</b> 193:5	240:10 242:21	<b>routes</b> 276:8	211:1 230:19
214:21 217:8	198:21 225:18	254:9 255:14	<b>run</b> 241:5 317:19	232:12,16,17,17
224:8 251:19,20	234:13 262:7	256:22 257:1	<b>running</b> 204:2,4	296:19
274:7 287:13	332:1	267:10 272:16	242:9 278:7 319:3	<b>science</b> 304:19
306:8 317:9	<b>responding</b> 305:12	280:10,21 284:4	<b>Russia</b> 262:14	<b>Scott</b> 280:1
<b>reports</b> 196:17	<b>response</b> 322:11	286:13 299:3	298:12,13 299:4	<b>screen</b> 256:9
199:22 224:18	<b>responses</b> 197:20	302:1 310:14	324:7	<b>Seattle</b> 283:2 285:8
271:12 319:22	225:1 317:13	312:5,6 323:19	<b>Rutgers</b> 295:14	293:18 307:10,14
329:7	331:19	328:13 330:20		307:15,18 308:8
<b>represent</b> 302:2	<b>responsibilities</b>	331:18	<b>S</b>	308:15,21 309:2
<b>representatives</b>	237:5	<b>rights</b> 195:6 200:2	s/ 333:21	318:6 321:5
198:3	<b>responsibility</b>	232:7 269:7,21	<b>Sacramento</b> 305:2	322:11
<b>represented</b> 302:3	225:19 227:12	270:1 280:11	305:6	<b>second</b> 198:7
<b>reproduced</b> 333:15	229:4 333:14	283:15 305:4	<b>safe</b> 203:3,20	244:18 259:8,9
<b>reputation</b> 271:3	<b>responsible</b> 227:1	<b>riots</b> 269:13 279:2	216:14,18 220:6	273:20 313:12
<b>Request</b> 197:18	<b>responsiveness</b>	305:14,15	223:1 228:12	322:17
199:19	302:8	<b>risk</b> 294:22	236:18 287:22	<b>secondly</b> 251:12
<b>requested</b> 307:20	<b>result</b> 238:3 304:2	<b>RMR</b> 192:16	<b>safer</b> 205:5 206:10	323:12
<b>requesting</b> 305:15	313:1	333:21	217:18 218:2	<b>sectors</b> 209:1,2
<b>Requests</b> 198:1	<b>resulting</b> 273:1	<b>road</b> 251:3,11	228:16 233:5	221:16
<b>require</b> 195:10	<b>retail</b> 315:22	262:6	326:19,19 327:14	<b>see</b> 204:17,19,21
<b>required</b> 196:2	<b>retired</b> 268:7 271:5	<b>robbery</b> 237:9	<b>safety</b> 195:9 206:12	227:20 233:15
206:2 221:21	271:14 275:22	<b>Robert</b> 197:5	219:13 236:2	237:22 250:4
<b>requirements</b>	<b>retiring</b> 305:8	<b>Rodney</b> 205:16	243:10 265:1	274:13 281:17
195:19 254:22	<b>return</b> 270:8	207:15,18,19	295:14 304:15	292:22 293:20
<b>requires</b> 195:17	<b>revamped</b> 230:3	213:1 224:15	313:17	296:6,9 306:5
196:20 326:16	<b>revert</b> 254:14	227:16 237:3	<b>Sam</b> 283:19	308:12 318:19
<b>reread</b> 201:2	<b>review</b> 195:22	238:21	<b>San</b> 276:22 285:20	319:5 328:18
<b>research</b> 205:21	250:22 271:11	<b>role</b> 194:4 201:20	286:4 298:1	330:7
221:19 280:21	305:15 306:15,16	201:21 214:7	<b>sat</b> 263:2 285:12	<b>seeing</b> 290:20
304:1,5 305:9	308:5 320:7,10	215:10 217:1,5,5	<b>satisfactory</b> 237:1	<b>seek</b> 202:22 203:1
<b>researchers</b> 219:2	<b>Reviewing</b> 306:4	218:19 243:6	<b>saw</b> 324:18	<b>seen</b> 208:20 272:22
304:17	<b>reviews</b> 196:16	244:19 248:9,11	<b>saying</b> 256:7	293:18 295:9
<b>resident</b> 211:22	242:2 305:10	248:17 249:20,20	<b>says</b> 234:5 255:17	327:21
219:6 267:1	<b>revised</b> 196:1	266:19 267:9	257:17	<b>segregation</b> 268:13
<b>residents</b> 204:15,17	<b>revitalized</b> 230:3	269:20 300:3,8,13	<b>Schiff</b> 202:19 203:8	269:8

<b>selected</b> 302:1	<b>sex</b> 236:17 244:15 313:6	<b>silo</b> 318:17	<b>solve</b> 227:6 294:5 299:2,3 316:5	207:20 241:21 242:22 244:8 245:10 253:22 254:1 275:2,6 304:3 305:8 306:12
<b>selecting</b> 197:11	<b>sexual</b> 203:12	<b>similar</b> 286:2 293:8 306:4 316:9	<b>solved</b> 294:7 299:18	<b>spoke</b> 213:1 258:4 262:18,18 266:16 325:4
<b>selection</b> 194:4 197:15 198:20	<b>share</b> 202:6 218:14 219:4 223:3 224:14 327:20	<b>simple</b> 233:4	<b>somebody</b> 193:5 325:1	<b>spreadsheets</b> 256:10
<b>self</b> 311:3	<b>shared</b> 219:7 227:12 273:6	<b>simplification</b> 250:20	<b>sons</b> 270:13,15	<b>squad</b> 245:8
<b>self-analysis</b> 318:9	<b>sharing</b> 216:19	<b>simply</b> 272:5 298:16	<b>sorry</b> 232:19 303:19 321:20	<b>squads</b> 245:7
<b>senior</b> 280:2 295:13 303:3	<b>sheriff</b> 271:18	<b>single</b> 199:12	<b>sort</b> 215:6	<b>St</b> 306:7
<b>sense</b> 214:16 250:2 250:5,7,8 251:22 253:10,16	<b>sheriff's</b> 244:9 306:14,20	<b>sit</b> 225:20,20 235:4 326:9,22	<b>sorts</b> 254:22	<b>staff</b> 201:5,9 219:21 304:16,18 307:5 329:2,10 330:4
<b>sensitive</b> 245:12 257:10	<b>shielding</b> 322:1	<b>sitting</b> 256:8 262:22 272:4,16 276:2	<b>sought</b> 272:8	<b>staffing</b> 322:10
<b>separate</b> 199:14	<b>shift</b> 279:15 323:1	<b>situation</b> 322:6	<b>sounding</b> 294:22	<b>staffs</b> 256:2
<b>separation</b> 263:15	<b>shifts</b> 226:1	<b>situations</b> 293:9	<b>source</b> 288:2	<b>stage</b> 193:16 200:16 202:3 262:22
<b>sergeant's</b> 198:16	<b>shooting</b> 280:18	<b>six</b> 203:9 277:2 288:12	<b>South</b> 259:14 270:14	<b>staggering</b> 263:5
<b>Sergio</b> 280:8,10 282:17	<b>shootings</b> 213:9 306:17	<b>size</b> 266:3	<b>space</b> 216:14,18 236:18 314:4 329:6	<b>stakeholder</b> 198:9 257:2
<b>series</b> 214:10	<b>Shore</b> 270:14	<b>skilled</b> 265:8	<b>spaces</b> 223:1,2	<b>stakeholders</b> 196:7 198:8 206:21 248:21 258:15 271:16
<b>serious</b> 327:6	<b>shored</b> 222:4	<b>Skills</b> 307:3	<b>Spanish</b> 193:14,18	<b>stamp</b> 254:13
<b>seriously</b> 223:13 325:7	<b>short</b> 198:21 239:4 241:12 267:17 302:11,13	<b>Skokie</b> 262:12 298:9 324:4	<b>speak</b> 222:22 240:17 242:20 245:3,22 246:15 248:6 250:14,21 252:8 260:6,7 262:15 264:22 305:21 319:1	<b>stand</b> 296:13 320:4 <b>standard</b> 235:14 321:6
<b>serve</b> 195:8 210:17 211:14 326:20	<b>short-sighted</b> 298:17	<b>slide</b> 219:15 284:17	<b>speaking</b> 202:3 258:14,15 314:3	<b>standards</b> 216:20 235:12 275:18
<b>served</b> 212:8 244:10,22 245:7 271:6 278:19 282:20,22 322:8	<b>shorthand</b> 333:2,4	<b>slightly</b> 221:20 321:13	<b>spearhead</b> 245:21	<b>stands</b> 290:19
<b>serves</b> 204:17 273:22	<b>shove</b> 256:15	<b>small</b> 223:2 244:21	<b>spearheading</b> 242:6	<b>stark</b> 262:17 263:15
<b>service</b> 294:6 316:2	<b>show</b> 285:7 293:7 327:8	<b>smaller</b> 246:19 247:1	<b>special</b> 229:9 271:7 271:9 280:14 281:16 306:18	<b>start</b> 209:9 227:13 237:11,12 240:2,5 268:6 278:11 294:3,7 297:17 299:16 311:20 314:6,6,7 315:10 319:4 321:11
<b>services</b> 195:4 209:18,19,20,21	<b>showed</b> 293:4	<b>smarter</b> 315:18	<b>speaking</b> 202:3 258:14,15 314:3	
<b>servicing</b> 300:15 320:13	<b>side</b> 211:13 259:14 259:14 278:13 319:15	<b>snapping</b> 231:16	<b>spearhead</b> 245:21	
<b>session</b> 193:20 194:6 202:4	<b>sides</b> 295:22 296:6 296:9 308:4	<b>snippets</b> 208:19	<b>spearheading</b> 242:6	
<b>set</b> 198:7 215:2 252:7 285:10 310:16 311:14,14 323:11 333:17	<b>sign</b> 193:13,15	<b>social</b> 206:12 209:17,18 219:13 231:9 278:21	<b>special</b> 229:9 271:7 271:9 280:14 281:16 306:18	
<b>sets</b> 224:17	<b>signal</b> 201:5,8	<b>socially</b> 234:9 262:11 298:9 324:3	<b>specialists</b> 241:4	
<b>settle</b> 194:11	<b>signed</b> 333:13	<b>Sodiqa</b> 206:9 217:12,15,16 223:9 231:7 232:19,22 233:21	<b>specialize</b> 231:11	
<b>settlement</b> 206:19 207:9 210:18	<b>significant</b> 208:5 219:8 243:2 275:6 283:22	<b>soft</b> 315:17	<b>specific</b> 249:18 328:15	
<b>seven</b> 276:21	<b>significantly</b> 210:16	<b>sole</b> 329:17	<b>specifically</b> 224:4 246:6 287:9 317:5	
	<b>silence</b> 224:4 287:9 288:9 317:5	<b>solution</b> 220:9	<b>spell</b> 231:19	
	<b>silenced</b> 220:5	<b>solutions</b> 209:6	<b>spelled</b> 274:11	
			<b>spending</b> 256:12	
			<b>spent</b> 203:22	

<b>started</b> 202:17 208:8 229:3,8 244:18 275:12 277:1 278:6,22 279:6,20 282:6 285:21 286:1 288:15 304:1 305:11 314:15	252:16 <b>stood</b> 311:11 <b>stop</b> 213:4 255:13 286:8 318:13 <b>stop-and-frisk-re...</b> 244:2 <b>stops</b> 318:18 <b>stories</b> 324:21 327:20 <b>story</b> 224:21 324:16 <b>straddle</b> 295:22 <b>straight</b> 250:18 252:3 <b>strategies</b> 216:11 227:20 265:16 <b>strategy</b> 217:14 300:17 310:1 <b>street</b> 224:10 235:11 245:9 268:18,22 269:1,5 289:16,18 328:1	<b>submit</b> 199:14 302:20 <b>submitted</b> 197:19 198:22 217:9 <b>submitting</b> 202:12 <b>subparagraphs</b> 311:17 <b>subsequently</b> 239:18 <b>substantive</b> 195:11 <b>suburban</b> 234:10 <b>success</b> 213:11 331:10 <b>successes</b> 300:2 <b>successful</b> 205:5,20 212:1 218:5 293:18 298:15,22 314:12 <b>successfully</b> 205:12 331:9 <b>suffer</b> 324:11 <b>sufficient</b> 319:15 <b>sum</b> 284:4 322:16 <b>summarize</b> 197:13 <b>summer</b> 260:15,17 <b>summit</b> 232:11 <b>supervision</b> 195:14 <b>supervisor</b> 245:11 <b>supervisors</b> 306:19 <b>supervisory</b> 243:14 <b>supplemental</b> 197:20 <b>support</b> 278:17,17 290:21 <b>supports</b> 265:22 <b>Supreme</b> 271:14,14 <b>sure</b> 216:2 217:8,15 222:17 223:18 232:15 241:15 244:4 245:17 247:17 248:3 251:17 256:19,22 257:11,13 259:2,4 259:6 264:17 266:9 272:3 274:16 283:6	284:16 288:20 289:12 290:9 294:18 297:13 303:15 310:20 318:22 320:12 325:6 <b>surgical</b> 330:2 <b>surveys</b> 196:11 246:14 329:19 <b>sustainable</b> 233:19 <b>swaths</b> 243:2 <b>symptomology</b> 321:15 <b>symptoms</b> 321:9 <b>system</b> 210:3,6,20 212:2 246:7 273:8 <b>systematically</b> 218:5 <b>systemic</b> 317:22 319:8 <b>systems</b> 218:2 246:8 308:10 318:3,9,11,17,21 318:22 319:2,3,13 320:6,7,9,11,14 325:8	262:21 267:1 270:15 273:12,20 280:10 282:15 283:7 303:6 307:2 310:10 314:1,1,3 316:12 317:18,19 318:10 319:19 325:11 331:15 <b>talked</b> 226:15,16 273:4,8,17 286:20 290:10 291:12 299:8,9 329:6 <b>talking</b> 208:22 218:18 223:11 232:1 233:8,9,10 259:17,17 288:16 289:18 312:13 321:11 <b>tap</b> 331:4 <b>task</b> 194:22 275:12 275:13 306:20 <b>tasked</b> 303:22 <b>tasks</b> 235:2,4 <b>taught</b> 270:9 277:8 290:18 <b>teach</b> 270:8 290:16 <b>team</b> 194:2 196:15 199:12 200:6,10 201:3,13 202:21 203:6,21 204:8 205:3,9,15 206:6 206:8 207:17 211:12 212:20 213:16,18,20,20 214:2,2 218:8,10 218:13 222:3,13 222:15 224:4 230:3,9,10,22 231:8 235:18 240:6,9,14,15,21 248:7 256:5,16 257:22 260:1,5 264:16 266:13 267:20 268:1,5 274:2,5,9,17 280:5,9,15 284:1
<b>T</b>				
<b>table</b> 193:19 202:9 261:6 276:15 <b>tables</b> 240:22 <b>tackled</b> 205:12 <b>take</b> 220:13 222:19 223:19 237:13 238:5,12 239:1 251:2 263:20 267:13 282:3 284:14 287:16 288:2 300:20 301:11 <b>taken</b> 220:21 290:19 325:7 326:1 333:10 <b>talk</b> 210:10 217:13 223:10,16,18 227:17 240:6,8,20				

284:5,5,11,11 287:10 288:19 292:18 294:17 295:1,1,6,16 296:8 301:2,15 309:12 311:20 312:1 317:5,14 322:8,18 326:1 329:14,14 <b>team's</b> 200:18 212:14 229:19 290:5,15 320:22 <b>teams</b> 196:21 198:5 198:6,20 200:15 201:1 256:1 291:19 305:17,18 <b>Teamsters</b> 271:8 <b>technical</b> 206:1 214:4 244:20 279:5 303:10,22 304:6 312:3 320:6 <b>techniques</b> 315:19 <b>technology</b> 200:3 231:15 304:20 <b>tell</b> 213:10 224:21 225:3 226:13 231:10 233:20 246:18 250:17 257:21 268:9,12 272:11 297:7 325:11 <b>ten</b> 195:10 283:11 <b>ten-minute</b> 239:2 <b>tenure</b> 279:10 <b>term</b> 316:14 <b>terms</b> 218:20,22 223:20 255:16 259:9 265:19 266:6 328:16 329:9 <b>terrorism</b> 305:13 <b>Terry</b> 318:13 <b>test</b> 230:8 <b>thank</b> 193:4,12 202:20 207:18 211:19 213:15	217:15 219:11 220:15 223:22 224:1 226:7 228:18 229:12 230:16 238:8,8,17 238:18,20,21,22 239:21,22 240:3 250:12 255:11,14 260:22 267:11,12 267:15 268:2 286:13 289:20 291:21 293:14 294:11 296:17 298:4 299:22 300:22 302:5,7,9 302:10,22 303:2 312:4,5 313:4 314:16 317:2 320:15 326:4 328:21 330:6 331:19 332:2,3,4 <b>thanking</b> 240:2 <b>thanks</b> 240:4 <b>thereof</b> 333:13 <b>Theron</b> 282:19 <b>they'd</b> 259:15,16 259:20 276:10 <b>thick</b> 231:20 <b>thing</b> 221:22 223:5 225:3 226:17,18 227:7 232:6,20 236:7 280:4 284:22 293:16 295:21 316:17 321:8 326:8 327:18 329:8 <b>things</b> 197:14 208:17 217:3 221:12 222:4 224:15,19 228:7 228:21 237:10 238:5,6 241:2 242:11,15 244:12 249:15,16 250:1 251:2 255:8 256:4 256:6,15 261:20	262:22 263:17 287:17 292:18 293:18 296:5,16 311:4 312:11 314:9 320:1 325:21 326:18 <b>think</b> 211:8,9 220:4 221:7,13,18,22 222:4 228:22 229:3 231:22 233:3 236:19 237:4 254:2 258:3 261:6 262:3 263:5 264:1 265:8 266:17 267:8 277:12,15 280:5 286:11,22 289:1 290:9 292:14 293:7,11,15 295:2 296:7,8,15 299:4 300:8,16 301:12 311:9 312:12,19 313:1,13,22 314:11 315:21 316:14 324:9,14 325:3,18 327:17 328:4,9 <b>thinking</b> 250:7 313:3 <b>third</b> 216:14 <b>Thompson</b> 277:19 277:19 289:4 292:14 300:5 302:9 <b>thoroughly</b> 310:11 <b>thought</b> 301:17 <b>thoughts</b> 202:6 216:19 232:3 <b>three</b> 196:18 207:22 254:11 263:3 269:22 272:6 280:17 306:12 310:17 <b>tied</b> 253:12 <b>ties</b> 253:3 255:21 264:16 294:17	<b>time</b> 203:11 215:18 217:9 219:20 225:14 241:21 244:18 245:19 247:21 252:20 253:2,4 255:6,9 255:10 256:12 268:19 270:18,18 271:22 273:11 275:7 284:17 285:10 310:8,12 311:8,15 322:1,3 326:11 <b>timeliness</b> 225:12 <b>times</b> 214:20,20,21 226:1 233:3 265:5 296:5 <b>tips</b> 299:16 <b>title</b> 270:3 308:2 <b>today</b> 193:15 197:8 198:19 199:2 200:15 206:8 217:20,22 218:14 238:19 240:3,16 240:19 261:13 <b>today's</b> 193:9 199:8 202:4 <b>token</b> 225:5 <b>told</b> 226:17 266:13 281:6 <b>Tom</b> 285:12 295:10 <b>tonight</b> 312:4 <b>tool</b> 295:18 <b>tools</b> 290:22 291:6 291:9 <b>top</b> 258:8 265:10 <b>topic</b> 201:15,19 <b>torture</b> 272:9 <b>touch</b> 289:8,14 301:8 <b>touched</b> 242:7 311:18 <b>town</b> 256:6 269:1 <b>track</b> 325:8 <b>tracking</b> 256:11 <b>traditional</b> 264:12	294:14 <b>trafficking</b> 313:18 <b>train</b> 228:5 <b>trained</b> 321:17 <b>trainer</b> 244:22 <b>training</b> 195:13 196:1 211:2 225:11 226:4 228:7 230:4,9 232:12 237:17 242:5 243:7,7,8 244:10 247:3 265:12 279:5 290:16 291:8 300:9 308:5,9 316:20 321:19 326:16 331:7 <b>transactions</b> 271:11 <b>transcribed</b> 333:10 <b>transcript</b> 192:7 333:8,12 <b>transcription</b> 333:6 <b>transform</b> 205:6 212:16 <b>transformation</b> 202:22 <b>transition</b> 239:2 267:13 <b>translate</b> 331:5 <b>translated</b> 289:16 <b>translation</b> 193:18 <b>translators</b> 219:3 <b>transparency</b> 195:15 207:5 250:3,3 262:19 296:22 297:14 308:15 309:1 <b>transparent</b> 207:13 255:8 308:19 <b>trapped</b> 325:13 <b>treated</b> 234:15 278:7 299:5 <b>tremendous</b> 287:17 297:17 301:18 <b>trends</b> 311:4
---	--	--	--	---

<b>trial</b> 272:4	<b>types</b> 214:19 238:5	240:18 246:16	<b>values</b> 214:2,4	<b>Walker</b> 283:19
<b>trials</b> 280:3	270:2 273:13	<b>unhappy</b> 265:6	<b>variety</b> 201:16	<b>walks</b> 327:15
<b>tried</b> 270:1	295:15 325:21	<b>union</b> 198:17	226:1 291:12,19	<b>want</b> 207:14 213:18
<b>triggerpoints</b> 323:8	<b>typewriting</b> 333:5	<b>unique</b> 205:11	313:19	218:14 221:2,10
<b>triple</b> 224:6 287:11	<b>typically</b> 309:4	240:9 252:9	<b>various</b> 196:6	222:17,20 226:2
317:7		265:15 285:20	200:8 225:22	227:16 235:21
<b>trooper</b> 275:5	<b>U</b>	330:16 331:2	245:2,2 260:11	240:2,5,7,20
<b>troubled</b> 230:11	<b>U.S</b> 204:1,2 247:10	<b>unit</b> 244:15,16	310:13	242:20 244:6
274:19	269:11 270:20	265:10 310:16	<b>vast</b> 260:16 275:3	246:15 248:6
<b>true</b> 208:9,15 320:3	272:19 280:12,13	<b>unite</b> 208:3	<b>versed</b> 241:6,7	249:9 250:13,20
333:7	305:17	<b>United</b> 194:19	<b>versus</b> 210:5	252:8 258:17,22
<b>truly</b> 218:9 233:5	<b>UIC</b> 206:16	198:15 244:21	306:11	259:2,6 260:7
<b>trust</b> 195:7 204:22	<b>ultimately</b> 197:2	245:12 265:2	<b>vested</b> 274:16	263:8 265:4
207:1,13 216:21	276:20 277:1	305:5 307:13	<b>vet</b> 258:22 266:20	267:10 284:14
217:2,2 223:14	289:2	330:21	<b>veteran</b> 245:7	286:8,9 289:4,12
227:7,9,14 233:13	<b>unconstitutional</b>	<b>units</b> 229:9,10	<b>vetting</b> 267:3	296:22 297:7
263:6,19 264:4	194:15	<b>University</b> 206:13	<b>vibrant</b> 207:22	302:7 308:18
288:13,17 289:2	<b>undergrad</b> 277:20	206:15 243:19	<b>vice</b> 206:9 217:17	316:6,9 331:15,19
290:13 293:5,20	<b>underscore</b> 249:10	283:17 291:5	279:12 303:3	<b>wanted</b> 219:4 281:8
294:2,6 299:8,11	<b>understand</b> 205:10	295:15 300:1,6	<b>victimized</b> 313:15	281:13 282:3
299:13,15,19	215:20 220:8	<b>unmovable</b> 240:18	<b>victims</b> 272:9 273:2	310:10 311:11
301:3 314:6	226:2 227:21	<b>unnamed</b> 248:11	280:7	<b>wants</b> 231:15
327:19	228:16 230:19	<b>unrest</b> 304:2	<b>videotaping</b> 275:14	265:17 316:6,8
<b>truth</b> 317:19	231:2,12 235:9	<b>unusual</b> 221:7	<b>view</b> 218:19 247:4	<b>Washington</b> 203:8
319:12	236:20 241:11	291:15	248:17 249:1	277:21 303:5
<b>try</b> 200:20 222:21	246:8 267:8	<b>updating</b> 246:8	261:19,19 297:5	<b>watches</b> 228:3
234:2,3,17 271:19	296:19 297:1	<b>upgrades</b> 246:7	<b>viewed</b> 259:15	<b>Watson</b> 283:21
326:9	309:11 321:15,16	<b>urban</b> 207:16,22	<b>VII</b> 270:3	291:5
<b>turn</b> 202:8 207:14	322:2 326:13	<b>use</b> 195:12 204:20	<b>violence</b> 204:8	<b>way</b> 215:7 217:11
211:17 213:18	327:2 329:21	212:11 213:8	213:9 231:5	220:18 231:17
217:12 230:14	<b>understandable</b>	238:11 306:4	244:15 245:9	234:8,12 235:2
<b>turned</b> 230:5	299:11	315:22 318:14	<b>Virginia</b> 209:15	251:18 254:15
292:10	<b>understanding</b>	<b>use-of-force</b> 277:5	<b>virtually</b> 241:13	260:21 265:15
<b>turns</b> 298:20,21	222:18 225:1	<b>uses</b> 194:15 225:3,7	319:7	276:13 286:19
<b>two</b> 196:12 215:18	227:18 264:4	315:18	<b>Visible</b> 287:19	302:2 305:22
221:9 240:11	297:11 304:14	<b>utilize</b> 328:9	<b>vital</b> 228:2	306:7 307:5
256:1 258:8	314:7,17 321:9,21	<b>utilized</b> 328:5	<b>voice</b> 214:3 224:22	308:12 312:9,16
269:14 270:13	323:7 327:15		224:22 289:13	313:15 315:22
280:14 296:4	329:3	<b>V</b>	<b>voices</b> 216:2,3	316:10 319:10
299:10 305:18	<b>understands</b>	<b>valid</b> 308:20	218:11 220:13	324:9,10 325:16
313:10 322:8	202:21 205:3	<b>validate</b> 251:10	222:12 313:5	327:18 328:3
329:2	<b>undocumented</b>	<b>valuable</b> 248:1	<b>VOLUME</b> 192:5	330:22 331:1
<b>type</b> 210:22 237:7,8	313:6	<b>value</b> 208:9,13	<b>volunteering</b> 228:3	<b>ways</b> 219:1,16
237:10,15,18	<b>unfettered</b> 317:17	216:6 228:8,9,10		243:11 251:22
265:9 273:9	319:18	229:1 248:5	<b>W</b>	289:6
325:12,15	<b>unfortunately</b>	293:21	<b>walk</b> 217:1 263:4	<b>we'll</b> 214:20,20,21

216:10,19 219:19 223:5 225:17 239:1 254:12,14 255:4,5,5,6 258:5 273:20 286:14 302:11 312:6 <b>we're</b> 208:22 211:1 213:1 216:22 217:8 218:17,18 220:13 221:8 231:3,22 232:1 233:8,9,18,21 234:11 239:5,8,13 241:1 250:5 251:5 251:18,19,19 252:21 256:22 257:1,1,2,4,11 258:8 265:3,5,8 267:4,13,18 274:12 277:7 286:4 289:7 290:20 291:4 299:1 300:15 301:15 317:22 329:20 330:11,14 331:9 <b>we've</b> 212:18 223:12 251:6,7,12 252:7 258:20 271:22 282:15 284:8 286:20 289:9 293:18 297:18 315:6 327:12 329:5,6,7 329:8 <b>wear</b> 324:13 <b>Webb</b> 280:15 <b>website</b> 202:12 219:19 251:21 <b>wedding</b> 280:9 <b>week</b> 199:5 288:10 <b>welcome</b> 193:6 220:12 314:4 <b>welfare</b> 228:14,14 271:9 <b>wellness</b> 195:14	<b>went</b> 252:13 258:18 269:10 277:1,21 296:5 305:4 307:18 310:12 <b>West</b> 259:14 <b>whatsoever</b> 259:7 <b>WHEREOF</b> 333:17 <b>white</b> 269:3 <b>wholesome</b> 209:12 <b>wholly</b> 329:1,11 <b>wide</b> 214:19 <b>wide-ranging</b> 245:16 <b>wiggle</b> 249:14 <b>Williams</b> 206:9 217:13,15,16 223:9 231:7 232:19,22 <b>willing</b> 228:4 <b>Winnetka</b> 262:12 298:9 324:4 <b>Winston</b> 280:15 <b>withhold</b> 308:21 <b>witness</b> 280:19 333:17 <b>witnessed</b> 269:15 <b>witnesses</b> 273:2 280:7,19 295:22 319:19 <b>woman</b> 324:17 <b>women</b> 236:16 304:8 313:5 <b>won</b> 276:21 <b>word</b> 261:4 <b>words</b> 299:10,12 <b>work</b> 197:6 199:9 203:19 209:9 217:21 218:3,4 221:21 227:5,15 228:20 229:8 230:6 245:22 246:3 247:12 254:5 264:18,22 266:4 273:5 275:10 276:11	277:10,12 278:3,4 279:12 281:15 283:22 284:18,21 285:18 292:6,10 292:13,21 293:1 294:19 296:14 297:19 299:17,20 300:6 303:7,11 304:1,3,5,7,11,12 304:13 305:14 308:14 313:6,16 313:20 320:5 322:14,18 325:12 327:12,13,22 329:5,19 331:13 <b>worked</b> 203:18 213:14 230:6 232:11 253:21 275:17 277:22 278:12,13,15,20 278:22 279:9,13 279:16,21 280:1 280:14,15 281:11 281:14 283:11 284:18 285:9 287:21 291:12 293:4 295:10,11 296:2 312:21 323:9 330:9 <b>workers</b> 236:17 <b>working</b> 200:7 206:5 208:10 210:3 218:8 230:11 241:22 242:4 243:19 244:3 245:11 252:17 260:1 264:13 278:6 279:1,4,6 280:8 280:16,18 286:4 291:4,5,14,20 294:4,14 300:3 301:22 305:7,22 309:22 311:21 315:10 329:12,13 <b>works</b> 226:22	227:19 245:13 266:3 274:16 292:17 293:19 295:20 322:21 323:1 <b>workshops</b> 226:12 <b>World</b> 283:19 <b>wouldn't</b> 234:21 301:20 <b>wrap</b> 219:4 237:17 <b>wrapped</b> 225:11 <b>wrinkles</b> 268:13 <b>write</b> 200:19,20 238:13 <b>written</b> 197:20,22 198:21 199:7 200:1 235:1 238:10 316:21 <b>wrong</b> 282:7 301:19 310:15 <b>wrote</b> 275:18 283:18 309:2 <hr/> <b>X</b> <hr/> <hr/> <b>Y</b> <hr/> <b>yeah</b> 219:17 230:1 <b>year</b> 196:13,22 208:17,17 269:21 <b>years</b> 196:12,19 203:6,22 207:20 211:22 212:3,9 215:18 230:2,13 238:1 243:1,21 244:9 245:10 246:10 247:10 249:11 253:22 254:11,11,12 256:19 264:8 269:22 271:13 272:6,14,15 280:1 282:20 283:12 285:4 304:3 305:1 305:9 306:12 <b>yelled</b> 322:3 <b>yesterday</b> 198:6 248:22 258:16	263:2 <b>York</b> 207:6 241:19 243:1,13,22 245:9 252:22 256:9 269:21 279:21 <b>young</b> 211:6 291:7 324:17 <b>youth</b> 210:2,4,5 212:5 232:9,11 233:17 236:16 243:12,12 260:12 260:15 297:20 <b>youths</b> 260:14 <hr/> <b>Z</b> <hr/> <hr/> <b>0</b> <hr/> <b>084-002503</b> 333:22 <hr/> <b>1</b> <hr/> <b>1</b> 275:5 <b>1,000</b> 280:22 <b>10</b> 285:3 <b>10-minute</b> 267:13 <b>11</b> 285:3 <b>11,000</b> 261:7,11 <b>11,000-person</b> 261:5 <b>12,000</b> 204:15 <b>13</b> 285:4 <b>13th</b> 194:9 <b>14</b> 282:20 <b>18</b> 211:1,4 <b>18th</b> 197:21 <b>19</b> 307:12 <b>192</b> 192:6 <b>1970</b> 303:12,19,20 <b>1986</b> 270:20 <b>1990s</b> 307:1 <b>1994</b> 270:20 <b>1999</b> 307:1 <b>1st</b> 198:3 <hr/> <b>2</b> <hr/> <b>2</b> 192:5 <b>2.85</b> 196:22 249:12 <b>20</b> 200:16 242:22
---	---	---	--	--

253:19 267:21 281:22	<b>5th</b> 202:16			
<b>20-minute</b> 239:14	<hr/> <b>6</b> <hr/>			
<b>2001</b> 278:22	<b>6,000</b> 214:15			
<b>2002</b> 305:3	<b>60</b> 213:7			
<b>2009</b> 275:21 276:7	<b>60s</b> 304:2			
<b>2010</b> 271:6 276:15	<b>68</b> 264:8,8 269:13			
<b>2011</b> 271:7	269:13			
<b>2012</b> 307:12	<hr/> <b>7</b> <hr/>			
<b>2014</b> 279:6 307:18	<b>70</b> 213:7			
<b>2015</b> 307:22	<b>70s</b> 304:2			
<b>2016</b> 194:21 279:11	<b>72</b> 309:4			
<b>2017</b> 194:11	<b>75</b> 251:3,10 258:9			
<b>2018</b> 192:9 194:9	258:12			
330:21 333:18	<hr/> <b>8</b> <hr/>			
<b>22</b> 225:22	<b>8th</b> 306:13			
<b>225</b> 242:13,14	<hr/> <b>9</b> <hr/>			
253:19	<b>9:00</b> 322:11			
<b>24</b> 309:5	<b>90</b> 326:10			
<b>25</b> 244:8	<b>911</b> 308:5			
<b>25-year</b> 245:6	<b>9th</b> 333:18			
<b>27</b> 203:6				
<b>27th</b> 197:16				
<hr/> <b>3</b> <hr/>				
<b>3:00</b> 192:9				
<b>30</b> 200:17 267:21				
<b>30-minute</b> 201:14				
<b>30,000-foot</b> 247:4				
<b>33</b> 211:22 305:1				
<b>333</b> 192:6				
<b>3500</b> 268:16				
<b>39</b> 203:14				
<b>3rd</b> 192:8				
<hr/> <b>4</b> <hr/>				
<b>40</b> 207:20 238:1				
<b>40-hour</b> 321:18				
<b>47</b> 304:3				
<b>48</b> 304:3				
<hr/> <b>5</b> <hr/>				
<b>5:00</b> 322:11				
<b>50</b> 200:16				
<b>53,000-person</b>				
242:8				
<b>581</b> 311:16				