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So I want to start, like I said, by introducing our team members. So what you have in front of you is the core team from the StoneTurn group. I would be the monitor if our team was chosen.

All of us are here from the core team except for two people. Brent Larrabee could not be with us. He had a conflict that could not be moved. We tried to figure out a way to Skype him in or something, but he is in a place where he has no connectivity. So I apologize for that. I would have had him here otherwise.

And we also -- if you have looked at our proposal, you'll know that we left as a placeholder our community liaison person. And I'm going to speak to that in a little bit, but I just want you to know that we consider that person to be a member of our core team even though we have not yet named that person.

So I want to just start by, like I said -- this is what I'm going to do. I'm going to introduce all of us. I'm going to talk for a little bit about all of us. I know you have questions for us, and that's the real focus here, so I won't take too long. I'm also going to speak to our background generally and then just basically turn it over to you.

### Background

I am a career prosecutor. I started out at the Manhattan DA's office in New York City, and I was then a federal prosecutor also in Manhattan.

I went from there to becoming counsel to the police commissioner at the New York City Police Department. I worked on a lot of different things there ranging from reviews and reforms in various departments within the police department as well as working with community groups; overhauling training, including training connected with constitutional policing, and a lot of other things.

I also have background in running monitorships within the private sector for about six years now, and I have experience running big projects, running monitorships.

Dr. Monty Long is to my right, and he is a former NYPD, New York City Police Department, as well, over 20 years. And while there, he oversaw big pieces of the police department, including the police academy; community affairs; the school safety division, which deals with interactions in part between the police and youth; and he also was second in command of internal affairs there.

He is now a professor in New York City, and he also works for the monitor now on the outside of the NYPD monitoring the NYPD in connection with the stop-and-frisk litigation.

And, now, down to my left is Dr. Carol Rasor-Cordero. She is also former law enforcement. She's got a 25-year career working for the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office. She served as that agency's training advisor.

A couple of highlights from her career in law enforcement, she established a citizen-community policing institute while there, and she also established that agency's first domestic violence unit and sex offender unit.

Since leaving law enforcement, she's had a second career. She's what I call a law enforcement change agent. In that role she's provided technical assistance to police departments all over the United States. She's worked as a trainer and provided a lot of technical assistance in helping police departments that have big problems.

And he's not here, like I said, but Brent Larrabee is former chief of a lot of smaller police departments. These are departments that are a lot smaller than the Chicago Police Department.

And part of the reason I asked him to join our team is because when you're running a smaller police department you're not delegating out tons of things that need to happen. You're actually there, boots on the ground, making sure things get done.

He understands the inner guts of police departments and how they work and how things change and how you get them to change, which I think everybody here knows is not easy.

He also brings something else to the table. He, while running one of those police departments, the East Haven Police Department in Connecticut, he was running the police department while they were under a federal consent decree.

And he came in after the U.S. Department
of Justice started investigating that police
department. He was asked to come in, and he was
there on the inside overseeing all the changes
that needed to happen to comply with that consent
decree.

So he's got that unique perspective of
making sure things change from the inside. And in
the end, the Department of Justice was very happy
with the work he did. He did it on time. He got
it done.

Just moving on, then, to my immediate
left is David Burroughs. He's also former law
enforcement, but he's former FBI at the federal
level. And he's served on a lot of different
squads as supervisor as well in the FBI. And he
now works with me at StoneTurn, and he helps me
manage big projects, big monitorships. He brings
a lot of the know-how on that front to our team.

Last but not least is Mr. Michael Costa
sitting down here on the end. He's our quant guy.
He's the data analysis guy. He's the one who
would deal with a lot of the more technical things
would have to happen in the course of this
monitorship, including making sure that surveys
are done and that the data is gathered and that
the data is analyzed the right way.

There's also a lot in the consent decree
that pertains to looking at data, gathering data,
sifting through data, and he's the one that would
spearhead all of that work for us as well.

So I want to go on to speak about a
couple of aspects of our team before I turn it
over to all of you. And there are some things
that are different about our team compared to
other teams you've already met with.

And, you know, one thing is we're a
smaller team. We're a smaller team, and that was
a deliberate choice on our part. We felt like
there's a lot that needs to get done, and if
you've got a ton of people on this it can be a
hindrance.

You want a smaller core team -- that's
our view -- so that things get done, deadlines are
met, the left hand is talking to the right hand,
and all the mandates, all the requirements of the
consent decree happen and they get done on time.
I will tell you that in my experience
I've run a lot of projects. And, you know, you

And that is a crucial part of this. The
DOJ findings, Department of Justice findings,
spokes loud and clear as to the consent decree that
there's a feeling that there's no transparency,
and people don't know what's going on, and they're
not told what's going on. And I'll speak to more
of that in a moment.

So our role, again, is to make sure that
change happens. It will be at times to be the
heavy in the room, to make sure that if things are
not happening when they should that the judge
knows, and then there are strong ways for the
judge to deal with that as well.

I want to speak to one other -- a second
aspect of our team. And, you know, this is
something, if you've read the proposals -- if not,
I'm just going to tell you flat out right now,
that what's different about us is we have fewer
ties to Chicago. I'm going to tell you that up
front.

We do have some ties. I went to law
school here. I have family here. Michael Costa
lives here, grew up here. StoneTurn, the firm
that we're a part of, has a Chicago office.
I want to speak to one piece of what I referred to already, though, and that's the community liaison piece. And I want to be crystal clear that we did not name that person yet. And that is not because -- there's going to be a lot of negatives in this sentence. I'm really sorry. I have a 15-minute warning. Thank you.

I'll be done before then.

That is not because -- sorry for all the negatives. That is not because we don't think it's important. To the contrary, the community liaison person -- people, as it may be -- are a crucial part of our team. They will be here at the table. They will be part of the core team meetings. They are the first step, not the only step. They are the first step ensuring that people -- people who you represent, people you know, people out there -- know what's going on. They know about the progress that's happening or, as it may be, the progress that's not happening but is supposed to be happening.

So that community liaison is a crucial role. We have not named them yet, and we did that deliberately because we believe that that person, those persons, should not be named without some kind of consultation with stakeholders in the City of Chicago and with the parties as well. And it's just too important. What a mess it would be if we picked someone who some people at this table here knew or people at the other tables knew and had a bad past with. Wow.

What a mess that would be.

We decided it would be too important. And if we were to be named as the monitorship team, one of our two top priorities would be to get that role filled. So I wanted to speak to that.

And the other part of -- the other flip side of us not having as strong Chicago ties as some of the other groups is that we're independent. And the title of the job is independent monitor, and that's for a reason. It's for multiple reasons.

All of you, all of your constituencies -- and I'm not only speaking to Pastor Biekman's constituency or Black Lives Matter and -- there's so many of you here --

And, you know, I want to speak to something that I spoke a lot about yesterday.

Yesterday there was a lot of discussion here. I'm sure you all know that we met with people from the other tables here, the representatives of the Attorney General's office and from the city. And there was a lot of discussion about how important it is to have police officer buy-in. There's a lot of time that's gone by with a lot of problems that have not been fixed. And many of us at this table have worked and/or led police departments, and we know that if there is going to be lasting reform there's got to be buy-in from police officers. And we spent at lot of the time talking about that yesterday.

And, you know, I will tell you that yesterday after we talked about that for quite some time -- I'm going to single out Mr. Smith, who asked me a particular question yesterday. We had a lot of this talk about the importance of police buy-in.

And he asked me -- I might be phrasing the question not quite as he said, but he asked me about the Department of Justice findings, the report that came out in January 2017. And he asked me whether I thought there was a culture of corruption, I think you said, in the Chicago Police Department.

And I'll tell you, he caught me a little bit flatfooted. I think it was not one of my better moments yesterday. And it was a hard question. Part of it is because it's just a big question. There's 11,000 people in the police department, and it's hard to brand an 11,000-person group of people as having a culture of corruption, I think you said, in the Chicago Police Department.

And I'll tell you, he caught me a little bit flatfooted. I think it was not one of my better moments yesterday. And it was a hard question. Part of it is because it's just a big question. There's 11,000 people in the police department, and it's hard to brand an 11,000-person group of people as having a culture of corruption or not.

But the piece of this also that caught me off guard and I think a little bit flatfooted is because I had looked at the Department of
Justice findings, but really, truthfully, a couple of months ago when I was working on this proposal. And I will tell you that coming here today -- I had planned on, before coming here today, reading the 225-page consent decree again, being ready to give you all very technical answers perhaps to very technical questions. And I had planned on being prepared and to talk about deadlines and statistics and all of this stuff. And, you know, I thought -- when I first got up this morning I thought of Mr. Smith's question, and I thought of the Department of Justice findings. And I thought, I've just got to sit down and read that again. And so I threw aside all my plans today, and I sat down for three hours. I will tell you I'm a little cross-eyed right now because it's a long report. And I sat down for three hours this morning, and I reread that report. And it's a good thing to do because it is a reminder of why we're here. It's a reminder.

And I will tell you, when you're preparing for something like this and you're writing a proposal and you're thinking of staffing your team and you're looking at budgets and you're looking on Excel spreadsheets and you're looking at hourly rates and you're thinking of all this stuff -- And, look, I'm a lawyer. A problem we lawyers sometimes have is we veer toward the technical. And it was a real good -- I thank Mr. Smith for that question because it was a real good reminder to sit down and read that again and read all those stories in that report and read about all the things that have gone wrong. And I'm going to tell you another thing. I'll be really frank. Something that's really hard about being here today is there are a gazillion constituencies in this room, right? There's a lot of people with different points of view. It is a guarantee: In the next hour and a half I'm going to say something that's going to make one person happy and it's going to upset somebody else. It's just a given. That's the way it is. So I apologize in advance, but that is a given.

And the other risk sitting here is I said -- we said a lot of stuff yesterday. And if I say something today that sounds a little different from yesterday, these people on the back tables are going to think that we're just retrenching and we're pandering. We were pandering to them or them (indicating), you know, or we're doing that today. And I just want you to know that's not the case. This is a multifaceted, difficult undertaking that's being proposed here, and there's a lot of different ways to look at it. And one thing you can always count from everybody at this table is you can count on our sincerity. And it's not always pretty. The right answer is not always pretty. We're going to say things you don't want to hear or that either of the other parties are not going to hear. But we're going to say it. And -- but again, reading that report I think was the way to start the day today after yesterday's meetings. And I don't have so much more to say. I think that we are the team to pick. I haven't met the other teams, but I've read their proposals. We're the team to pick.

We've got the expertise, and you've got someone at the helm who is used to getting things done, used to getting difficult things done, who is not afraid to report when things are not getting done, who is not afraid to give the unvarnished truth when the unvarnished truth needs to be given. I'm going to stop myself there. And I would say I would welcome your questions, but I think it's going to be probably a tough hour. I think it's going to be probably a tough hour. I think you've got some really tough questions probably for us. But that's all for now. Thank you very much for listening to us here today. And over to you.

MS. NUQUES: Pastor Biekman, you can start with your question.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Sure. I'm going to give you a tough question now since you've prepared for it. How many angels can dance on the head of a needle?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 21</th>
<th>Page 22</th>
<th>Page 23</th>
<th>Page 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PASTOR BIEKMAN: SO you've already said that this is your first time doing police monitoring. Can you talk about the experience of your team with being a monitor beyond yourself?</td>
<td>1 here in Chicago. But one thing that I do understand is the many different ways that you've got to look at reform if it's going to happen and it's going to stick.</td>
<td>5 And one thing that I did do while I was working at the police department is I brought in -- I did a reengineering project where we looked at many, many different aspects of the New York City police department, and we changed some.</td>
<td>12 that are issues here -- how promotions are done, how recruiting is done. And I'm not saying these in order of priority at all. I'm just throwing these things out there. How training is done, how inservice training is done, a lot of things that show up in that DOJ report. So these ideas and changes are not new to me as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MS. LEMIRE: Certainly, certainly. That's not a tough question, so thank you.</td>
<td>2 One, we may have a police chief that contacts us and wants us to come in and look at his or her department and see how we can enhance it, increase performance level, be more accountable, look at the community.</td>
<td>14 DR. RASOR-CORDERO: I have not served as a monitor, but I have worked for the Center for Public Safety Management now in Washington, D.C. We do a similar process to monitoring. However, it is initiated in two ways.</td>
<td>21 Anybody else? Carol, do you want to speak to your experience as well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 So beyond myself, Dr. Long -- I'll turn it over to him for a moment to speak to the work that he's done, but he's working on a police monitorship now within the New York City police department. And I think in some ways -- he'll correct me if I'm wrong, but the scope of that is narrower than what is encompassed in the consent decree here.</td>
<td>4 the consent decree with the NYPD. The scope is stop, question, and frisk in general in public places, in public housing and in private buildings that are enrolled in what they call the TAP program, Trespass Affidavit Program.</td>
<td>15 And we looked at a lot of the issues that are issues here -- how promotions are done, how recruiting is done. And I'm not saying these in order of priority at all. I'm just throwing these things out there. How training is done, how inservice training is done, a lot of things that show up in that DOJ report. So these ideas and changes are not new to me as well.</td>
<td>22 What we do is we do a top-to-bottom assessment. We look at every unit in the agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 But what is important to remember is that he's also dealing with a police department that's 34,000 uniformed officers. That is not at all to belittle the -- that's not at all to say you know, 11,000 uniformed officers here, piece of cake. Huh-uh.</td>
<td>6 all to belittle the -- that's not at all to say you know, 11,000 uniformed officers here, piece of cake. Huh-uh.</td>
<td>16 Sometimes we get the call from a city manager or mayor who may not be so happy with the police department, and we have to go in and work with that department. So I'm familiar with going into cultures in which there may be conflict that exists.</td>
<td>24 We look at their case management systems, we look at their hiring, their recruitment, their promotional processes -- which, I can tell you, that is extremely important for the culture of a police department because the police department has to represent the community it serves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 But there are particular problems that have to be addressed when you're trying to change things with 34,000 officers. So I'm first going to have him speak to that a bit, and then we can come back to me.</td>
<td>8 But it's all within the scope of stop, question, and frisk.</td>
<td>17 What we do is we do a top-to-bottom assessment. We look at every unit in the agency.</td>
<td>24 We look at their case management systems, we look at their hiring, their recruitment, their promotional processes -- which, I can tell you, that is extremely important for the culture of a police department because the police department has to represent the community it serves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also look at property and evidence, every single unit within the department. And then we do our analysis and we make recommendations for change for the department.

So I understand -- while I have not worked as a monitor, I understand the process that you're looking at accomplishing. It's not going to be an easy one, but I believe it's a necessary one.

And I can tell you from our organization is that I think one of our strengths is that we're good at looking at all issues and taking in all viewpoints and doing analysis that way because everyone should have a voice.

We need trust with the community and buy-in, and we need the trust and the buy-in with the Chicago Police Department. We've got to work together as a team or this is just not going to happen.

If I could add to that, you know, I think there's a risk when we say that some of you sitting here are saying, well -- who cares about that, maybe you're thinking. I don't know. You know, we -- look how we've been treated. Read that DOJ report.

And again, though, it is crucial that if there's going to be lasting reform that there's buy-in. It's just reality of working with the police department.

I want to say at the same time that this is a monitorship, and there are things that have to happen. We can speak about viewpoints and being conciliatory, but there is a consent decree that lays out mandates.

So there's some parts of what needs to get done that has nothing to do with listening to viewpoints from the perspective of the city and the police department because it's all there.

It's all printed.

Things have to happen, and if they're not happening, it is our job -- it would be my job as the monitor to make sure as the agent of the court, of the judge, to let him know that things are not happening as they should, because a lot of those directives are pretty clear. Those directives are clear in that consent decree.

And again, though, it is crucial that if there's going to be lasting reform that there's buy-in. It's just reality of working with the police department.

I want to say at the same time that this is a monitorship, and there are things that have to happen. We can speak about viewpoints and being conciliatory, but there is a consent decree that lays out mandates.

So there's some parts of what needs to get done that has nothing to do with listening to viewpoints from the perspective of the city and the police department because it's all there.

It's all printed.

Things have to happen, and if they're not happening, it is our job -- it would be my job as the monitor to make sure as the agent of the court, of the judge, to let him know that things are not happening as they should, because a lot of those directives are pretty clear. Those directives are clear in that consent decree.

Just a quick followup. So this is more directed toward -- it's Dr. Long?

Well, I mean -- so broken windows is basically a theory that if you address lower-level disorder, lower-level criminal activity, you don't give it an opportunity to develop into more problematic behaviors. Some police departments, you know, use that as a strategy. They concentrate on these kind of like small issues of disorder.

But, you know, it could be problematic in terms of, you know, where you deploy those resources, right? Because, you know, they tend to be -- if you're going to be data-driven -- and the more progressive departments are data-driven -- you're going to look at where your crimes are occurring, where is the criminal activity occurring, and that's where you're going to deploy your resources.

And if you're deploying your resources in those areas, there's going to be more proactive policing, there's going to be more contact with the members of the community. That does not necessarily mean that those contacts have to be poor contacts, right?

It's really, really important for police how they engage the community. You know, there's this notion that we talk about, procedural justice. And part of it is dignity and respect.

It's one of the four pillars.
and you're abusing citizens' rights. It doesn't mean that. Some departments have kind of got off the rails and took it there. It doesn't mean that. A lot of it has to do with how you're engaging the members of the community.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you.

MS. NUQUES: Eric, your question.

MR. WILKINS: Well, good question. I've got one question. That's -- what you're doing in New York, that's what you're doing right now, currently?

DR. LONG: The monitorship I'm on now is limited to stop, question, and frisk, so it's anything that impacts the police department -- the NYPD's policies and practices with respect to stop, question, and frisk.

MR. WILKINS: Okay. How much experience do the monitors have working with people with disabilities?

MS. LEMIRE: Dr. Long?

DR. LONG: Wow. So in terms of me as a police professional, all the time, right? I mean from training when I ran the police academy in New York City. And when I was First Deputy Commissioner in Westchester County, I oversaw the director of training.

And so that's a large part of how you train your police officers. You know, how do you engage communities that -- you know, whether it's physical disabilities, whether it's developmental disabilities? It's different than how you engage someone else who doesn't have those special needs.

So I've done it from a training aspect as a trainer, and I've done it as a police officer in terms of practice.

DR. RASOR-CORDERO: And similar to Dr. Long, I have had the same experience with law enforcement. But what we also have in common, too, is we both work for colleges where we do have students with a variety of disabilities. And it's a continuation to work and to bring them to a level of where they can be successful, and be sensitive to it.

MS. LEMIRE: Mr. Wilkins, if I could add, if Mr. Larrabee were here he could speak to this as well because when he worked at all these smaller police departments I remember in speaking to him and reviewing his bio that he definitely dealt with these issues, not only when he was a police officer on the street, but also in making sure that policies within those departments, policies were in place to address dealing with what one could call people in crisis or people with disabilities, et cetera, the kinds of things that are spoken about in the Department of Justice report.

I wish he were here to give you more detail than that, and I apologize for that. But he would be able to speak to that as well.

MR. WILKINS: Okay. What is your CIT expertise?

MS. LEMIRE: My CIT expertise specifically?

That -- yeah.

MR. WILKINS: I mean that's in general for everyone. You know, that's what I'm asking.

DR. LONG: So there are several models in policing now when you're talking about crisis intervention teams, and it always depends on, you know, the specific demographics and needs of the community in terms of the model that you're going to employ.

But a lot of it is, you know, just kind of like slowing it down, right? You know, when you engage a member of the public and you're giving them directions, you're giving them commands, and they're not following your directions, well, it could be that they're disregarding your directions, or maybe they have a hearing impairment. Maybe they don't hear you.

So it's training officers to recognize certain signs or certain conditions that maybe, you know, what you're seeing is not what you initially think it is, it could be something else, and how to adjust and how to react appropriately.

MR. WILKINS: But you guys don't have expertise or any training?

DR. LONG: So as being a -- certified CIT training? No. In terms of general policy and practice, there also are a lot of professional police practice organizations -- such as National Association of Police, Major City Police Association -- and they have policies, you know, guiding policies that police departments can look at and you can train directors, associates.

So there are a lot of professional police organizations that give, you know, advice.
and publish model policies for police departments
to kind of look at to be guiding and developing
these types of programs or these types of training.

DR. RASOR-CORDERO: And let me state, their
standards of training have a CIT program that's 40
hours that officers attend to address this so that
they get certified. And if they go through that
training, every three years they have to have
eight hours of additional training.

MS. LEMIRE: And, Mr. Wilkins, if I could
explain the way our proposal is structured and why
Dr. Long and Dr. Rasor-Cordero are talking about
other trainers, et cetera, it's because we don't
come here saying we can do all the direct training
that needs to happen.

But, rather, in our proposal we leave
room for subject-matter experts who we might need
to bring in perhaps in an area such as this to
provide what we call technical assistance, someone
who could come in and train the trainers of the
Chicago Police Department, you know, reviewing
policies, making sure that in this specific area
everything is as it should be and, if not, that

So we don't come before you claiming we
know everything, we can do it all, we've got it
covered. There's some flexibility in our proposal
as well. I hope that makes sense.

MR. WILKINS: I mean you cleared it up for
me, because the understanding I took when you
first came in was -- I might be wrong, but you
said that you have a small group because it's
tightly niched, and you didn't need all the extra
help.

MS. LEMIRE: We may need some help for
specific subject-matter experts, and we built
that into our budget. If you were to look at our
budget, it's a big grid, and there's a line that
says subject-matter experts. So we left room
financially to bring in people with specific
expertises.

We know a lot at this table. We don't
know everything. We're not the best at
everything. But our core team is tightly knit,
and that's why we think we would be able to get
the job done.

MS. LEMIRE: Flat out. But we certainly are connected to networks that
have those people. I think that's what
Dr. Rasor-Cordero was speaking to.

DR. RASOR-CORDERO: The State of Florida has
a CIT program, and they have trainers available
that we're able to contact.

MS. LEMIRE: So we're not coming in here with
a list of all the people, but we have the
networks. We can get people. That's not an issue.

MS. NUQUES: Jeanette, go ahead with your
question.

MS. SAMUELS: So I apologize if I missed
this, but when Mr. Smith asked yesterday whether
the Chicago Police Department had a culture of
corruption, what was your response?

MS. LEMIRE: Oh, boy. What was my response?
Honestly, I don't remember because it was -- my
brain sort of fogged up a little bit because it's
tough question to answer.

I will say I don't think you can brand
11,000 people collectively as being corrupt. I
can think that you can have serious issues, systemic
issues. I think that you can increase
accountability, increase discipline, increase
transparency in such a way that those big problems
can be addressed and reduced. But -- yeah.

Can you speak to that as well, Dr. Long?

DR. LONG: You know, I mean, so when you're
coming from the outside -- and so I can talk
generally about police culture, right? There's
consistent themes. But when you look like
specifically within a department, you know, that
will come over time.

But, you know, it's a very, very tough
question in the sense that you're painting every
sworn member in the department with the same --
with the broad stroke of the brush. I don't know
if that's fair, you know, to categorize everyone
in that department as being part of this kind of
culture of corruption or something like that.

My experience in agencies that I've
worked in, in agencies that I've assessed, is
that, you know, that tends to be a small part of
the police officers. I think that generally
police officers go into those jobs for, you know,
good reasons and purposes. You know, they want to help people. You know, they certainly don't go into it for the pay. All right?

So, you know, is there that element of police officers who engage in misconduct and who do bad things? Absolutely. But, you know, I think to categorize the entire department that way, I think that's probably the exception, that an entire department would probably have to be disbanded because they're just so corrupt. I think that's probably a very, very small proportion.

MS. HERNANDEZ: If I could ask, have you considered, for instance, in a church -- you could say the Southern Baptist Church has a culture of music, but not everyone in the church plays music.

I think that's more like what we mean by culture of corruption.

I think that may have made the question a little more like challenging looking at it as like we're saying every single cop. But the culture -- anyway. It's okay. I think that's what we meant. I didn't mean to --

MS. SAMUELS: Do you have any history of working with police officers in schools or anything like that?

DR. LONG: So I was the commanding officer of the School Safety Division of the NYPD, so I was responsible for 1.1 million New York public school children who attended over 1200 schools. It's much more than that now.

And so, you know, my job was working with the Department of Education to ensure not only the safety and security of the schools and the schools' employees, but to make sure that there was an environment in which learning could occur, right? So, you know, there shouldn't be a concern about safety, because if the primary concern is about safety, learning is not occurring.

So that required, you know, a partnership with all the stakeholders, with parents, PTA associations, with the educators, with the staff at the schools. It was a big deal; it was a big job. But, you know, it was a challenge.

You only get that done in terms of a partnership, because one of my big concerns is you don't police in schools the same way you police in other environments. It's very different, particularly younger students, right? I used to always say that, you know, they engage in age-appropriate inappropriate behavior, right?

I mean like so you have to expect that, you know, if they're playing basketball out during recess and, you know, somebody hits a hard foul and, you know, they go at it, that's not an assault. That's not -- you don't come in and --

you know, you're not going to arrest kids for stuff like that. That's the principle, you know, like that's getting the parents on it.

So there are a whole list of alternatives, you know, that are available to educators before the police come in and arrest someone. And I mean I think that's the approach that you have to take in schools. You know, it's a different environment. You do not police in schools the way you police other environments.

DR. RASOR-CORDERO: You know, and, unfortunately, Dr. Long and I did focus groups in Parkland, Florida, where the 17 youths lost their lives in a high school. And seeing the pain that really affects the entire community from that, the policing in schools is such an important component.

MS. NUQUES: Can you describe your methodology for identifying, preventing, and redressing gender bias and gender-based violence in policing?

MS. LEMIRE: If I could just ask you to clarify. When you say gender-based violence, are you speaking -- are you speaking about police responses to, for example, domestic violence crimes and sex crimes?

MS. NUQUES: I'm talking about different things, right? I'm talking about gender bias within the police department itself, with the police, you know, hiring practices, et cetera.

But also the relationship from police officers to the community I think relates to like, you know, the responses to both domestic violence, but also things like investigation when, you know, women are involved, et cetera.

MS. LEMIRE: Yeah. So I'm going to start in reverse order to your question.

So with regard to domestic violence and
sex crimes responses, when I worked at the NYPD,
I -- over the course of the four years there,
there were two working groups that I convened and
I chaired during that time. And one was a working
group addressing how the police responded to sex
crimes, to sex crimes complaints.
And primarily what that focused on was,
if someone calls 911 because they have been
sexually assaulted, how is it that the police
respond? And we had big problems. We had big
problems because, you know, we all -- maybe we've
seen Law and Order SVU, Special Victims Unit,
right, those detectives? They're good. They're
trained. They know what they're doing.
The problem is that when you call 911
Special Victims Unit is not responding. It's your
police officers from the precinct who come out,
and they typically have nowhere near the training
dealing with those crimes and those victims. And
people call them survivors rather than victims.
They don't have that training, and so
there were many reforms that we pushed through.
And some of those reforms included creating
inservice training for police officers in
responding to sexual assault 911 calls, basically
You know, I can tell you a lot of horror
stories where we had officers responding to those
calls, and they would meet an upset, crying
victim, and their first question was, "Were you
drinking?" you know, which automatically, you
know, turns the tables as if it's her fault even
before she's ever told her story.
You would get officers responding to
hospitals where the victim had gone to be treated
after being sexually assaulted, and those officers
refused to allow the hospital's victim advocate
people to be in the room. There were all kinds of
problems, and I am not going to tell you I fixed
it. There are thousands and thousands and
thousands of cops involved in these calls.
But some of the things we did was we
required -- and this took a lot of staffing and
resource changes. We required that, going
forward, if there was a call from a hospital, a
911 call because a victim had shown up there after
being sexually assaulted, Special Victims had to
respond. It could not be police officers who
didn't have that training.
We also changed things -- we also did a
lot of staffing changes. And this reminds me of
some things I saw again in the DOJ report I reread
this morning.
Special Victims, quite frankly, within
the NYPD, despite the TV show, had become a place
where officers did not want to go. They didn't
want to go there because there weren't a lot of
promotions in Special Victims, people were not
paid as well, and it had lost its cachet. It
doesn't matter if there's a TV show about it. It
had lost its cachet.
So we started promoting a lot more
people out of there, made it a place where more
talented, interested police officers wanted to go.
There were a lot of different things we pushed
through.
And within the rank and file of the
police officers and precincts, over 10,000
officers, we had a training video done that was
professionally done that was about a 12-minute
video to be shown at roll call multiple times
throughout the year on how you are to respond to
victims who call in a sexual assault, sensitivity
training.
And, you know, look, watching a video
doesn't change a culture. It doesn't change
everything. But it helps, and it helps if you
show it over and over and over again. So those
were some of the things that we did on that front.
On the domestic violence front, again, I
had a working group for that. We had some similar
problems, and we had issues where officers would
show up and say to the victim and perhaps -- and
the alleged perpetrator, you know -- I'm just
going to make it simple -- showed up and had him
in a room and talk together and would
not make any arrests.
So again, we had to go back to the
policies and fine-tune. You know, if it's a
he-said-she-said, but there's evidence of
injury --
Should I pause? I'm sorry. I thought
you had a moment where you weren't feeling well
and she grabbed you. I'm sorry.
MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I'll actually --
I'll go to the restroom and come back.
·1· MS. LEMIRE: Okay, okay.
·2· So, again, there were a lot of
·3· on-the-ground issues that we dealt with there as
·4· well.
·5· I feel like I might be going astray with
·6· your question. Does that answer your question?
·7· MS. NUQUES: Uh-huh.
·8· MS. LEMIRE: Yes. Okay, good.
·9· DR. RASOR-CORDERO: Could I just make a
10· statement?
11· In the State of Florida, one of the
12· things we found successful for domestic violence
13· is a preferred-arrest policy in which the primary
14· aggressor goes to jail. No more of these "let's
15· get a room and talk it out." The aggressor is
16· going in handcuffs.
17· MS. LEMIRE: And that's what I was trying to
18· say, but Dr. Rasor-Cordero said it in a much
19· better way.
20· Thank you.
21· DR. RASOR-CORDERO: Do you want me to do some
22· internal gender?
23· MS. LEMIRE: Yes.
24· There was another piece of your question

1· that spoke to internal gender issues within a
2· police department, and Dr. Rasor-Cordero will
3· speak to that.
4· DR. RASOR-CORDERO: I think one of the things
5· that is very important for women and minorities is
6· to have a level playing ground when they go into
7· law enforcement. The statistics are lower in the
8· representation.
9· It's a tough job to go into, but in
10· promotional processes you can't have a
11· good-old-boys network. You need processes that
12· are based on the job task analysis of the position
13· that measures the knowledge, skills, and abilities
14· of that position.
15· For example, for a sergeant should be
16· more than just a written test in itself. It
17· should -- could be composed of an in-basket
18· exercise to measure administrative skills.
19· It might be an oral board tied to
20· real-life scenarios, maybe what someone would do
21· in terms of if corruption came in their sites; and
22· to have graders that are trained there to have the
23· oral board anchored to specific responses that is
24· consistent grading; and that there's a testing

1· year with our highest cost is the first year, and
2· that's about 1.6 million. So it leaves a lot of
3· wiggle room to bring on board people and certainly
4· spend money on the community aspect piece of this
5· if we need more.
6· There's a lot that's got to happen.
7· There's got to be town hall meetings, there's got
8· to be speaking out to meeting with stakeholders,
9· there's got to be a lot of outreach that happens
10· and -- in addition to the givens, like setting up
11· a website, obviously.
12· And we've left a lot of financial wiggle
13· room so that we have the ability to have the
14· people here that need to be here to make that
15· happen.
16· Anybody else want to speak to that?
17· PASTOR BIEKMAN: What do you know about
18· Chicago?
19· MS. LEMIRE: Well, I did live here during law
20· school. I will not -- I'm not going to tell you
21· that that makes me a lifelong Chicago resident. I
22· will tell you that in a very forthright way.
23· I certainly -- are you asking me
24· directly or us as a team?
PASTOR BIEKMAN: Anybody on your team.

MS. LEMIRE: Yeah. So I will turn to the others as well. But, you know, certainly I will say that, sitting here right now, our team knows less about Chicago than some of the other teams who you’ve seen. I would be ignorant if I didn’t just put that out there. Quite frankly, I would not be being forthright with you.

That said, I did go to school here. That’s not everything. I do have family here. That’s not everything. Mr. Costa also lives here. And, look, it’s partly why the community liaison piece is so important. I do want to say one thing on top of that. There’s a risk when I keep talking about that role --

Hello. Everything okay, I hope? Okay. There is a risk that it sounds like, oh, we’re going to put that community piece on that person. We’re going to bring them in; don’t you worry. But I want to make clear to you that my role is not only to make sure everything is happening, but to be part of the reach-out and part of the transparency.

I’m not just the lawyer figurehead off to the side, the technocrat, but I’m going to be out here. I’m going to be here. We all will as well, and we built that into our proposal. So that’s an honest answer. It’s not a perfect answer, you know, but it’s an honest answer.

PASTOR BIEKMAN: Thank you.

MS. LEMIRE: Anyone else want to speak to that or enough said? Enough said. Okay. Good.

MS. NUQUES: So due to the current federal climate, there have been very low participation of undocumented immigrant communities in the whole police accountability conversation.

There’s both underreporting for sure of incidents that happen between the immigrant undocumented community and the police, but also there’s a lot of fear, right? So that particular community doesn’t necessarily get engaged in the conversations. Just seeing the word “police” on the flyer is enough for them to not attend these meetings, etcetera.

So can you tell us about some of the strategies, if you at all have, you know, already thought about these, about how to attract communities that have, you know, historically not been very engaged in the conversation even though they’re, you know, one of the victimized groups.

MS. LEMIRE: I think that’s an excellent question. I’m hogging the air space. Does anyone want to say anything? I certainly have something to say to that.

DR. LONG: Well, at least from my perspective, I think that’s where the community liaison function is key, because that person has to be from Chicago, and that person has to be connected into the various communities that comprise, you know, the City of Chicago.

So I think that that person will be very helpful and insightful in terms of, you know, what organizations you need to reach out to to kind of connect with these communities and bring them in. So I think that person is going to be key.

MS. LEMIRE: But one of the reasons I think that’s an excellent question is because we’ve all read the headlines, right, about how the census might now have a question as to whether you’re here legally or not. And if that happens, what you’re speaking to will only be worse, I think.

And so, you know, one thing that comes to mind -- and again, this is why we cannot be the only people involved in making sure things happen as they should. This is why we need stakeholders because you’re thinking about issues like this, and it’s an excellent issue.

But one thing that comes to mind, for example, is that if we are putting up posters around the neighborhood inviting people to come speak with us about the work that we’re doing, perhaps it could scare people away if we even had on there the word “police,” right, just that alone.

There are ways to frame the discussions on that poster to make sure that people actually show up. Some people might see “policia” or “police” and decide I’m not going there. So it’s an area where we have to be very careful.

Obviously -- this is just a given -- we have to have Spanish speakers who are present when we’re going into, you know, certain areas and have town hall meetings and meeting with people.

But I think it’s an excellent question.
I think it's a sensitivity that we would have to have during the entire time. And, frankly, like I said, it's a problem that could get worse given current events.

MS. SAMUELS: Having reviewed the consent decree, is there anything about it that you would change or improve?

MS. LEMIRE: That's a hard question. It's a good question, and I thought that question might be asked, so I thought about this before coming here today.

And, you know, I'm going to go lawyer on you for a moment, which is to say that the consent decree in a sense is a contract, right, binding the different parties. And there is a provision in the consent decree -- we talked about this yesterday.

There's a provision in the consent decree that does say that at any time the parties -- I wrote this down -- the parties or the monitor may propose substituting alternative requirements for one or more requirements of the consent decree. So there is -- call it some flexibility there, call it a safety valve for things to be changed.

But I don't want to -- I'm not going to say that I would come here and I'd meet with people and learn that there are big chunks of things that should have been in that consent decree that weren't in there, and, you know what, I'm going to get it in there, don't worry. There's a whole process that has to happen. I want to be really very realistic with you. And the judge signed off on the consent decree as it is. Now, given that language in there, yes, yes, I would have it -- I would have the ability to get a discussion back on the table. The judge would have to sign off on it. If the parties don't agree and they think it shouldn't be added to the consent decree, shouldn't be added to the monitor's duties, to their jurisdiction, then ultimately it's going to be for the judge to decide. So I don't want to be unrealistic and tell you, yeah, I'll get it changed. There's a process that happens.

At the same time the consent decree covers a lot of different areas, and there is a lot -- a lot of work to be done. And it could be that there's more information that comes to light in the course of the consent decree.

I think the work that the Department of Justice did lasted perhaps about a year, and, you know, we would be here for several years, and there might be things that we find that the Department of Justice just didn't get into their report and therefore didn't make it into the consent decree.

So those are the kinds of things where I think the judge, the parties maybe even, might be amenable to considering adding in to what it is that we're supposed to do.

I hope that answers your question. Anybody else want to speak to that? No? I think we're good there. Okay.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. I wanted to ask -- so in terms of -- I guess we talked a little bit about what makes Chicago different from -- this consent decree process a little different from your previous experience.

How do you feel you would deal with some of the unique elements of the Chicago decree; in particular, the MOA with the coalition groups as well as just the overall like emphasis on community engagement or anything else that you feel is unique particularly about the Chicago decree?

MS. LEMIRE: Well, there is plenty that is unique about it. I will tell you that I interviewed -- we didn't get the job, but I interviewed to be the monitor for Ferguson I think last year. It's kind of running together now. Two years ago. And it really doesn't matter, but we were told we were the runner-up. Well, you know, that's not worth much, but this consent decree is actually very similar to the Ferguson consent decree. I hesitate to say that because I've got someone right behind you from the division of the Department of Justice that worked on that consent decree, and he'll tell me if I say anything wrong.

But they're very similar, right, Mr. Smith, very similar?

MR. SMITH: Very similar.

MS. LEMIRE: Yes, very similar. And so there was a whole community engagement piece to the
And by saying it's similar, I'm not trying to denigrate the importance of that piece or the uniqueness of the Chicago consent decree. But even then we put a lot of thought and budgeting towards that community engagement piece. And it's every bit important here as it was for us there, and, again, you can see it in our budget, not only in how we have staffed the community piece of it, but also how we've left that financial wiggle room to expand that as well.

As is now abundantly clear, we're not all from Chicago. But, therefore, this is a big piece. And we've got to budget for it because we don't come in here saying, yeah, we know, we know what it's like. I went to Northwestern Law School. I lived up there for a few years. That doesn't mean I know what it's like in some parts of the city, and some of us have never lived in Chicago. So that is a very, very important piece of this.

I think I'm repeating myself now, but I think you understand.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

And then the last question I had on this part is: A lot has been discussed about community participation and oversight and police accountability, so what methods do you plan on utilizing in your monitoring of the decree so that the community is respected, and specifically so that the CPD understands that they're accountable to the community just as they are to their employer, their union, et cetera?

MS. LEMIRE: So part of the answer I'm going to give you is not the most satisfying because a lot of it is already there in the consent decree, and that came straight from those DOJ findings. So I can -- and I've got the list right in front of me, you know, when I was going through it this morning. I can sit here and tick off those different lists.

But I just want to tell you that it's there. It is not a simple answer. And the consent decree provides for a lot of that. I mean there is a lot of ink in there about all the problems with the -- I'm sure you say it a different way, so I'm going to give it away that I'm not from here -- the I-P-R-A. Is it IPRA?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 61</th>
<th>Page 63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Biekman?</td>
<td>huge question. It's a huge question, and it's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Biekman: So I just wanted -- if I</td>
<td>what so much of this boils down to, right? And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may --</td>
<td>it's all tied together. So when you're talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nuques: I just wanted to follow up.</td>
<td>oversight, you're also talking about supervisors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The question in terms of the methodology</td>
<td>and what are the roles of supervisors on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or the tools and vehicles for community oversight,</td>
<td>streets, sergeants, for example?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what are those? You know, maybe, like you say,</td>
<td>And you can see how much has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you may have referred to these and you are all</td>
<td>written about supervisors don't act like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting to have the community liaison in place and</td>
<td>supervisors sometimes, or not often enough do they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throughout the conversation.</td>
<td>not act like supervisors, and there's not good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But if you at all have reflected about</td>
<td>training for supervisors, and supervisors are too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how community engagement would work in terms of</td>
<td>friendly with police officers. And, therefore,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability, we would like to hear it.</td>
<td>that also has a bad effect on accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lemire: Yeah. So if I could just say --</td>
<td>within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I could say I see community engagement --</td>
<td>So it's a big -- it's a big, big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there's a lot of overlapping stuff here, right?</td>
<td>problem. I could write an essay about this and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There's community engagement. There is</td>
<td>answer it in a more effective way, but I hope I at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creating the sense that people are being heard and</td>
<td>least partially answered it for you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you know what is going on over on this side,</td>
<td>Pastor Biekman: So one question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right, the monitorship and within the Chicago</td>
<td>Ms. Lemire: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department. That's community engagement.</td>
<td>Pastor Biekman: And I think we're down to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But then there is the other piece -- and</td>
<td>like, what, two and a half minutes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again, it overlaps -- which is oversight, right?</td>
<td>Ms. Scruggs: At least ten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And I see the mechanisms in place that are being</td>
<td>Pastor Biekman: At least ten. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 62</th>
<th>Page 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>set up. I know COPA, it's early days with regard</td>
<td>But we don't have to take all that time to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to whether or not COPA is going to be as effective</td>
<td>respond, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as IPRA was not. And there are those mechanisms</td>
<td>So my question is really easy, really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in place to -- there are mechanisms in place to</td>
<td>quick. And that is, so we retrain, we revamp, we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get us to a better place than where things have</td>
<td>do all the things that you said, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been.</td>
<td>So what happens -- how do we sustain the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I'm not dodging your question, but</td>
<td>work that's been done, and how is that going to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what I'm trying to say is that it's in the consent</td>
<td>be -- part and parcel be integrated into your plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decree. There's a lot to be measured still.</td>
<td>as the monitor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can anyone help me out? I'm just really</td>
<td>Ms. Lemire: So this goes back to what I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muffing this up.</td>
<td>spoke to earlier about in terms of -- by the way,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rasor-Cordero: There is a lot of</td>
<td>if I do talk for the next eight minutes, are we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis on revamping the idea of community</td>
<td>done then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policing to make it more engaging with the</td>
<td>So this goes back to what I spoke to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community, more accountable, to have the officers</td>
<td>earlier about the way our team is modeled in that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better trained.</td>
<td>we're a small core group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And that in itself, many departments</td>
<td>The consent decree speaks about our role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that have been successful at community policing, I</td>
<td>being one of auditing, assessing, reporting. And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think their response would be -- is that the</td>
<td>if we come in -- if we were a team four or five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community engagement, working as a team together,</td>
<td>times as big as we are, and we came in and we did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is what made the difference, not being on</td>
<td>all that work, and we did the training, and we're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different sides of the fence.</td>
<td>there on the ground all the time because we're in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lemire: But there's a reason I get</td>
<td>Chicago and we don't have to get on a plane to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangled up answering that question because it's a</td>
<td>come here, but we just get it all done, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
problem is this consent decree is going to end at some point. The monitorship will end. And so the real -- the real -- the real challenge is making sure that the reforms last, right, which feeds into the bigger questions of culture, changing culture, changing infrastructure in a way such that things continue in the track as they should. And so what our methodology -- one aspect of our methodology is to come in, train the trainers. That's not meant to say that we would be absentee monitors. That's not it at all. But we come in and find the elements within the Chicago Police Department that are working. There's got to be -- there are some parts that are working; there are good people there -- and focus on empowering them and those pieces to be working better. I know that sounds potentially very "pie in the sky."

Dr. Long wants to speak to that as well.

DR. LONG: So one of the things I can tell you about policing is, you know, what gets measured gets done, right? So if you are focusing on these methods -- you know, civilian complaints, measured gets done, right? So if you are focusing on these methods -- you know, civilian complaints, the community engagement programs and how you're interacting with youth, what kind of programs do you have to kind of bridge those divides -- you know, once this monitorship is over, the leadership of the police department is going to continue to look at these metrics, right? Because they're going to be looking at it during the course of the monitorship, and they're going to continue because, you know, the outcomes are going to be favorable. So that's going to be something that they're invested with, that they want to see continue to grow and to develop.

So, you know, I don't -- you know, it's not, at least my belief, going to be that, you know, once the monitor is gone, then it's business as usual, because I think the benefits -- and I think that, you know, when you look at all of the good that's going to come from making these changes within the Chicago PD and how they engage members of the community, they're not going to want to go back to the way it was, right? Because it's -- you know, we're at a better place operationally in terms of efficiency and community engagement. They're not going to want to go back.

MS. LEMIRE: If I could say one more thing as well. Yeah, if I could say one more thing on that front, part of what is going to happen -- and it's mandated by the consent decree -- is increased transparency. And Dr. Long spoke to measurability, measurability and transparency.

So from what I see, what I know about what was written about in that January 2017 report, there wasn't a lot of transparency. There was a sense of on the outside you didn't know what was happening on the inside.

And part of what this monitorship is about is creating that transparency, reports, numbers to be posted, knowing much more about what's going on with regard to discipline, with regard to police-involved shootings, with regard to other officer misconduct.

There's a lot that you don't see now that you will start seeing just by merit of what is going to happen within the workings of the consent decree. And that's going to go on. That doesn't disappear. I'm sure that judge won't let it happen.

MS. NUQUES: Thank you.

MS. LEMIRE: Yeah.

MS. NUQUES: Maria has the last question.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Could I ask a question? And this is -- because there's a couple of you that we actually haven't heard anything from at all, so this is one -- I know we're short on time. If folks would keep it as direct as possible. But it's kind of -- well, okay.

So, full clarity, I went to university in New York, so I was actually there during the time that you were working for Ray Kelly. So I think it's very interesting to see this team and the different backgrounds that you all bring.

So one question for each of you is: How have you each -- did you each come to this process? And in particular, I'm interested in how you manage differences between your backgrounds, especially considering that you were there when Ray Kelly was kind of the architect of stop and frisk as we know it right now in this country, and then you're coming in to regulate work that your -- her former boss was doing.
So how do you negotiate those kind of like -- kind of like you kind of came and cleaned up what the previous administration had done. So how do you navigate those relationships with each other? And just how did you each come to be part of this team together? I'm curious.

DR. LONG: I just want to say one of the strengths of this team is the diversity of thought, right? And so we don't all think the same way. And so, you know, Katie gets the benefit of hearing, you know, our different views of whatever the issue is at hand. Ultimately, as the monitor, she'll be the decision-maker, but her decision will be informed on, you know, this broad spectrum of ideas and thinking. So I think that that is definitely a strength of this team.

MR. BURROUGHS: Well, as far as how I came to be part of the team, as Katie mentioned earlier, I was with the FBI for 25 years, all of it in New York. And eight years of that career was spent working street gangs and violent crime. And during that time, Katie and I met. She was a federal prosecutor, and we actually successfully prosecuted some gang cases. And then our careers -- I was transferred to another squad. But eventually, as my career sort of came to a point where I was eligible to retire, Katie had started a firm on her own and had reached out to me, and I took the opportunity to work together -- to work with her. And then, when this opportunity of this monitorship came up, it was for me -- I don't have the expertise of some of my colleagues here, but I did work violent crime, and I was profoundly impacted by some of the things I read, and I wanted to be part of something that could hopefully help fix it.

One of the things that touched my heart when I was working violent crime was the impact it had on the families with children. And I just thought if I could be part of something that helps to fix that need, I enjoy people, and I think I have a valuable role to play here, even if it's in a supportive capacity.

MR. COSTA: I came to this process -- I'm going to go next. Katie and I actually work for the same company, StoneTurn, but this opportunity came up prior to us joining forces. It was actually over Labor Day weekend that Katie reached out looking for people who might have the relevant expertise. And I, of course, was interested due to the local nature of Chicago. And, pretty simply, I think data analysis is going to be an important component of this monitorship.

So combined with the fact that I live here, the fact that it's I think all the more important that data can be used to help the police department in its efforts and there's also a need to rehab a lot of their systems so that data can be used effectively going forward, no-brainer.

DR. RASOR-CORDERO: I got here because I worked with Dr. Long through the Center for Public Safety Management. We've worked on many departments together. And, like I said earlier, the process we used mirrors a lot of what's done in monitoring. Also, too, is that after serving 25 years in law enforcement, it's still in my heart.

I'm also a professor at St. Petersburg College in the Department of Public Safety Administration. I teach seniors, juniors and seniors, and there's nothing more rewarding than to look at preparing future leaders for law enforcement, because we've got to make the efforts to make our profession better and better every day.

And how I deal with differences of opinion, I was a crisis negotiator at the sheriff's office for 15 years, so I'm pretty good with dealing with conflict.

MS. NUQUES: Thank you. That's all. Thank you for your time.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Do you have any thoughts on like what it was like working with someone who was reforming your former boss's policies?

MS. LEMIRE: Yeah. So I -- I know we're out of time. And I spoke to this a little bit yesterday, so I'm happy right after this to -- let's you and I talk more.

MS. NUQUES: We have a few minutes. Go ahead.

MS. LEMIRE: So working with Dr. Long, not a problem whatsoever. He's fabulous. So just to speak a little bit to stop...
and frisk and working for Ray Kelly, it's --
there's a possibility in saying this it sounds
like an excuse or something, but when I came on
board in 2009 at the NYPD, the controversy
surrounding stop and frisk, it was all -- there
was a lot of public outcry over it.
And so, No. 1, I'm going to say it was
going on before I got there. It's not like I came
in and I was an architect of the policy. Let's
just make that clear.
But, No. 2, there had been litigation
that had been filed, the Floyd case, which is what
led to what Dr. Long is working on, that
monitorship. That was going on already, and so I
was not a part of that.
But, there are things that I did, work
that I did that went towards mitigating some of
the stop-and-frisk issues. And I'll try to
condense this from how I explained it yesterday
because I know we're last and people want to go.
But I was ten days on the job at the New
York City Police Department when I learned that we
had a big problem on our hands. And we were
going -- our civilian oversight board is called
the CCRB. You know this; you were in New York.
There were CCRB complaints that -- a lot
of them relating to police officers stopping
tests on public housing grounds. Do you remember
this? It was in the papers a lot.
Yeah. They would even go
inside people's buildings and wait for you to
check your mail.
Exactly right. So you've read
about it.
And police officers -- there is a lot of
law that governs how police officers interact with
people on the ground. There's the Terry v. Ohio
decision. I won't go into all of this, but
there's De Bour, which covers what goes on in
New York.
And police officers were getting the law
wrong because if someone walks up to you and
you're getting your mail out of your mailbox and
they say, "What are you doing here?" and you don't
answer them, you don't have to answer them. And
they cannot arrest you if you don't answer them.
There were a lot of the officers who
didn't get that right. And they thought that
because it was public housing grounds they had the
authority -- it's almost like they thought they
were the custodians of the property and they had
the authority to arrest you if you didn't respond
to their questions, and that is not what the law
says in New York.
And so I went to Commissioner Kelly
about this, and what I ended up doing was pounding
through changing the patrol guide on this front.
You can see it now. We added examples relating to
exactly this kind of thing. If this happens, this
is not grounds for arrest. These are the laws
that apply. We ended up hammering through
training affecting -- 12,000 officers went through
that training.
And, look, I will tell you that I had
initially some battles about this because there
were people in the police department who thought,
well, we've just done it this way always, and this
is how it should be. And it was not the law. It
was illegal.
And so it was a lot of work. I spent my
first six months spending a ton of time on that.
I worked very closely with the commanding officer
of the police academy to rewrite that training.
Of course, I did not do the training. He had
people who did that. But I was very, very, very
involved in that, and there's a New York Times
article that references my involvement in that.
So I just want to make it clear that I
understand why you asked that question. Ray
Kelly, stop and frisk, who am I to think I can
come in here now and address issues in Chicago
given that? But that's actually what I did in New
York City as well, and I want you to know that,
okay?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. They would even go
inside people's buildings and wait for you to
check your mail.

MS. LEMIRE: Exactly right. So you've read
about it.

And police officers -- there is a lot of
law that governs how police officers interact with
people on the ground. There's the Terry v. Ohio
decision. I won't go into all of this, but
there's De Bour, which covers what goes on in
New York.

And police officers were getting the law
wrong because if someone walks up to you and
you're getting your mail out of your mailbox and
they say, "What are you doing here?" and you don't
answer them, you don't have to answer them. And
they cannot arrest you if you don't answer them.
There were a lot of the officers who
didn't get that right. And they thought that
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