1	COMMUNITY COMMISSION for PUBLIC SAFETY and ACCOUNTABILITY
2	PUBLIC MEETING
3	Thursday, April 24, 2025, 6:30 p.m. Pui Tak Center 2216 South Wentworth
4	Chicago, Illinois
5	
6	
7	APPEARANCES: President Anthony Driver
8	Vice President Remel Terry Commissioner Aaron Gottlieb Commissioner Sandra Wortham
9	Commissioner Sandra Wortham Commissioner Abierre Minor Commissioner Rubi Navarijo
10	Commissioner Rubi Navarijo Commissioner Gina Piemonte Executive Director Adam Gross
11	Executive Director Adam Gross
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

```
PRESIDENT DRIVER: Good evening, everyone.
1
 2
     The April 24th meeting of the Community
     Commission of Public Safety and Accountability is
     called to order at 6:31 p.m. We will begin by
 4
     calling the roll.
 5
                    Commissioner Gottlieb.
 6
          COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB:
                                   Present.
7
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Driver.
 8
     Present.
 9
                    Commissioner Minor. Commissioner
10
     Piemonte.
11
12
          COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Present.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Rubi
13
     Navarijo.
14
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: Present.
15
16
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Terry.
17
     Commissioner Wortham.
                    With four out of the six members of
18
     the Community Commission for Pubic Safety and
19
     Accountability present, we have a quorum and can
20
     conduct the Commission's business.
21
22
                    Before we begin, I would like to
     take a moment to welcome our newest Commissioner.
23
                    On April 16th, City Council
24
```

confirmed a new Commissioner to fill a vacancy by the resignation of Commissioner Presley. Commissioner Piemonte was nominated by a committee made up of representatives of each of the 22 District Councils which is charged with nominating people to fill vacancies on the Commission. By law, only people who were first nominated by the District Councils can serve on the Commission. The Mayor then selected Ms. Piemonte, and last week she was confirmed by the City Council.

I will give her a moment to introduce herself.

COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Hello. And I'm so happy to be here. So excited for my first meeting. I'm Gina Piemonte. I'm a Cook County public defender. I've been in that office for about 31 years now, both as a line attorney and in upper management. Right now I am chief of the felony trial division.

I think I have a wealth of experience in criminal justice issues that I think will be beneficial to this body and the work that they do. And I came in -- well, I

started last Thursday, so I've not been here long. I'm hoping to have an impact and do my best to get -- work with the community and with the Commissioners to help and improve things in the City.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. I also ask we take a brief moment of silence for Captain David Meyer of the Chicago Fire Department who tragically lost his life in the line of duty.

Thank you. The next item of business is public comment. If you would like to share something related to the Commission work on publicly safety and accountability, you have a few options. You can speak at a public meeting. You can also submit public comment in writing by emailing your comment to CommunityCommissionPublicComment@cityofChicago. org. Again, that's

CommunityCommissionPublicComment@cityofchicago. org. Or you can bring a copy of your comment to one of the Commission meetings and give it to someone either on the Commission or on the Commission staff.

People who wanted to speak during

the public comment period tonight were asked to submit their names in writing earlier tonight.

The names were drawn at random by a member of the Commission staff. Speakers will be called in the order in which their name was drawn. If your name is drawn, we ask you approach the microphone and line up in the order in which your name is called. When it is your time to speak, say your name and spell your name and then offer your comments. Each speaker will have two minutes.

We have allotted a total of 20 minutes public comment. I will call you all in groups of three to approach the microphone.

The first speaker Tiwon Sims, Lee Bielecki, number two, and number three is Edwin Castro-White. Please approach the microphone to offer your comment.

MR. SIMS: Good evening, Commission. My name is Tiwon Sims. I am here with a number of complaints. But the most was the consideration here in the City of Chicago, and just not having to deal with psychopaths dressed up as law enforcement.

I was arrested April 16th, and I

was taken to jail. I was jailed until the other 1 2 day. Released from County. Sat in County Jail for simply trying to exercise my civil liberty, 3 you know, going to talk to City Council about 4 5 being homeless, being attacked on the street by, once again, criminals dressed up like law 6 enforcement. Bielecki going to come in here and 7 speak up for these individuals. That's like John 8 Catanzara, a criminal. These people criminals. 9 But they come here. But I got to deal with this. 10 The number is JJ 220113. I was arrested by -- or 11 12 attacked by Norman Sloan. And just like to have these addressed because we come to these 13 commissions and whatnot to -- for what? Speaking 14 to empty air. 15 Adam, the executive director. Adam 16

Adam, the executive director. Adam you are once again for civil -- what? Civil law or something like that. And how do you use that? How do I use that? How do I utilize you to help me as a civilian?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Direct your comments to me.

MR. SIMS: I'm directing to you all because I emailed you. Don't ask me to address you when he

is sitting there. 1 PRESIDENT DRIVER: All comments should be directed --MR. SIMS: Waste my time. All requests 4 should be, right, acknowledged. I should be 5 6 helped. The Commission was put together to 7 help, to hold individuals like Bielecki that come 8 here accountable, but he retired. So help me 9 out. 10 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you for your 11 12 comments. MR. SIMS: My time wasn't up. So I need your 13 help. I need your help. Because they pay you 14 all to do this. I don't get \$80,000. I'm not 15 16 the one with -- I'm not one -- I need y'all help. 17 Adam, I need y'all help. I'm going to go to trial in a couple of days. 18 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Okay. We're good. We're 19 good. There's no need --20 MR. SIMS: Come on. All weaponizing -- so 21 22 y'all, the citizen, look like they mad or deranged or crazy because they not being aided. 23 And we create these conditions --24

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you for your comments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SIMS: You all going to hold people like this up.

MR. BIELECKI: Okay. Good evening, everybody. Again, Gina Piemonte, welcome. I appreciate your being here.

Obviously, one of the agenda topics is traffic stops. I just -- we should all have gotten this hand-out. I did a couple of FOIAs, updated some of the information. I know it is -last listening session I heard some of the District Councils from the north side talk about the number of guns recovered in traffic stops which is over 8,000, which is a small percentage. I know 8,000 guns over two years is a pretty significant amount of guns on traffic stops. But if you flip over to the FOIA I did with COPA, and you look it over, and it shows the number of complaints. It's a total number of complaints for almost 2 million traffic stops in the City of Chicago by Chicago police officers, and the amounts are on there. If we're going to disregard the amount of guns based on

percentages, I mean what we're looking at here, this is over two years and almost fully traffic stops, and 28 sustained complaints against Chicago police officers. That's it. 28. 30 not sustained because the explanation of not sustained is in there. 55 exonerated and 4 were unfounded. So when we look at this as -- from the perspective are people being harmed or are they just being inconvenienced?

I know, Anthony, you and I talk about this a lot. I think you getting stopped five times is ridiculous. I think people are getting stopped for some violations that they probably shouldn't be stopped for. It's justified. You know, you listen to that. But the other side of the coin is we cannot take articulable reasonable suspicion we learned about over a weekend at training and take that away from police officers. We can't take probable cause. We can't take instinct away from the police officer. We cannot continue to take law enforcement away from police officers.

Getting a lot of guns off the street. We talk about percentages. Let's be

realistic. Here are the numbers --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

MR. CASTRO-WHITE: Good evening. My name is Edwin Castro-White. So I would like to make a formal complaint to an event that occurred on April 19th at King College Prep High School. I was harassed. So as a black gay man and a military veteran, I was harassed by off-duty Chicago Police at a COPA event hosted at King College Prep, and I was asked to leave the premises without any explanation. So I would like to make a formal complaint. And also as well as the gentleman that approached us, they didn't give us a reason as to why. They just asked me to leave the premises. I was with an associate at the event, and that was pretty much what happened.

I don't like the fact that I attended a public-funded event, and I was asked to leave. Anyone that -- to the public, anyone in the public should be able to attend an event at their own will. I should not have been asked to leave this event.

Also -- yes, that's pretty much it.

24

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I would like this to be addressed. I would like someone to take accountability for it as well, because I don't appreciate being disrespected at a publicly funded event. And that's pretty much what I have to say.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

Our next three speakers are Jenny Schaffer, Troy Gaston, and Alexandra Block.

MS. SCHAFFER: Hi. Jenny Schaffer. I represent the 19th Police District Council. I'm also proud to be part of the District Council Workforce Allocation Study Group, along with Alex Perez from the 2nd District Council, Aisha Humphries from the 6th, and Erin Vogel from 9, and Deirdre O'Connor from 20.

Together we've been advocating for a more collaborative approach between District Council Members and CPD with the focus on ensuring that community engagement is not just a formality but a meaningful and transparent part of the workforce allocation study.

We're grateful for CPD to invite us to a meeting yesterday where we had the opportunity to learn and provide initial feedback

at upcoming community effort -- engagement 1 effort. Our working group looks forward to supporting these efforts, helping to keep our communities informed and centring their voice in 4 the study. 5 We will be working with and 6 encouraging the other District Councils to engage 7 their communities around the study as well. 8 We believe that transparency CPD 9 has committed to for the workforce allocation 10 study will foster greater understanding and, in 11 12 turn, help build the trust that is so essential to public safety. 13 This work is done by the District 14 Councils, reaching Consent Decree compliance, and 15 16 ultimately to create a safer City for all. 17 Our working group is looking forward to hearing tonight's update. Thank you. 18 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. 19 MR. GASTON: Good evening, everyone. My name 20 21 is Troy Gaston. T-R-O-Y. G-A-S-T -- sorry. 22 Good evening, everyone. My name is Troy Gaston. T-R-O-Y. G-A-S-T-O-N. And I am an organizer 23 with Black Lives Matter Chicago. 24

I just had the opportunity to 1 2 completely read the draft submitted by the Commission in collaboration with CPD, attached to 3 a CPD policy -- draft policy as well. 4 After reading this policy and 5 having communications in a quick Zoom meeting --6 because I got the policy at exactly 2:33 today --7 I know the community support the analysis from 8 the following Commissioners: Aaron, Minor, 9 Andrew, and Gina. For me, I will say, Gina, you 10 are a breath of fresh air. 11 12 A gentleman came up here and talked about the history of traffic stops and 13 statistical analysis around guns. I can't see 14 how you can say that in the face of Dexter Reed. 15 I thank the Commission for its 16 17 work. I want to hold my tongue because I'm sidetracked by some of the Commissioners up here. 18 The Commissioner Sandra, you a clear outlier. 19 You are a clear outlier. We looking at Chicago 20 Police Department --21 22 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Your time is up. MR. GASTON: Thank you, y'all. 23 My name 24 MS. BLOCK: Good evening, everyone.

is Alexandra Block. I am director of the criminal legal system and policing project of University of Illinois, and I represent the plaintiffs in Wilkins versus Chicago, which is a class action lawsuit against the Chicago Police Department for its discriminatory mass traffic stop program.

We want to thank CCPSA for all of the work drafting and commenting on policy about how CPD conducts traffic stops.

CCPSA has really done a job of holding outreach sessions, listening, bringing the community feedback and being very transparent about their work.

We're really impressed with the care and the thoughtfulness that each of you and CCPSA collectively has put into this process, and we know this is just the beginning.

There's additional feedback expected, future negotiations coming between the City in general and the Monitor.

Since CPD's policy draft and CCPSA's responses were only released today, we've not had a chance to fully digest them, but on first read,

we want to express support for many of the CCPSA's majority positions, and especially the positions of Commissioner Piemonte, Minor, and Gottlieb.

But there are three big-picture concerns that we do want to highlight. First, reducing racial disparities in who is stopped. Second, reducing the total number of traffic stops, and third, prohibiting pretextual traffic stops.

We think these are big picture issues that are not addressed in either policy and really need to be talked about.

First, reducing racial disparities.

The policy doesn't address the fact that CPD's traffic stops disparately impact black and Latino drivers. We know that CPD intentionally targets neighborhoods where most residents are black and Latino for more traffic stops.

We appreciate the CPD suggestion to analyze traffic stop data, but the data needs to be used to fix these disparities.

A second goal of the policy should be to reduce the total number of traffic stops.

And the third goal should be prohibiting pretextual traffic stops. While the policy proposes a definition of pretextual traffic stops --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: That's your time. Thank you.

MS. BLOCK: -- it does not propose limiting or ending pretextual traffic stops, and we think that's crucial. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

Our next three speakers are Amy Thompson, Brad Kessler, and Jasmine Smith.

MS. THOMPSON: Good evening, Commissioners, and welcome, Commissioner Piemonte. My name is Amy Thompson, and I am a member of Impact for Equity and a member of Free2Move Coalition. I am here to talk about the Commission development of a traffic stops policy.

I want to thank the Commissioners and Commission staff for their hard work and dedication to moving this process forward and getting to this point. We appreciate your commitment to listening to community and are grateful for your transparency and really the

CPD's draft policy, the individual Commissioner response, and proposed alternatives.

We look forward to giving more specific feedback which we had more time to review; however, even after our initial read it is clear that CPD's proposed policy falls far short of those needed to make meaningful change in CPD's traffic stop practice.

We know what the problem is. Each year, CPD makes far too many minor traffic stops as a pretext to stop and fish for criminal activity that they don't have suspicion of in the first place.

We know that black and Latino drivers are disproportionately stopped, and that those stops aren't making our communities or our roads any safer.

CPD's proposed policy does nothing to limit the prevalence of stops. It fails to ensure that CPD focuses on actual threats of public safety or traffic safety rather than wasteful fishing expeditions, and it lacks the clear restrictions that are necessary to rein in this practice.

In order to truly solve this problem, the ultimate policy needs to directly address the issue at hand and needs to do so by, at minimum, explicitly ending pretextual stops by eliminating stops for low-level offenses that often serve as a pretext and by ending susipcionless consent searches.

Half measures that skirt around the core of CPD will only get in the way of much needed transformative and lasting change. A policy that just tinkers around the edges rather than confronting the issue head-on versus allowing CPD strategy to continue just with a new coat of paint.

We can't waste this critical moment. To solve problems, we have to have more solutions.

Let's work together to make sure the ultimate traffic stop policies are more effective, transformative, and responsive to the actual problem at hand.

Thank you for your work and for your time. Looking forward to more conversations to come.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

MR. KESSLER: Hi, Commissioners. Brad Kessler. I am chair of the 18th District Council. Welcome to the new commissioner as well.

I wanted to bring attention to an officer that we lost in the 18th District on April 10. I'm not going to take up my time to do a moment of silence, but I do hope the Commission will do this.

Melissa Torres, CAPS officer in the 18th District, she tragically took her own life. Came into the station after a shift at 2:00 a.m. and did it inside a bathroom of the station. She was a mom. She was a community advocate. She was obviously a CAPS officer. She was who we reached out to and who was surrounded by us at any moment that we needed her. I'm going to try not to get choked up.

Mental health is such a significant issue inside the Police Department. I know the goals set for CPD. The fifth goal was trying to figure out how to support mental health and to consider some predetermining factors and try to

determine the officers that need it.

On the way to her wake on the far west side, just outside of Chicago in Elmwood, it took me an hour and 45 minutes to drive from Streeterville to the wake. And a mom that has to drive that long out of her district to see her child is horrific to me.

My wife is a surgeon and does whatever she can to support people while also trying to be an amazing mom to my kids.

So, if anything we can do to learn from this, I want us as a City to not only focus on mental health but think about how to bring officers actually into our community, whether through incentives to live in the communities that they are not from but they want to support, or to help them return back to communities they are from in order to work there.

I support the workforce allocation study, hence it was a huge part of it. Should be try to figure out a program that's going to get our officers into our communities, not just to police, but to live and hopefully part of their family.

I thank you for your time today.

2 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. SMITH: All right. Good evening, everyone. Activist Jasmine Smith with Chicago Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression, and I just want to say thank you to finally creating a policy for pretextual stops. haven't read it yet, but it is done, and we will see what's going to happen now. But I do want to acknowledge the fact that this body -- I think I said last time I spoke in public comment, that the body was created because of the movement. We created this body for police accountability and for public safety against the police harms, right? So we all are speaking about how the community needs to work with the police. But it's a different thing of trying to work with police who actually wants to work with us. Right?

So we've been living in generations of wrongful convictions, torture survivors and stuff for -- like that I fight for my two loved ones who are still sitting in prison rotting due to wrongful convictions. Right?

So it's important when we fight for bodies like this to be created, that you guys never shy away from why you create it.

You know, it's people -- thousands of men and women still sitting in prison rotting because of these officers. A lot of these officers are still on our force right now getting paid by our tax-paying dollars. The City have to pay out millions in misconduct. So I just -- every time I'm just stressing that to y'all.

We know it is good cops, but the code of silence in the FOP is real, and they intimidate a lot for y'all that we fought for and sit at these tables.

I just want you to all understand that we are winning, and we will stand with y'all and fight with y'all. Do not let these people take y'all from doing the right thing. Justice is justice. Wrong is wrong. If they are wrong, they need to be held accountable.

That's all my organization been fighting for for 50 years. And it seem the KKK, the racists, and the real extremist people fight against us when all we fight for is right. Just

continue to do the right thing by us and each other.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

Our last speaker is Rhonda Smith.

MS. SMITH: Good evening. My name is Rhonda Smith. I am with Chicago Alliance as well.

Actually, there's been several people that come up before me that have spoken on the pretextual stops, and that's actually what I was going to speak on, but they said it all as well.

Ms. Jasmine spoke on the wrongfully convicted and torture survivors that are in prison. That was another subject.

And I'd like to agree with the 18th District Council board member that said it should go back to police the neighborhood that you live in. This was something that happened years ago. Officers lived in the neighborhood, and they knew everybody, everybody knew the officers. But then it changed. Everyone — anyone could live in the suburbs and still work in the City. They didn't have to work in the neighborhood they lived in. I think it should go back to that, police the

neighborhood that you live in. That might change a lot of things.

Lastly, I want to speak on the training of these officers. They mentioned mental health, and there is a lot -- you read about a lot of mental health cases where the person is killed instead of them calling the specialist to come in. They don't usually have time to do that, to call a specialist. I don't think that's the solution.

I think these officers should have better training, and they should be specifically trained to deal with mental health instead of jumping the gun, because they are not of the same culture of that person. And just all in all -- I know my time is running out -- for mental health. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. This concludes our public comment period. Thank you, again, to all of our speakers. We value your input.

The next order of business is approval of minutes. Before today's meeting, draft minutes of the Commission's regular meeting held on March 27th were shared with all

Commissioners. Are there any corrections to the 1 draft minutes that were circulated? If there are no corrections, I move that we approve the Is there a second? minutes. 4 5 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Second. PRESIDENT DRIVER: It's been moved and 6 seconded that we approve the minutes of the 7 Commission's meeting held on March 27th. 8 there any debate on the motion? Hearing none, we 9 will move to a vote. Those in favor to adopt the 10 motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held 11 12 on March 27, please signify by saying aye. (CHORUS OF AYES.) 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Those opposed, please say 14 15 nay. 16 (NO RESPONSE.) 17 PRESIDENT DRIVER: The ayes have it, and the motion carries. 18 We will now move to new business. 19 By ordinance, the Commission is responsible for 20 establishing goals for the year for the Police 21 22 Superintendent, Police Board, and the COPA Chief Administrator. 23

24

The Commission approved goals at

our meeting in January.

Then we work over the course of the year to assess the progress that the Superintendent, Police Board President, and COPA Chief are making on those goals.

As part of that process, CPD, COPA, and the Police Board are required to provide public updates at Commission meetings over the course of the year.

Tonight, we will begin our updates with two presentations related to CPD goals.

We will then give a deeper update on traffic stops. Afterwards, we will provide all remaining updates related to Q1 goal deliverables for the Superintendent, Police Board President, and COPA Chief Administrator.

I would like to welcome Executive
Director Allyson Clark Henson to the stage to
give us an update related to CPD's Workforce
Allocation and Community Policing Assessment.

MS. HENSON: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Good evening, everyone. I just want to send my
thanks again for the opportunity to come and
speak to the Commission and look forward to any

future opportunities to do this and continue updates and conversations regarding the Workforce Allocation and other topics.

I know I have a short period of time and a couple of other folks on my team that are going to talk. Just to begin -- next, please. Go to the next one, please. One more.

So real quickly, just a brief overview. The Workforce Allocation Study is intended to meet critical requirements of the Consent Decree, and it really is to ensure that all the proper staffing and resources and reform efforts are established and maintained. And it's really divided up into six key areas. The first one is really around stronger supervision. So what that will look like is that 10 to 1 ratio of a supervisor supervising their members, but more than that, it's the same supervisors the majority of time. So they get to know the members they are supervising, and it is a manageable number of resources.

The second piece to that is now these officers -- and I think we talked a little bit about this -- is they are working in the same

geographic area, so they do know the community members, resources in that community, the need for resources. So that's another really important piece to the Workforce Allocation Study that's being conducted.

The third part is talking about demand-based complaints, so things like calls for service, you know, the 911 calls, response times, those things are all factored into the analysis to determine what resources are needed where.

We also have community policing integration to align with the CPD's neighborhood engagement strategy so that they're consistent with those.

The total resource analysis is really trying to see where there are gaps currently where we just don't have sufficient resources to effectively do the work. So that we're looking into that.

And related to that as well is the civilianization opportunities. Is there work that can be done by skilled civilians freeing up officers to then be working out in the field and patrol. So those are the six key areas that the

Workforce Allocation Study is going to be considering as they go through their analysis.

Just a little background on the consultant that was selected, it's Matrix

Consulting Group. They're a California-based firm with over 20 years of experience. They've done over 400 police studies conducted over U.S. states and Canada. Their clients include major metropolitan police departments, such as San Francisco and Los Angeles. They are led by the President Richard Brady, combining decades of law enforcement leadership with police consulting expertise.

A little bit about the two examples given. The San Francisco study was a department-wide resource allocation study developing interactive staffing model for ongoing analysis.

Los Angeles, they did an assessment on community policing and deployment and implemented a new 200-district system to better align resources with neighborhoods.

I think just what I would like to highlight here, this study is unique because it

is not just patrol centered. And I think we've seen studies in the past that that was the only focus and that's problematic. We need to assess resources across the Department in its entirety at every level, at every role, and that's what this study will do.

And the other piece to it is a study that provides standard recommendations. Yes, they're pertinent at the time at the conclusion of a study, but the piece here is an interactive model. What does that mean? As things change, as needs change, as resources or responsibilities change, this is an interactive model that then provides further data-driven information as we decide where our resources are best served.

Next one. Timeline. Timeline is 12 months from the beginning of the work. You can go to the next one. This is just a visual of the timeline. So project timeline here is just kind of breaking out the way to the final report and presentations. The red stars are key areas where we're going to be working to get feedback from community organizations and community members. So we want to make sure we have that built in,

and those opportunities are provided for them and 1 for them to provide feedback to inform us on the work that's being done. So Director Milstein is going to 4 5 take the next copy of slides. I will be here for 6 questions. MR. MILSTEIN: Good evening, everyone. 7 Michael Milstein, Deputy Director of the Chicago 8 Police Department. 9 I'll just give a guick update on 10 the community policing assessment and workforce 11 allocation. 12 I think that folks may be aware the 13 Department's launched an effort back last summer 14 to do a comprehensive assessment of the 15 Department's community policing program. 16 17 Really looking at how does the Department operationalize community policing as a 18 philosophy, not just a program that many folks 19 are familiar with being CAPS in a district. 20 Thinking about what does a CAPS office do and how 21 22 can every member of every district be engaged in some sort of community activity. 23 If you go to the next slide. 24

a quick update about where we're at in this process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Next slide, please. So we launched -- as I mentioned, last summer we partnered with Civic Consulting Alliance and a handful of community-based organizations to do this work. On the left-hand side there is like three different inputs that went into the first phase of the assessment, first being CPD perspective, where interviews and focus groups were conducted with about 350 CPD members, ranged from all across the Department, folks on patrol, sergeants, all the way up to the Superintendent. Really engaging and asking questions around how do you view community policing and how do you see community-oriented policing being implemented going forward? What does that look like?

Another key input was community feedback. We had partnered with eight community-based organizations who hosted about 30 different community engagement sessions across the City at the end of last year. They engaged about 800 folks throughout their process. There was co-led or co-design sessions where those

eight community-based organizations really designed their own engagements on their own and developed their own questions that related to this work and worked with CPD to provide their own recommendations and their own findings.

Finally, the last was a leading practices report. The Department partnered with 21CP Solutions, which is a national consultant and research firm that looked at what do other cities do. Really looking how do other law enforcement agencies across the country operationalize community engagements, what kind of programs do they do, what works for them, what may work for CPD, probably won't work for CPD.

Just kind of get more of a national perspective.

So these three inputs on the left side have been completed. We're in the process right now of drafting a guiding philosophy that we think will help guide where this work will go, what this philosophy of community-oriented policing will look like. And next week or so we're launching another round of community stakeholder feedback.

We're really going back out to the

community and saying, Here's what we've heard so far, here's where these few inputs have gotten us. Take a look at them all. What are we missing? What was not in the first round of engagement that we still need to think about?

Really another comprehensive engagement.

Those eight community organizations are going to continue doing public engagements through their organizations.

As District Council Member Schaffer mentioned earlier, we met with the District Council yesterday. Looking forward to include them in this work as well in this next phase.

And then we'll be working with CCA as well, Civic Consulting Alliance, and they are going to continue to do benchmarking of current operations against the future state, guiding philosophy, identify more gaps, and address state operating models. They'll be looking more in depth at CPD's processes, people, and capabilities, organizations and governance, partnerships, leadership, and culture, metrics and accountability. And then helping us to actually develop implementation plans moving

forward. That will happen in the fall.

So next slide. So, again, phase one of the engagement, community members expressed their desires to have stronger relationships with officers to be met where they are in community spaces and events, better communication, and input on priorities, and more visible, purposeful officer presence.

We heard from the various stakeholders across the City. We also held focus groups with District Council members, coalition members, community policing members, as well as the -- I believe the community policing subcommittee commission also held focus groups on this work.

Next week we anticipate releasing all of those reports that were mentioned previously publicly, so they will be publicly available for folks to review and to read, and we will be announcing the upcoming engagements to get more involved and share feedback. Again, as part of phase 2.

I will pass it over to Chelsea.

MS. DIAZ: Thank you. I know we're almost at

time. I'll try to keep this quick.

I'm Chelsea Diaz, Project

Administrator in our Reform Management Unit, and

I am working under the Executive Director working
on the Workforce Allocation Study.

Just kind of outlining the link between both of these projects. They are distinct in scope, but they're deeply interconnected in practice.

So throughout the summer, I will demonstrate how we are combining some of these engagement initiatives to ensure that we are able to collectively bring that feedback into the police project.

So connecting these two workforce allocations -- I'm sure many of you are familiar -- this is how we assign our officers across the City to meet those public service needs, and then how to build relationships, trusts, and long-term safety in neighborhoods is more focused on that community policing assessment, and we structured our questions as such as well.

So while these efforts are deeply

connected, we're looking at things from the community to help us understand what successful community policing looks like, what should officers focus on when they're not responding to 911 calls, and where should officers be most visible and why. This is going to shape not just the community policing assessment but also various components of the Workforce Allocation Study.

Next slide. So I just want to give an overview of how the phase of community policing will look. As you can see, where we've seen over fall and this past winter, we've asked for broad, big-picture ideas of what the vision for community policing is. And phase 2 where we are currently moving into for the summer. We are sharing what we heard from that last feedback and asking for input on these next steps, including things that will help us inform the staffing model.

Phase 3, we're going to be focusing on into the fall as we have some of these preliminary ideas of what's coming out from the staffing analysis. We will share some of those

preliminary themes and also ask the community and other members how do we put this into action?

Obviously, the way that we would implement, you know, changes and communicate changes in a district that would be receiving those is different than what we receive with the general public. So we're really looking to the community to help guide some of that preliminary communication.

And then in phase 4, this is just standard informational updates on what the implementation plan is going to look like based on that phase 3 feedback.

Next slide. So more specifically going into the deeper input, we're looking at how officer -- what officers should know before engaging in communities, how they should be informed about updates to local resources, if they are a new officer or an officer that's been in that district and isn't aware of what new resources are becoming available. Also what spaces work best for positive connection with CPD. This varies by neighborhood. So being able to get that feedback is critical.

Also, how do you want to shape district priorities in your neighborhood. How they want to shape crime reduction strategy. Then what activities officers should be prioritizing outside of 911 calls. And then where should they be patrolling for what purpose. Last two questions are very targeted towards the Workforce Allocation Study.

Next slide. Finally, as Mike suggested, we have a webinar that will be coming up here on May 8th reporting out on a lot of this engagement. Encourage all of you to attend that. Of course there will be summer engagement sessions going through May, mid July, and we will be posting updates on those and providing access to that to our workforce allocation. The QR code is up here. Also for CPD transform. It is the very top of that page as well.

A couple of things that you will see on our web page, just a general overview of the project phases to really encapsulate the full project timeline, as well as four documents, like scope of work, the project proposal, the grant services agreement, as well as updates to the

project as we have more of these outreach initiatives.

Another critical component here is we have Q and A format that's open, so you will be able to see what questions other people have asked and then responses to those questions. So in lieu of being able to have, you know, more public meetings like this, we encourage people to ask questions on that format, and we will be sure to provide those responses as we are able to. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Are there any questions from Commissioners for the Chicago Police Department team members today?

COMMISSIONER MINOR: I just have a quick question. Just for the folks who are rushing home and probably could be potentially new to this process, you showed us a graph of the timeline. Can you exactly describe exactly where we are in the process?

MS. DIAZ: If you want to pull that timeline slide back up, I can walk through that.

So as you can see, we are obviously in April. Right now what we've just gone through

was the conclusion of the initial interviews. This has allowed us to be able to set a staffing profile. Those of you who have been to the Steering Committee meeting know that this has been about a 250-page document that we are now reviewing and having an iterative process with the Steering Committee and CPD members to ensure that that document is an accurate current state of the CPD. And then we'll be moving into the build-out of the interim staffing -- or the interim framework report, which really outlines the methodologies, how you would assess a patrol mode -- how you would assess a patrol officer versus someone like me in a project administrator role isn't the same methodology. So they are looking at each of those special roles and assigning a specific type of methodology to assess that. So that will be taking us into the summer. Then as you see us moving into the

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Then as you see us moving into the fall, that's where we actually start to see some of the first outcome of the staffing analysis itself with the implementation plan being finalized in November, December.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you. I also know that previous -- at least in the last session -- there was a lot of questions about timelines and updates and delays. Is there any mechanisms on your website or resources where folks can get a real-time view of the timeline?

MS. CHELSEA: Yes. That's on the right side of the web page. They have current phases, and you can see where we're currently in. It is an abbreviated version, so if for any reason we have a much more extended need to move some of these deliverables back, we can update that on the web page as well.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Any other questions from the Commissioners?

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: I do have a question. So I know that there is an analysis related to the gaps, but has Matrix committed to providing any recommendations on what you all need to be fully functional? Because it is one thing to share with you how you're able to utilize what you have, but will they also say what you need?

MS. DIAZ: That is part of the study. So

they're going to -- that's why this current state is so important to see where our present state is, as they are conducting the study on identifying resources, those gaps, suggestions, and recommendations as to where things may need to be changed for better efficiency, that will be included as part of their recommendations.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you. And the other question I have is dealing with community engagement. So if you can share a bit about the organizations that you all are working with and how they -- what's their strategy around engaging community to ensure that, you know, you have a wide range of voices heard.

MR. MILSTEIN: Yes. The eight community-based organizations that are partnered with us improve, build, Target Area Development, Great Space Alliance, the Coalition for a Better Chinese American Community, Resurrection Project, El-Hor, Bright Star Church, and YWCA. They're all selected for representing different communities across the City, including many of the different populations. We really looked at organizations that had folks that have, you know,

interaction with police many times, harmful interactions. We recognize that. We're working with them very closely to make sure that they are the ones who determine how they reach out.

We recognize they are all experts in their own communities and their own neighborhoods. So making sure that they're the ones kind of driving that work outreach based on what they know is best for their community, and we're trying to do what we can to support those efforts.

All of those engagements in the next phase will be open to the public, and we hope to amplify their messaging through our strategies as much as we can.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RUBI NAVARIJO: I have one question. You touched a little bit, but I was wondering if there's any more specifics you can give on how Matrix will use the community engagement sessions and reports to inform the Workforce Allocation Study?

MS. DIAZ: I can take that. So in part, some of the engagement that's already occurring, a

large part to do with how we're currently structured in our Community Policing Office. A lot of the work that Mike's team has done is already informing that new structure, whereas currently the CPD Office of Community Policing exists in one facet, and it is important for Matrix to understand where the Department wants to go based on that community feedback.

So a lot of what Matrix is listening out for is what we're hearing from the community, what the Department intends to change, because they can't look at our current framework and say, Okay, we can move these people around here to meet the same goals because this Department is looking to change those goals or that structure. These things are all kind of happening at the same time. So it's important that they're involved, they're hearing that feedback, hearing how the Department plans on responding to that and ensuring the Workforce Allocation Study is shaped in that format.

COMMISSIONER RUBI NAVARIJO: Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Any more questions?

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: So this question is

about expectations. So I know the community -- I heard a lot of community members being like -- being really excited about this study. And I'm wondering how we should think about kind of the outcomes. Like will we -- so I think it's pretty clear we learn how the CPD is using its resources, right? But will we know -- will we learn how CPD should be using its resources? Like there's potentially a distinction between -- and that doesn't mean it's not valuable if we're just learning how they're being currently used, but will we be able to figure out what's the best way to reallocate resources?

MS. DIAZ: So the fundamental purpose of it is optimization of resources. So as they're conducting the analysis at every level of roles, responsibilities, and every bureau obviously including patrol, it is identifying places where we can improve efficiencies and utilization of our resources. So that will be a component that will be resulting in that final analysis and those recommendations.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: All Commissioners good? Thank you so much to everyone.

I would ask the audience and folks who are watching to bear with me. This next one is very long, but it is important and detailed, so I am going to read it in full. I will be providing some information about traffic stop policy development.

On Monday this week, the City of Chicago submitted two versions of a draft of traffic stop policy to the Illinois Attorney General and the Independent Monitor in the Consent Decree between the City of Chicago and State of Illinois.

One version is from CPD, and one is from the Commission. The Commission's version includes most of the language of CPD's version but with changes -- some changes that a majority of Commissioners think are very important.

The policies were submitted to the Attorney General and the Independent Monitor because more than a year ago, the Independent Monitor advised the judge in the Consent Decree case that she thought traffic stops by the Chicago Police Department should be included in the Consent Decree.

That would mean that changes to

CPD's traffic stops policy would be made through
the procedures laid out in the Consent Decree and
would be overseen by the Independent Monitor and
the federal judge in the case. The Commission
has always said that if traffic stops are
included in the Consent Decree, the Commission
would need to play an important role. CPD and
the Commission have now been working together on
the policy for several months.

The policy would govern how CPD conducts, reviews, and trains officers on traffic stops and lays out how the policy will be assessed and potentially change the future.

A majority of the Commissioners support most of what is in CPD's draft policy, but there are very important differences between CPD's and the Commission's versions.

We will cover some important provisions tonight, but we encourage you all to look at the documents posted on CPD's and the Commission's websites.

I'm going to start with the provisions of the policy that CPD and a majority

of the Commissioners agree on. The policy describes when and how the Police Department members can conduct traffic stops.

It says that traffic stops must be conducted in a way that guarantees fair and equal treatment under the law.

It says the CPD members will act in a way that promotes safe and positive police-community interactions and treats all people with courtesy and dignity.

It also ways that traffic stops will be conducted without bias and not based on factors like race, ethnicity, gender, gender identify, or immigration status.

The policy also laid out specific procedures that CPD members will be able to follow when conducting traffic stops.

For example, every traffic stop would need to be recorded on camera, and CPD members would need to be clearly identified as CPD officers.

The policy describes when it would be permitted for police officers to remove a driver or passenger from a car, or to handcuff

the driver or passenger, or to search the car, and it describes what police officers will need to communicate to drivers and passengers when any of those things happen

The policy says that every traffic stop will need to be documented in a "Stop Report," and, unless a traffic stop results in either a ticket or arrest, CPD must give the driver a written receipt with information about the stop.

The policy also says at the end of every shift, CPD supervisors would be required to review every traffic stop to see if it was conducted and properly documented.

Information about all stops to be public and posted on CPD's website.

Every year, CPD would do an annual report on traffic stops. At least every two years, CPD will do a review and assessment of traffic stop policies, and that process would include community engagement and work with the Commission.

So those are the key elements of the policy that Commissioners and CPD agree on.

One Commissioner, Commissioner
Wortham, does not propose making additional
changes to the policy. A majority of the
Commissioners think that some significant changes
are necessary. There are two changes that a
majority of the Commissioners think are
especially important.

A majority of Commissioners think that certain traffic stops for vehicle equipment or license compliance violations do more harm than good and should therefore be prohibited, with some exceptions. A majority of Commissioners support limiting stops for six different vehicle equipment or license compliance violations.

Based on CPD data, these stops account for a large majority of traffic stops that CPD carries out. For example, a majority of the Commissioners think that CPD should be able to make stops for -- shouldn't be able to make stops for: Vehicle registration that's expired within a year. Having one non-functioning headlight, taillight or brake light during daylight hours, as long as the vehicle has one

functioning headlight, taillight or brake light, or a missing or improperly displayed front license plate, as long as the vehicle has a properly displayed rear license plate.

A majority of the Commissioners also support exceptions to those restrictions, meaning there will be some situations where CPD can make stops for these violations. There isn't a majority view about what the specific exceptions would be. Some Commissioners want to allow stops in those otherwise restricted categories if police have reasonable articulable suspicion of a Class A misdemeanor or felony. And some Commissioners want to allow those stops when a police officer believes the violation creates an immediate threat to public safety.

The other big difference between CPD's draft version and the Commission's draft policy of the policy is about consent searches. A consent search is when an officer asks for permission to search a car, and the driver gives permission. If the driver gives consent, then it is legal for the officer to conduct a search.

CPD's version of the policy says

that CPD could only conduct a consent search if an officer has "specific articulable information regarding suspected criminal activity," other than activity that was the basis for the stop.

This basically means that if an officer makes a traffic stop for a broken taillight and if the officer wants to search the car, when the officer asks for consent, the officer would need to have some specific information that ties the driver to suspected criminal activity.

A majority of the Commissioners think that CPD members should only be able to conduct consent searches of a vehicle if the officer has reasonable articulable suspicion or probable cause of criminal activity, not just information about suspected criminal activity.

Some Commissioners think there should be reasonable articulable suspicion for probable cause of suspected criminal activity other than the basis of the traffic stop. Some Commissioners think there should be reasonable articulable suspicion or probable cause of a Class A misdemeanor or felony. Again, one Commissioner does not support making changes to

CPD's proposed policy for consent searches.

So there's a lot of agreement between CPD and a majority of the Commissioners, and there are also some important ways that the majority of the Commissioners don't support CPD's draft version of the policy. So where do we go from here?

Submitting the two versions of the policy to the Attorney General and Independent Monitor is an important step, but there's a lot of work ahead.

Going forward, the City of Chicago, which includes CPD and the Commission, will work with the Illinois Attorney General and the Independent Monitor to try to come to an agreement on the conclusion of traffic stops in the Consent Decree. If traffic stops are included in the consent Decree, the City of Chicago and the Illinois Attorney General will try to come to an agreement on a traffic stops policy. If the parties can't come to an agreement, the Consent Decree said that the judge can hear all sides and decide how to move forward.

As we move through the next phase of 1 2 this work, the Commission will continue to get your input, and we will try to build an agreement with CPD, the Office of Attorney General, and the 4 5 Independent Monitor and work to get their approval from the court. 6 This is a lot of information. 7 Again, we encourage you to look at the version of 8 the policy on CCPSA's website. 9 Next I'd like to invite 10 Commissioners to offer their perspectives if they 11 12 so choose, and we will keep listing and continue to refine this policy. 13 This is just one step in the 14 So please limit your remarks to two process. 15 16 minutes. 17 Are there any Commissioners that would like to speak on this policy? 18 COMMISSIONER TERRY: I would just like to 19 acknowledge the amount of work and thank everyone 20 who's been involved in this work from the 21 22 Commission staff, the Commissioners, from Lieutenant Kapustainyk, his team, the R & D team 23

who has been behind a lot of this work. Usually

24

those who are running these organizations are who we hear a lot about, but there's a lot of work that's been happening, so I do want to acknowledge that.

I also want to be clear that this is just the beginning. This is the very, very first step. There is a lot of work ahead of us. A lot of time ahead of us. So, hopefully, we will continue to see people caring about this issue, because it will not happen overnight.

And so, again, thank you for everyone who's been participating in this. Thank you for the community, for everyone, anyone that cares about this issue, because in order for us to get through this, we'll need you on this journey, because this is just one stop of a very long journey.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Any other Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thank you, President
Driver.

So I want to speak specifically to the issue of pretextual traffic stops. The research, along with community and expert testimony, demonstrates that these stops are not

effective, are often traumatic and cause distrust between community and police.

The Commission's draft policy addresses some really important traffic stop issues, but it does not do enough, in my view, to curb the practice of pretextual stops.

What is a pretextual stop? A pretextual stop is when an officer stops someone for a traffic infraction but is not actually concerned about that traffic infraction.

Instead, the real reason for the stop is to allow the officer to investigate that person for a separate unrelated crime, a crime that they do not have strong evidence the person committed.

The Commission draft policy restricts the use of six low-level and equipment violations, such as a broken taillight. These are the stops that right now are most used in a pretextual way. So it is a great start. But it is not enough. And the reason why is clear.

Ten years ago, these six low-level traffic stops were used much less frequently than they are today.

At that time, stop and frisk of

pedestrians was the primary way pretext was used.

In 2016, CPD agreed to reduce reliance on pedestrian stop and frisk. Only then did CPD dramatically begin increasing their use of low-level pretextual traffic stops.

With our current draft policy, it will be much more difficult for CPD to use the six low-level pretextual traffic stops in a pretextual way, but if the past is any predictor of the future, there's a significant risk that CPD may respond to our current policy by pulling people over for other traffic infractions much more frequently; infractions that are not on our list of six. Not because those infractions are putting the public at risk, but rather as a means to investigate for other crimes when they lack strong evidence.

We should learn from 2016. To best ensure that pretextual traffic stop practices do not remain status quo, we need to do more than just restrict the use of the six low-level traffic infractions that currently have majority of the Commission support.

As Commissioners Minor, Piemonte,

and I have articulated, it's necessary to explicitly prohibit the use of traffic stops as a pretext to investigate criminal behavior.

That means that if you were to get pulled over for rolling through a stop sign, the officer could not use that infraction as an excuse to question and investigate you about a nearby burglary. The other way the officer can question you about that burglary would be if he had strong evidence you were involved.

I encourage all of you to read the traffic stop documents the Commission made public today. The position I take on this policy has been grounded in the conversations I've had with many of you.

This material is complicated, so if you have question on my position or have specific suggestions, reach out to me by email.

I'm looking forward to continue to engage with you as we work towards the strongest traffic stop policy as possible.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Anybody else want to speak on the subject?

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Currently, the

Commission holds two differing views on the exceptions of this policy. These exceptions are powerful because they would allow officers to disregard our prohibitions and continue traffic stop enforcements on practices of these low-level stops as outlined.

A weak or subjective standard risks making this entire policy ineffective and/or merely symbolic.

Commissioner Gottlieb, Piemonte, and I agree that these exceptions should be that an officer can make a stop for vehicle equipment or license compliance only when the officer has reasonable articulable suspicion of a Class A misdemeanor or felony.

A Class A misdemeanor, per the Illinois Criminal Code, includes crimes such as unlawful use of a driver's license, reckless driving, DUIs, hit and runs, street takeovers, fleeing or attempting to elude officers, possession of stolen property, unlawful use of a weapon, and a host of other offenses.

While three other Commissioners assert that the exception should be that an

officer can make stops for vehicle equipment or license compliance violations when CPD believes that the violation significantly compromises public safety, my position is that the second standard would not stop the current practice of pretextual traffic stops because the standard is too vague and subjective.

According to the language, it relies on officers' personal beliefs of an undefined standard of significant interference with public safety.

To further dissect the language, our standard will require reasonable articulable suspicion.

In Illinois, reasonable articulable suspicion means a police officer must possess a specific fact combined with rational inferences from those facts to create suspicion of a person, whereas as the second exception an officer must believe that the violation significantly interferes with public safety, a belief.

It is a conviction lacking necessary certain evidence offering no safeguards against personal bias or stigma.

For instance, an officer can argue that a loud sound system poses a significant public safety risk because things have shown that noise pollution is linked to negative outcomes and can interfere with one's driving ability.

Even if you think an officer would not make this argument, there is nothing in our policy that would prevent it.

However, our policy as defined -however, our policy defines a significant public
safety threat, in my view, with the second
standard as conduct that would constitute at
least a Class A misdemeanor, carrying a potential
jail sentence of six months or more. This
standard allows officers to address the situation
with a -- where a vehicle or equipment violation
facilitates more serious crimes. For example,
like a loud sound system being used to aid a
street takeover, which is a Class A misdemeanor.

Furthermore, this standard offers consistency and oversight, requiring legal action if someone wanted to change a Class A misdemeanor classification.

Lastly, this approach is already

being used in the foot pursuit policy GO-0307, which limits pursuits to an offense of a Class A misdemeanor or higher.

That said, I welcome community feedback on this policy, and I appreciate all of your insights.

I believe that this is a policy foundation, and I am committed to collaboratively developing a final version that reflects both written and verbal community input. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Anybody else that would like to speak?

Started in this position last Thursday, so roughly a week, and it was a lot to catch up on and a lot to digest, and there was a lot that happened before I got here that I really haven't been party to, but I will say, in my career, I've seen firsthand the results of pretextual stops and the effects it has on the community, as well as the Police Department. And I'm very excited to be part of this work, and I, too, am looking forward to the next phase where I can be more of an active participant, hear from the community,

and help this move forward, because I really think that if we do this, we're going to have a safer City, a better relationship between the community and the Police Department. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RUBI NAVARIJO: Hi, everyone. I want to thank all my Commissioners for having an open line of communication with me.

I think whether you agree or disagree with some of the policies, stay with us. This is just the beginning, like Vice President Terry said.

I think -- when I think about this policy, I think of the people that it has done harm to, traffic stops. I also think of the safety of the police officers doing the traffic stop.

Unfortunately, my first funeral was for a police officer that was killed during a traffic stop.

These are incredibly dangerous interactions that our law enforcement have. Both ways, right? Some people feel unsafe with the interaction during a police traffic stop, and the

officer has -- sometimes has reason to believe that their immediate safety is at risk.

So you should understand what to expect from a Chicago Police when you get pulled over. You should expect how to conduct yourselves. Moreover than that, there should be a system when police officers are abusing tools that is supposed to be used to increase public safety, that there's a way that they can get remediated or they can figure out that problem.

So I continue to support a balanced approach. I don't think that we need to increase interaction that could be harmful for both parties. I think we can do -- I think we can do both. I think there has been changes in this policy that some Commissioners agree on and language is forthcoming and developing as we speak. So continue to engage with us.

I also think a lot about resource allocation, right. How much time do we spend on traffic stops? Think about when you see a car pulled over, how much time are we spending on that?

What I hear a lot from the District

Councils meetings I go to is police officers don't respond to my calls. There aren't enough police. Right? However, we're spending -- I don't know, probably 500,000 traffic stops in 2023. How much time are we spending on those traffic stops?

And I also got to say, the Safety
Act changed a lot of the perspective of how
police officers are thinking about public safety,
crime, et cetera, and I think we can definitely
piggyback off of that. But understand that
officers have already sort of undergone that
understanding under the Safety Act.

And I think that we need to understand the difference between a traffic stop and what is extremely dangerous, which is actually covered under the investigatory stop policy, which I think should be -- I think it is clear on the policy there.

I encourage everyone to read the entire policy in its length to really understand what to expect from a Chicago police officer, what your rights are, the purpose of why we should be doing traffic stops, and how we can

learn from that information so we can make a better decision on training, resource allocation, et cetera.

I thank the Commissioners, everyone for having passionate positions on the topic, but our goal is to keep people safe, keep people alive, and ensure that the resources we're using are being used constitutionally and efficiently.

So I'm going to stick to my comments from I think two meetings ago that we were able to share our perspectives on this policy. I support a balanced approach. I think we can do both. I thank everybody for your time.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Good evening,
everyone. It is no secret that I joined this
Commission or applied for this Commission because
my focus is public safety.

It is also no secret that I have repeatedly said I believe the Chicago Police Department can be a vital partner, resource in increasing public safety in this City.

I've also said that I believe law enforcement to be a profession, just like all of

you, I'm sure, in the room have professions. 1 If I walked into your job, and I've never done it before, I would have no idea how to 3 tell you who how to do it. 4 So when I approach this work, I see 5 6 us as, yes, oversight, but also partners who ideally in working to create policy would 7 listen to law enforcement and listen to their 8 experiences, along with the experiences of the 9 community to craft policy. 10 I'll echo Commissioner Terry who 11 12 said everybody on this stage put a lot of work into this. Different kinds of work, different 13 perspectives, but a lot of work. 14 Several things have been said about 15 my opposition to the proposed changes, 16 17 specifically the restrictions and the elevated standards for consent search. 18 My opposition to that is based on 19 what I started my comments with. 20 Law enforcement is a profession. 21 22 They have a toolbox, just like all of us do at our jobs. 23

24

I do not see this work, our job, as

taking a tool away from law enforcement that they could use with their professional experience to do their job.

I have listened to every single public comment. I have gone to every single listening session, except the first one, and I believe the draft policy that the Department put forward actually goes further than I -- listen, it goes very far, I believe, to respond to a lot of the concerns people have expressed regarding the interaction during traffic stops. But to restrict lawful traffic stop -- I'm also -- you know, I'll echo the recent comment, please read the policy and read the proposed restriction.

There are proposals to take out the word "lawful" from the order. Why do we not want to start the baseline of the conversation with truth? First truth is, these are lawful stops. The officers are making stops that are permitted by law. This is an administrative body. So if there is a desire to say that these should not be lawful stops, that would happen at the state level. I -- hold on. Hold on.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Please. If you are a

member of the audience, please refrain from commenting while Commissioners are speaking. Thank you.

commissioner wortham: So my desire is to ensure that the Chicago Police Department is doing the job that they are tasked with doing constitutionally, safely, with procedural justice to ensure the safety, yes, of the public and of the police officers, and to ensure that they have every single tool in their toolbox to work to keep the City safe.

It was said during public comment that I am an outlier. I'm so glad that was said, because that's a perfect transition to my frustration about this process.

In fact, for an entire society, I am not an outlier.

Sadly, in this echo chamber that we often see here, it sounds like I'm an outlier.

We have gone to listening sessions. We have seen survey feedback. I have talked to community members who absolutely do not want a tool taken away from the Chicago Police

Department that is lawful and that they can use

as a part of their total public safety strategy. 1 So to say that my opposition to 2 restriction is somehow radical is just not 3 consistent with the reality of the totality of 4 5 Chicagoans. And I'm really saddened that this 6 body that's supposed to be representative of the 7 entire City --8 I ain't gonna let you do that, 9 MR. GASTON: Commissioner. 10 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: You don't let me do 11 12 anything, sir. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Please don't respond. 13 got it. I got it. If you can please -- if you 14 can please -- if you can please not yell while 15 Commissioner Wortham is speaking. 16 17 MR. GASTON: She already said what she said. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Please allow us to 18 continue the meeting. Please allow us to 19 continue the meeting. 20 MR. GASTON: Can you hold her accountable? 21 22 PRESIDENT DRIVER: She has a right to speak. Please, we got to get through this meeting. 23 This has got to stop. You are 24 MR. BIELECKI:

now doing the same thing he is doing.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: The next person that makes another outburst, I am going to ask you to leave the meeting. Please stop. Please stop. Please continue. Please do not respond to the audience.

MS. WORTHAM: I respond when I'm -- I won't respond if I'm not interrupted.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: I asked them not to interrupt you. Please finish your statement.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: I'm so glad things play out the way they do. This is why we have the echo chamber. This is why I am seen as an outlier, because people don't want to come and express diverse opinions, because everybody is not as comfortable as I am with hearing this.

So what I hope as we continue our engagement on this is that we do hear more diverse voices, because I know that my perspective in wanting this department to have every single tool possible to keep us safe is not an exception to the rule.

There's much discussion about the disparity in race in traffic stops. I am a black woman. You know where else there is a disparity?

In murder rates.

And so it isn't a surprise that the overlap in increased traffic stops mirrors the overlap where we repeatedly index in 77 to 80 something percent of murders every year, the black community.

So we can talk about disparities.

We can talk about keeping people safe during traffic stops. We can talk about constitutional policing, but let's talk about all of it, and let's make everyone feel welcomed doing so.

The last thing I will say -- and I know this is not what my fellow commissioner meant, but I have to say this because it continues to come up. When people reference Chicago police officers who have been murdered during traffic stops, they weren't murdered because they conducted a traffic stop. They were murdered because a violent offender who was the subject of said traffic stop murdered them. And I think we need to center that whenever we reference a dead police officer in relation to traffic stop work.

Thank you. I look forward to

continued community feedback, and for whoever might be watching who's not at this meeting, please engage us. Please give us those diverse opinions, because, otherwise, it's going to continue to be said that people who want this Department to have every tool are outliers, and I know that not to be the truth. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Commissioner Wortham.

So I had a lot to say. I did not prepare remarks. Forgive me if I am taking a minute to kind -- the temperature rose -- to gather my thoughts.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of this Commission for their work on this policy, this draft policy.

I would like to thank our staff.

We are a short-staffed agency, and our staff has been working long hours every single day, every single week to make this happen.

Also, I want to thank the many community members. There are over 2500 community members that we've heard from. Five listening sessions of people who responded to our survey.

I'm very grateful and appreciative of the feedback that we received from you all.

This is a very, very complex and tough subject.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's something that impacts every single Chicagoan who interacts with the Chicago Police Department. It impacts every officer.

So I'd like to start with just a personal anecdote for myself about why I'm in this work and how I approach it.

I'm a person who, as I mentioned, have been pulled over five times in the last Two of those times was my fault. expired license/registration, and I am aware of that. The second time I was on my way to get ready to fix it. The other three times -- two times I was not given a reason, and one time I was told it was because of a signal violation. say that to say I do believe some of those stops are pretextual. And I do believe that officers who approached my vehicle and looked at my vehicle saw my car was clean, that I was speaking a certain way, and maybe they even recognized me, but the basis of the stop I do believe was to look into my vehicle to see if I had something

going on.

I have experienced that. It is frustrating for me as a person. I'm also a person who was violently robbed in 2023, and I wished people would have gotten pulled over. I still — it happened to me so much, it doesn't really impact me, but I will never forget how my mom felt when she broke down crying knowing that four people put guns to my head.

As I was writing policy for the Chicago Police Department, there's a lot of nuance here. The officers pulled me over. None of them were white. So as a black man, I have to sit and grapple with that because it was black people who pulled me over all five times. Four times in the 2nd District where I live. I have to grapple with that.

So as I'm approaching this policy and listening to people, and I'm learning, and I'm initially coming into it saying, Okay, I feel this way, but you hear a motorcyclist or a bicyclist say, Hey, when people are driving and it is nighttime, and there is only one light, I don't know if it's a four-wheel vehicle or

two-wheel vehicle. I never thought about that.

My perspective is broadened. Now I have to

consider this biking community and how they feel

about this policy. And this has happened over

and over again. Right?

So in drafting this policy, we are trying to not only strike a balance but keep everybody safe.

One thing I did take exception to.

I don't do virtue-signaling. I am not up here to do politics. This is not something that I'm getting paid for. This is not something that I am excited to do. I do this because I think it is a necessity. I think it is necessary for our City to talk to all people.

There was comments made,
particularly by Commissioner Gottlieb and
Commissioner Minor, that I take exception to, and
I think we have to be real about this. There are
two types of stops that officers conduct. One of
them is a traffic stop. That's for a vehicle
code violation. If your light bulb on the back
of your license plate is out, that's a traffic
stop. If your license plate registration is

expired, the tag, that's a traffic stop. You don't have a seat belt, that's a traffic stop.

If an officer has reasonable articulable suspicion, that is what's called an investigatory stop.

virtue-signal to you. If an officer has what they said suspicion of a Class A misdemeanor or felony, they already have the right to pull you over, regardless of a traffic violation. So to put that language in there to send smoke signals to people so you can be seen as if you're the most liberal or progressive when the reality is it doesn't change anything is not helpful. And I think to say that it changed the entire policy if this language is in there, I think that does a disservice to everybody that's been working on this.

If an officer has reasonable articulable suspicion of a crime, a Class A misdemeanor or a felony, that is an investigatory stop. That is not a traffic stop. Investigatory stops are already in the Consent Decree. There's already policy around it.

What we're talking about is traffic violations. I took exception to that, and I want to set the record straight, that there is nobody in here who is trying to give people an out or make a policy weaker.

I see no need to pontificate and say words and buzzwords that make people feel better when the reality is it doesn't do anything. It does nothing.

We're not touching investigatory stops at all. If an officer has suspicion of a crime, they can pull you over. They will pull you over. They should pull you over.

We're talking about traffic stops.

I want to set the record straight on that. If
anybody wants to respond, or we can move on with
the agenda. Thank, everybody.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: I just want to say that at the end of the day, I am not here to give certain validation. I'm not here to say I am the most liberal. I am not the smartest. I am not here to say that I am the best in the room. I'm here giving you the work I was asked to do.

If reasonable articulable suspicion

was not the standard, then it would not be in other policies that we see throughout the nation, and it would also not be presented to us as an option in our discussions when we were considering drafting this policy.

I believe that is a strong standard, and I believe that -- the reason why I believe that I've already outlined that, and I will leave it to you all to make your own decisions, and I welcome your opinions, just as much as I welcome my fellow Commissioners.

I want to make sure the record is set straight that I am doing all the work I can within my integrity and within the scope of my vision, my passion, and my goals for this policy. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Anything?

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: I would also like to respond. So I agree with Commissioner Minor in this case. Yeah, I mean I think we have a different understanding of what our standard would do than what you said, President Driver, but I would just -- the part I took exception with your comment is I don't think it's

virtue-signaling. We have a disagreement, and I respect the fact that we have a disagreement. I disagree with you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. I'll pass it to Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Good evening again.

So as we've all now said, the good news is this is just the beginning. Truly, we've all said it, I think, in our remarks. Though there's these drafts out, A, please read them. Please read them carefully. And then ask -- I don't want to speak for everyone. I think everyone here will be comfortable. If you have a question, please ask us, and I think any of us will be happy to have a discussion with you about where we are so far.

So moving forward in that we are still going to be looking for tons of community feedback. We will continue obviously to circulate the draft language. There will be a new feedback form on our website -- on the CCPSA website. We're going to hold a District Councilor webinar, a community webinar, conducting focus groups, again, hopefully,

with -- President Driver talked a little bit about particular constituencies that might have certain concerns about the policies, so holding some focus groups like that. Holding a community event in a central location, and then meeting with subject matter experts.

So we are going to use all of this feedback hopefully in the development of the final policy, and so please tell a friend, tell a neighbor, continue to engage with us. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

Our next order of business will be reports and updates. We will begin by discussing reports and updates. For that -- first will be an update from Commissioner Minor on the CPD goals working group.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Awesome. So this year, the Superintendent has six goals that broadly covered the following topics: Traffic stops, workforce allocation, the implementation of two Commission-passed policies, community policing, officer wellness, and victims' services.

Thank you again, Executive Director Allyson Clark Henson, for your updates and your

work on the Workforce Allocation Study and the community policing assessment and for answering our questions. We greatly appreciate you and your time.

Commissioner Driver and I will be meeting with First Deputy Talley to discuss the CPD's approach to workforce allocation before the study is complete and changes are implemented.

The Community Policing goal also includes implementing the recently passed GO-11 policy that describes how the Commission, District Councilors, and CPD interact.

On April 16th, CPD and CCPSA held a joint training on the new policy where District Councilor members and District Commanders came together to learn how the policy will be in practice.

In November 2023, the Commission passed a policy which clarified and strengthened CPD's ban on police officers belonging to, participating in, or associating with criminal or biased organizations. This goal focuses on evaluating how CPD is enforcing the policy.

This quarter, we learn the

Department has developed and submitted e-learning training to the Consent Decree Independent

Monitor team and the Illinois Attorney General.

If there are no objections from the Attorney

General or the Monitor, the Department will then implement this training.

The Department also worked with COPA to better track allegations that a police officer has associated with or participated in a criminal organization, bias-based organization, or gang. The hope is that this will make it easier to enforce the policy and access how well the policy is being enforced.

For the last few years, one of the Superintendent's annual goals has been continuing to improve CPD's facilities.

In 2025, CPD had -- sorry. Has been meeting every month with the City departments that play a role in maintaining City government buildings, and they have been discussing maintenance issues, facility improvements, and developing a longer-term plan to make significant changes to the buildings that need the most work.

This goal also evaluates CPD's progress on developing an Early Intervention and Support System, or EIS System, to identify police officers whose behavior suggests that they may be at risk of problems in the future.

The EIS System would be a part of a larger effort to support Department members' mental and physical health and address the possible behaviors identified.

CPD is currently working with an outside vendor to create a new system that will collect information about the performance of CPD employees, which will be an important part of this larger effort.

The Department anticipates having the system partially implemented in 2026.

Victim Services. For the
Superintendent's final goal update, the
Department recently launched an Office of Victim
Services to provide assistance to victims of
domestic violence and non-fatal shootings in
several districts.

This quarter, the Department has also developed and began implementing a formal

tracking system for services provided to victims, including referrals, outreach efforts, and a number of community family services.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Are there any questions from Commissioners?

Next we will have an update from Commissioner Gottlieb on the COPA goals working group.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thank you, President Driver.

For 2025, the COPA Chief has four goals, including goals related to drafting a policy related to communication with media and other stakeholders about open investigations, implementing a pattern-and-practice investigation policy, and a mechanism that improves public safety outcomes in Chicago, creating a mediation policy built on community feedback, and implementing a mediation program, and implementing a policy that defines and supports the collaborative relationship between COPA and CCPSA. Each goal had specific quarter one deliverables.

Regarding the media and stakeholder

engagement, COPA reported that it's begun the work of reviewing current policy and engaging experts. They report that they have reviewed their current policies and have contacted six other oversight agencies and six law enforcement agencies on ways to improve its policies.

Regarding patterns and practices,
COPA reported it has reviewed current policies
and identified revisions, outlined the plan to
achieve the goal by the end of the year, the
types of stakeholders they will prioritize for
outreach, and has provided a description of its
process which will include a review by senior
leadership and the public.

For the mediation goal, COPA provided a robust Q1 report including its approach to community engagement which began with engagement and partnership with District Councils.

copa reports that the community engagement plan was discussed with a group of District Council members from each of the five police areas. Engagement will continue with the public safety professionals and the subject

matter experts.

COPA plans to finalize its community engagement plan in quarter 2.

Finally, regarding finalizing and implementing policy that supports a collaborative relationship between COPA and CCPSA, COPA reports that it has begun looking at other policies that could be helpful models, and they have started reaching out to subject matter experts to get input.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Commissioner Gottlieb.

Next, we will hear from Commissioner Rubi Navarijo on Police Board goals.

COMMISSIONER RUBI NAVARIJO: One of the Police Board's powers and duties is to adopt rules and regulations for the governance of the Chicago Police Department. These rules provide the standards of conduct of the Department.

The Police Board President's goal for 2025 is to conduct a comprehensive review of the rules and regulations to determine which existing rules and regulations should be revised, modified or deleted, and to identify new rules

and regulations that should be implemented.

This will ensure that CPD's rules and regulations align with the principals of 21st Century constitutional policing for more transparency and accountability, enhanced community trust and foster equitable and effective law enforcement practices.

These rules and regulations which have not been updated since the '70s are there to promote respect between the police and community, guide officer conduct and behavior, and help maintain a system of accountability and discipline.

I laugh because one of the rules is you can't smoke out of a pipe. I haven't seen a police officer smoke a pipe. As a matter of fact, I haven't seen a police officer smoke at all. Maybe I'm not looking in the right places.

Anyway, it is essential that public confidence be maintained in the ability of the Department to investigate and properly dispose of complaints against its members.

Additionally, the Department has a responsibility to seek out and discipline those

whose conduct discredits the Department or impairs an effective operation.

The rights of the member, as well as those of the public, must be preserved, and an investigation arising from a complaint must be conducted fairly, impartially, and efficiently, but the truth as its primary objective.

President Cooper reported that conversations are currently in progress with public sector stakeholders. This includes conversations with Superintendent Snelling, COPA, and the Department of Law.

The Police Board has also spoken with past Police Board presidents about previous attempts to rewrite these rules.

The next phase of the work will be to engage the broader community, including

District Councilors and members of law enforcement.

CCPSA will have President Cooper present at a meeting during Quarter 2 to review the process and give the community an overview of the role these rules and regulations play in the accountability system.

Reviewing these rules and making any needed changes is critically important to create more fairness for officers and the community around discipline. Any changes to these rules will not impact tactical or police actions if done in accordance with suites of other policies.

We look forward to updating you on this very important work.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Commissioner Rubi Navarijo.

Are there any questions from the Commission? Hearing none, we will now move to update from Commissioner Terry on the COPA Chief Administrator search.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: On February 28th, the position of the COPA Chief Administrator became vacant following the previous chief's resignation.

By ordinance, the Commission is responsible for choosing a new COPA chief who will then need to be confirmed by the City Council. We will be holding a virtual listening session on April 30th. At the listening session,

we would like to hear from the community about what qualities we should be looking for in the next COPA chief.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Are there any questions? Hearing none, we will now move to what I believe is our last update on the Community Engagement working group. Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you so much. The Community Engagement working group has definitely been busy. One of the things we did was we had a community engagement listening session with the Policy working group, with students from the Mikva Challenge to talk about traffic stops. We really wanted to get the youth perspective in the room, and they had a lot of insightful updates for us.

One of the things that I walked away with that really stuck with me from that session was one of the students said that police anxiety is inherited for generations.

One of the conversations that we had was about how these young students never -- some of them never had a traffic infraction or

experienced a traffic stop, but a lot of them felt afraid for when it would come, and they talked a lot about their parents' experiences forming their opinions and also social media.

I also attended few District Council meeting this is month, so I wanted to say thank you so much to the District Councilors that provided outreach to me. Thank you so much to the community members who took me up on that charge to have more conversations with me and ask me about anything that's going on with the Commission and wanted to get more insight. I'm definitely excited to have more engagements like this in the future.

So I attended the District 6
District Council meeting, and we talked a little
bit about traffic stops, teen takeovers, and
youth violence prevention.

I know District 6 has been very intentional and reached out to all the Commissioners and a few other districts did the same. So thank you so much for doing that.

I also met with District 15 in

Austin and talked about pretextual traffic stops

and Mayoral Task Force, and alternative response work. It was a super great meeting, and was the first meeting I took outside. We was in a community garden. I really appreciated that.

I will be meeting with District 4 soon. They actually asked me to meet at their District Council meeting today, but, of course, there was a conflict with the Commission meeting. And I also am working with District 6 to be a panelist for the youth summit in their district. The district commissioner -- I mean councilor, the District 6 Councilor has been working with her commander to put it altogether. And I also did a career day at Hedges Elementary school to talk about the work on the Commission and public policy that way.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Are there any questions for Commissioner Minor? Hearing none, we will move now to miscellaneous business.

Is there any further business for the Commission?

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Yes. I just wanted to acknowledge the elected officials in the room.

Thank you, Alderman LaSpata for being here.

Thank you so much for our District Councilors. 1 2 Oopsies. I always get you mixed up with LaSpata, Brian -- Brad. I'm sorry about that. Thank you so much for District Councilors Ashley Vargas, 4 Beth Rochford, Jen Schaffer, Brad Kessler, Dion 5 6 McGill. Oh, hi, Alderman. Do you want to stand Thank you so much for being here. Is there 7 any electeds that I missed in the room? Would 8 you like to introduce yourself? 9 MR. RAMSON: Bryan Ramson. You don't know 10 me. I'm Bryan Ramson, District Council 11 on the 11 12 west side. COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you so much for 13 being here. Hi, Erin. 14 MS. VOGEL: Hi. Erin Vogel, District 15 16 Councilor of the 9th District. 17 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Awesome. Thank you so much. It's so awesome to have District 18 Councilors in the room. Please make sure to sign 19 this slip so I can make sure to continue to 20 acknowledge you and thank you for the work you're 21 22 doing for our communities. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. The 23 Commission's next regular meeting will be held on 24

May 29th at 6:30 at South Shore National College 1 2 Prep. Any other comments from any 3 Commissioner before I close? 4 5 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Just you can connect with the Commission via social media. Our 6 7 Facebook is www.facebook.com/ChicagoCCPSA, or search Community Commission for Public Safety and 8 Accountability on Instagram. Stay connected 9 @CCPSA Chicago. Twitter and YouTube. All of our 10 meetings are recorded, and that's at 11 12 @ChicagoCCPSA. I see a lot of new faces, so please 13 make sure to follow us. 14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you everybody that 15 This meeting is adjourned. 16 came out tonight. (WHEREUPON, the proceedings 17 were adjourned at 8:08 p.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 1 2 Re: Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability 3 I, MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, C.S.R., do hereby 4 certify that the foregoing Report of Proceedings was recorded stenographically by me and was 5 reduced to computerized transcript under my direction, and that the said transcript 6 constitutes a true record. 7 I further certify that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of 8 any of the parties, or a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially 9 interested directly or indirectly in this action. 10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand of office at Chicago, Illinois this 6th 11 day of May 2025. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, CSR License No. 084.002740 19 20 21 22 23 24