1	COMMUNITY COMMISSION for PUBLIC SAFETY and ACCOUNTABILITY
2	SPECIAL MEETING
3	March 19, 2025 Tilden High School 4747 South Union Avenue
4	Chicago, Illinois
5	
6	
7	APPEARANCES: President Anthony Driver Vice President Remel Terry
8	Commissioner Aaron Gottlieb Commissioner Sandra Wortham
9	Commissioner Abierre Minor
10	Commissioner Rubi Navarijo Executive Director Adam Gross
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
_ 1	

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Good evening, everyone. 1 The March 19, 2025, public meeting of the 2 Community Commission for Public Safety and 3 Accountability is called to order at 6:18 p.m. 4 We will begin with the call by establishing a 5 6 roll, a quorum. Commissioner Gottlieb. 7 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Here. 8 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Driver is 9 present. Commissioner Minor. 10 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Here. 11 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Rubi 12 Navarijo. 13 COMMISSIONER RUBI NAVARIJO: 14 Here. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Terry. 15 Commissioner Wortham. 16 17 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Here. PRESIDENT DRIVER: With five out of six 18 members of the Community Commission for Public 19 Safety and Accountability present, we have a 20 quorum and can conduct the Commission's business. 21 22 We'll begin with starting the listening session, and for that I will pass it to 23 Commissioner Wortham and Commissioner Gottlieb. 24

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. All right.

Good evening, everyone. Thank you all for your patience.

Again, we are going to, as

Commissioner Driver said, start with the

listening portion of the evening. To do so, we

just wanted to give a little bit of foundational
information.

As you all know, this is a hearing about traffic stops. So we just wanted to give a little bit of information about current Chicago Police Department policy. Again, not going into too much detail, but just giving you some basics to frame the beginning. Traffic stops currently are covered by several policies that focus on how police cite traffic violations, traffic court procedures, traffic stop documentation, and data collection.

These policies include two special orders. The first is the Illinois Traffic and Pedestrian Stop Statistical Study, and the second is the traffic court citing and scheduling special order.

CPD also has policies that cover

just basically and broadly how police and community interact and encounters which include, of course, traffic stops.

Two policies. These policies include two general orders and one special order, first the protection of human rights policy, the prohibitions on racial profiling, other biased-based policing, and the investigatory stop system.

For your reference, all of these are available on the Chicago Police Department's website if you'd like to look into them for further.

The Chicago Police Department is also working on developing policies and training that will guide, again, interactions between the Chicago Police Department and community, and these interactions we're talking about which, of course, include traffic stops. And those policies will take place — the training on all of — that's what I have on that.

So, again, all that information is available online if you'd like to look into it in further detail.

We just wanted to start with a little bit of that basic information based on our experiences at previous listening sessions to ensure that you have all the information necessary to proceed with your thoughts on this. All right. Mr. Gottlieb.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thank you so much, Commissioner Wortham.

We're here tonight to hear from We request that speakers provide public vou. comments specifically related to traffic stops, traffic stop policies, or traffic stops policy, and traffic stops experiences. If you would like to share your feedback, 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, including "Traffic Stops" in the subject line, or you can bring a copy of your comment to one of the Commission's public meetings and give it to someone on the Commission or someone on the Commission staff.

People who wanted to speak during

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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

Names were drawn at random by a member of the Commission staff. Speakers will be called in the order in which their names were drawn. If your name is called to offer public comment, we ask that you approach the microphone and line up in the order in which your name was called.

When it's your turn to speak, please say your name, then spell your name, then offer your comments. Each speaker will have two minutes. We have allotted a total of one hour for public comment.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Before we begin, can somebody from staff verify whether or not the meeting that we posted had a 6:00 or 6:30 start time? I think there's some confusion. That's important for the public. Is it 6:00?

So I'll call you in groups of three. You can either line up at the microphone. If you are not able to get to a microphone, please let one of our staff members know, get someone's attention, and we'll bring one to you. The first speaker is Ali Longbottom, followed by Maya

Simkin, followed by John Catanzara, Junior.

MS. LONGBOTTOM: Hi. My name is Ali
Longbottom, and I'm here today speaking on behalf
of the community as a member of the Free2Move -I don't know how much closer I can get. Is that
better? Okay.

My name is Ali Longbottom. I'm here to speak on behalf of the community as a member of the Free2Move Coalition and Chicago Appleseed Center for Fair Courts to advocate for an end to pretextual vehicle stops.

I'm glad the CCPSA has had so many hearings on traffic stops to make decisions that take into account the voice of the community.

At the last hearing I attended, we heard from a man who had just been discharged from the hospital after experiencing police brutality during a traffic stop.

What I hope the CCPSA sees and what the Free2Move Coalition and Chicago Appleseed are finding is supported by data is that this man's story is not uncommon.

We know that pretextual stops are more likely to create a dangerous situation for

the person in the vehicle than they are to result in the seizure of a weapon or illegal contraband.

Less than 1 percent of pretextual stops lead to firearm recoveries and only 2.2 percent lead to arrest.

This is extremely inefficient for a practice that is supposed to increase public safety.

So many of the community members attending these hearings have attested that these traffic stops make them feel less safe, and the data shows us that most of these stops are for minor infractions that do not threaten road safety.

In fact, nearly half of all traffic stops last year were for minor issues, like registration violations, not dangerous driving.

We urge CPD to stop wasting time on traffic stops that do not make us safer.

Accordingly, we urge the CCPSA to be accountable for making policy decisions with the community's autonomy in mind. Decisions about our community ought to be made with the community's approval and insight. Instead of

making these susipcionless stops, officers should focus on actual dangerous driving behaviors that pose a risk to public safety, not on minor violations.

Searches during traffic stops should only happen when there's actual suspicion or probable cause. Consent searches should be fully documented on body cameras to ensure transparency.

MS. SIMKIN: Hello. Hey. I work with Ali at Chicago Appleseed Center for Fair Courts. My name is Maya. I'm going to reiterate a lot of what Ali has said in support of that. We're a community-driven advocacy organization. We use mixed-method research approaches to interrupt cycles of poverty, mass incarceration, and racial injustice inherent in the legal system.

We're also part of Free2Move and are excited to carry on the advocacy work of reforming the Chicago traffic stop policy.

We really want to ensure that CCPSA does not finalize any draft policy without true community approval. This Commission was --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Can you hold for one

second? There's a lot of feedback. I want to 1 make sure we can hear you. MS. SIMKIN: Can you hear me now? PRESIDENT DRIVER: It's like a bad echo. I'm 4 5 wondering if it's because of this microphone. Hello. Better? Okay. Cool. 6 MS. SIMKIN: As I was saying, we really want to make sure that 7 all draft policies have community approval. 8 This Commission was established to 9 ensure that those most affected by public safety 10 policies have a direct role in shaping them. 11 12 everyone is impacted equally by traffic stops, and we hope CCPSA prioritizes those voices. 13 Issuing a policy proposal without 14 consent or feedback from the community would be a 15 16 huge disservice to the work y'all are doing with these listening sessions. Can you hear me? 17 Okay. Cool. 18 What we want is a safer Chicago with 19 effective resource use. We want police to stop 20 wasting time and money on stops that don't make 21 22 us any safer. Traffic enforcement should be 23 24 concentrated on dangerous driving.

With almost half of all traffic stops in 2023 being for minor licensing or registration violations, we know that resources are being wasted.

If the City truly cared about people driving with broken lights, it would be cheaper and more effective to automatically issue those people vouchers for car repairs instead of tickets that keep the poverty cycle going and eroding trust with the police.

Instead, we find that officers use these stops to investigate people for completely unrelated activity. Consent searches should only happen when there's probable cause or reasonable suspicion with clear documentation, as Ali stated.

What we want is a clear timeline and plan for how community feedback is going to be incorporated into the draft policy. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: If you can wait one minute. I want to -- it's like a really, really, really bad echo, and I want to see if we can resolve it.

Sorry, everyone, for the technical

difficulties. If we can't hear you, though, it's a pointless hearing, so we want to take a minute to try to make sure we get the microphones correct and that we can actually hear what you're saying.

MR. CATANZARA: Good evening. I'm sure it's going to come as no mystery that I'm a hundred percent against any changes to the policy, but I feel the need to educate some people in this room.

If you have an issue with pretextual traffic stops, equipment violations, registration issues, then I suggest you fight the legislature down in Springfield to have those statutes removed from the books, either there or in City Hall. That's where you start, not here.

The laws are on the books for a reason. Politicians thought they were useful reasons to put them there, and the police are just enforcing that.

Now, this nonsense basis that these pretextual traffic stops affect certain demographics more than others is just ridiculous.

The reality is the highest murder

rate in Chicago is on the west side of Chicago in the 11th District for 11 out of the last 14 years. The police are not going to stop an Irishman on the west side, if they could even find one. Maybe at that point he might have drugs. But nonetheless, you're not going to find an Irish guy driving around the west side in the 11th District. It's going to be an African American individual. The same with certain areas and neighborhoods throughout this City. That's who's going to end up getting stopped. It's not a bias you're looking for a certain person. That's where the crime rates are highest. That's where police are focused to try and save lives.

I always thought it was unique that the City talked about one life saved or one life lost is too many, but apparently one life saved is not enough.

Guns are taken off the street. And, again, I will just tell you, the thought that now you're going to take taxpayer dollars to pay for vehicle code violations for people who don't want to get their vehicle fixed makes perfect sense.

Just steal more tax dollars to pay for other

people's problems that they don't want to get addressed. That's a whole different thing than this conversation as far as being able to afford vehicle upkeep. But I can tell you, the police officers — you are going to hear a lot of that next month if you come to the Lodge for that listening, but the police officers are at no higher — are at a higher risk than anybody in this City when they make these traffic stops, and they do it to make the rest of the City safe. You should say thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Next three speakers are Jean Bossard, Carol Mangan, Denise McBroom. Is Jean here?

MS. BOSSARD: I'm just here in support of the police. We need to stop tying their hands, for one. Traffic stops are essential for maintaining road safety and ensuring that drivers follow the rules of the road. These stops help deter reckless driving, impaired driving, and other dangerous behaviors that could lead to accidents or fatalities.

Additionally, traffic stops provide an opportunity for law enforcement to address

violations such as expired license or registration, ensuring that all drivers are legally operating their vehicles and contributing to overall public safety.

By enforcing traffic laws, police lay a crucial role in preventing accidents, promoting responsible driving habits and behavior.

MS. MANGAN: My name is Carol Mangan, and I'm here in support of the Chicago Police Department. I had the unfortunate experience of sitting through a Free2Move presentation during one of our DC meetings, about 90 minutes of my life that I will never get back, with uneducated people trying to tell me that drivers not using their blinker or their headlights or taillights being out are not a safety risk when, in fact, there's a reason why we have automobile engineers and why they came up with these safety features.

And I just wonder why, you know,
Mr. Driver is the driving force of this when we
all know that he's had some traffic stops and
some issues in the past. That's a rhetorical
question.

So that's it. I support everything that Mr. Catanzara has spoken about, that traffic stops help keep our City safer. We want to move forward to keep the City safer. We don't want to move backwards. This is a move backwards with skewed data, people that don't live in the City, people that didn't grow up in the City. We live in the City. We've grown up in the City. We know the City problems. We know things that need to be fixed.

MS. McBROOM: Hi. Denise McBroom. I have lived in Canaryville my entire life, so I feel I'm a good representative for this community. But today I'm reading a letter on behalf of Alderman Raymond Lopez.

President Driver and members of the Commission, welcome to the 15th Ward and its historic Canaryville community.

I wish I could have been here to offer these remarks in person; however, a lack of coordination by the CCPSA has made tonight's meeting difficult for myself and members of the community to participate.

Thank you to 9th District Councilor

Denise McBroom for sharing this message with you and the members of the community in attendance tonight.

Currently, the Chicago Municipal
Code grants the ability to the CCPSA to create
policy for the Chicago Police Department. What
the enabling ordinance of the CCPSA does not
allow is the Commission's ability to create
parameters, policies, or procedures that violate
the Municipal Code itself and its subsequent
enforcement by the Chicago Police Department.

It remains highly disingenuous for any leader or organization to mischaracterize traffic stops as anything less than the enforcement of the law. Window tints, non-functioning vehicle lights, failure to obey traffic signal, speeding, et cetera, are all legitimate reasons to be pulled over by local law enforcement. It should not be the goal of the Commission to create mechanisms to avoid individual accountability.

I believe the CCPSA should focus its attention on ensuring that all policies are adhered to by responding and/or engaging

officers. Your policy goals should be ensuring all cameras are working, police lights and sirens are activated, and appropriate tone and tenor when possible for those who are being investigated.

If the City Council-created body is serious about improving positive outcomes during traffic stops, I recommend the Commission and all District Councilors read The Stop: Improving Police & Community Relations by Dwayne Bryant. His work combined the themes of mutual respect, personal responsibility, and accountability. These three benchmarks should be the guiding pillars of the discussion.

The CCPSA has the opportunity to educate communities ignorant to their rights and responsibilities when pulled over, the need for respectful engagement by both driver and law enforcement and an understanding of what happens when either side chooses to violate the previous tenets.

As someone elected to make laws in the City of Chicago for the last decade, I take that responsibility very seriously. It falls

upon all of us to educate our constituents to 1 understand what laws exist and what the repercussions are should they choose to ignore them. Consider that as you decided what exactly 4 5 the purpose of this conversation. Until then, I 6 remain respectfully Alderman Raymond Lopez. aware of the time. 7 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Next three speakers were 8 Lee Bielecki, Joi Imobhio, and Anna McBroom. 9 MR. BIELECKI: Lee Bielecki, 22nd District 10 Police Council. I'm here to talk about the issue 11 12 of traffic stops. No doubt, anti-police activists, 13 social justice groups like Impact for Equity, 14 Free2Move Coalition will tell you that traffic 15 16 stops are racist and that they harm the black and 17 brown communities. But let's dive into some facts. 18 Between January 1st, 2023, and December 31, 2024, 19 police -- Chicago Police have recovered over 20 8,000 guns on traffic stops. 21 22 Now we can play with percentages, but that's a fact. 23

On traffic stops alone, here in the

9th District, Chicago police officers have recovered 183 guns in 2023, 238 in 2024.

hands of police.

The last traffic stop data posted by the Illinois Department of Transportation is from 2023. 51 percent of drivers stopped in Chicago by Chicago Police were black drivers, 31 were Hispanic, 14 percent white. The highest percent of citations were issued to white drivers. 96 percent of all traffic stops resulted in verbal warnings.

But let's dive into some other statistics. The latest community area trends list the top ten communities for violence. I ask you, what are the police resources supposed to do? Since many shootings and acts of violence occur in these communities and cause undue harm and tragedy to the victim's families, where do you want the line in the sand to be drawn?

Children are dying, not at the

Now, I could suggest some suggestions, and I will be making a proposal to the Commission, but the bottom line is that while police continue to be the punching bag for these

so-called social justice groups, the true problem lies in the communities where violence is occurring.

Police need the ability to do their job. As I've said many times over, traffic stops must be based on probable cause and reasonable suspicion. They must be done constitutionally. And I know Brian took my poster -- knocked my poster down, but I have a list -- I have pictures of guns recovered on traffic stops. I suggest everybody take a look at them.

MS. IMOBHIO: Good evening. My name is Joi Imobhio, and I am the policy strategist at Impact for Equity. I'm here tonight to weigh in on CCPSA traffic stop policy deliberation. Let me first start by saying no one needs to be educated on their lived experience of being stopped multiple times in a month. And to simply say thank you to CPD is spitting in the face of black and brown people who get stopped and harassed every day here in Chicago.

So the bottom line is that CCPSA needs to create a strong and effective CPD traffic stop policy that disrupts the status quo

and addresses the root cause of Chicago's pretextual traffic stop problem.

The traffic stops policy should include a minimum of three components. First, the policy should prevent police from making stops for a set of low-level traffic violations that we know don't pose a significant traffic safety risk that will require an immediate police response. Rather than spending thousands of officer hours on low-level violations, like a single broken headlight or registration that is expired last week, the police should prioritize responding to driver behavior that is actually dangerous.

I actually got a call today that there was a 16-year-old girl who was murdered, and that they called the police, the police didn't come. She was outside for hours until the police came.

So these are the types of incidents that we're saying that the police should actually be addressing.

That would include also stopping someone when they're driving at dangerous speeds

or if they're running a red light.

Second, the policy should end pretextual traffic stops, which means they should stop using traffic code violations as an excuse to stop someone to look for evidence of crimes that they don't have reasonable suspicion or probable cause for.

Pretextual traffic stops take a needle in a haystack approach. Stopping as many cars as you can in the hope that you will maybe find some evidence of a crime.

What the community wants is for police to focus their attention on actual suspicious activity. Our proposal to limit pretextual traffic stops would have no impact on police's ability to stop someone from robbery, carjacking, or any other investigatory stop.

Lastly, I wanted to say that this issue does not need to be addressed in Springfield. This is why we created a Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability. We want you guys to keep your power and introduce policy. And the last thing about this gun that he — this board that they brought, the Office of

Attorney General Office has data that shows a lot of these guns that they're recovering are actually for technical violations and not because of serious crime. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: So everybody's clear in the audience, I'm the chair of this meeting. I didn't stop anybody from talking, and I haven't stopped anybody from talking.

If you would have kept talking, I wouldn't have stopped you, but I'm chairing this meeting. This is my first verbal warning to you all. Please stop. If I feel the need to stop somebody from talking, I will do that.

Our next speaker is Tree Palmeras. Hope I got your last name right.

MS. PALMERAS: Dexter Reed would still be alive if we had a policy against pretextual stops.

The police -- the social justice movement is not using police as a punching bag. Police are a punching bag to the black community. The Department of Justice found that they could not even stop themselves from brutalizing Chicagoans and violating the law during

ride-alongs. Not even with the Department of 1 2 Justice in the car could police behave. They are a danger to Chicagoans. 3 And therefore in the interest of public safety, 4 5 police need to be kept away from citizens as much 6 as possible. Dexter Reed would still be alive. 7 There are so many others that would still be 8 here. 9 A broken taillight or something 10 that needs to be fixed on a car is not enough of 11 12 a safety violation to invite citizens into what we already understand is a dangerous problem. 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Is there 14 anyone else who has not turned in a witness slip 15 16 that would like to speak? You can come up to the 17 microphone. Please say your name and spell your 18 name and offer your comment. 19 MS. VOGEL: Hi. Good evening. My name is 20 Erin Vogel. I'm one of the District Councilors 21 22 from the 9th District. Thanks for holding this session in our district. 23

Pretextual traffic stops do not make

us safer. And as you heard from my colleague about guns and gun violence, that is not traffic stops.

Some data to consider among those numbers, less than 1 percent of stops led to firearm recovery, showing the inefficiency in detecting crime, and only 2.2 percent of those traffic stops resulted in arrest, demonstrating the lack of evidence of pretextual searches.

Fishing for contraband perpetuates cycles of harm and distress. The number one complaint I'm hearing from my constituents is about slow or in some cases no response time to actual emergencies. Regarding officer capacity, officers should focus enforcement efforts on infractions that pose immediate public safety risks, rather than minor vehicle issues.

And for you as Commissioners, we need a clear timeline for this community feedback on the draft policy, public reporting for the community input, and justification for any feedback that may not be included in the reports.

There has been a lack of communication to the District Councilors and the

public as to what stage of progress that the 1 2 Commission is currently in and what's being drafted and really how our feedback is being incorporated. 4 I look forward to hearing that 5 information. 6 CCPSA must not finalize any draft 7 policy without the community's approval. You are 8 the Community Commission for Public Safety and 9 Accountability. 10 I do expect you to keep those most 11 12 marginalized impacted by police violence at the center of your work and for the duration of your 13 term. Thank you. 14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. There are two 15 16 online public commenters. The first being 17 Derrion Barnes. MR. BARNES: Hi. Good afternoon. Can 18 everyone hear me okay? 19 20 PRESIDENT DRIVER: We can hear you. You can begin. 21 22 MR. BARNES: Thank you for your time. I'll begin -- so I was pulled over about twice 23 per week for a total of seven times during the 24

month of February. For context, I'll just tell you that I'm young, I'm black, I drive a Cadillac, my windows are tinted, and I was alone each time that I was pulled over.

I'm known for staying calm. I rolled all of my windows down. Usually keep my hands at 10 and 2, and I asked to reach for my wallet. Yet each police stop made me become increasingly uncomfortable each time. Some of the stuff were fast, and they seemed routine. I was issued a warning and able to move on, while the more uncomfortable stops included me being able to step out of the car without consenting to a search.

I was told that although legal, it is illegal to smoke and drive and have tints while doing so and can result in a DUI, but, again, no time was I actually caught doing this while driving. And of the seven times that I was pulled over, only one actual ticket was issued. The most uncomfortable, however, was an extremely detailed search, including three squad cars and six officers blocking me in. Three officers surrounded me and two others searched my car for

over 20 minutes, even checking the area where my spare tire sits. I expressed how I was becoming more anxious because of the over-policing and not because that I thought that they would actually find anything.

One, they asked me if I was taking medicine for that anxiety. And in addition to the search, that line of questioning made it feel like a more targeted investigation instead of a random traffic stop.

The interaction showed me that although legal, the war on drugs still seems to persist as a way to over-criminalize and police black-populated areas which do not to enhance actual public safety in our neighborhoods. I think some policy should redefine the reasonable suspicion or probable cause for a crime. What that is, because it can vary greatly from officer to officer, if only 2.2 percent of traffic stops resulted in an arrest and only 1 percent of stops find illegal contraband, and less than 1 percent of stops leads --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Our next speaker is District Council member Alees Edwards.

MS. EDWARDS: Can you hear me now?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PRESIDENT DRIVER: We can hear you.

MS. EDWARDS: Great. My name is Alees Edwards. Thank you so much for allowing me to speak publicly.

I am going to talk about one situation with a community member I've talked about before. A pillar of our community's son was coming home from work. He works in construction. Parked in front of his home. Не had his lights on. He was bending over in his car to pick up his bag and go in the house, and when he got up from that position of bending over in his car, there was an officer out there telling him to get out of the car. They told him that they were basically asking for his ID because he had his car lights on while the street lights were on. And it's a bogus, you know -- I would say pretextual stop. They were asking him to get out of the car. He felt uncomfortable. And they said if he doesn't get out, that they were going to bust the window. They were going to drag him out of the car. He finally did get They tossed his car. Found absolutely out.

nothing. And so for those who think that this is just us being ridiculous, the stop was ridiculous. He had to go to court, and the court actually threw the case out. It was for zero reason. Even asking for a white shirt to come to the scene, they backed up the bogus stop. So there could have been a scenario where the officers could have maybe introduced themselves to him. Maybe created some kind of friendly conversation, but they instead decided to do a pretextual traffic stop and caused some anxiety on him.

The second thing that I wanted to say is Derrion, who just spoke, is a personal friend. I actually know him. And I was enraged when I found out he had been stopped so many times, as calm, cool, and collective as he is.

When you say that we are in the black community just being -- I don't know what the right word is, someone who just said. What we're trying to do is keep the community safe. It really doesn't keep us safe if you're pulling us over with a lot of anxiety, causes PTSD, and it could cause unsafe results.

And we're asking that you only pull people over that actually --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Your time is up.

That concludes all of our virtual speakers. Is there anyone else that's in the audience that did not turn in a witness slip that would like to offer public comment before we close out the public comment portion of this program?

Because you didn't turn a slip, state your name and spell it for the record.

MR. PATTON: My name is Jackson Patton.

J-A-C-K-S-O-N, P-A-T-T-O-N. I live on the west side, and I would like to encourage people to read traffic stop policies from police districts other than Chicago that have virtually banned pretextual traffic stops by eliminating pulling people over for low-level civil offenses. It can be done. It's not radical. And it actually contributes to community safety. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Last call before we end this section. We will now move into -- that concludes our public comment

portion.

MR. CRAWFORD: Good evening. My name is
Anthony Crawford. I think it's weird that people
think not having your taillights working is a
minor thing.

I ride a motorcycle. When I'm coming up on a car, and it doesn't have taillights, I'm assuming it's in motion. And then when it turns out not to be in motion -I've had many friends who have run into the back of cars and end up paralyzed or worse. The same when you have a vehicle coming at you, and it only has one light, you assume that it's something small, like another two-wheel vehicle, only to find out at the last minute that it's a four-wheel vehicle, and it doesn't have both of its lights working, and now you're in the middle of it, and you get hit by it.

I don't know who everybody thinks is supposed to stop and tell these people that they need to get their car fixed.

A civilian can't do it because these kids will kill you, so it has to be the job of the police. It's not a small thing to not have

your car functional. It's a vehicle that weighs 1 2 several tons, and you're moving at a high speed down the street. You need to have someone let 3 you know that it's not functioning correctly, and 4 5 that needs to be a person who has the authority to enforce that. 6 Maybe what we need is fix-it tickets 7 like they have in California. If you get the 8 thing fixed in a certain amount of time, they 9 waive the ticket. But to get rid of it wholly 10 just puts people at risk. But apparently people 11 12 nobody cares about. Thank you. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. This concludes 13 the public comment period of our special meeting. 14 We will now offer Commissioners 15 16 five minutes each to share their perspective on 17 the proposed traffic stop policy. We will begin with Commissioner 18 Gottlieb. 19 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Can you hear me? 20 Okay. So thank you --21 22 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Before you begin -- before you begin. For the record, Remel -- Vice 23

President Remel Terry is present, and we have six

24

out of six commissioner present for a quorum.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thank you, President Driver. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to speak with you all today and to make very clear where I stand on traffic stop policy.

I've been thinking about this issue for a very long time. I've engaged with countless community members and analyzed many studies that have examined what happened in other places when traffic stop policies change.

The evidence provides a clear picture of what to do. It is clear that traffic stops are a remarkably ineffective and inefficient way to fight crime. It is also clear that prioritizing low-level traffic enforcement places officers at greater risk of harm and hinders the ability of the officers to enforce traffic laws like speeding that actually keep us safe.

For these reasons, I unequivocally support the following: One, substantial restrictions on the use of consent searches.

Two, substantial restrictions on the use of low-level stops. And three, substantial

restrictions on the use of pretextual stops.

I will break this down point by point, but I want to be super clear, state law does not preclude us from making these restrictions. Instead of debating whether to restrict these types of stops, I believe the Commission should focus on identifying the exceptions to these restrictions, determining what standard of evidence should apply to these exceptions, and clearly defining the types of stops that are low-level.

Consent searches are unique in that we have a legal obligation to restrict their use. The Consent Decree clearly states that to conduct an investigatory stop officers need reasonable articulable suspicion that the person is involved in a crime or possesses evidence of the crime.

The Consent Decree is a floor, not a ceiling. So we are required to restrict consent searches to at least this extent.

I believe we should restrict consent searches to serious crimes, and that we should look at whether reasonable articulable suspicion is a rigorous enough evidentiary standard for

vehicle searches.

In addition to restricting when consent searches are done, we also have an obligation through the current Fourth Amendment policy to place guidelines and how these consent searches are conducted. Specifically, we must require officers to communicate in procedurally just ways, to treat individuals with respect throughout the duration of the stop, to make stops no longer than necessary, and to have body-worn cameras turned on so that the incident is reported.

In the case of pretextual and low-level stops, we do not have the same legal obligation we do with consent searches. But the evidence and logic makes it clear that we must treat them in exactly the same way.

There's no reason why officers should be permitted to conduct a traffic stop for the purpose of investigating a crime unless they have evidence that this person was involved in that crime.

There's also no reason for an officer to stop someone for a low-level offense,

unless they have evidence that this person committed a serious crime.

In the end, in the exceptions where pretextual or low-level stops need to be conducted, officers absolutely should be required to communicate in ways consistent with procedural justice to treat individuals with respect throughout the duration of the stop, to make the stop only as long as is necessary, and to have body-worn cameras recording the incident.

We have an incredible opportunity here to create a policy that improves the lives of many people.

An effective traffic stop policy guided by evidence and community input can help build trust between the police and the community they serve, improve road safety and make the work of officers safer.

Given these stakes, I will only be able to support a traffic stop policy if it, one, substantially restricts the use of consent searches; two, substantially restricts the use of pretextual stops, and three, substantially restricts the use of low-level stops.

In closing, I want to thank all the community members and advocates who raised the alarm on this issue.

Thank you for pushing the Commission and others in the police accountability space to address the harm that current practices are causing. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Good evening,
everyone. So my perspective on the issue of
traffic stops is really framed by the same
reasons that I joined the Commission in the first
place, so I'll start with those.

The reason I was interested in serving on the Commission is because I believe that everything in our City flows from our ability to be safe. Public safety is the chief concern in my opinion for everything else that we're able to do, business, education, et cetera, and we have a public safety crisis here.

So I say that to say that I believe that the Chicago Police Department is a vital partner in ensuring the public safety of Chicago.

I do not believe that we can do it

without them.

To that end, I see members of law enforcement, just as I see teachers or doctors or lawyers or sanitation workers, I see them as professionals. I see them as people whose experience and training and education should drive the policy for the work that they do.

That said, when I think about traffic stops, I think of them as a tool. One of many tools that members of the Chicago Police Department have to, yes, one, enforce the law because that is their job. We are all bound by laws. And, two, to serve our communities to keep us safe. And so I am not inclined to support any policy that restricts the ability of the Chicago Police Department to enforce law. Let me be a little bit more specific.

If we're talking about limiting certain types of stops, the way I see that is that it is taking away or disregarding, yes, the education, experience, training of officers on the ground. It takes their eyes away.

You know, it's easy for I think people outside of law enforcement to decide what

should and shouldn't be done, but I think that that's a difficult prospect when you've never done the work.

Those of us who have never conducted a traffic stop can read everything that we want to about traffic stops, but you'll never know how dynamic a traffic stop can be. A stop, yes, could start for one thing and in a millisecond become a different thing.

When I hear my community talk -- and I want to say this, because in a lot of the conversations around traffic stops, I do hear race used as a justification for supporting a certain policy perspective. So I'm going to say this. That I believe every single Chicagoan is entitled to the same degree of safety, but I will say as a black woman who lives in Chicago, we have to be very careful about saying one entire community thinks one entire way about public safety and how the police should act, because I am a Chicagoan who has lived here my entire life with the exception of my time in college, and I don't hear some of the things that I hear about what the black community wants.

So I think that if we're going to have respectful conversation, we have to acknowledge that just like on any other issue, there is no one racial community that's the monolith. So there are various perspectives throughout all communities about how we want to be policed, how we want police to behave, and I

do think it's important to note that.

So, generally speaking, as it relates to limiting certain searches, as it relates to consent searches, as it relates to -- what else are we talking about? Oh, handcuffing, all sorts of behavior that could occur during traffic stops, my general opinion on these things is we need to respect the ability for police to do their jobs. Yes, lawfully, respectfully, constitutionally so that both parties are respected, the police and the citizens, but I am very, very concerned about being so prescriptive that we take away the discretion that we painfully -- to train for, to have, and to understand so that they can keep both the public safe and themselves.

I will say I am very concerned about

officer-safety issues as it relates to a traffic stop policy. We know that traffic stops are one of the most dangerous things that officers do. We have seen that.

And I'm also concerned about the public. What I hear from my community is a desperate desire to be safer in this City. And so I would like to give our Department every single tool available to them to get us closer to that reality.

I'm not inclined to support anything that takes tools away from them. And so I hope that whatever we land on is a policy that is smart, that's effective, and that gets us closer to the type of safe City that we all deserve to live in.

MR. RUBI NAVARIJO: Thank you, everyone.

I've also thought a lot about this issue. I

think if there is going to be a policy that gets

put in place that either restricts low-level

stops significantly or consent searches, it needs

to be done carefully, and it needs to be done in

consideration in regards to the discretion that

an officer will have in regards to these actions.

For me, a big thing is resource allocation.

On the north side where I'm from and where I've lived, traffic -- honestly, there really isn't any traffic enforcement. People blow red lights. People blow stop signs. There is no regard for that. Yet, we see people -- or I see officers on traffic stops for more than 20 minutes, or I notice that they spend a considerable more amount of time pulling people over, and this is just my personal observations as a resident of Chicago.

is an extremely important thing to consider. And if this is a tool which many officers have in conversations that I've had preliminarily with them, they've told me that this is a tool for them; however, a lot of them have told me that they'd like for more guidance around it. A lot of their colleagues don't perform traffic stops the same as others. And I think there's a desire not to have mandates, but to have standards. To have standards that all officers, especially when they conduct a good or bad traffic stop, that

both a driver and an officer can be held to that account. So documentation needs to be incredibly important as part of a policy. And then also the training portion is going to be incredibly important, especially if we're going to be talking about specific terms.

With that being said, I agree with a lot of about what Commissioner Gottlieb had said around consent searches.

I feel like there needs to be a real effort to reduce pointless interactions with residents. It's not safe.

I went to my very first officer funeral, and Officer Martinez, unfortunately, his life was taken away during a traffic stop. We also can't deny the dangers of traffic stops to police officers as well.

And it only takes one bad interaction in a traffic stop for somebody to have a bad taste in their mouth about the Chicago Police Department, and then the cycle of tension will continue, and we never will really reach public safety.

So I think that's another concern of

mine as well, that often I feel like maybe gets overlooked.

If people had been pulled over multiple times, which I've heard stories about at different District Council meetings, how do you think that's going to make them feel the next time they get pulled over?

So those are just some thoughts. No policy is final. We have -- we have had good conversations with the community, and the Commission is going to continue their community-driven process.

In short, I support a balanced approach. We can place sensible limitations on low-level stops, improve data collection, which I know is another important thing. Investigatory stops are different from traffic stops, and those are kept in different areas, and data interpretation and collection is important to understand the deployment of those resources, improving interactions with documentation and including informed consent rules for searches. Yet we must do so with an eye toward accountability, public safety and genuine

community building.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If done right, this policy has the potential to reduce disproportionate enforcement, foster trust, and offer a framework that both officers and residents find fair and effective.

After all, public safety is a shared responsibility. And any successful solution will require respect, clarity, and cooperation on all sides.

Somebody did mention examples in other cities and counties. In St. Peters, officers -- in Minnesota, I believe. Somebody correct me if I'm wrong. They -- officers mentioned in a study that they actually don't miss a lot of the pointless stops. In smaller counties and municipalities -- what is it called? Those standards numbers that they set, you need to pull X amount of people, you need to give X amount of tickets, they actually don't miss doing that. And they enjoy looking for actual public safety threats, like swerving on the road or lights or -- what do they call them? Ghost cars nowadays, driving without lights. So I don't think it's about creating mandates. I believe

it's about creating standards. And so the Commissioners have touched on a lot of points, and with that, I yield my time. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: My name Abierre Minor.

I want to just clearly at a high level talk about

my position on the traffic stop policy.

define pretextual stops in whatever policy we come up with. I believe that we need to have a restriction on the practice of pretextual traffic stops. I believe we need to have a restriction on all uses of consent searches, and I believe we need to prohibit stops for low-level traffic and non-safety-oriented infractions, also referred to as pretextual traffic stops, but also want to make sure that I am specific in my distinction.

I've heard through public comment a few community members calling for us to be more transparent about the policy and what they want to see in a policy. Okay. Can you all not hear me very -- okay. I hope you can all hear me a little bit clearer now.

So I've heard through public comment

a lot of folks asking about wanting -- wanting the opportunity to weigh in on a finalized policy. One of the things that I really want to address and talk about is an internal challenge that I've been having, and I know I have not been alone in this challenge, but some of the issues -- or some of the challenges to community engagement under the current Consent Decree process -- that we're -- what -- that we are walking into right now to draft this policy.

So far, we've noticed that there has been a prohibition of releasing the policy, right, for feedback.

I remember when we originally did our pretextual traffic stop policy hearing, we heard from all of these various communities throughout the country who have released -- who created some kind of pretextual traffic stop policy, and they talk a lot about the community engagement process. They talked about releasing their policy months in advance and allowing community members to write -- you know, to provide feedback, having these very intentional listening sessions, not just to hear folks' lived

experiences, but also to allow folks to, you know, provide comment on what they want to see in a policy and what language they want to see in a policy. That is something that I would love to have happen in our space, and I'm really feeling a lot of tension that that cannot happen because we are in the Consent Decree.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I also am very challenged at the fact that we can be very transparent about a timeline and what certain things look like in terms of like those internal negotiations, also because we're in a Consent Decree. I believe that good policy is made in collaboration with community. I believe in the reason why we are the Community Commission, and I would love to see community be at the center of this policy a little bit more than it currently is. And I understand that there are certain challenges that's outside the realm of our control, but I do know that if we had -- if we followed our process as written per ordinance, this will take shape a lot differently. Nonetheless, I'm happy that we are here and -- and we have the opportunity to provide our own feedback and talk about our

perspectives and so that you all can have a grounded understanding on some of the things we are considering in the policy. And I look forward to future engagements like this.

Lastly, I really wanted to address some of the comments that I've heard about violence in the black community.

It's so funny, myself and another commissioner was bonding over the fact that we both had an experience where we almost got shot on 47th and Damen. I used to live on 47th and Honore. I also had — to that point, I also kind of want to share a particularly troublesome experience that I had when I was younger as we're talking about traffic stops and the prevention of violence.

I remember being in Maggie Daley
Park where this man approached me and told me
that he was going to do an on-the-spot job
interview for me because I just looked so smart
and articulate. He overheard a conversation I
was having with a friend. So I go over to this
business -- this office building with him,
thinking I'm going to have an on-the-spot

interview, and he says, We're not going to take the elevator, we're going to go through the staircase. I walk into the staircase with this man, just to realize as the door closed that it was locked. This man then tried to assault me in that space, but luckily because God is good, someone was coming down the stairs, and I screamed out for help, and I went upstairs and they let me out of that staircase. I called the police to report this man and to let them know that he was in that building. They never showed up. I was 16.

This underscores a very troubling problem that exists in the City. A troubling problem that many of you mentioned tonight.

I believe that the closest to the problem is often closest to the solution. And as I read the DC monthly reports, there are so many community members calling for us to address response times in our communities, particularly those who are most impacted by violent situations and violent crimes. And I also would be remiss as the youth commissioner not to mention that most of the murders that happened in the last

year happened between the ages of 24 and -- the folks who were victims of those crimes were 24 years and under.

That being said, that's what underscores my commitment to addressing alternative response -- I'm almost done. I'm wrapping up. I promise. That's what underscores my commitment to an alternative response in this work, and I believe that it needs to be done in collaboration with District Councilors and community members who are most impacted by violence.

I thank you so much for your time for sharing my thoughts.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any other

Commissioners that would like to speak before I

close the meeting? With that, I'll close. I

will not share my particular views on where I

think this traffic stop policy will land. What I

will say is at whether it's this meeting or

several meetings that I've been to now and

listening to folks in the community, it's very

clear that this is a very polarizing issue, and I

would like to ensure the public and everybody

else that's listening that the role of the CCPSA is to create a policy that listens to the community, that travels across the City, that listens to officers, that listens to impacted people, that listens to experts, and that's what we have begun and that's what we will be doing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'd also like to clarify, I think there were a few public comments that were addressed to me. I don't know who they were speaking about when saying that, you know, people aren't from Chicago. I'm from Chicago. Both my parents and my -- almost my entire family graduated from this school that we're sitting in right now. They also mentioned that I was pulled over by the police five times last year. a very true thing. It's a real thing. Twice I was pulled over for not having a vehicle registration sticker. The first time I was pulled over was in January. I was unaware that I need -- that I hadn't got it renewed. Didn't drive the vehicle again. I got back in the vehicle a week later to go to the Secretary of State's office after taking off work to go down there, and on the way to the Secretary of State's

office is when I was pulled over a second time.

There were three other times that I was pulled over.

I say all that to say that when it comes to traffic stops, we have to find a balance between excessive traffic stops. As the Superintendent has said multiple times, traffic stops are going down and gun arrests are increasing. So -- and I also understand that I'm a person who has been a victim, who has been robbed in my own community in front of the building that I lived in. So I absolutely understand we need to get guns off the street.

I stopped counting a long time ago how many friends and family members that I've lost to gun violence. So I do hear you. I do know that it's a tough job. It's hard to do. That you put yourself at risk during these traffic stops, but I also understand the community feels at risk as well.

So as the president of this

Commission -- and I think I can speak for all of

my fellow Commissioners in saying -- that we work

very hard to make sure that we create a traffic

stop policy that the City of Chicago can be proud of. And with that and there being no further business before the Commission, this meeting is now adjourned. (WHEREUPON, the proceedings were adjourned.) 

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