1	COMMUNITY COMMISSION for PUBLIC SAFETY and ACCOUNTABILITY
2	PUBLIC MEETING
3	Thursday, July 31, 2025, 6:30 p.m. JLM Abundant Life Community Center 622 West Jackson Boulevard
4	Chicago, Illinois
5	
6	ADDEADANCEC.
7	APPEARANCES: President Anthony Driver Vice President Remel Terry
8	Commissioner Aaron Gottlieb Commissioner Sandra Wortham
9	Commissioner Abierre Minor Commissioner Rubi Navarijo (Via Telephone)
10	Commissioner Gina Piemonte Executive Director Adam Gross
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

PRESIDENT DRIVER: The July 31st meeting for 1 2 Commission for public safety and accountability is called order at 6:30 p.m. 3 Good evening, everyone. We're going 4 to get started. If you can, please take your 5 seat and please place your cell phones on silent 6 mode, remain seated, and if you will be using any 7 small hand-held devices, please refrain from 8 using them in a way that interferes with the 9 ability of others to hear the proceedings. 10 We will begin with the call of the 11 12 roll to establish a quorum. Commissioner Gottlieb. 13 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Present. 14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Driver is 15 16 present. 17 Commissioner Minor. Commissioner Piemonte. 18 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: 19 Here. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Rubi 20 Navarijo. Angel, is he attending online, Julie? 21 22 Somebody from staff. Adam? Is Angel online? He is present. Can he come off mute and say 23 present? 24

COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: I'm present. 1 I'm 2 present. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Great. Commissioner 3 Terry. 4 COMMISSIONER TERRY: 5 Present. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham. 6 With five out of seven members of 7 the community -- Commissioners from the Community 8 Commission present, we have a quorum and can 9 conduct the Commission's business. 10 Commissioner Rubi Navarijo has 11 12 requested to participate virtually. I move that Commissioner Rubi Navarijo be allowed to 13 participate virtually. 14 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Second. 15 16 PRESIDENT DRIVER: I moved, and it's been 17 seconded by Commissioner Terry for Commissioner Rubi Navarijo to be allowed to participate 18 virtually. Is there any debate on the matter? 19 Hearing none, we will now move to a vote. 20 Those in favor, please signify by saying aye. 21 22 (CHORUS OF AYES.) PRESIDENT DRIVER: In the opinion of the 23 Chair, the ayes have it, and Commissioner Rubi 24

Navarijo's virtual attendance is approved.

The next item of business is public comment. If you would like to share something related to the Commission's business, related to the Commission's work on Public Safety and Accountability, you have a few options. You can speak at a public meeting. You can also submit your public comment in writing by emailing your public comment to

CommunityCommissionPublicComment@cityofchicago.

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

Names are then 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 you approach the microphone and line up in the order in which your name is called. When it is your turn to speak,

please say your name and then spell your name for the record and then offer your comments. Each speaker will have two minutes.

Our first three speakers -- our first speaker is online, and it is Michael Weisberg. Should I move to the next speaker? If you are up there in the control area, I cannot hear you. You got to yell. Our next speaker is Karen Kane.

MS. KANE: Good evening. My name is Karen Kane, K-A-N-E. I'm on the 18th District Council. My public comment tonight is about a letter that the three district councilors from the 18th District sent to each one of the seven Commissioners, as well as the five aldermen who represent the 18th District, and it has to do with the results of the survey that was put out by the CCPSA in regards to the public safety.

So we're very interested in making sure that the public is aware, as well as each one of you Commissioners are aware of the results of the public survey that was put out by the CCPSA.

So the results -- I think there were

over 1300 responses, and we sent you the letter that summarized that we had to FOIA the information in order to get it.

We were initially asked to help generate responses, and so we covered it in our monthly meetings, et cetera, but then when we were looking for the re -- the whole summary of it, that wasn't readily available.

So over -- so here's the summary of what the survey said, and this is all in a letter that was sent to each one of you. Over two-thirds of the survey respondents said Chicago Police should not be limited in types of traffic stops made for low-level non-moving violations.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Can you pause for one second? I don't know if it's just me hearing that. Is everybody hearing the ringing? Sorry about that.

MS. KANE: No worries. Are we good? Okay. So a clear majority of people who responded to the survey indicated a different road than a majority of what the Commissioners are saying, which is saying to add additional restrictions and to add additional prohibitions. The

responses were over 1300. They were from every
one of the 22 Chicago Police districts, and over
80 percent -- of the 22 districts, over 80
percent of the district had a majority saying
they did not want the Chicago Police to have
further limitations in regards to types of
traffic stops.

So in our letter that I would hope
that you read, is that we ask you to acknowledge

that you read, is that we ask you to acknowledge that this is what the public is saying. We want to make sure our voices are being heard, our 18th District voices, which is just one piece of the 1300. And we -- we strongly encourage you to consider the changes to public safety, at least maintain --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Thank you.

MS. KANE: -- public safety. Thanks very much.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Our next speaker is virtual. I believe this is Lindsay Watt or Wax.

There is a quorum. All seven members of the Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability are present.

I'll call our next three all here in

person. Lee Bielecki, Jackie Baldwin, and W. Robert Schultz the Third.

MR. BIELECKI: Good afternoon. Lee Bielecki, 26th District, 22nd District Police Council. I'm here to talk about the traffic stop policy as well.

I watched the last four meetings.

Two I attended, two I watched. I watched it again today, especially your May meeting, which resembled some sort of chaos. I hate to say it, but the most important thing that I take away from watching you guys talk about the traffic stop policy is that I don't think you really -- some of the Commissioners -- I could be specific, Commissioner Gottlieb and Commissioner Minor, don't really understand what articulate reasonable suspicion is.

You can sit there and look at an order and read it off of the special order, but you have to realize that it transcends onto the street. And when a police officer is on patrol, there are certain things — and you can't take away the instincts from police officers that resonate with what they're trying to do on the

street. I mean if you stop a car and the plate doesn't come back to that car, is that reasonable articulable suspicion? It should be.

Let's face it, if you think they used the family car to shoot up River North, that's not exactly what would happen.

I think you need to reevaluate your position. And I think that the six points that you put in your policy suggestions are -- don't reflect what public safety should be.

If you can't stop somebody for not wearing a seat belt, you're putting them at risk. I don't know if you've seen anybody ejected from a car, but I have. I've seen them beheaded and broken bones. You can't -- you can't. You've got to allow the police to be the police. And that's important.

And I'd like to see from Minor and Gottlieb, I had a list of what your actual responsibilities are as towards working groups.

I'd like to hear more about the budget. I'd like to hear more about community engagement and maybe listening sessions. Are there going to be any scheduled on the budget and on the hate crimes

task force? I don't see that.

I know you guys are doing the traffic stop world tour with all the districts, but I don't see you doing anything related to what you're actually supposed to be working on.

Fowler sent it out to me, and I think that's something that you have to actually focus in on. Thanks, Beth.

MS. BALDWIN: Shalom. I'm Jackie Baldwin, the -- I lead the antiracism and -- equity and antiracism work at JCUA. Okay. Thank you.

I'd like to thank everyone who's here tonight and the CCPSA representatives that lead this very important work.

And what I have seen and heard and after looking at -- looking at the data is that while there may be things the police believe that they can use to benefit them, for me, all of that is outweighed by the fact that it's rooted in harmful and racist practices.

All of the data and personal stories that I've heard over these past few months make it unequivocally clear that these pretextual stops are harmful. Continue to be

rooted in racialized practices. They're 1 financially burdensome, and they don't really do anything to create safety for our residents or 3 police officers. 4 In fact, sometimes I think they're 5 6 put in greater jeopardy. Historically, we know that these 7 stops don't build positive relationships between 8 community and police, yet they are still included 9 in policy. 10 Today, you all can choose to lead 11 12 and demand that Chicago begin to adopt antiracist policies and strengthen the power of other cities 13 that are looking at us to lead on this and demand 14 the same. 15 You've heard the stories. You've 16 17 seen the data. I hope tonight you will use your power to put an end to policing that preys on 18 people. 19 Use your powers to hold officers 20 accountable and to engage with community as 21 22 you've done. And to alderpeople or 23

representatives that are here, it's budget

24

It's time for more thoughtful, more 1 season. creative ways that we can use the money that's at hand to do many of the things that we want to be done. 4 So I thank you again for your work 5 and may -- good luck. Help us all tonight. 6 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. 7 MR. SCHULTZ: Good afternoon. Or good 8 evening. My name is W. Robert Schultz the Third. 9 Call me Robert. The spelling of my name is W. 10 R-O-B-E-R-T, S-C-H-U-L-T-Z. I'm here as a 11 12 representative for the Free2Move Coalition. also work at the Active Transportation Alliance 13 and work with the Transportation Equity Network. 14 I always state when I'm at these 15 16 meetings that 20 years ago, when I was on staff 17 at Amnesty International, we looked at the practice of racial profiling and pretextual 18 traffic stops and found it to be ineffective 20 19 years ago. 20 We use statistics from Chicago, and 21 22 20 years hence it's still the case that

pretextual stops are ineffective.

So we are urging the CCPSA today to

23

24

vote to ban pretextual traffic stops outright categorically.

We want you to vote in favor of strong restrictions against low-level traffic stops, and we want a strong policy that's actually impactful, not something that's just watered down.

We are concerned about the way that people move about the City. One of -- we're involved in a holistic approach to safety in our community, particularly on our streets. We're working on -- to change the way streets are designed so that people can move safely and encourage safe driving by drivers.

Unless you do that, people will drive like they're on the Kennedy.

So one of the ways to address safety is to redesign our streets, to eliminate pretextual traffic stops. There are many things I can go into, but I only have six seconds left.

Thank you, and I hope you vote to ban traffic stops

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We're going to try Michael Weisberg again who I believe is

online.

This is Michael or Michelle, so please forgive me if I mispronounce your name.

MS. WEISBERG: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me now? Hello?

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Yes, we can hear you.

MS. WEISBERG: Great. Thank you. Good evening. I'm a volunteer court advocate with the 18th Police District. Every day in criminal courts, I hear cases that involve police officers making valid and legal traffic stops that result in apprehending individuals who have illegal guns and drugs in their vehicles.

Those stops -- or these stops lead to arrests for driving with suspended, revoked, or nonexistent licenses and for DUIs. All public safety concerns that should not be ignored.

These stops also result in arresting people who have outstanding criminal felony warrants for some very serious offenses.

The CCPSA conducted a recent City survey about traffic stop limitations. Over 80 percent of the 22 police districts had a majority of respondents indicating CPD should not be

limited in the types of traffic stops made for low-level, non-moving violations.

I hope the Commission recognizes and accepts those results when they vote tonight.

If the Commission really wants to keep Chicago citizens as safe as possible, they should uphold what the current Illinois state laws are regarding legal traffic stops, which are in place to make all of us safe. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Our next three speakers are Justin Vincent, Alex Hinsley, and John Catanzara.

MR. VINCENT: Good evening, everyone. My name is Justin Vincent. I'm a 21-year-old entrepreneur from Chicago, Illinois. I'm blessed to be here and appreciate you guys for listening to our voice.

I want to speak about the traffic violation stops. I personally been have a victim of that since I could remember, you know, and people in my family. I don't know if it's because of my skin color or what, but I would definitely say that it wastes a lot of the police's time, my time, and I do believe it's

racism, but I understand why it is in place, because of the violence in our City, but I believe if the CCPSA actually believes in stopping the violence and helping the community be a safer place and hold the community accountable, that we should invest more money and more time into things that's actually preventing the violence from being stopped in our City.

Me personally, boots on ground in the community, help with the children, teach them about financial literacy and expose them to new ways about making money instead of them, you know, contributing to the violence.

So, again, I personally, I'm not going to say no one else here that spoke against it has been a victim of it how I have been, but I will say these rules and everything that's being put in place, unfortunately my type of people aren't here to speak about it, and my age or my skin color, and that's why I made sure that I was here today, to make sure I'm a voice for our people.

I pray that you guys really take it into consideration, and not just a consideration

of, you know, removing the law, but putting something in place that replaces it that actually focuses on violence prevention and making sure the public is safe. Appreciate you guys.

MS. HINSLEY: I'm Alex Hinsley. I'm actually a new resident to Chicago by way of Memphis,

Tennessee. And our city faced similar decisions to the ones you have before you today regarding pretextual traffic stops pretty recently. In fact, an organization I was a part of had hundreds of volunteer hours to assess the impact of pretextual stops over five years. Similar to reports that Free2Move has done, and we found that they disproportionately impacted black drivers. It didn't lower the crime rate, and traffic fatalities had actually risen when traffic stops rose.

In December of 2022, we presented this report to our City Council, and we asked them to do something about this ban -- about this and ban pretextual stops. Unfortunately, they didn't take action, and one month and one day later, Tyre Nichols was murdered by police in a traffic stop.

Unfortunately, it took a tragedy in the eyes of the nation on Memphis for them to do something. So I drafted ordinances, and I co-led the work to ban certain pretextual stops -- low-level stops.

What I learned from other cities across the nation is that the pattern is the same. They don't make it safer.

And, actually, a year after
Philadelphia banned certain pretextual stops,
their racial disparities dropped, and they
recovered more firearms.

So the ordinance I drafted originally banned 17 types of stops for low-level violations, and the City Council watered it down to five. A year later it was preempted.

It would be a mistake to assume that the same could not happen in Chicago, especially in this political environment.

I hope you will learn from Memphis's mistakes and protect marginalized people before a tragedy strikes, but I hope you will also acknowledge the great privilege that Chicago has in a state like Illinois to take bold action.

Many inclusive cities in the south 1 2 can't do that, so do that for them. Take bold Reduce as much harm as you can and lead the way for other cities to do the same. 4 Thank 5 you. MR. CATANZARA: Good afternoon. Oh, thanks 6 for paying attention because this is the first 7 time you've actually looked at somebody you know 8 that's going to dissent from your opinion. 9 I would like -- while I would like 10 your undivided attention. You are an elected 11 12 official. COMMISSIONER MINOR: Point of order. That's 13 a personal attack on my character, my person. 14 MR. CATANZARA: No, it is not. It is on your 15 16 attention level. 17 PRESIDENT DRIVER: John, can you please --MR. CATANZARA: I've been watching her stare 18 at her phone the whole time. 19 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Point of order. 20 Whatever. Let's be honest, 21 MR. CATANZARA: 22 your decisions are all made. I was in Canaryville at the meeting 23

where you were all asked what your positions

24

were, and three of the five of you raised your hand and already made up your mind before this whole process was even concluded. This is a farce. This is a major circus. And for people to stand up here and try and talk about other cities and compare Chicago to other cities, let me educate you a little bit.

Chicago recovers as many guns as New York and L.A. combined. Digest that. Two cities that are bigger than us, and we have more guns, more violence, and more murders than those two cities ahead of us in population combined.

So I don't want to hear about Memphis or any other city. We have a unique violence problem in this city.

I don't know how you think as

Commissioners and as a created entity you've had
any right to trump state law. Traffic violations
are a state law. That's where the change needs
to occur, if it's going to occur. You can come
up with all the policies you want. The

Department can come up with all the policies they
want. We're going to end up in court literally
fighting over this right for our officers to

enforce state statute, because most, if not all, of these pretextual stop violations are state statutes. You have no authority to overrule that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Quit thinking so much of yourselves as a power. Try and focus your energy on other stuff that really matters, because this new domino effect across the country of, Oh, we need to stop this policy of pretextual traffic stops. Follow the law. Listen to what you're instructed to do, and many, if not most, of these situations that make the news will be nonexistent. It just will. But this victimhood that you keep embracing and encouraging only leads to more and more people pretending like this is some problem that it really is not. And to attack a councilor who defends the men and women of this Department who lost a brother to violence, I could tell you in the last three officers we lost, two of three were because of traffic stops and armed offenders. If they'll shoot them, they will shoot any one of you and any one of you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Our last two speakers are Shannon Coleman, and then we'll go

back to our virtual speaker.

MR. COLEMAN: Good evening. My name is Shannon Coleman, and my public comment is how do you all plan to engage the youth and make them knowledgeable about what is going on in the politics?

There's policies put in place that the youth doesn't know about, but they're the ones who heard from them. Being my complexion and having locks, after a certain time, I'm considered a threat, and I can get pulled over consistently, but there are some who don't experience that type of racism and since it doesn't affect them, they will argue against it.

There's people here that agree that you should be ejected from your vehicle because of a license plate or like one may say, police instinct, but police instinct can be mistaken for abuse of power and blame racism, just like a license plate can come up wrong in the corrupt system.

A solution should be -- a solution should be people who are being pulled over where illegal substances are found instead of

completing -- hold on. I'm sorry. A solution 1 2 should be the people who are being pulled over for these illegal substances, instead of completely alienating them from society, you 4 should put a policy in order that teaches them 5 what to do and what not to do. 6 As you see today, people don't care 7 about the people who are victims for this law, so 8 instead of just completely abiding to that, let's 9 just make a change. Thank you. 10 And our last public 11 PRESIDENT DRIVER: 12 speaker is Lindsay Wax who is virtual. MS. WAX: Hello. Can you hear me? 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Yes, we can hear you. 14 Okay. Hi. I'm Lindsay Wax. 15 MS. WAX: 16 L-I-N-D-S-A-Y, W-A-X. My public comment today 17 relates to the pending vote of the Commission on traffic safety stops. 18 I want to voice my opinion that I 19 support new restrictions on the Chicago Police 20 Department on making certain types of traffic 21 22 stops.

I believe these restrictions will
make our city safer. Laws change. They have for

decades, and it's important to look at laws and change them when they no longer serve the purpose that they were meant to be for.

More than 44 percent of all Chicago drivers stopped by police officers in 2024 were black. Nearly 35 percent were Latino. By comparison, just 14.8 percent of drivers stopped by Chicago Police were white. The population of Chicago is 31.4 percent white, 30 percent Latino, 28.7 percent black, and 7 percent Asian, according to the 2020 U.S. census.

Black drivers were more likely to be searched during a traffic stop and black drivers represented more than 56 percent of people arrested by the CPD after a traffic stop.

Our efforts for change should be focused around system changes that address the root cause of crime, like public mental health centers, non-police crisis response, youth jobs, and violent prevention programs.

The solution to crime and preventing it isn't to punish those who we think are committing crimes the most, often by pulling them over more often for non-violent crimes, often

leading to violent encounters. The solution is root-cause-based investment in our communities. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We've reached the end of 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 June 26 was shared with all Commissioners. Are there any corrections to the draft minutes that have been circulated? If there are no corrections, I move to approve the minutes. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Second.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: I moved. It's been seconded by -- I think that was Commissioner Gottlieb -- to approve the minutes of the June 26 meeting. Is there any debate on the motion?

(NO RESPONSE.)

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Hearing none, we will now move to a vote. Those in favor of adopting the motion to approve the minutes of the Commission's

meeting held on June 26th, please signify by 1 2 saying aye. (CHORUS OF AYES.) PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any nays? 4 5 (NO RESPONSE.) 6 PRESIDENT DRIVER: In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the minutes from the 7 June 26 meeting are approved. 8 We'll now move on to new business. 9 It's important that the people of Chicago know 10 what services are available if they are ever a 11 12 victim of a crime. There are many victim service resources -- victim service resources that are 13 available at both the state and City level. 14 Today, and in meetings to come, the 15 16 Commission will be providing information on the 17 services that are available to crime victims across the City. 18 To start us off, we have invited a 19 representative from the Chicago Police 20 Department, Deputy Director Mike Milstein, to 21 share information about services for victims. 22 Deputy Director Milstein, please 23 24 join us on the stage.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: I'm not used to getting applause. Thank you for that.

Good evening, everyone. My name is Mike Milstein. I use he/him/his pronouns. I'm the Deputy Director for the Office of Equity and Engagement and Victim Services for the Chicago Police Department.

Appreciate the CCPSA Commissioners for inviting us to be here tonight. Thank you to everyone who came out on this summer evening and looking forward to talking a little bit about CPD's victim services program and answering questions from the Commission.

I'd also like to introduce two of our assistant directors, Leslie Guzman, who is our assistant director. Feel free to stand up.

Leslie is our assistant director for victim services for violent incidents. And Mariana

Martinez is our assistant director for gender-based violence and domestic violence.

They're in month two in these new roles, so please go easy on them, but they are quickly learning the fun parts about CPD.

If we can move on to the next slide.

So our mission with the Office of Victim Services for CPD, we are dedicated to -- sorry. We're dedicated to supporting and assessing victims and survivors of crime with the utmost respect, dignity, and care.

We are committed to reducing violence, enhancing departmental policies, and strengthening the Chicago Police Department's response to victims.

Our team serves as a viable bridge between the community and law enforcement, providing advocacy, guidance, and information on victim's rights through compassionate guidance and information on -- and information on victims' rights. We work to empower survivors, minimize trauma, and uphold the highest standards of victim-centered support, ensuring privacy and trust throughout the healing journey.

Next slide. We currently have two focus areas. The first is non-fatal gun crimes. So these will be incidents where someone is non-fatally shot, non-fatally injured through a gun crime. For any homicides, the City through the Department of Public Health has a partnership

with Chicago Survivors where homicide fam -families of homicide victims will get new
services through Chicago Survivors. So our
services are specific to folks who are shot
non-fatally on gun crimes or other violent
incidents non-fatally.

And then the other focus area in our program is domestic violence and gender-based violence, and we have a team that's specific within DV.

The next slide. On the next slide here, we just show our original structure. We have two distinct units, and that's to ensure that there is separation between domestic violence, non-fatal incidents. So, again, on the left side of your screen, we have violent incidents led by Leslie who has a team of program directors and victim specialists. And then on the right side is our domestic violence and gender-based violence team led by Mariana. Again, with program directors and victim specialists.

All of our victim specialists are non-police. They are civilian members. They are

not police officers. And they work throughout the City assigned to different districts, different locations throughout the City. Some are located within CPD station, some are located in a non-CPD station as well, but they are all non-police folks working hand in hand with victims and survivors.

Next slide. This slide here would just show the high-level process. What I really want to familiarize on this slide is we as CPD's victim services, we are not intended to be a long-term service provider. We recognize that victim services is best provided by community-based organizations, community-based service providers who can provide the more comprehensive wraparound services that a survivor may need. But we do have a unique position and ability within CPD where we have quick access to victims and survivors of incidents through case reports, through quick information about an incident occurring.

So our number one goal with any outreach that we give to a victim or survivor is to connect them with a community-based agency

that can provide them that more holistic support.

So when an incident occurs, our victim specialists will connect with victim or survivor and offer them to be connected to a community-based service provider. If that victim or survivor accepts, our team will help facilitate that warm handoff.

Sometimes we will be able to provide their information directly to a provider for that provider to reach out to them, or we'll provide the information for a contact at that agency to the victim or survivor for them to be able to follow up in their own time.

In many cases, we do have victims and survivors who are not ready for that connection yet. They're not ready to be connected with an agency. And so in those situations, our team will offer to provide them with whatever services that we can provide. And so in those cases, you know, if victim or survivor does accept to work with the CPD's victim specialist, we'll continue to try to provide them with the services that we can, with the goal still being to help connect them with an

agency when they are ready to do so.

And then there are many cases as well where we have victim or survivor who just says, you know, I'm good. I don't need anything at this time. Thanks for checking in. And, of course, we respect that, and we'll continue to follow up with that individual if any incidents occur following.

Next slide. So, again, we have two distinct roles, and these are victim specialist roles. The day-to-day functions of our victim specialist really is to review case reports, to identify victims and survivors, reach out to victims to offer immediate support, information and connections to community-based providers, and other immediate -- or support identified by that individual.

Similarly, we have folks who are victim specialists that are focused only within domestic violence. Those folks are 40-hour trained. They're state certified through the 40-hour domestic violence training to provide DV specific services for any victim or survivor that they work with, and then as we are expanding the

program, we are looking at adding additional specializations for survivors of human trafficking, sex assault, hate crimes, missing persons, you know, a handful of other kind of specializations.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Next slide. So just a quick list of some of the most common services that our team can provide. We can provide immediate crisis support assist in safety planning, help obtain orders of protection or navigate the justice system. We can help liaise between victims and detectives assigned to their case. If we have a victim who's being asked to do like a witness interview or meet with the detective and may not feel comfortable talking to that detective by themselves, we can be an advocate for them in those situations. We work to help file applications for crime victim compensation. Then, of course, refer and connect victims and survivors to community-based services and really other services as needed or as requested.

We always ask someone, you know, what do they need, what can we do to help start their healing journey or healing process and do

what we can to help facilitate that.

Next slide. Some other just considerations that it's important to highlight for us. All of our victim specialists are strictly prohibited by policy from sharing any information that they receive from a victim with anyone, including detectives or anyone in patrol, unless they have consent from the victim or survivor to do so.

Again, because our specialists are non-police, they're not officers, they're not mandated to report anything that a victim or survivor shares with them, unless there is consent. And so there are protections around situations where a victim or survivor may have been engaged in some sort of illegal activity. Our specialists cannot report that. They do not take action on those cases. They cannot share any of that information with anybody outside of themselves.

And then for our domestic violence specialists, they are all required to receive the 40-hour Illinois domestic violence training, which allows them to maintain confidentiality

under the Illinois Domestic Violence Act.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Next slide. Just some quick update on our staffing numbers. Currently, we have two assistant directors, as you just met. Four program directors, two for each of the different specializations. We currently have ten victim specialists. Those are folks doing the non-fatal work and then 14 domestic violence specialists. Again, those folks are specific to domestic violence and gender-based violence incidents. And then we currently have 28 vacancies. job is currently posted on the City's website. It is open until August 5th. If anybody's interested, please feel free to apply. But we are posting for 28 additional vacancies to be fully staffed at 55 victim specialists.

Once we are fully staffed, we'll be able to provide both a domestic violence specialist and a non-fatal specialist for all 22 districts across the entire City.

Next slide. Just some quick updates on our current service numbers. This is as of June 30th, so the first half of this year. As of June 30th, our team has done outreach to 5,006

victims or survivors. Of those individuals, 1,493 have denied services. We have been unable to make contact with 2,161 individuals. 234 we did not have the right information for, and we have provided services or connected with 1,618 victims or survivors.

The next slide. Just the top services that we provided. The number one that we most often provide is just information on the justice process. So this is sometimes just having a conversation with the individual, making sure that they understand what their rights are as a victim or survivor, making sure that they know how to go to court, obtain orders of protections if they would like, how to get access to crime victim compensation. Just making sure that they have the information that they need to help start their journey and what resources are available for them.

We've made referrals to a community-based organization to 758 individuals that we've connected with. So, again, these are going to be either we are providing them the contact information for someone at an agency that

they can call or they've given us permission to provide their contact info to that agency where we have partners that will do direct outreach to them.

We've done safety planning for 788 victims and survivors. We've helped find emergency shelter for 75 individuals, and we've assisted 197 individuals with going to court or the justice process to obtain orders of protections against offenders or abusers.

Last slide. Just any contact information. I did not list myself because I have new assistant directors who are new pros in this work, but please feel free to reach out to either Leslie or Mariana for any questions.

We're always looking for new partnerships, new folks to get involved, and any collaboration that anyone is interested in.

This is obviously a quickly growing work, and we want to make sure that the way that we implement victim services here at CPD works and fits well with a whole-of-government process for victim services that can support, you know, survivors in their most vulnerable times.

So appreciate, again, everyone being here tonight and happy to take any questions.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Deputy Director Milstein. Are there any questions from Commissioners? Recognize Abierre. Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you. Something that was new to me -- hi, thank you so much for your presentation. I know we've been in talks. I'm very grateful for all the changes that's happening in the Department, and I'm grateful for your leadership and your new directors. I'm happy I got the opportunity to be acquainted with them.

One of the things that's new to me is the safety planning element. I see that you serve 788 people, so I would love to know if you could just tell the audience a little bit more about what that looks like in the Department.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: Absolutely. So safety planning is going to come in many different forms. It often will be in a sense where we have -- in most cases, it's going to be a survivor of domestic violence or victim of

domestic violence where they may be a situation where they may feel unsafe to leave that situation, but they need some assistance in figuring out what is the right way to do so. And so our team will work with them to navigate their individual situation and see how we can help kind of give them some support to make a plan for how they can change their situation or just feel safe in their current situation.

A lot of times there's different complexities, you know, children involved, financial challenges, and so obviously very biased in the situation, but our team is equipped to help kind of navigate each individual situation and help work with that individual on coming together with a plan that makes that individual feel safe in their situation or having a plan to exit.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: I know domestic violence is one of the number one calls for service, so I think that's really critical work. Thank you.

My last -- I also just want to ask quickly, can you tell us a little bit more about service coordination, referrals, and partnerships

with other organizations in the City?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: So I just -- it is a little hard to hear with the echo, but just partnerships with other agencies? Yeah, absolutely. So we do partner with a lot of different agencies, depending on what, obviously, the victimization is. On our non-fatal side, we work a lot with your, you know, violence interrupters, violence intervention services. You know, I won't call it our ADS, but they all came from the nonprofit world. So they're very familiar, very connected. You know, we work with the typical agencies who are doing this work. A lot of agencies are funded by the City already through CDPH, so we work with them hand in hand, just making sure that there is a whole-of-government approach to those.

And then similar with the domestic violence and gender-based violence side, we have a lot of partnerships already. In some districts, we have direct hands-off with like connections for abused women and children or family rescue or lifespan. So we have a lot of partnerships in place with them as well.

Again, the overall goal for all of our services is to provide safe hands-off to agencies, and so we've been very intentional to build those partnerships upfront so that when we do have someone that we can refer or hand over, you know, connect with an agency, there's already a connection made between CPD and that organization, so it's more of a seamless process.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Any other questions from Commissioners? Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Hi. Thank you so much for your presentation. It's not so much a question but maybe a -- I don't know what it is, but I'll just say I really appreciated two things. One, you highlighting -- what you just said about, like -- your focus is on, for lack of a better phrase, the handoff, right? Because obviously the Department's main job is the enforcement of law, but we understand the interplay there and the importance of relationships.

The other thing, though, that I really appreciate you highlighting, I think for the public, is the dynamic of victim advocates,

specifically in domestic violence. Right? That there is the advocacy part that that communication of information doesn't always -- doesn't -- unless the victim agrees to get to sworn members. And I think, at least from my experience at the Department, I think one of these ongoing points of work -- and I'm glad to hear you talk about it -- is balancing that reality, and then also making sure the public understands that.

As I know you know, there's a lot of conversation publicly right now in government about domestic violence and the -- the increasing numbers, and I think sometimes it's important to say out loud what you've said is, even if we have advocates working with survivors, that doesn't necessarily mean the law enforcement have the information that advocates have. And I mean that doesn't always make the best story frankly and sometimes not the best ending, but I think it's just good for the public to understand those dynamics. And there's a reason for that, right? That makes a lot of sense considering the dynamics of domestic violence, but I don't know

that that's always reported in a way that does justice to the reality of being the law-enforcement entity in domestic violence and then being the advocate support system. I really appreciate you highlighting that.

And if I could just give an encouragement to the Department to continue to make sure that the public understands that. Even as this work continues. Of course we all want to see this problem go away completely. We also want to serve it with justice but with truth as well about the challenges of servicing survivors.

So I just wanted to say thank you for that and encourage you guys to continue to really, you know, say that, even as we talk about, you know, evidence-based prosecutions and the role of survivors and how they'd like to proceed. I just think it's a thing we don't necessarily talk enough about. So thank you for that, and I encourage us to talk more about it in public.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: Absolutely. Thank you for that. Appreciate it.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you, Deputy

Director Milstein. So my question is really quick. Based on the connections that community makes, how can we get you in community to share more about the work that you all are doing or, you know, having gatherings? Do you all do tabling, things of that nature? Because I think it's important to give you more of a platform and be out front so that maybe makes people more comfortable with engaging with you all, because you now start to have certain relationships, because I know you may partner with organizations, but that looks different than me seeing you in my community. So how can community bring you to them so that there's more intentionality in that engagement?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: Thank you for that question. I think the benefit of having a growing team is we have a lot more capacity now to be out more in community.

Obviously, you know, the number one goal every day for our specialists is to serve and support victims and survivors. But a key function of our office and our specialists and our program directors and even ourselves is to be

out in community talking about what CPD can provide, what we can do to help folks. So we are working, you know, as we are onboarding new staff, you know, making sure that they are understanding how to do community engagement, how to go out and talk about the work that we do.

And we do already have tables. We have a lot of fun giveaways that, you know, always was a good add-on.

So, yes, we definitely want to be out more. I would say like if there are folks who want us to come out to a table to a resource fair, anything you want to see us at, please reach out to Leslie or Mariana. We definitely support that and want to be out there as much as we can.

We are definitely trying to get out there a lot more now that we have a much bigger team to support it.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: You talked a lot about staffing in that last response, so I really want to highlight something that I thought was interesting in the Department.

Can you talk a little bit about what

traditional staffing levels looked like from the Department and maybe some of the changes that that presented and what current staffing levels really mean to the Department and how that might address some of the challenges that you might outline?

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: Specifically within victim services?

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Yes.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: I mean so prior to this year, our victim services program only was staffed to have seven victim advocates. And so, you know, thinking about only having seven folks to serve the entire City of Chicago, it's not -- you know, that's not really feasible. So to be able to go from seven victim advocates at the end of last year to now even having 21, 23 -- my math is off -- but even having 21 or 23 today and to still have 28 more to be able to bring on is a huge increase. I think it will definitely help increase the amount of folks that we can provide services to.

Definitely I think to Commissioner
Terry's point, get more community engagement

involved. So it's a huge significant expansion and growth. We're definitely having a lot of growing pains. Good ones, of course. But, yeah, it's been a very significant expansion in just the first seven months of the year, and my hope is we are fully staffed by the end of the year.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Any other questions from any Commissioners?

Thank you so much. We really appreciate you.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR MILSTEIN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Our next order of business will be new business.

We will start with votes on the Commission's traffic stop policy position. As we discussed in prior public meetings, the Commission is now reviewing the Chicago Police Department's policies and practices for traffic stops. We are working to develop a potential policy that reflects constitutional standards, national best practice, and the ideas and concerns that people from across the City have shared with the Commission.

We are working with CPD, the

Illinois Attorney General's Office, and the Independent Monitoring Team established under the federal Consent Decree that is focused on improving policing in the City of Chicago.

In early 2023, the Independent

Monitor recommended to the federal court in the

Consent Decree case that traffic stops by CPD be
added to the Consent Decree.

If the Court adopts that recommendation, any future traffic stop policy will be made through the process set out in the Consent Decree. That process includes review by the Independent Monitor and the Attorney General's Office, opportunity for community input, and the final approval by a federal judge. It would also mean that implementation of any new traffic stops policy will be overseen by the Independent Monitor and the federal judge in the case in order to assess CPD's compliance.

Right now, under City ordinance, the Commission has the authority to make traffic stops policy. So the Commission has been working to ensure that if traffic stops are included in the Consent Decree, the Commission continues to

play a major role in shaping that policy.

In April of this year, the City of Chicago submitted two versions of a proposed traffic stop policy to the Attorney General and the Independent Monitor. One version was a proposal developed by CPD, the other reflected individual Commissioner's position on CPD proposal.

The Commission has not yet taken a vote to provide direction to the Commissioners — the Commission has not yet taken a vote to provide direction to the Commissioners directly involved in policy negotiations.

Tonight, the Commission will discuss and vote on proposed policy provisions. These votes are intended to provide clarity about where the Commission stands at this point in the process.

It's important to note that the process of developing a final traffic stop policy is ongoing in negotiations with CPD, the Attorney General's Office, and the Independent Monitor.

Those negotiations and the related work with the court are governed by

confidentiality requirements. So the Commission can't talk about the content of those discussions, but we can talk about our own views and the Commission's position.

The Commission is working to support development of a policy that is grounded in constitutionality principles, guided by data and research, reflects community input, and designed to advance public safety in a fair and equitable manner.

As the negotiations continue, the Commission may revisit and revise its positions.

Until a final policy is adopted,

Commissioners will continue to work with CPD, the

Attorney General, and the Independent Monitor to

gather public input and support the development

of the best possible policy framework for traffic

stops.

I want to be clear that the Commission's work on traffic stops does not stop here. The votes that we are taking on specific policy prescriptions are to provide direction to the working group tasked with negotiating on the Commission's behalf.

I move that the Commission remain 1 2 engaged in the negotiations with the IMT, the Attorney General's Office, and CPD and continue 3 to be a part of the policy development process 4 until a final policy is adopted, regardless of 5 the outcome of the votes on policies that will be 6 taken today. 7 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Second. 8 PRESIDENT DRIVER: I moved, and it's been 9 seconded by Commissioner Terry that the 10 Commission's work not stop at these votes, and 11 12 that we will continue to be a part of the policy development process until the final policy is 13 adopted, regardless of the outcome of these 14 policies that we will be taking today. 15 16 Is there any debate on the position? 17 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Aye. Sorry? PRESIDENT DRIVER: Is there any debate --18 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: 19 Sorry. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Hearing none, we will move 20 to a vote. Those in favor, please signify by 21 22 saying aye. (CHORUS OF AYES.) 23 24 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any nays?

## (NO RESPONSE.)

PRESIDENT DRIVER: In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the motion prevails.

Next, we move on to the consideration of Commission positions on traffic stop policy.

We will focus on two policy positions that some Commissioners included in the response to CPD's draft policy in April.

Commissioners may also propose other policy positions for consideration. We will start with proposed positions that reflect the language Commissioners included in the April policy document. Commissioners may vote to amend that language. We will debate different proposed positions and see if there are positions that a majority of Commissioners support.

Commissioner Gottlieb.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: We will begin with the potential restrictions on traffic stops.

I move that the Community

Commission for Public Safety and Accountability

support the development of traffic stops policy

that reflects the following provisions: Members

of the Chicago Police Department shall be 1 2 prohibited from conducting a traffic stop or temporarily detaining a driver of a vehicle that 3 is not a commercial, livery or chauffeured 4 vehicle where the primary basis for the stop is 5 any of the following violations: A missing or 6 improperly displayed front license plate, so long 7 as the vehicle has a properly displayed rear 8 license plate. A displayed registration sticker 9 that has expired within one year; improper 10 license plate fastening or positioning where the 11 12 license plate is otherwise clearly displayed; improper rear license plate illumination; one 13 non-functioning headlight, taillight, or brake 14 light during daylight if the vehicle has at least 15 16 one functioning headlight, taillight, and brake 17 light, and operating a vehicle with a loud sound Is there a second? system. 18 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Second. 19 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any 20 amendments -- it's been moved by Commission 21 22 Gottlieb, seconded by Commissioner Minor. Are there any amendments to the proposed motion? 23 COMMISSIONER MINOR: 24 Yes. I move to amend

```
the proposed motion with the following exception.
1
     Exception: CPD can conduct any of the
     aforementioned six stops if an officer is acting
     upon reasonable articulable suspicion or probable
4
     cause of serious criminal activity.
5
6
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Can you reread that -- can
     you reread the amendment, please?
7
          COMMISSIONER MINOR: Exception: CPD can
8
     conduct any of the aforementioned six stops if an
9
     officer is acting upon reasonable articulable
10
     suspicion or probable cause of serious criminal
11
12
     activity.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Is there any debate on the
13
              Is there a second on the amendment?
     motion?
14
          COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Second.
15
16
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: I second the
17
     amendment.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: There's been an amendment
18
     proposed by Commissioner Minor. It's been
19
     seconded by Commissioner Gottlieb. Is there any
20
     debate on the amendment?
21
22
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: No.
          COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. I don't know,
23
24
     not so much a debate, as, I guess, a question
```

about clarification. So the police would already be able to do that. Right? So I don't know that we would need to amend the motion.

I mean obviously I'll talk about this in the debate of the motion. I don't support it, but -- is the amendment to give them the right they would be able to pull someone over anyway for that? I'm a little confused by that.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: I have an answer, but I didn't make the --

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: I understand. I just can see --

COMMISSIONER MINOR: I can defer to the Chair, and if I need to jump in, I can. Sure, awesome.

So one of the things that makes this amendment very important is because it clarifies our legislative intent and then talks about the rule of -- the forms of engagement that would be acceptable in these six cases, because we're making an overall ban. So it's very important to be clear about what level of interaction -- what level of -- like what standard is needed in order to continue the

interaction outside -- inside within the parameters of the ban, in addition to understanding what level of activity would be responsible for -- what would be appropriate for engagement as it relates to the ban given -- and i.e., why we have the language reasonable articulable suspicion or probably cause, that's a legal standard, and that's also why we have "Of serious criminal activity." Again, it talks about the kind of engagement that they should be looking for if they're going to be operating in the six low-level stops that we're moving to ban.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. And the only thing I'll say on that is I think we -- and we've discussed this in previous meetings -- that when you say serious criminal activity, this is where, again, we get into the subjective nature of what one person finds to be serious criminal activity and what another person finds to be serious criminal activity.

In my meetings with colleagues, we have not yet defined that. So that's just -PRESIDENT DRIVER: If I may, just so
everybody's clear, this is a vote not to approve

that language but to -- one second. We're voting 1 2 to accept this language into it, and then that debate that I hear you all having is for the second vote. 4 5 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. That's --PRESIDENT DRIVER: Everybody clear on that? 6 So we're not voting on the amendment -- we're not 7 voting on the package as proposed. We're voting 8 to adopt this exception to language that was 9 already there. 10 Are all Commissioners clear? 11 Any 12 questions on that? So it's been moved by Commissioner 13 Gottlieb and seconded by Commissioner Minor to 14 add to the language an exception that says "CPD 15 can conduct any of the aforementioned six stops 16 17 if an officer is acting upon reasonable articulable suspicion or probable cause of a 18 serious criminal activity." 19 We'll now move to a vote. 20 Those in favor of adopting this amendment, please 21 22 signify by saying aye. (CHORUS OF AYES.) 23 24 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any nays?

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Nay.

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: In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the motion passes.

This amendment is adopted into the language that we are about to discuss.

Is there any debate now on the main motion for restrictions on traffic stops? I'll read it again with the new amendment language. "Members of the Chicago Police shall be prohibited from conducting a traffic stop or temporarily detaining a driver of a vehicle that is not a commercial, livery or chauffeured vehicle for any of the following violations: One, a missing or improperly displayed front license plate, so long as the vehicle has a properly displayed rear license plate. Two, a displayed registration sticker that has expired within one year. Three, improper license plate fastening or positioning where the license plate is otherwise clearly displayed. Four, improper rear license plate illumination. Five, one non-functioning headlight, taillight, or brake light during daylight hours if the vehicle has at least one functioning light. Six, operating a

vehicle with a loud sound system, with the 1 2 exception that CPD can conduct any of the aforementioned six stops if an officer's acting upon reasonable articulable suspicion or probable 4 cause of serious criminal activity." 5 Is there any debate on the main 6 motion? 7 COMMISSIONER MINOR: So, Sandra, I remember 8 your question. Should I continue or would you 9 like to rephrase or ask it again? 10 PRESIDENT DRIVER: I'm having a very hard 11 12 time understanding what you're saying. Are you asking me? 13 COMMISSIONER MINOR: No, I'm asking Sandra. 14 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: You want me to 15 rephrase my question? 16 17 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Yeah. I'm asking -- I remember your question. Would you like to ask it 18 again? 19 20 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: If you want to answer 21 it, you can. 22 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Absolutely. So I really appreciate the question. Actually, that aligns a 23 lot with my advocacy that has happened since 24

previous on the Commission.

Personally, the original standard was that this engagement would be on reasonable articulable suspicion or probable cause of a Class A misdemeanor, and then there's a list of what those misdemeanors would look like.

After talking to my fellow

Commissioners and really wanting to work in

collaboration since we had a three/three split,

this was the language that we landed on to make

sure that this was passable.

We do believe that it's very important to provide clarity on our legislative intent in terms of what this engagement will look like on the field, and so this was the language that was proposed in collaboration with my fellow Commissioners, and I do support it and believe that we should move to support it as well.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. And I appreciate that. I guess what I'd say to that -- and, again, I'll get to what I think about the motion in general after everybody else has a chance to speak -- but if this is -- if this were to pass, and this were to end up in the policy,

and this were to be the Department's directive, to say to officers that you can do this -- okay, you can't do this, but then you can do it if you have RAS or probable cause of a serious crime. I can't think of a more, like, vague way to direct officers what is and what is not appropriate and legal. That's a setup. I mean it is really setting our officers up to have all sorts of allegations of doing or not doing the right thing. And I mean we've had this conversation among Commissioners many times, like if this is -- if my colleagues -- if you all are going to vote for this -- and, again, I'll get to my general feelings, you at least have to be very specific about what is and is not a crime that qualifies for the exception. You can't just send them out there and say unless there's RAS for a serious crime, because per this discussion, even about the pretextual "low level" stops, in some people's opinion, some people think they're low level, some people don't. So we have to be specific if we're going to be giving direction for law enforcement officials going out here enforcing law. That's all I have on that.

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: Would someone who is a proponent of the amendment want to answer that or speak to that?

COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: Can you hear me fine or --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Yeah, we can hear you.

COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: The point of this exception was to give officers discretion based on their training and based upon what they know about RAS. That is separate from, you know, the initial six stops. So, yes, they would be restricted under this recommendation. Nothing is final, right? This isn't policy that's going to be final.

This exception was proposed in order for officers to practice their discretion based on what they know about RAS, right? They have extensive training on that and/or PC, so I hope that brings a little more clarity. But the point wasn't to set up officers. The point was to give officers a little bit of discretion based on extenuating circumstances on what's going to occur.

My fear is that if we get too

specific on the public safety piece, it may cause even more confusion.

So for the purposes of coming up with a position and for negotiations, I believe that this -- this exception can provide some wiggle room if there are extenuating circumstances during a traffic stop or before a traffic stop.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: So my responses to the other -- all motions that are currently on the table, which is inclusive of the exception that was just being clarified, and so as a stakeholder committed to an equitable system, sound governance, and accountability, I must express serious concern regarding a proposed departmental policy restricting actions that are already codified into law.

even considering a policy that appears to intentionally avoid enforcement of lawful provisions. This sets a dangerous precedent, one that could undermine public trust, confuse law enforcement responsibilities, and expose vulnerable individuals to unintended harm.

The most immediate and alarming issue is a lack of due diligence. There has been no transparent or comprehensive assessment of the unintended consequences that this departmental policy may trigger. For instance, prohibiting certain actions made directly as a result in the inability to renew vital documentation, such as insurance, placing people at significant risk. It is unacceptable to move forward with a position that has not been thoroughly evaluated for its real-world impact.

Furthermore, this proposed position would only apply to the Chicago Police

Department, while other agencies with overlapping or adjacent jurisdictions, including those in neighboring municipalities and counties, will remain unaffected. There is no uniformity, no coordination, and no support at the state level to justify this position. This fragmented approach not only creates confusion but also renders the policy ineffective if the intent is achieving any meaningful or systemic change. The motivations behind this policy appear to be aligned with public grandstanding than principled

reform. If this effort is merely to placate egos or solicit applause at the expense of meaningful progress, then we are failing in our collective responsibility.

Recklessly imposing restrictions that do not supersede state law offers a false sense of protection, ultimately harming the very people we claim to serve.

We have a fiduciary and moral obligation to establish policies that are not only rooted in legality and constitutionality but also centered on accountability, transparency, and measurable impact, that includes building in effective oversight mechanisms, accurate data collection, and the ability of independent evaluation. Progress in this space demands more than passion; it requires discipline, clarity, collaboration.

This is not a space for personal agendas. It is a space for shared responsibility even when consensus is difficult, and this is coming from someone who has personally been impacted by being pulled over for some of the very things that we're seeking to have removed

from this policy. And I want to be clear. 1 2 only have I been pulled over by CPD, I've been pulled over by Evergreen Park, if I'm out in 3 DuPage County, all of these things. Black people 4 are impacted overwhelmingly in the numbers by 5 being pulled over, but we are not helping them if 6 we are only saying that the CPD cannot do this 7 when we know we travel around the entire state of 8 Illinois, and I do not want to be responsible for 9 someone hearing one thing and going out into the 10 public expecting or demanding that other 11 12 jurisdictions are not allowed to do something to them. 13 I have a point of --COMMISSIONER MINOR: 14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Wait, wait. We're going 15 16 to do this orderly. You both said you wanted to 17 go. So we will go Commissioner Minor, and then, Commissioner Gottlieb, do you have a response? 18 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: I have like two 19 points of clarification. 20 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Is it point of clarity or 21 22 a comment? We'll defer --COMMISSIONER MINOR: I have a point of 23 information. I'll start. I have a point of 24

information. I'm trying to understand a little bit more about the argument. I want to make sure that I'm understanding exactly what you're saying. So are you saying that we should not be considering pretextual traffic stops policy because it is not a state law?

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: That's absolutely not what I said at all, and I believe everyone in the audience and everyone on this stage is pretty clear. What I stated is, we are looking to put exceptions into a Departmental policy that do not supersede state law; therefore, directly impacting those who we claim to serve.

If I am in Evergreen Park, if I am in Oak Park, if I am in Oak Lawn, if I am in the University of Chicago Police jurisdiction, they will not have to follow any of these restrictions that we are proposing. That is a fact. It is not a feeling. It is not an opinion.

If I do not have an active plate, I will not be able to get things like insurance.

That is a fact. That is not a feeling.

So what I'm saying is, we're pushing things that will negatively impact the

very people that we're saying we want to help, and that for me is too concerning, and I cannot allow that to be on my watch where I agree to it, but if it becomes the position of the Commission, then that will be what we put forth, but I have to be clear that I'm not against restrictions.

They should be done and codified into state law, so that no matter where I am, every jurisdiction is following it, and when I'm pulled over, I won't tell the folks in Evergreen Park or Oak Park what they're not allowed to do because the policy that I'm referring to only applies to the Chicago Police Department.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Two points of clarification. So, first, state law sets a basic lore. The City of Chicago is well within its right to be more restrictive than state law. Like there's no legal issue with that.

A second point of clarification is the only city we're serving is Chicago. So we don't have -- like we can't change it in other places. Sorry. The only place we're serving is Chicago, so that's the one we're going to

hopefully focus on changing. 1 COMMISSIONER MINOR: I have another point --PRESIDENT DRIVER: We're going to let commissioner -- Vice-President Terry respond, and 4 then we'll come back to Commissioner Minor. 5 6 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: And I am not in disagreement with what you have stated, 7 Commissioner Gottlieb, but I want to make clear 8 that not only am I serving Chicago, I'm also 9 focused on black people who live and travel in 10 Chicago and out of Chicago. 11 12 COMMISSIONER MINOR: So my point of information is, are you recommending that we have 13 no change to our current -- to the -- are you 14 recommending that we have no change to CPD's 15 16 traffic stop policy until it's adopted in a state 17 legislature? VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: No. 18

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Then what are you recommending exactly?

19

20

21

22

23

24

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: I don't want to belabor. There are other people who want to speak. This topic that we're speaking of is restrictions, which is not the entirety of the

CPD policy, so your question is do I not want to see changes to the policy if it's not in state law? No. I'm speaking specifically to this topic of restrictions, because a lot of the rest of the policy have absolutely nothing to do with state law.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: So you don't want to see any restrictions to the current CPD policy on traffic stops?

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: I don't want to see anything that will not be done across the state.

A Departmental policy will negatively impact people who do not only drive in the City of Chicago. We are setting people up for failure. It's no different than any of the other traffic laws that have been changed at the state. When you think about something hanging in your window, when you think about the tint restrictions, the state saw that there were too many inconsistencies about which jurisdictions had a certain level of tint, so they made it a state law to ensure that no matter where you drove in the state, everybody was following the same law.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you so much. just want to say to that point, I'm really grateful to understand your position. point, my background is actually as a policy and budget staffer for the state senate, so I have a lot of relationships in that space. I try to -that's also one of the reasons why I'm a part of the Public Safety Working Group for the Commission, where we're responsible for lobbying specifically the City, because that's within our jurisdiction. So our aldermen -- and I also have relationships with our aldermen as it relates to public safety matters. That's a part of the Commission's whole wheel, right? So we need two-thirds majority in order to -- well, I guess majority in order to move forward on certain policies.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But to that point, I believe that there is and could potentially be an appetite from our state legislatures. I'm actually having some names right now in my mind that might want to adopt a level policy if it is done in the City level. In fact, that is what happens historically. The City of Chicago might come up

with a more progressive policy or a different change to a policy that currently exists, and our state legislature will move to adopt it.

In addition to that, in my background as being a policy and budget staffer, I'm also a member of a -- I guess a -- I don't even want to call it a non -- like an organizing organization called the people's lobby, and even now we are working on a City ordinance for a certain thing, and then we're going to be moving to a state ordinance.

So if you do have that appetite to then lobby our state legislatures on this policy once it is passed, I'm more than willing to support you in that.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Thank you. So I don't want to be repetitive, so I object to this policy. I object to the amendment. I object to any notion of restrictions, and I'll just tick down the reasons why and try to be very brief without being repetitive to Vice-President Terry.

So, generally speaking, as I have said at pretty much every meeting, I believe that

law enforcement is a profession, like teaching, like medicine, like being an attorney, and I believe that professionals are entitled to the tools in order to perform their duties. Traffic stops are without a doubt in my opinion one of those tools.

I think it is very concerning and dangerous for us to start taking tools away from our Department that do, again, in my opinion without a doubt assist them in the overall public safety -- execution of public safety for the residents of Chicago.

Second, as was just kind of noted,
I'll go to the procedural appropriateness of this
entire notion of restrictions. I interpret our
ordinance as charging us with ensuring that the
Department does the very best job possible in the
most constitutional, respectful way to serve
Chicagoans.

I do not interpret that ordinance as charging us with telling the Department not to enforce current law.

I actually think that is contrary to what our ordinance charges us to do. I think

it's inappropriate to say there are laws that exist. We, or a certain contingent of people, don't like them, so we're going to tell you you can't enforce them. That is not the body that we are. We are an administrative appointed body. Laws are made by lawmakers. So the appropriate place, as Vice President Terry has noted, for someone to go if they believe that certain laws should not be enforced or should be changed -- I think someone actually said this in public comment, that laws change all the time, that is true, and they change at the body where they're enacted.

So if all of the people who believe that these restrictions should be in place because these laws shouldn't be enforced believe that, then they are very free to go down to Springfield and advocate for that. And then I would have no problem saying our Department certainly shouldn't enforce a law that doesn't exist anymore, but they certainly should have the authority to enforce all laws that currently exist.

To that end, what we don't hear

about a lot are the people -- the many people -some of whom I heard as I was walking in today -who do not want the Chicago Police Department
restricted from enforcing law. Who are we as a
body to say we know that there are residents of
Chicago who want their Department to have every
right to enforce every existing law to say you're
not entitled to that enforcement of law because
this subset of people don't like those laws, so
we are now going to tell the Department they
can't enforce those laws.

We talk all the time about equity and fairness and respect of life experience.

There are a lot of people -- and, again, we haven't talked about it a lot, but we've received public comment. We put a survey out. We've received all of this feedback. It's not necessarily the people who come to these meetings, but we certainly have received significant feedback from people who say they do not want any restrictions placed on this police department.

I think we have to respect those voices as well.

Listen, there's always going to be differing opinions about life experience, about law, and that's why in a democracy -- in a law-making democracy, the north star should always be the law. If you don't like the law, then you can change it. But because we will always have diverse opinions, when we start to pick and choose which laws our Department can enforce, we are setting ourselves on a precedent for a very potentially dangerous slippery slope.

It's going to sound very dramatic what I'm about to say, because we can't imagine it right now because of the current makeup of our City, but let's say we start doing this. We don't like these laws right now so the department can't enforce them. Let's say this panel looks a lot different in ten years, and some people don't like some laws some people think are important. Right?

We talked about domestic violence earlier. We all do know there was a time when where people said like, Oh, we're not going to involve ourselves in what goes on in the marital home. Egregious, right? We can't even imagine

that being a thing now because we recognize that no one should be subject to violence even in their home. But what if we had a terrible turn of events and some people said, you know what? We think we're going to pooh-pooh that law now, and everyone is saying, Oh, that's different. These are low-level traffic stops. It's not different. It's not different because it's a subjective decision to tell the Department not to enforce certain laws. No. If you don't like a law, go to the place where the law is made and tell them you don't want it to be there anymore. You don't get to decide that that law shouldn't be enforced.

Now, in addition, I want to say this. I do think our ordinance charges us with making sure this Department operates to the best capacity possible. So in that regard -- and a lot of the feedback I have listened to -- what I hear is concerns about interactions, about behavior, about treatment. And, frankly, about what I perceive to be a lack of understanding of the roles of each actor in a traffic stop, the Department member and the resident, and I think

we could do a lot to respond and be responsive to the concerns that some of the public have by working to make sure our Department members are educated and trained and the public is trained and educated about that interaction so that it is not a panicked, escalating situation.

And then I will wrap up and just say -- I said it at our very first meeting. I joined this Commission because my concern is the public safety of Chicagoans. I think the Police Department plays a vital role in that. I think we have to give them their tools. We have to make sure they're trained. We have to make sure they do things with procedural justice and constitutionality, but we have to give them their tools so that we can be safe, and that is all I'm ever concerned with.

So I do not support any restrictions, and I'll be voting no. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you, Chair. This is a very interesting take, especially understanding the policy authority of the Commission and also understanding that, like,

you -- that, you know, Commissioner Wortham, you are on the policy team. So I just wanted to kind of have this point -- I really have a question.

So are you saying that the Commission should not exercise our policy-making authority per our ordinance and tasks for being the Commission, and instead defer to our state legislatures to write policy for CPD?

PRESIDENT DRIVER: So I do want to eventually close this debate. I'm going to allow Commissioner Wortham the chance to respond, but I believe we're getting to a point where we're starting to belabor the point.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: That's absolutely not what I said. I was very clear. I think that we should exercise all of our authority per ordiance.

What I said was, our ordinance does not charge us with telling this Department not to enforce current law.

Quite frankly, I think that is counter to our ordinance. The laws that some of my colleagues, you, are suggesting that we restrict the Department from enforcing are

current law. We are not a law-making body. So I did not say we should not have policy. I said we should have policy that's consistent with our charge per our ordinance.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any other comments from Commissioners? Commissioner Gottlieb. It's been moved and seconded. We will now move to a vote. Commissioner Rubi Navarijo, did you have anything to say?

COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: I believe this exception piece is a middle ground to what we're trying to do. Traffic stops was still an issue, and it's why we're here. So I understand what people are saying.

I haven't heard that we aren't able to move forward with something like a restriction. So if there's somebody who has that information where it says we aren't able to move forward with this, I would appreciate it.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. So -- were you about to say something? You already called the question, right?

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: I would say that there's nothing that says we cannot move forward.

Maybe I missed what Angel was saying. Anyway.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Okay. So what I will say about this is, I am a person who generally supports restrictions. I have been frustrated by the way this process has played out. I think the points that Commissioner Terry specifically is raising are valid. I would like to see those questions answered in a negotiation process.

I realize that we're not voting on policy today, we're voting on a position, but she is raising valid concerns.

As a black man who has been pulled over who lives inside the University of Chicago's jurisdiction, I do think that's a valid point. I also think it's a valid point that this should be addressed in state law. That is something that I can support. We are making policy right now that is specific to the Chicago Police Department.

On the flip side of that, I do recognize that this Commission is charged with making policy for the Chicago Police Department.

I will say also, I would have loved to get this language in advance. I saw this language for the first time yesterday, the

exception part. But, nevertheless, I do think we 1 2 have belabored the point here. We will now move to a roll call 3 vote. We will start with Commissioner Rubi 4 5 Navarijo. 6 Actually, before that, I do want to say this, too -- I will explain it when I get to 7 my vote. 8 Go ahead, Commissioner Rubi 9 Navarijo. 10 COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: Can you repeat what 11 12 we're voting on, just so I'm making sure that we're -- are we voting on the exception piece or 13 the six? 14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: How do you vote? 15 16 COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: Aye. 17 PRESIDENT DRIVER: So a point of information. I will read the full thing again with the 18 exception so everybody can hear it. 19 Members of the Chicago Police 20 Department shall be prohibited from conducting a 21 22 traffic stop or temporarily detaining a driver of a vehicle that is not a commercial, livery or 23 chauffeured vehicle for any of the following 24

```
violations: One, a missing or improperly
1
     displayed front license plate, so long as the
2
     vehicle has a displayed properly rear license
3
     plates. A displayed registration sticker that
4
5
     has expired within the year. Three, improper
     license plate fastening or positioning where the
6
     license plate is otherwise clearly displayed.
7
     Four, improper rear license plate illumination.
8
     Five, one non-functioning headlight, taillight or
9
     brake light during daylight hours, if the vehicle
10
     has at least one functioning headlight, taillight
11
12
     or brake light. Six, operating a vehicle with a
     loud sound system. The exception to this, CPD
13
     can conduct any of the aforementioned six stops
14
     if an officer's acting upon reasonable
15
16
     articulable suspicion or probable cause of a
17
     serious criminal activity.
                    That is the motion that's on the
18
             It's been moved, it's been seconded.
     table.
19
     Commissioner Rubi Navarijo, how do you vote?
20
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: I vote in favor of
21
22
     the restrictions with the exception.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Gottlieb?
23
24
          COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB:
                                  Aye.
```

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham. 1 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Nav. PRESIDENT DRIVER: The Chair votes aye. 3 Commissioner Terry. 4 5 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Nay. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor. 6 COMMISSIONER MINOR: 7 Aye. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Piemonte. 8 9 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Aye. PRESIDENT DRIVER: With a vote of 5 to 7, the 10 ayes have it and the motion passes. 11 12 We will now move to discussion and vote on consent searches. 13 I move that the Community Commission 14 for Public Safety and Accountability support the 15 16 development of a traffic stop policy that 17 reflects the following provision: Chicago Police Department members will not request or conduct a 18 consent search of a motor vehicle or its driver 19 or occupants during a traffic stop unless a 20 member is acting upon reasonable articulable 21 22 suspicion or probable cause of suspected criminal activity, distinct from the basis of the initial 23 24 traffic stop. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Second. 1 PRESIDENT DRIVER: It's been moved and seconded by Commissioner Minor that the 3 Commission support the development of traffic 4 5 stop policy that includes the specified limitation on consent searches. Is there any 6 discussion? 7 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: So when we say 8 conduct, does that mean if someone volunteers, 9 does that supersede -- that's the question that I 10 have. 11 12 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Is this to me? VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: No. The conduct piece 13 isn't clear. 14 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: So I mean I think 15 16 that will obviously depend on where in -- on the 17 rest of the policy, but my understanding of this is that this is specific to the asking consent 18 and not about any voluntary. 19 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Okay. Thank you. 20 21 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Is there any other debate 22 on the motion? COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Motion to amend? 23 Sorry. Motion to amend to the following, and 24

just to sort of summarize it, it's adding 1 "serious" in front of criminal activity, but it 2 now reads "Chicago Police Department members will not request or conduct a consent search of a 4 5 motor vehicle or its driver or occupants during a traffic stop unless a member is acting upon 6 reasonable articulable suspicion or probable 7 cause of suspected serious criminal activity 8 distinct from the basis of the initial traffic 9 stop." 10 PRESIDENT DRIVER: And the amendment as 11 12 proposed, what's added is the line that says "distinct from the basis of the initial traffic 13 stop"? 14 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Serious. 15 16 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Okay. We'll now move --17 you've moved. Is there a second on Commissioner Gottlieb's motion? He's moved. 18 19 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Second. 20 PRESIDENT DRIVER: It's been moved by Commissioner Gottlieb, seconded by Commissioner 21 22 Minor. COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: It was Commissioner 23 24 Piemonte, but that's all right.

```
PRESIDENT DRIVER: Sorry. It was seconded by
1
     Commissioner Piemonte, not Commissioner Minor, to
 2
     adopt this. This is not a vote to -- this is not
     the vote on this package. This is a vote to
 4
     adopt this new language which adds one word into
 5
 6
     this language.
                    We will now do a roll call.
 7
     Commissioner Rubi Navarijo.
 8
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: Nay.
 9
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Gottlieb.
10
11
          COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Aye.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.
12
          COMMISSIONER WORTHAM:
13
                                  Nay.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Driver is
14
     nay. Commissioner Terry.
15
          VICE PRESIDENT TERRY:
16
                                 Nay.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor.
17
          COMMISSIONER MINOR: Aye.
18
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Piemonte.
19
20
          COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Aye.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: It fails, right?
21
22
     four people -- with a vote of 4 to 3, this motion
     fails, and the amendment is not adopted.
23
                   We will now move back to the
24
```

original motion that was on the floor. Is there any -- are there any other amendments anyone else would like to propose?

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: I'm sorry. What was the question?

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any other amendments that anyone else would like to propose? Is there any debate -- now we're moving to debate. Is there any debate on the original language?

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Sure. I'll start here. So I also object to this motion. I'll be voting no, but I will just explain briefly why.

So, again, we're talking just for the public about consent searches. So when an officer asks the driver or the occupant of the vehicle to search the vehicle, I want to remind everyone that, perhaps, different from years past, we are now talking about everything being on body cam. Okay? So this interaction is videotaped which I think -- again, listening to public feedback at all of our sessions, to me eliminates the concern one might have about, A, he said/she said, he said/he said, whatever it

is, she said/she said, that there was a request for consent, one gave consent, and then that didn't actually happen.

Second, in reality, what this proposed language does is eliminate the context of a consent search, because if an officer has to have this -- reach this legal standard, they'd be able to conduct a search in many instances anyhow.

So I mean I think first we need to be, you know, intellectually straightforward about what we're doing here.

Second, I think we have to give people credit. I don't think that drivers are incapable of being -- and if you look at this in the context of the entire draft order, it's not just this. They're explaining that you can revoke consent at any time. You have to give willing consent. Again, it's all on body camera. So I think it's a -- I don't think the motion actually has much use. I also think it creates an extra level of an extra barrier, an extra level of work that's not necessary when everything is on body cam, and we're asking --

```
someone is free to say no if they'd like to do
1
     so, and that would all be documented. Of course,
     if officers are coming back with no body cam
     saying someone consented to the search, well,
4
5
     then we have a problem because you don't have
6
     this. Right? But we have body cams, as we know.
     So I just think the motion is poor. So thank
7
     you.
8
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Is there any other debate
9
     on the motion? Hearing none, we will now move to
10
     a vote, a roll call vote, and we'll start with
11
12
     Commissioner Rubi Navarijo.
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: Aye.
13
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Gottlieb.
14
15
          COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB:
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.
16
17
          COMMISSIONER WORTHAM:
                                 Nay.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: The Chair votes aye.
18
     Commissioner Terry. Commissioner Terry votes
19
20
     aye.
                    Commissioner Minor.
21
22
          COMMISSIONER MINOR:
                               Aye.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor votes
23
     aye. Commissioner Piemonte.
24
```

1 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Aye. 2 PRESIDENT DRIVER: With a 6 to 1 vote, this motion passes. The ayes have it, and the motion 3 carries. The Commission will support the 4 development of traffic stop policy that includes 5 a specified limitation on consent searches. 6 Our next order of business will be 7 report --8 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: I have a motion. 9 PRESIDENT DRIVER: There's another one? 10 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: I'd like to make a 11 12 motion. PRESIDENT DRIVER: On what? 13 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: I would make a motion 14 to add the following language to our proposed 15 traffic stop policy: That CPD is prohibited from 16 17 conducting pretextual traffic stops. Oh, I move. I thought I said that. All right. Oh, I move --18 I'm sorry. 19 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Do I have this language? 20 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: You should have it. 21 22 Do you want me to repeat it? Okay. I move to add the following language to our proposed 23

traffic stop policy: That CPD is prohibited from

24

conducting pretextual traffic stops. 1 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Second. PRESIDENT DRIVER: We will stand at recess 3 for a few minutes. 4 (Brief Pause.) 5 6 PRESIDENT DRIVER: It's been moved by Commissioner Piemonte and seconded by 7 Commissioner Minor. Is there any debate on the 8 motion? And I will start the debate. I wasn't 9 aware of this. I did not get this in advance. I 10 didn't get the language in advance. I also just 11 12 asked our Executive Director and confirmed with other Commissioners. I was not aware this was on 13 our agenda. So that's my comment on this. I'm 14 happy to move to a vote. Is there any other 15 16 Commissioner that would like to comment? Also, I'm not sure this is legal. Like I think -- I 17 don't know how we are voting on things. Like we 18 should be clear with the public -- very clear 19 with the public about the power and authority 20 that this Commission has. 21 22 COMMISSIONER MINOR: I clearly believe that it is --23 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Well, I wasn't done 24

talking. I have the floor, and I will recognize people as we go, but we should be clear with the public that I don't -- I am not clear on if what we are about to vote on is even legal in the first place, considering everybody is governed by state law.

And with that, I saw Commissioner Wortham who is going to speak first, and then we will move to Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: All right. So, again,
I hate to sound like a broken record, but
pretextual traffic stops are very clearly legal
as articulated by the United States Supreme
Court. I think we have to be very careful about
what we're doing here. We are an appointed
administrative body for the City of Chicago.

We have a Chicago Police Department that is very clearly charged with enforcing law.

I think it is beyond inappropriate to start taking well-established law and say now this Department cannot do it. This was mentioned by Vice President Terry earlier.

Again, not to be repetitive, but if there is an appetite for changing law, there is a

place to do it. And, frankly, if some of my colleagues would like to be lawmakers, there are avenues to go do that.

This is not a law-making body. We are supposed to be working with this Department so that they work at their maximum capacity, not telling them not to enforce current law. This motion is wholly inappropriate. So I'm a definite no on this, if it goes to vote.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: I yield my time to Commissioner Piemonte.

COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Pretextual stops are legal only under a Fourth Amendment analysis, but under an equal protection analysis is where they fail, especially in the City of Chicago, because these laws — these pretextual stops are not applied equally to the population.

You have an overwhelming number of black and brown people who are routinely and -- I mean they're just pulled over all the time, and that's the problem with the pretextual stops, and that's why I'm asking that they be banned.

You can stop someone if you -- you know, if you have a reason to, but it shouldn't

be pretextual because it's not applied equally, which is why there's such a small percentage of the white population in the City that are affected by this.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: I have a real concern.

And we're both attorneys, so I'm just going to call that out right now. We can't be giving the public information that is not true. I mean I'm just going to say it like that. Because you see disparate numbers, doesn't make the stops illegal. I mean that is a completely inappropriate leap of fact that's not supported in law, and I think we both know that.

There is no dispute that pretextual traffic stops are legal per the United States

Supreme Court. Please don't tell the public that there's some sort of legal analysis that has not been applied by the U.S. Supreme Court, that because we see differing racial numbers -- and if we want to start about differing racial numbers, we can do that -- but they certainly aren't just in traffic stops.

That's not an appropriate legal

analysis, nor an appropriate legal conclusion to share with this public about the legality of pretextual stops. We have to be -- we have to be truthful here. And this is why I have exception to some of my colleagues wanting to take the word "lawful" out of the Department's draft policy, because there is this notion to suggest to the public that pretextual traffic stops are not lawful. That is not true. So you cannot like them. You can even vote to ban them if you want to do that -- even though I think that's inappropriate -- but please don't suggest to the public that they're not legal, because that's not true.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: I have a point of information for Commissioner Piemonte who proposed this motion. And so I was pulled over the last time near my home on the -- in the 2nd District. An officer pulled me over. He said that I didn't signal. I don't think that was the case, but he pulled me over. He put his light in my car, asked me a few questions. He didn't ask for my license or registration, and then he -- no, he asked for my license. He didn't ask for

my insurance card. He left. I felt as though that was a pretextual traffic stop. Right?

That's how I feel. How -- if this was to vote and pass, how can I prove that if the officer is saying I didn't signal, and I don't actually remember whether I signaled or not? So my question to you is, specifically, how do you measure something that is a feeling?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Well, as was pointed out earlier, there are body cams and there are cams on all of the police vehicles. So if you did not use your signal, that would -- should be on video. That is not one of the enumerated low-level stops that we're talking about, but a pretextual stop is where you stop someone under a pretext. So you're stopping them to look for something else. And then once you stop them and then search them, or you ask them if you can search them, or you search the car, that's when it escalates, and that's what -- with video now, we're seeing these instances where people are pulled out of cars, they're put on the sidewalk, they're handcuffed. So I think that we should eliminate the use of pretextual traffic stops.

I am arguing that I believe they're unconstitutional because they do violate the equal protection clause, and the Whren case that I'm assuming my fellow Commissioner was referring to was a Fourth Amendment challenge to pretextual

So I think that's the problem that we see in the City. And we have an opportunity here to do something about it.

stops. It was not an equal protection argument.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Is there any other debate on the motion?

commissioner Gottlieb: Just, actually, I want to talk about the measurement issue like that you raised, President Driver. I would also say that I think -- thinking about measurement on a case-by-case basis is the wrong way to think about it. I think you can determine whether the Department is engaging in a pattern of pretextual stops by looking at actual patterns of data, and that is how things like -- like that's how sort of a lot of this is in -- in general, as a general matter, when we think of even like a pattern and practice investigation, it is a similar concept, where you are actually able

to -- any decent statistician can figure out this. So that's sort of my perspective.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: So on that, though, to answer your question directly, there is no way currently. There is no document -- there's no Chicago Police Department reporting mechanisms that documents an officer's state of mind. The only way you can with certainty know if a stop was pretextual is if you know the officer's state of mind. So everything everyone's saying that's other than that is an assumption, not based in fact.

To your point, often based in feeling, and it is -- you cannot -- you can't use a data set that's totally based in people's feels. It is without dispute, there is no document in this Department that documents an officer's state of mind when conducting a traffic stop. We -- hold on. I'm not finished.

So I think anyone who's saying something other than that is being, again, not truthful with the public.

You don't have to like it, but you

do have to be honest, please. 1 PRESIDENT DRIVER: I would like -- we will now proceed to a roll call vote. 3 Do you have a comment? 4 5 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Yeah, I do have a 6 comment, because it sounded like I was being told that what I was saying wasn't telling the truth, 7 and the data we'd be looking at are not about 8 people's feelings, it is about irregular patterns 9 of how stops are occurring. So I mean, again, 10 just because we have a different opinion doesn't 11 12 mean -- anyway. I don't think you're a statistician. 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We will now 14 move to a roll call vote. 15 16 Commissioner Rubi Navarijo. 17 COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO: PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Gottlieb. 18 Commissioner Gottlieb. We're voting. 19 20 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham. 21 22 COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Nay. PRESIDENT DRIVER: I vote nay. 23 Commissioner Terry? 24

COMMISSIONER TERRY: 1 Nav. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor. COMMISSIONER MINOR: Aye. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Piemonte. 4 5 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Aye. PRESIDENT DRIVER: This motion fails 4 to 3, 6 and we will now -- I guess this is still -- I 7 don't know who's making this next motion. 8 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: I'd like to make a 9 motion -- move to make a motion. 10 PRESIDENT DRIVER: You need a second. 11 12 COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Okay. I move to make a motion that CPD officers will not conduct a 13 pretextual traffic stop unless the motor vehicle 14 matches the description of a motor vehicle 15 suspected of having been involved in any crime 16 17 for which failure to immediately apprehend the suspect is reasonably likely to result in death 18 or serious bodily injury to a person other than 19 the suspect. 20 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Second. 21 22 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Moved by Commissioner Piemonte and seconded by Commissioner Minor. 23 Is there any debate on the motion? 24

```
Hearing none, we will now move to a roll call
1
 2
     vote.
                    Commissioner Rubi Navarijo.
          COMMISSIONER NAVARIJO:
 4
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Gottlieb.
 5
 6
          COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Aye.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.
 7
          COMMISSIONER WORTHAM:
 8
                                 Nay.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: The Chair votes nay.
 9
     Commission Terry.
10
          COMMISSIONER TERRY: Nay.
11
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor.
12
          COMMISSIONER MINOR: Aye.
13
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Piemonte.
14
          COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE:
15
                                  Aye.
          PRESIDENT DRIVER: This motion fails with a 4
16
17
     to 3 vote.
                   Next order of business will be
18
     reports and updates. We will begin by discussing
19
     working group updates.
20
                   At the beginning of the year, the
21
22
     Commission set annual goals for CPD, COPA, and
     the Police Board.
23
                   The goals lay out things that CPD,
24
```

COPA, and the Police Board are supposed to do to show progress every three months.

We're now going to report on progress for the second quarter of this year, from April through June. We will start with Commissioner Minor with an update from CPD.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you so much, Commissioner. Just give me one second as I transition from the debate to this portion. Thank you.

Earlier this month, the Commission received CPD's Quarter 2 updates on their goals for the year.

The Superintendent's 2025 goals broadly cover the following topics: Traffic stops, workforce allocation, the implementation of two Commission-passed policies, community policing, officer wellness, and victim services. For traffic stop. In addition to traffic stop policy that the Commission is working on, the Superintendent's traffic stop goal includes data system development. CPD is creating a new electronic platform that documents all officer-initiated stops, including investigatory

stops and those related to gang and narcotics loitering and enforcement.

Once there is a stop policy in place, the electronic system will also document all traffic stops. The system is being tested with users now, and CPD is aiming to roll out the system either later this year or early next year.

Workforce Allocation and Community
Policing. Two of the Superintendent's goals
focus on CPD's Workforce Allocation Study and
community policing assessment. For its workforce
allocation study, CPD is working on multiple
projects phases that should conclude in October.
This work includes finishing a comprehensive
overview of CPD's current staffing levels and an
organization structure and building an
analysis -- building the framework to be used for
conducting the staff analysis.

The next phase of the community engagement for Workforce Allocation Study will include a targeted focus group with both internal and external stakeholders. I hope that that information on who they will be soliciting will be made available soon.

CPD published four reports summarizing its findings for its Phase 1 focus group in community engagement.

In Phase 2, CPD is conducting a comprehensive review of current program offerings, roles, and responsibilities, community partnerships, trainings, and performance metrics to inform strategies for community-focused policing.

Stages of updating the district strategic plan.

I know so many District Councils are very interested. The district's strategic plans outlines each police district's core crime reductio discussion priorities and the community engagement goals over the course of the year.

Currently CPD is gathering community feedback and recommendations to improve its district strategic plan development process as its community policing assessment.

CPD will include the community input that the district councilors are collecting on the district strategic plan process.

On May 29, CPD met with the District

Council subcommittee to provide an overview of its current program. I'm so happy to hear that the District Councilors are working in collaboration on this policy.

Yeah, I know. You can clap. Y'all can clap. I hear y'all. Yeah.

This is -- yeah, I know that you all advocated for this. I'm happy to hear that's happening.

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

The quarter -- this quarter, CPD developed an online curriculum that trains officers on updates to the two policies that prohibits the Department from posting, sharing, liking, following, or otherwise distributing content with the intent to promote, support or otherwise endorse a specific criminal or biased

organization or its activities.

CPD received feedback from the IMT and OIG on this curriculum and plans to administer the training in Quarter 4 of this year.

There's also an additional report that I would like to add to that statement. Does it relate to this? No. I will table that for now.

Member wellness and support. For the last few years, one of the Superintendent's annual goals has been to continue improving CPD facilities. CPD has been meeting monthly with City agencies to discuss facility improvements.

This goal also evaluates CPD's progress on developing an early intervention system. Right? Or EIS system, and that standards for early intervention and support to identify police officers whose behavior suggests that they might be at risk of problem in the future. The early intervention system support would be a part of a larger effort to support the Department member's mental and physical health and address possible behaviors identified.

CPD is in Phase 1, the development stage of this EIS initiative.

CPD continues to work with Benchmark Analytics to build out a data system that can identify members who could be considered at an increased risk for behavior that has concerns or could potentially have harmful outcomes.

CPD is currently estimating a partial implementation of the system in 2026. A new policy is conditionally approved by the IMT and OIG but revisions will be made to bring it into alignment with the final system.

Once a new EIS directive has been drafted, CPD will post it for public comment on its policy review.

Victim services. The

Superintendent's final goal focuses on the

Department's Office of Victim Services which

provides assistance of -- to victims of domestic

violence and non-fatal shootings and several

districts. I'll be kind of repeating some of the

information that you heard today from Director

Mike Milstein, but for the purpose of recap, I

think it's still important to highlight this

information.

As of July 1, the Office of Victim Services had added two program directors, five victim services specialists, seven domestic violence specialists to a staff and awaiting start dates for 13 victim services victims and domestic violence specialists.

Overall, the office is 77 percent staffed and has 15 remaining vacancies to fill. We heard a little bit more than that. I think it was 28 today.

The Office of Equity and Engagement is working with research and development to update CPD's current policy with the Department, with members' interactions with crime victims and witnesses to ensure that it includes best practices, policies for victim services and will continue to craft a special order that's SO2-01-03, Crime Victim and Witness Assistant Policy, for some of you all who might want to look it up on your own time.

CPD also provided updated stats on the victim outreach work. As of June 25th, CPD has reached out to over 5,500 victims. CPD has

provided information to victim services, such as referrals, to community-based organizations, orders of protections, justice services, and emergency planning. Wow. You all hear a lot from me.

Oh, there are also two pieces that I also want to make sure to include. There is an EIG task force statement. So there has been a relaunch in the extremism and governmental task force. We recently met on Wednesday with attendees from the Office of Community Safety, Office of Equity and Racial Justice, Department of Law, Office of Public Safety Administration, and the Department of Human Resources.

The new goal of the task force is to build a workforce free of bias, hate, racism, and extremism by preventing, identifying, and eliminating the behavior through policy and practice change.

The task force will work with law and labor to define bias, hateful, racist, and extremist behaviors to adhere to labor laws and other First Amendment rights.

The task force intends to implement

a citywide policy on the prohibitions and personnel rules.

The policy will not be focused on lists of biased or organizations but rather highlighting behaviors that could indicate associations with extremism movements or ideologies. The last piece is that there has been a CPD goals follow-up.

So our next step for our CPD Quarter 2 goals will include a follow-up meeting with CPD focused on their ongoing work for the workers' allocation study and the community policing goal.

Additionally, the Commission has requested additional documents and reports for CPD to supplement our understanding of the workforce allocation progress and to -- and the build-out of the early intervention system. That concludes my report. Thank you all for your time and attention.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: We will now move to an update on -- from Commissioners Piemonte and Gottlieb on COPA's accountability 2025 goal.

COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Thank you, President Driver. We met with COPA earlier this month to

discuss the 2025 goals. 1 COPA's first goal was to draft internal guidelines around how COPA communicates 3 publicly to media and other stakeholders during 4 open investigations. 5 COPA has shared with the Commission 6 a framework for the drafting of these guidelines. 7 COPA will have a first draft for the 8 Commission to review this quarter. 9 COPA's second goal is to implement a 10 robust policy for identifying and addressing 11 12 patterns of police misconduct to improve public safety outcomes in the City of Chicago. 13 14

COPA is mandated under ordinance to identify and address patterns of police misconduct.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COPA has reviewed its current policy and is meeting with subject matter experts on the best practices around this work.

Additionally, CCPSA has reviewed COPA's current policy to identify how the policy can be expanded or improved upon.

Commissioner Gottlieb and I will be meeting with CCPSA staff next week to review the

analysis and staff's recommendations for the next steps.

The Commission will share its feedback with COPA.

I will ask Commissioner Gottlieb to provide an update on the last two goals.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thank you,

Commissioner Piemonte. Start about the

development of a mediation program. As part of

the Consent Decree, COPA's been asked to create a

mediation program. This program would allow for

the resolution of certain types of misconduct

allegations through facilitated dialogue between

complaints and police officers.

Types of complaints that qualify for mediation include perceived bias or harassment, failure to provide service or neglect of duty, discourteous treatment or unprofessionalism, unnecessary physical contact, use of force that does not result in death or bodily injury and not otherwise ineligible, Fourth Amendment violation complaints not otherwise ineligible.

As part of the goal-setting

process, the Commission established a goal to ensure that community feedback was incorporated into this policy.

From February through May of this

year, COPA worked with District Councilors to educate the community on the draft policy and to collect feedback.

COPA has now set up a steering committee to help identify community mediators and to determine qualifications for those mediators.

Members of the Commission and District Councils are part of the steering committee.

COPA will also be meeting with members of law enforcement to help inform the process. The Commission will invite COPA to attend the future meeting to discuss this policy and give all Commissioners an opportunity to ask questions.

A draft of this policy can be found on COPA's website.

The fourth and final goal the Commission set for COPA is to create a policy

that governs the working relationship between the two agencies.

CCPSA's new general counsel will be collaborating with COPA's general counsel to draft this policy.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Commissioner.

We will now hear from

Commissioner Rubi Navarijo on the Police Board's

2025 goal. Is he still online? So we'll skip

that, and we'll move to hear an update from

Commissioner Terry on the COPA search working

group.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: The Commission is responsible for the selection of the next COPA chief and is required to use a search firm for -- to conduct a nationwide search.

The Commission is pleased to announce that it has selected The Byers Group to lead the national search for the new Civilian Office of Police Accountability, also known as COPA, Chief Administrator.

The Byers Group has over 15 years of experience leading executive-level search engagements on behalf of the public, private,

nonprofit, and educational organizations.

We are continuing to meet community members and subject matter experts to get input on the preferred qualifications for the next chief of COPA.

The Commission is using this input to develop the application, interview questions, and to inform the selection of the next COPA chief. We will announce when an application has been finalized, posted on the Commission's website. There's also still an opportunity to give us your feedback. You can visit our website or download the QR code -- it's not behind me, but there is a QR code, and there's also a handout at the check-in table that you walked by when you came into the room that has a copy of the QR code and more information on the important role that COPA plays in the accountability system.

So the Chair has stepped away, so that means I have to Chair.

Are there any questions? Is Angel back? No. Okay.

I'll go back to the update on Police

Board, and I'll turn it over to you, Commissioner Piemonte.

COMMISSIONER PIEMONTE: Thank you. The Commission set one goal for the Police Board in 2025. That goal is to review the Chicago Police Board's rules and regulations which fall under its authority and to make recommendations for updating them.

Chicago Police rules and regulations serve to guide the actions of CPD members, ensuring they operate within the law and uphold ethical standards.

These rules are important for establishing guidelines for conduct and interactions with the community.

Part of the process for reviewing the community rules and regulations is to meet with the key stakeholders.

To date, the Police Board has met with CPD Superintendent Larry Snelling, COPA interim Chief Administrator LaKenya White, First Assistant Corporation Counsel Aja Carr-Favors, Public Safety Inspector General Tobara Richardson, Deputy Mayor for Community Safety,

Garien Gatewood, retired Police Board Executive
Director Mark Iris. Police Board President Kyle
Cooper is currently conducting a comprehensive
review of the rules of conduct to determine which
existing rules may be revised. We will share an
update on this at a future meeting.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you,
Commissioner Piemonte.

So I do want to go back to the COPA -- the search process to see if there are any questions about that. No? Okay.

So now I will turn it over to

Commissioner Wortham to provide an update related
to the traffic stops policy.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: All right. Well, you've all heard a lot about traffic stops.

Tonight, just to remind you, that in June, there was a webinar hosted where CPD and CCPSA reviewed some of the information regarding the CPD draft policy and the CCPSA feedback to said draft policy. That is available online for you to view if you'd like to do so. I would encourage you if you're going to view that, to also look at the CCPSA memo where our individual positions are

articulated and just also the draft policy so you know what you're listening to in conjunction with the documents. And I think it's also important to note that we continue to take public input, focus groups, online input, our meetings, of course, through public comments. So please continue to share your input, tell your neighbors to share their input. We, of course, want to hear and consider what the public has to say on the issue of traffic stops and Commissioner Terry, and I will continue to meet with CPD to discuss the policy language, and we look forward to moving this policy forward. Any questions? That's not my job.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Are there any questions related to what Commissioner Wortham just shared? All right.

So really quickly, I'll give a point of privilege to Commissioner Minor who wants to address young people in the room.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you. I just wanted to take a moment to address our young people in the room.

There was a comment earlier today

about some of the engagement that has been happening in community, but I want to -- and I want to let you all know that it has all been specific to wanting to make sure that our youth feel like they can access these Commission meetings and that their voices can be heard.

So I've been able to attend spaces like the Youth's Budget Roundtable Talks, the Mayor's Fireside Chat with the Youth, the Youth Justice Ministry Talk with St. Michael's Baptist Church, Social Storms Youth Panel, discussing my civic engagement pathway. I also am in the process of coordinating a youth listening session with elected officials at the Kroc Center in the fall. I did a peace walk with the St. Sabina Church, and so many other things to organize in the space.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: To organize in the space to make sure that I am serving my youth -- serving the youth.

So for the young people in the room that if you're under the age of 30, can you please just stand up and be recognized, please?

We also had a group of four in the front. 1 2 you over there, but we going to clap for you anyway. You definitely deserve to be recognized. 3 I met so many of you all in community, and I 4 thank you for being here today. You deserve to 5 be here, and I'm grateful that some of you all 6 took the initiative to do public comment today as 7 well. 8 Thank you, Commissioner. 9 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Please follow the Commission on all of our social 10 channels. The Commission's next regularly 11 12 scheduled meeting will be Thursday, August 28, 2025, 6:30 p.m. at DePaul College Prep. 13 I would like to thank you all for 14 joining us tonight. We hope to you see you 15 16 August 28th. With there being no further 17 business before the Commission, this meeting is 18 now adjourned. 19 (Proceedings were adjournedat 8:40 20 21 p.m.) 22 23 24

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
Re: Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability
July 31, 2025
T MAIDEEN A WOODMAN C C D do horoby
I, MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, C.S.R., do hereby certify that the foregoing Report of Proceedings was recorded stenographically by me and was
reduced to computerized transcript under my direction, and that the said transcript
constitutes a true record.
I further certify that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of
any of the parties, or a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially
interested directly or indirectly in this action.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand of office at Chicago, Illinois this 15
day of August 2025.
MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, CSR
License No. 084.002740