1	COMMUNITY COMMISSION for PUBLIC SAFETY and ACCOUNTABILITY
2	SPECIAL HEARING ON PRETEXTUAL TRAFFIC STOPS
3	SPECIAL REARING ON PRETEXTUAL TRAFFIC STOPS
4	August 27, 2024 6:30 p.m. DuSable Museum
5	740 East 56th Street
6	Chicago, Illinois
7	PRESENT:
8	
9	MR. ANTHONY DRIVER, Commission President; MS. REMEL TERRY, Commission Vice President; MS. GANDRA MOREUMA. Commission members
10	MS. SANDRA WORTHAM, Commission member; MS. KELLY PRESLEY, Commission member; MS. ABIERRE MINOR, Commission member;
11	MR. AARON GOTTLIEB, Commission member; MR. BRIAN KENNER, Deputy Director.
12	int. Britist Repute, Bepate, Biroccor.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

PRESIDENT COOPER: Good evening, everyone. 1 The August 27th, 2024, meeting of the Community 2 Commission for Public Safety and Accountability is called to order at 6:30 p.m. 4 We will begin with calling the roll. 5 Commissioner Driver is present. Commissioner 6 Gottlieb. 7 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Present. 8 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Terry. 9 Commissioner Minor. Commissioner Presley. 10 COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Present. 11 12 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham. COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Present. 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: With four out of seven --14 four out of six members of the Community 15 Commission of Public Safety and Accountability 16 17 present, we have a quorum, and we can conduct the Commission's business. 18 The next order of business -- the 19 next item of business is public comment. If you 20 would like to share something related to the 21 22 Commission's work on public safety and accountability, you have a few options. You can 23 speak at a public meeting. You can also submit 24

your public comment in writing by emailing your comments 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 the public comment period tonight were asked to submit their names in advance. Names were then drawn at random by a member of the Commission staff.

Speakers will be called in the order in which their names were drawn.

public comment, we ask that 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 and then offer your comments. Each speaker will have up to two minutes. We have allotted a total of 30 minutes for public comment.

Our first two speakers are -- our first speaker is virtual, and it is Humberto

Maldonado. Not here. 1 Alees Edwards. District Council 2 Member Alees Edwards. 3 MS. EDWARDS: Can you hear me? Good 4 5 afternoon, everybody. Can you hear me? Hello? 6 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Should we keep going? Somebody from --7 MS. EDWARDS: Hello? 8 PRESIDENT DRIVER: She's going to speak? 9 MS. EDWARDS: Can you all hear me? Hello? 10 COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Hello, Alees. 11 12 MS. EDWARDS: You can hear me? Because I've been speaking. Can you hear me? 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Yes. 14 MS. EDWARDS: My name is Alees Edwards. 15 A-L-E-E-S. Last name E-D-W-A-R-D-S. 16 17 District Councilor in the 11th Police District. And I am giving public comment in support of 18 stopping the pretextual traffic stops in my 19 district. We have the largest number of 20 pretextual traffic stops. And as I am going into 21 22 the community, having conversations with some of my community members, they're always commenting 23 about some of the negative experiences that 24

they've had with, you know, the Chicago Police

Department, and the majority of this is with

traffic stops. And I can say that there was at

least one experience that we had with someone

that we actually knew, that was a family member

of one of the pillars in our community, and not

only was this individual who has a, you know,

outstanding, you know, reputation within the

community, has a job as a construction worker,

was stopped in front of his home and was given ---

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Did we lose her?

MS. EDWARDS: I'm sorry?

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Go ahead.

MS. EDWARDS: He was stopped in front of his home and was given a ticket for having his car lights on while the street lights were on. He was harassed by Chicago Police Department because he was afraid to get out of his car as a young black male. They called other officers. They were threatening to, you know, break his window and drag him out of the car. He did end up getting out. They tossed his car, which was an illegal search that they did, you know, to his glove compartment box. It was a very traumatic

experience for him, for his parents, his mother, his father, and his sister. His sister actually witnessed it and taped some of it. And so for this reason alone, I do know that sometimes traffic stops are needed, but when it is being used disproportionately in underserved communities for I would say no purpose, no reason, no cause, there's a lot of trauma that happens to community members, and it sometimes ends deadly, and so for that reason, that reason alone --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Alees. That is time.

Our next speaker is Ali Longbottom.

I'm going to call you in groups of three so you
can line up, and it will help move the process a
little faster.

First speaker, Ali Longbottom, second is Dominic Amato, and the third Alderman Daniel La Spata.

MS. LONGBOTTOM: Hi. My name is Ali Longbottom. A-L-I, L-O-N-G-B-O-T-T-O-M. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Ali. I'm here with Chicago Apple Seed Center

for Fair Courts to address the critical issue of pretextual traffic stops and to emphasize the role of the CCPSA in representing our communities' priorities.

First and foremost, we must end racially biased pretextual traffic stops through long-standing policy reform. These stops disproportionately target marginalized communities, eroding trust between the public and the police.

The data is clear that this practice does not enhance public safety, but instead perpetuates systemic injustice.

CCPSA has a unique opportunity to lead the charge in ending this harmful practice.

Any policy implemented must be comprehensive. We can't afford half measures that allow the police to pivot to similar practices under a different name.

We need a policy that outright ends pretextual traffic stops, limits stops for low-level offenses that do not present road safety dangers, and end suspicionless searches during traffic stops.

Over half of traffic stops CPD made from 2019 to 2021 were for having a headlight or taillight issue or improperly displayed or expired registration plates. Stopping someone for these issues is more likely to create a dangerous scenario for them as they interact with police than to improve road safety. Consent searches also enable cops to conduct fishing expeditions of people and have very racially disparate enforcement.

Law enforcement needs to have an independent legal basis to search before asking for consent.

CCPSA is entering closed-door negotiations on these issues, despite being created to be the voice of the people on matters of public safety and policing.

We expect transparency on how these conversations are progressing, and we trust that CCPSA will advocate for policies that align with the community's demand for accountability, transparency, and true public safety.

In conclusion, the problem of pretextual traffic stops is extensive and

requires strong, swift action.

The CCPSA has the power to make meaningful change, and we urge CCPSA to --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: That's time. Thank you.

MR. AMATO: Hi. My name is Dominic Amato, and I am the co-chair of the Transportation Group for the Chicago Chapter of the Sierra Club.

As part of our work towards ending traffic violations in the City, we also believe that enforcement needs reform in a way that leads to safer and more equitable outcomes for all the citizens who live here.

We believe we should not be responsible for enforcing minor violations.

In 2023, 70 percent of traffic stops occurred either due to expired tags or a burnt-out light. Does that sound like a useful -- a good use of police resources?

That also does not include data from 200,000 unreported stops, nearly a quarter of all stops that was recently unearthed by investigations and the outlet Injustice Watch. Or how about the 911 rapid response teams that were too busy pulling people over for minor

offenses instead of responding to emergency 1 calls? How can we justify the use of such police force for such colossal waste? Chicago also lags in homicide 4 5 closure rates compared to the nation at large. Using loose pretext to search for weapons hasn't 6 fixed that and has only widened the gulf of 7 mistrust between the people and the police. 8 Imagine if we used some of those 9 wasted resources for solving crimes by doing 10 actual investigative work. 11 12 Maybe we could make meaningful progress in addressing fighting crime in the 13 City. 14 Police officers shouldn't be 15 16 involved with traffic enforcement because there 17 are better options. We can reduce speeding through infrastructure and automated enforcement. 18 Police don't enforce these laws 19 consistently between people of color and other 20 citizens of Chicago. 21 22 If we really want to address these problems, we can do so without active policing. 23

Sorry. People of color, and especially black

24

Chicagoans are unfairly targeted by law 1 enforcement, either human or machine, and buried under punitive fines that leave them having to risk jail time for minor infractions that lead to 4 unpaid tickets. 5 We punish poor people for being poor 6 as if that's a fault of their own, rather than 7 equal investment in their well-being. 8 I don't want someone to go to jail 9 because they couldn't afford to fix their 10 taillight, but need a car because they live in a 11 12 food and transit desert. I want the City to do a better job of making this a choice no one should 13 ever have to make. We all --14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Time. Thank you. 15 16 ALDERMAN LA SPATA: Good evening, 17 Commissioners. My name is Daniel La Spata. represent the First Ward as alderperson here in 18 the City of Chicago. 19

I also chair the Committee on Pedestrian and Traffic Safety for the City Council.

20

21

22

23

24

What brings me here today is the opportunity to work with you on following up on a

hearing that we actually had in my committee a year ago in collaboration with a lot of the individuals in the room this evening in collaboration with the Free2Move coalition, knowing that this is an issue that is directly related to your work.

When we see the way traffic stops operate in the City of Chicago, those who gave public comment in my committee just about a year ago shared how that fractured their trust with the Chicago Police Department, how it gave them traumas that persisted in their lives. That is work that is a relationship with the Chicago Police Department that we can't afford for Chicagoans, particularly for Black and Brown Chicagoans.

I'm a Chicagoan who has lived in this City for 25 years now this August who has never been pulled over by the Chicago Police Department. Contrast that with my colleagues in the room, Black, Latinx, Asian American, alders who all that day had stories of pretextual traffic stops that impacted their lives, and not stories of their youth, of recklessness in the

past, stories from their adulthood, stories of traffic stops from their time in office.

I was really grateful last term to have an opportunity to vote for the creation of this Commission. I'm glad that we voted to create one of the most powerful bodies for police accountability in the United States. And I trust and believe and am encouraged by this hearing, and that you will use the full power of your authority to create meaningful and lasting reform where traffic stops are concerned. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Our next three speakers are Alexandra Block, David Orlikoff, and Kyle Lucas.

MS. BLOCK: Good evening, Commissioners and members of the public. My name is Alexandra Block. I'm the director of the Criminal Legal System and Policing Project at the ACLU of Illinois, and I have the honor of representing the plaintiffs in Wilkins versus City of Chicago, which is a proposed class action lawsuit against the City of Chicago of based on the discrimination that our clients and hundreds of of thousands of other black and Latinx clients

face based on CPD's pretextual traffic stop program.

It's beyond dispute that CPD's mass traffic stop program has disproportionately affected Black and Brown drivers throughout the City for years.

What's less well understood but very important to examine is what are the policies and practices that CPD employs that cause the racially disparate effects that everyone here today and for years has been complaining about. And our investigation has shown that there are three issues that are creating the problems. Three policies and practices that CPD is employing. One is quotas. Quotas that require police officers to stop certain numbers of drivers in a day or in a week or in a year, and those quotes incentivize officers to make baseless, unconstitutional, unlawful, and discriminary traffic stops.

The third is saturation policing.

Sending police disproportionately into Black and

Brown neighborhoods.

And the third is simply racial

profiling. It's important to understand why
these disparate impacts are occurring, to
understand what to do about them. And we
encourage CCPSA to look not only into solutions
but into causes.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Thank you.

MS. BLOCK: Thank you.

MR. ORLIKOFF: Good evening, Commissioners.

My name is David Orlikoff. I am a lifelong

Chicagoan and elected 14th District Councilor

working to achieve greater community control over

police in beautiful Humboldt Park where I live,

as well as Logan Square, Wicker Park, and

surrounding areas.

We held a survey that shows constituents overwhelmingly want police to spend their time answering 911 calls and responding to emergency situations, and conducting traffic stops is their lowest priority, alongside non-emergency activity.

The biggest disconnect between the people's priorities and CPD's practices is around pretextual traffic stops, a discriminary and dishonest replacement for the federally banned

stop and frisk practice.

Pretextual traffic stops are as wasteful for Chicago's taxpayers as they are harmful to the Black and Brown communities that are receiving over 97 percent of all associated use of force.

There is a real frustration that police are not responding to over half of 911 calls as reported by the Inspector General of Chicago, and are instead violating constitutional and civil rights through a systematic top-down practice that closely resembles racist quotas.

I'm also here today to mark a momentous first of its kind historical event. 35 District Councilors representing millions of Chicagoans across the City have officially joined a DC proposal group calling for the passing of Free2Move's three-point policy platform to end pretextual traffic stops by limiting low-level stops, banning suspicionless consent searches without probable cause, and ending the use of stops for an excuse of unrelated motivations.

This is the first and only time in history that a majority of District Councilors

have come to a clear policy consensus, revealing that ending pretextual stops is the number one issue for public safety in Chicago.

Solving this problem is exactly why the CCPSA was created and the following elected District Councilors will not rest until Free2Move's policy platform is fully enacted ending pretextual stops for good. Alexander Perez, District 2. Anthony Bryant, Kenya Franklin, District 3. Lovie Bernard, Gloria Jenkins, Brenda Waters, District 4. Robert McKay, Ponchita Moore, District 5. David Boykin, District 6. Teresa Chandler, District 7. Erin Vogel, District 9. Kiisha Smith, Rosemarie Domingue, Elliana Bahena, District 10. Alees Edwards, District 11. Michelle Pag, Leonardo --PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Thank you.

MR. LUCAS: Hi. My name is Kyle Lucas. I'm the executive director of Better Streets Chicago. We are a grassroots organization fighting for safer streets for all Chicagoans. And we are a proud member of the Free2Move coalition that's fighting to end pretextual traffic stops.

I am a victim of traffic violence.

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In the last year, I have been hit three times while riding my bicycle in the City of Chicago.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Every single time that I was hit, the police never came when I called.

Last year, I heard a crash outside of my window one night. Me and the neighbor rushed out to see what was going on, and we found a car with a mother and five children, and their father was running around trying to play police officer, getting footage from any businesses around the area, because when we called 911, police never showed. Me and my neighbor waited around with the family while the mother was taken to the hospital. But the police never came. And this is really striking to me as you hear all these stories about people who have so much police intervention in their lives from small infractions, getting pulled over for a broken taillight, for example. But when people are actually facing crisis and need help, they're left alone. And this is, I think, the stark contrast that really highlights why it's so important that we actually change this policy because this policy is having a dramatic negative

impact on Black and Brown Chicagoans' lives, 1 people who really need help and getting the help they need when they need it. So I urge you to adopt the Free2Move 4 5 Coalition's three-prong platform and end this 6 injustice. Thank you so much. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. 7 Our next three speakers are David 8 Boykin, Lee Bielecki, and Beth Rochford. 9 Also for the purposes of a quorum, 10 all six Commissioners are now present. 11 12 Commissioner Terry and Commissioner Minor are now 13 present. David says he is not going to 14 MR. BIELECKI: speak, so Lee Bielecki, L-E-E, B-I-E-L-E-C-K-I, 15 District Councilor for the CCPSA in the 22nd 16 17 District. I know there's going to be a lot of talk about how the traffic stops affect people in 18 the marginalized communities, and they do, they 19 affect them. They affect them to the tune of 20 Chicago Police in the last two and a half years 21 22 recovering over 10,000 guns on traffic stops.

It was last week I witnessed a video of a young man coming out of a convenience

23

24

store in Chicago and Laramie when a car pulled up, and as he was coming out of the door, two men jumped out, one with a handgun and another with an AK-47 and shot him dead. Would his life have been saved by a traffic stop? I can't say.

I do think there's a better way to conduct traffic stops, as one of the few people probably in this room that's ever had conducted traffic stops, since I was a Chicago police officer for 27 years. I can tell you they're very dangerous. They're very traumatic.

I still remember when Ella French was across the street in the hospital after she was shot and murdered on a traffic stop. So -- and the hundreds of police officers that stood outside there.

I think there is a better way, hopefully Alderman La Spata and the City Council can come to some resolution to help Chicago police officers in conducting traffic stops.

L.A. County is investigating in May to create a study on civilians who can perform low-level traffic stops. It would be interesting to see how that survey comes out.

But the trauma caused by violence 1 2 in the marginalized communities far outweighs the trauma from a traffic stop. Thank you. MS. ROCHFORD: Hello. My name is Elizabeth, 4 5 traditional spelling, Rochford, R-O-C-H-O-R-D, and I'm a 17th District Coucilor. 6 I'm not a prognosticator but allow me to fast forward to 7 some of what we will hear tonight. 8 Traffic stops are coming down, but 9 what I would like to know is why did they 10 increase so drastically when stop and frisk as a 11 12 harassment technique was obviously in peril. Superintendent Snelling was not in 13 charge, but he was part of the leadership and 14 should have access to this information. 15 Why is Chicago the only major city 16 who has seen a dramatic increase in traffic stops 17 since the COVID era? 18 A New York Times journalist 19 recently stated "Chicago broke our scale," while 20 other cities are consistently decreasing in 21 22 traffic stops. Now let me move to the future. 23 We

want pretextual traffic stops gone.

24

We live in a city with significant violence problems. Police need to extract themselves from the ticket business. You need to be in the solving crimes and finding an actual effective way of getting guns off the street business.

As in South Africa, there would be no reconciliation without truth. We need CPD to acknowledge the real harm their policies and practices have caused, and they need to partner with us to begin the healing process. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Our next three speakers are Patricia Jjemba, Darrell Dacres, and Omar Dacres.

MS. JJEMBA: Patricia Jjemba on behalf of the Cook County Law Office. I'm the director of legislative and external affairs at the Cook County Public Defender's Office. I'm here because Chicago Police practices impact the majority of the 70,000 cases we represent clients in annually.

The Cook County Public Defender's Office stands with Free2Move Coalition, position them in negotiations with CPD. CCPSA must uplift

community demands that prioritize public safety, accountability, and transparency.

It is undisputed that the CPD uses investigatory stops, pat-downs, and traffic stops in a disproportionate and even violent manner against Blacks, Latinx, and poor Chicagoans.

Officers target and wait for these drivers to commit minor traffic offenses, or outright fabricate violations as justification to pull them over.

These stops are not only constitutional violations, but also the gateway to criminal charges inflicting a lifetime of collateral consequences.

Our attorneys reviewed tens of thousands of hours of body-worn camera footage. Drivers and passengers are harassed, bullied, taunted, and pulled out of their vehicles in the most violent and humiliating of ways.

The Sun-Times reported the five officers involved in Dexter Reed's shooting death conducted 50 traffic stops in three days between March 19th and the 21st, including eight that were made within the roughly three hours before

the deadly encounter. None of these 50 stops address actual threats to community safety, but all of them harass drivers and serve as fishing expeditions.

Many of other clients mistakenly believe that having a valid FOID card alone allows them to legally possess a firearm. When CPD finds a gun in the car, they arrest drivers and even passengers who would otherwise be law-abiding gun-carrying citizens, but for a lack of their concealed carry license. Begins then the criminal prosecution that leads to jobs and housing loss, pretrial appointments, and conflicts with work, child care, and educational commitments.

Without oversight, CPD lacks the ability to curb these oppressive practices. We urge CCPSA to listen to the community and involve them in --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Thank you.

MR. DARRELL DACRES: Thank you. Hello, everybody. I'm Darrell Dacres, violence prevention program manager for ONE North Side Violence Prevention Program, CP4P, also District

Council for the 20th District.

Now I've experienced from early in stages of traffic stops when it was stop and frisk transform into this pretextual thing.

Started when I was 12 being harassed, bullied by police in my own community. And I seen that transition into my participants, the same people I work with, being pulled over, harassed, speakers pulled out their car, parts of their car being dismantled, broken, not paid for. There's no repercussions for it. Unnecessary. A lot of these times there's no arrest made, and when there is an arrest, it is oftentimes dismissed when it goes to court because it is petty cases.

I recently in the past three months been pulled over twice by CPD for -- once -- or the last time it was for being too close to the fire hydrant. I wasn't in the yellow. I wasn't on the fire hydrant. It was nothing illegal happening. They pulled up to me, guns out, drawn, looking in my car, pulled out -- you know, trying to pull out to see if there was people in the car. There was nobody. I was released. But my life was in danger.

Time before that, I was arrested on 1 2 false pretenses. They were trying to take me to There was, you know -- they say it was 3 DuPage. -- I was a victim of identity theft, but we all 4 know that that was just you fit the description. 5 I did 36 hours in the County Jail 6 away from my family, and eventually they 7 dismissed the case. 8 How many times are we going to 9 watch our Black and Brown children arrested for 10 things they have not done for petty cases such as 11 12 restrictions on a taillight, expiration of registration. 13 These things are not criminal, and 14 people shouldn't be labeled criminal for these 15 16 petty things. 17 I encourage the CCPSA to take action and take control. 18 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Thank you. 19 MR. OMAR DACRES: Good evening, ladies and 20 gentlemen. 21 22 My name is Omar Dacres. I am the victims advocate for Rogers Park and Uptown on 23

the North side of Chicago. Under the CP4P model,

24

I work for ONE North Side.

The man who just left the stand, I also work for him under the same model and the same program. I was in the car with him on his last stop. They came up to the car, guns out, asking me questions. I was a passenger. I don't know if you saw me walk down the steps, I need a lot of help because I am what you would call disabled, but it doesn't stop me from doing my job.

The point that I'm trying to make here is that for me to have this job that you see me carry better than I do -- better than anybody else in the City who has my job, as I was put under 17 weeks of extreme training to teach me about traumas and all the different kinds of traumas.

Now, I'm not up here to give you stats on who was shot, when, where, and how and when and why. I'm here to tell you that the police should be under the same scrutiny, should be under the same training as we talk — the same practices that we were taught to do the job that we have to do. They came up to the car with

their guns out.

Now, that police officer could have been having a bad day, and my three children wouldn't have had no father, just because of a traffic stop where I wasn't even the pilot of the vehicle.

I'm not here to waste time, and I'm not going to wait until you tell me to stop the clock, but if he came up and had a bad day, my clock would have been stopped. Stop pretextual stops, please.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Our last two speakers are Crista Noel and Dion McGill.

Go ahead, Crista.

MS. NOEL: Good evening, everybody. Hey, how y'all doing? Okay.

Go on ahead and pass this stuff they talk about, because it sounds really simple, but I want you to notice that the people who are Black who spoke about actually getting stopped, didn't say nothing about those three things when they got stopped. Okay? They talked about gun pointing, they talked about being snatched out of cars, they talked about things that -- these

three little things that they want you to do ain't got nothing to do with.

You do not know what's going on during these traffic stops by passing that stuff they talking about. So just pass it, so it's over. Okay?

And then we'll get down to the nitty gritty of going in to the community and actually talking to black people who were stopped and not white allies who are telling you what's happening based on stats. Okay?

You need to know what's happening during these traffic stops, because there is your change. Okay? Your change is not in stats.

Your change is in voice, knowing what exactly happens so that you can change the behavior of the police officers that are doing this. Okay?

One of them in particular, I don't know how many times y'all have come and sat in the federal court with the judge over the Consent Decree, but one of my guys had his CCL, right, his FOID. They stopped him over the sticker, and they arrested him, an arbitrary arrest.

Pretextual, my butt. Arbitrary arrest. These

guys want to arrest people. That is part of traffic stops, arrests. They ain't talking about arrests. So just pass that real quick so we can get down to business.

MR. LEWIS: Hello. My name is Gary Lewis. I am one of them such cases. As I was going home, and I was pulled over for no more than driving a nice vehicle in what the police officer stated in a not-so-nice neighborhood.

I sued the City, and I was awarded a settlement. But more importantly, Chuck Goudie did a story in February the 21st, and it was called Search Switch, and it was the answer to stop and frisk.

Chuck Goudie came over to my house and did an interview. I was pulled over just doors from my house. And I was in the car with just me and my dog, and the officer was coming up a one-way street, so I pulled over, and he went down to the stop sign, and he bust a U-turn, and he came to the side of me and stated that my license plates didn't come back to anything. I was driving a loaner vehicle, because my vehicle was at Hinsdale Land Rover, and I was in a Land

Rover Defender, which is kind of flashy. And I knew that that was fabricated, because I am in a loaner vehicle. And long story short, I was in prison -- I was in the police station for two days. And COPA confirmed that the license plate did come back. They was coming to my door telling me false stories. And I had a seizure while in custody. So I'm one of them horror stories, and I had just lost my mother to death prior to getting pulled over and basically taken into the police station.

So you can look up my story, Stop Switch by Gary Lewis, CPD. Chuck Goudie did it.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: I'll let Dion go, and then I'm going to let you close.

MR. McGILL: Dion McGill, District Councilor, 7th Police District.

I want to thank everyone who got us here, all the people who did the hard work, coalition, you guys are amazing. Everyone that spoke has been so eloquent. I don't even want to even try to talk about some of the things they talked about. So it gives me a great opportunity to talk about a little bit of a higher umbrella

Like this is just a tip of the iceberg. 1 issue. 2 Right? What we have in this City is a trust problem, and it is the tip of the iceberg. That, 3 like, the District Councils are supposed to build 4 5 trust between the community and the police, build 6 relationships. So then I go to people, and I go you have to take that leap of faith of trust, but 7 then I'll see a news article that says on top of 8 the countless traffic stops that we all see each 9 and every day in the community, there's 200,000 10 unreported ones that are occurring. Right? 11 12 have, like, not been put on the books. So how am I supposed to tell people 13 to trust when they're being lied to every day? 14 I like to use just absolute terms. 15 Those are lies. So I go to the community, I go, 16 17 Well, you have to trust the police. Right? Is that what I'm supposed to tell them? 18 That doesn't make any sense to me. 19 So if these pretextual traffic 20 stops continue, it erodes everything. Right? 21 22 I was reading a research just the other day that a traffic stop can actually stop 23 someone from voting. Is there any coincidence 24

that the communities that have some of the highest traffic stops also have some of the lowest voter turnout in the City?

That's not a coincidence. Right?

We don't even think that deep, but we have to at some point. And I wished -- I wish to my soul Snelling was here, because I wanted to tell him eye to eye, We have a trust problem. You have the power to fix it. These people in front of us have the power to help you to fix it, but if you don't comment, you don't deny, that's not true, that's not the real -- f*** all that. It's just -- it's frustrating, and it does nothing to get us to where we need to go. Thank you.

MR. SIMS: For every speaker that came up here, I commend y'all for just being open.

However you all don't even hardly realize the reality that we suffer as Black Americans in this City.

Just last night, I spent 13 hours in District 1 arrested for nothing.

On July 22nd, just past, I spent hours in the 50 West Washington building arrested for nothing.

I have three order of protections.

In July 22nd, 2020, I was jumped on by the criminals dressed up as police officers in the 24th District.

Countless events that take place.

I spoke with you all. I spoke with the Free2Move
Coalition, and most of you all in this room
possibly know who I am. I'm just attending these
meetings and being here, sharing with you all my
consistent trauma.

I got our so-called allies and a host of other people in this room that will never realize that they have the freedom to move throughout life, they have the freedom to move throughout the workplace, freedom to move throughout education, freedom to move throughout business, and just life, period; whereas, I'm hindered, hampered in every motion.

Same to you as you tell your story, but here it is. These moments for me are too consistent, which means they must be manufactured.

And I have an organization, a Community Commission of Public Safety to aid me,

however I'm not getting aided. 1 Free2Move Coalition should have 2 jumped along, but no. And so I'm a man in the 3 wind. Just like most Black Americans here in the 4 City of Chicago, in the wind, arguing points in 5 which we won't get anything out of, policies 6 which won't aid us, legislations that won't even 7 help us. 8 So where we stand? I'm just 9 saying, honestly, where do we stand? 10 I don't want to be told to sit down 11 12 when I need to say something, especially when it's important. Especially when it pertains to 13 this. 14 You all know who I am. But 15 16 pretextual stops, I guess, is more important than 17 the people. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We've reached 18 the end of our public comment period. 19 I would like to thank you, 20 everyone, who offered their comments tonight. 21 22 Your input is valuable. COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. Hello, 23 everyone. Good evening. 24

So there are actually several groups of policies on Chicago Police Department's website that are currently posted for input and comment.

So I'll just read those off. The first is interactions with persons with disabilities, policy suite. The comment period for that group of policies ends on September 12th.

Also, we have the gang and narcotics-related loitering suite of directives, as well as the police encounters and the Fourth Amendment policy suite. And the policy period for both of those last two -- that's not what I meant to say. Comment period for both of those last two ends on September 9th.

So if you are interested, which -if you are interested in reviewing those policies
and commenting on them, you can use the QR code
on the screen. And those policies related to the
police encounters and the Fourth Amendment are
related to traffic stops, and the Commission is
reviewing those to better understand the
implications for our work and the next steps on

all of this.

So UR code if you'd like to offer comment on those. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Our next order of business is going to be a panel discussion. And before I read prepared remarks, I feel like it is important to say a question that I've gotten over and over in regards to how did we get here in this moment. Specifically, why didn't the CCPSA address this issue or take on this issue long before today. And that's a question I've gotten maybe five times since I've even stepped into this room.

We had an Interim Commission. The District Council members, the Nominating Committee were going through their process of investigating permanent commissioners. There were a number of issues that the Interim Commission did address. This is an issue that is very critical, very important that we get it right. So rather than me and myself and Remel Terry, who are now the only two people who are from the Interim Commission rushing to do that, knowing that there was a chance that the

nominating committee may not select us, knowing that there was a chance that Mayor Johnson may not select us, and/or the Nominating Committee could have selected people who would have joined the Commission and may have wanted to go in a different direction, I felt it inappropriate to start something and not know if we will be able to finish it or get it right, knowing that a permanent Commission was coming.

We've been on record a long time ago saying that the moment the permanent Commission was established, this would be something that we would look to address.

So I did want to clear that up, because there were a lot of questions that I got about that when I came into this room.

The ordinance creating the Commission -- our next order of business is a subject matter hearing on pretextual traffic stops.

The ordinance creating the

Commission gives residents of Chicago the power

to require the Commission to hold a public

meeting on a specific subject.

If at least 2000 Chicago residents 1 2 sign petitions supporting a meeting on some subject, the Commission must meet to discuss it. 3 On July 25th, 2024, the Commission 4 received a petition with more than 2000 5 signatures, calling for a special meeting on 6 pretextual traffic stops. 7 The purpose of this special hearing 8 is to learn about how pretextual traffic stops 9 impact communities and public safety and to learn 10 from other jurisdictions that have changed their 11 12 policies on police-initiated traffic stops. First, we will hear from 13 representatives from the coalition that led the 14 petition drive. 15 They will summarize why they 16 17 submitted the petition. The Chicago Police Department will 18 then give a brief statement. 19 Then presenters who have worked on 20 or studied changes to traffic stop policy in 21 22 other jurisdictions will address pretextual traffic stops and Commissioners will ask them 23

questions.

24

Before we begin, it is important to understand that what we mean tonight when we talk about pretextual traffic stops.

A pretextual traffic stop is when a police officer stops a car for violating a traffic law, like for a broken taillight or an expired license plate, but the traffic law violation isn't the primary motivation for the stop, it's a pretext.

With a pretextual traffic stop, the officer's primary motivation for the stop is to find evidence that the driver has committed another crime, like they are carrying an illegal gun, or have stolen property, or possess illegal drugs.

The Supreme Court has ruled that pretextual traffic stops are constitutional.

Police can stop drivers for violations of traffic laws and use the stops to try to find evidence that the driver has committed another crime.

Even though the U.S. Constitution allows pretextual traffic stops, state and local governments are permitted to pass laws, and police departments can enact policies that place

quardrails around them.

And over the last several years, a number of jurisdictions have passed laws or changed policies that put restrictions on traffic stops.

Tonight and in the coming months, the Commission will look closely at traffic stop policies and practices in Chicago and in some of these other jurisdictions.

The Commission first took up the issue of traffic stops at the beginning of the year during the goal-setting process.

Every January, the Commission sets goals for the Police Department, and then, over the course of the year, works -- we work to assess the progress the Police Department is making towards those goals.

This year, with support from Police Superintendent Snelling, the Interim Commission adopted a goal to articulate a crime-fighting strategy that is rooted in constitutional policing and supported by the community.

As a part of this goal, the Commission noted that it wanted to ensure that

the Superintendent address concerns about the potential overuse of policing tactics that disproportionately impact Black and Brown people, devastate communities, and reduce trust and police — reduce community trust and police legitimacy without necessarily making communities safer.

As part of this goal, Superintendent Snelling agreed to ensure that all CPD officers receive effective training on constitutional policing, with a special focus on policing guidelines related to traffic stops and consent searches of vehicles.

The goal also says that policing actions must be guided by well-articulated community-informed strategies. So the Commission can explore whether CPD's traffic stops policies and practices are guided by a strategy that is both clearly articulated and community informed. And the goal also says that the CPD practices must be "data-driven, effective, and mindful of equity."

So as part of this goal evaluation, we will be looking for evidence about whether

CPD's traffic stops practices actually meet that description.

The Commission is also engaged in conversations with the Independent Monitoring

Team that oversees the consent decree, the

Illinois Attorney General's Office, and the

City's Law Department to ensure that the topic of traffic stops remains within the Commission's policy jurisdiction.

Tonight, we will hear from experts who will speak about what jurisdictions have done to address concerns about traffic stops and about the impact those changes have made.

Thank you to all our presenters who volunteered to be here and provide their perspectives and experience and to engage in a thoughtful discussion.

We ask that everyone remain respectful throughout tonight's discussion and allow each presenter the opportunity to answer questions that are posed to them.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Good evening,
everyone. The following statement is being
shared on the advisement of our counsel at our

City of Chicago Department of Law.

The City of Chicago is currently a defendant in a class action lawsuit on the subject of traffic stops. Because of the lawsuit, there are limitations on what City officials can say tonight. This means that the lack of any City or CPD response to statements made or data presented at this hearing should not in any way be construed as the City's agreement with or acceptance of any such statements or data and should not be construed as an admission of any wrongdoing.

A representative from the Chicago Police Department will make a statement tonight but won't be responding to questions.

After tonight, we'll have other opportunities to get information from CPD using tools that the Commission has by law.

Additionally, Dr. Baumgartner, one of the panelists this evening, has been retained as an expert witness against the City in another pending lawsuit, and as part of this work in that matter has reviewed materials related to the class action traffic stop lawsuit and written an

opinion in support of the plaintiff's case against the City.

This won't have an impact on the Commission's work. Our primary focus tonight is to hear from experts from around the country and to ask them questions, and we will do just that.

Going forward, we want to continue to hear from community about solutions.

Our next outreach steps include:

Reaching out and learning from people most impacted and getting their input regarding solutions. Listening to all stakeholders and other constituents to determine the most impactful approach for City of Chicago; additional hearings on traffic stops, and working in partnership with CPD to determine the purpose and strategy for using traffic stops, and to define how CPD evaluates the outcomes of their strategies.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: We would now like to invite Amy Thompson and Joy Imobhio of Free2Move to the podium to describe why they worked to gathered signatures for the petition that led to tonight's meeting. Thank you for joining us.

MS. IMOBHIO: Good evening, Commissioners and fellow Chicagoans and friends. Thank you all so much for being here and your commitment to this important issue.

My name is Joy Imobhio, and I am joined by my colleague Amy Thompson, and we're here today representing the Free2Move Coalition. The Free2Move Coalition is an alliance working to create a safer, more racially equitable system of traffic safety in Chicago.

Over the next three years, we've analyzed data on pretextual traffic stops that attest to the lived experiences of Chicagoans. It's clear that change is needed.

Today we want to share with you what that research shows and what our coalition thinks needs to be done to begin addressing this serious issue. Next slide please.

I want to briefly explain the types of stops that our coalition is focused on.

We analyzed data we obtained from CPD that document CPD's traffic stops for a moving, equipment, or licensing registration traffic offense. Any of these stops could be a

pretextual traffic stop. That's when an officer uses the violation of the traffic code, typically a minor violation, as an excuse to pull someone over when their real motivation is to investigate the person for signs of criminal activity that they don't have a reasonable suspicion of.

We are not talking about stops for crimes like robbery or carjacking. If an officer has reasonable suspicion or probable cause for crimes like that, they can pull over a car for that reason.

So those are not the type of stops that we're talking about here. Rather, we're talking about stops made for a traffic code violation. Slide, please.

In 2015, CPD was required to limit its use of pedestrian stop and frisk; instead, it just funneled that discriminatory practice into escalated traffic stops. From there, traffic stops increased by 700 percent and have stayed high ever since. Although it's been reported that stops this year have gone down by 40 percent, that's still too high.

If you assume those numbers remain

steady through the rest of the year, that's still over 350,000 stops, more than any year before 2018.

So while the decrease is good, there's still a long way to go. Slide, please.

In 2004 and the years thereafter, most stops were made for moving offenses. Now, however, CPD stops are focused instead on minor violations.

In 2023, nearly 70 percent of traffic stops were made for registration or light issue.

CPD has said it uses traffic stops to find criminal activity and fight violence, but when you really look at the data, it shows that the strategy of using minor traffic stops as a pretext to fish for criminal activity doesn't work.

In 2023, just 3.7 percent of stops resulted in a citation. Only 2.2 percent resulted in an arrest. Less than 1 percent resulted in a recovery of illegal items like drugs or weapons. And within that, less than 0.5 percent resulted in finding any gun. With over

half a million stops last year, this data shows 1 that using traffic stops as a pretext to fish for people engaging in crime is remarkably 3 ineffective. Slide, please. 4 But beyond being ineffective, CPD's 5 6

traffic stop practices disproportionately harm Black and Latine drivers in communities.

In 2023 Black drivers were over 51 percent of those stopped, and yet they make up less than 29 percent of Chicago's population.

In District 11, a district with over 96 percent Black or Latine residents, had 10 percent of the City stops despite being only 2.5 percent of the City's population.

Slide, please. We also see racial disparities in consent searches which is what happens when an officer asks the person for their permission to search. Officers don't need to have any suspicion of criminal activity before asking for that consent.

In 2023, over 95 percent of consent search requests were made to Black or Latine drivers.

To address these problems, the

24

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Free2Move Coalition developed a three-part policy to reduce racially disparate pretextual traffic stops.

We don't have time to fully dig into those today, but we wanted to briefly mention them, because the panelists you're going to hear from will be discussing some of these policy changes.

First, we want to limit stops made solely for the low-level violations that are the most common pretext; things like recently expired registration or one broken headlight. These stops aren't keeping us safe, and they're a waste of public resource.

Second, we want to prevent police from being able to use this stop code -- the traffic code as an excuse to stop someone when what they're really interested in is criminal activity. This will make it so police focus on actual evidence of criminal activity instead of relying on traffic offenses as an excuse to fish.

Finally, we want to end suspicionless consent searches during traffic stops. This will require police to have some

level of criminal suspicion before asking a driver for consent to search.

Next slide. This is such an important issue that sits at the heart of why this Commission exists. This is why community members submitted over 2,400 signatures to demand this hearing.

Today we want to increase public safety. To learn more, please follow this QR code on the screen or reach out to me or Amy.

I hand it back over to you,
President Driver.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Thank you again for submitting your petition calling for a special meeting on this important topic.

Now I would like to ask CPD's Chief of Constitutional Policing, Angel Novalez, to give a brief statement on the work the Department has done regarding traffic stops.

This information, in addition to the information derived from future meetings hosted by the Commission, will help inform our discussions with them regarding the development and implementation of any necessary policy or

reforms. 1 The Department has committed to stay for the duration of this special meeting to 3 hear what the experts are saying about this 4 5 topic. I'd now like to invite the 6 Department up to give an update. 7 CHIEF NOVALEZ: Good evening. And thank you 8 very much for having me today. My name is Angel 9 Novalez, Chief of Constitutional Policing and 10 Reform. I'm honored to be here on behalf of 11 12 Superintendent Snelling. At the Chicago Police Department, 13 we must always have connection to communities. 14 This is why I'm here, to listen to communities 15 16 and everybody in this room. 17 Thank you all for coming and sharing your experiences this evening. 18 Since becoming Superintendent about 19 a year ago, Superintendent Snelling has made it 20 very clear that a strategy to reduce crime should 21 22 not -- should not solely encompass traffic stops. I want to acknowledge -- I'm sorry.

Additionally, Superintendent has acknowledged

23

24

that oversight of our traffic stops is absolutely necessary, and then he has taken steps to show this.

I want to acknowledge that discussion of traffic stops can be complicated. What we define in policy is nuance and detail; however, it must always be rooted in the Fourth Amendment and in constitutional policing principles.

More importantly, I am here to listen this evening. Thank you for sharing your concerns during this public comment, and I look forward to hearing from the panel and the subject matter experts here today. The more we listen, the more we can learn, and the more we can learn, the stronger we can make our policies and our training.

In order to ensure that we are serving you, the communities, we must have sound policies and first-rate training for our officers.

This is why CPD believes that traffic stops should be added to the Consent Decree. We believe that adding traffic stops to

the Consent Decree provides a robust oversight process to ensure that we develop strong policies and training.

Uniquely, with the addition to the Consent Decree, we will also be folding CCPSA to have a role in the policy development process.

This is new, but we believe that it's important.

We need to hear the voices of the community that CCPSA is connected to.

In 2025, we will be prioritizing Fourth Amendment training which will include training on traffic stops.

This training will include an eight-hour foundational course and an eight-hour practical scenario-based course for officers.

The foundational course is a -- in combination with the scenario-based course is pivotal to training as it reinforces these concepts.

We are developing this training in conjunction with national subject matter experts with a review of community members. We see this training as a starting point, and as new policies develop, we'll have additional training.

During our policy development 1 2 process, we will continue to seek community This can be accessed through the Chicago 3 Police Department website. 4 As always, we hope to hear from all 5 6 of you, and we hope that you all continue to share your feedback. 7 At the end of the day, this is about 8 culture change. We didn't get here overnight, 9 and we're not going to get out of this overnight; 10 however, we do believe that the Police Department 11 12 is taking concrete steps to go in the right direction. 13 We ask that you walk with us in that 14 direction. 15 16 With your community voices and 17 expertise, we can get at this together. Thank you, and I look forward to 18 listening to everybody here. Thank you. 19 Thank you, Chief Novalez. 20 PRESIDENT DRIVER: We will now move to the presenters. 21 22 Presenting to us today are Dr. Frank Baumgartner, Dr. JJ Naddeo, Rory Pulvino, 23 John Choi, Charmin Leon, and Max 24

Carter-Oberstone.

Due to the limited amount of time we have in this venue and scheduling constraints for our presenters, we have allotted ten minutes per presenter for presentations and questions from the Commission.

This is the start of the conversation, and the presenters have all agreed to continue working with the Commission as we conduct our research on this topic.

We will start with Dr. Baumgartner.

DR. BAUMGARTNER: Thank you very much for having me. I'm going to try to be very, very brief. I just wanted to --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Dr. Frank Baumgartner holds the Richard J. Richardson Distinguished Professorship in the Department of Political Science at UNC-Chapel Hill. In recent years, he has focused on studies of criminal justice issues, including the death penalty, racial disparities in traffic stop outcomes, and other issues.

Dr. Baumgartner, thank you for joining us.

DR. BAUMGARTNER: Thank you very much for having me. I'll be very brief, and I wanted to agree with the Chief who just spoke about the need for culture change. And one of the things I want to talk about is where did the current culture come from.

I want to focus on a particular sheriff's deputy in Daytona Beach, Florida, in the 1980s. His name was Bob Vogel. Sheriff Vogel. He eventually became the elected sheriff in Volusia County, Florida. He kept pulling over Black and Brown men on I-95 as they drove through his district in Florida, based on a hunch that these men might be drug couriers. And judges in the local courts kept throwing out these arrests based on racial profiling saying that it was illegal. So sheriff -- Deputy Sheriff Vogel went to the Florida traffic code, and he studied it in detail, and he found over 500 legal justifications for a traffic stop.

And since that day, the pretextual traffic stop was born. And it has now been instructed and entered into the curriculum in police academies throughout the country.

First, one has to find the legal justification to pull over the driver. Second, one can pull over the driver, but you can't pull them over without first identifying that legal justification. That's a pretextual traffic stop. It's been common practice since the 1980s.

In the United States, police conduct over 20 million traffic stops every year, and as we saw in Chicago, it's over 500,000. So, naturally, some small percent of those traffic stops do lead to the discovery of some bad behavior; some guns, some criminal behavior, some contraband. But it has been from the beginning understood even by the police who conduct these stops, it's a needle in the haystack, fishing expedition as was described.

The crime-fighting value of these traffic stops is quite low, but there are anecdotes that confirm the value for the police. The main anecdote is Timothy McVey. The Oklahoma City bomber was actually arrested after bombing the Oklahoma City federal building by an Oklahoma State trooper in a routine traffic stop. So there is some — there are occasional times when

somebody who is an actual serious criminal is pulled over in a traffic stop, but that's related to the millions and millions of traffic stops that occur on a routine basis, not the effectiveness of traffic stops as a strategy.

I want to mention three things that are lost, and then three important considerations, and then I'll conclude my remarks.

Three things that are lost are the innocent individuals who are humiliated, frightened, and detained creating long-lasting material harms and emotional harm -- emotional pain from those unjustified detentions by the police.

Second that's lost are drivers who are actually driving dangerously. We need to enforce the traffic code against people who are speeding, going 80 miles an hour in a 35 zone, people who are actually putting other citizens at risk by their dangerous driving. And diverting the traffic code into the war on drugs is not a way to keep the road safer.

Third, better ways to fight crime.

If the goal is to arrest people who are involved in serious crimes, we need to investigate the criminals, do some detective work, spend time investigating their activities and arrest them for some valid legal reason. Don't simply pull over 10,000, 20,000, a hundred thousand people hoping that a few of them by luck and mere chance will be the ones -- will have been involved in some crime.

I want to mention three elements of the environment that should structure any understanding of pretextual traffic stop. First is the legal environment. Sheriff Vogel had it right legally. The police do have the right to pull you over if you have an expired tag. It is illegal to have an expired tag. It would require the legislature to decriminalize that behavior and to reduce the scope of the traffic code down to some small number of violations, and I don't expect that to happen.

So the legal environment is still on the side of the police, and we can't expect the United States Supreme Court to come to the aid of people who argue that they've been unjustly

detained. So that's not a route that I think we can take.

The political environment is a different thing. There is a crisis in almost every community in Chicago and elsewhere about trust in the police. And I would just say from the police perspective, pulling back on pretextual traffic stops will have very little effect on crime, but it's going to have a great effect on community trust and community engagement with the police.

I would challenge any police leader, identify the top 100 arrests of which your department is most proud in the last 12 months, the top arrests that your department has made, then count how many of those arrests that are the top value arrests came from a traffic stop.

If that number is low, then don't allow anyone in your department to claim that a traffic stop is a, quote unquote, "Effective tool in reducing crime," because they may not be.

And then finally, I would mention the institutional environment, the legal environment, the political environment, and

finally the institutional environment. 1 To 2 enhance public safety on the roads, to reduce injurious or deadly traffic accidents, perhaps we 3 should assign traffic safety to an agency that 4 5 does not have the authority to arrest people. 6 Perhaps there should be an agency that's totally focused on traffic safety and reducing accidents. 7 The police would naturally oppose this, because 8 the creation of the automobile was a fantastic 9 improvement in the authority of police agencies 10 throughout the United States, but it would allow 11 12 the police to focus on fighting crime, rather than being involved in needle-in-the-haystack 13 strategies to pull over hundreds of thousands of 14 people --15 16 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Can you hear me? 17 DR. BAUMGARTNER: -- a year. Thank you very much. 18 Thank you. PRESIDENT DRIVER: We want to 19 move to Commissioner questions. And I know 20 Commissioner Gottlieb had a question for you. 21 22 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Yes. So, Dr. Baumgartner, thank you so much for taking the 23 time today. I know you've done a lot of work on 24

Fayetteville, North Carolina, and I was wondering if you could speak to the experience there that they've had with -- originally with traffic stop reform and then rolling it back.

DR. BAUMGARTNER: Certainly. The City of Fayetteville, North Carolina, is a very racially diverse city, and there were quite significant controversies in the city about allegations of racial profiling by the police, similar to what we're talking about here.

This led to allegations by the local NAACP, challenges by the city council, the city manager, finally the police chief left, and the city manager was fired, I believe. It was quite a big shakeup.

They brought in a new police chief who was committed to reforming the way that people -- that his police department interacted with citizens, and that new police chief brought in a policy that he was able to convince his officers to adopt as with a pretty strong consensus that this might be an effective strategy. So there was buy-in by the police leadership, and they stopped doing pretextual

stops. He told them to stop doing equipment stops, tag stops. And what happened in Fayetteville is that crime continued to decline as it had been declining, but that community calls to 911 increased as a rate compared to the crime rate.

So people seemed to be more trusting of the police and more willing to call them into their neighborhoods when they thought that they were being fairer.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. I have a quick follow-up question, and that is how much of this do you believe is a -- and I heard you mention that Chief Novalez talked about culture. How much of this is a policy change and how much is a cultural shift, and how much can policy influence culture?

DR. BAUMGARTNER: Well, I would point out that at the same time that Fayetteville's police chief and the leaders of that department enthusiastically adopted a reform, in another city of North Carolina, the reform was forced on the department against its will, and it totally backfired. They mandated that consent searches

had to get a written signature by the driver, which drivers typically would not consent to. But they had such an increase in probable cause searches, that there was a net increase in overall searches. And I think that was because the police leaders, from the chief on down, refused to participate in that culture shift. They disagreed with the policies that were mandated on them by the city council. So it really requires institutional shift. And I think some hard questions for

buy-in by the police. And it requires a culture shift. And I think some hard questions for police leaders to challenge their own training. The training in the police community is that this is an effective strategy. The evidence suggests it may not be.

So that's a hard question for people.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Hello. Hi. Thank you for your time this evening. I have a question actually just based on what you just said.

I heard you say I believe in your introductory remarks that the evidence suggests it may not be an effective strategy. And I'm

going to tie that to your Timothy McVey example. When -- in the jurisdictions you've worked with or studied, do you have any data -- I understand the subjective characterization, the Timothy McVey examples, or examples where we are getting guns, and we are seeing contraband or illegal activity are -- subjectively a small percentage. Do you have the data on that?

And then a related question is, when you were working -- or your experience of any work with communities on the concern about that subjectivity. So if you get five guns off the street out of a hundred thousand stops, sure, you can say that's a small number, but I'm sure to the life that's saved from those five guns, they might not see it as small. So do you know how that conversation, if at all, was navigated in jurisdictions that made this change?

DR. BAUMGARTNER: Yeah, I think that's a really good question, and it's important to understand, you might get five guns out of a hundred thousand traffic stops, or whatever the number is, some low percentage. So we have to understand the difference between a percentage

and a number. It's nice to remove whatever number of illegal guns that might be used in crime from a community that could make us safer, but there's two things to balance with that.

There's 99,995 people who got pulled over who were innocent for each of those five guns that got removed. So what happened to those 99,000 people and what is their trust level in the police after they were subjected to a policy that singled them out with no suspicion, only because of their appearance or a stereotype of their demographic profile?

So I think that's a very important thing. And the other is just community trust in the police. And would the police be able to spend their time better on something else? Could they have gotten 50 guns out of the community if they had reallocated all the time and money and cars and equipment and officer time that went into those 100,000 traffic stops that generated five guns?

I would like to think that they could spend their time better, but that's a question for police leaders. I'm not an expert

on that. But certainly we have to understand the 1 low pay-off per traffic stops. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Dr. Baumgartner. I don't mean to cut you off. We do 4 5 have to get to our next presenter. I really 6 appreciate your insight. Next we will hear from Dr. JJ Naddeo 7 and Rory Pulvino from the Justice Innovation Lab. 8 Dr. Naddeo is an economist with the 9 Center for Economic Studies at the U.S. Census 10 Bureau and a researcher at the Justice Innovation 11 12 Lab and economist and data analyst at Free Our Vote. 13 Rory Pulvino is Director of 14 Analytics at the Justice Innovation Lab where he 15 16 leads a team of data engineers, analysts, and 17 outside researchers in designing data-driven solutions for a more equitable, effective, and 18 fair justice system. 19 JJ and Rory, thank you for joining 20 21 us. 22 MR. PULVINO: Thank you. Next slide, please. So JJ and I worked together to examine when the 23 City of St. Paul changed their policy to no 24

longer conduct non-public safety stops.

I'm going to go over this really quickly because we've already heard a lot about what this was.

But in the case of St. Paul, what they were -- the conduct that they were stopping was stopping stops for minor vehicle violations that they determined were non-public safety stops. And so I just want to highlight, and this was highlighted earlier, that non-public safety stops does not necessarily mean that they are pretextual stops, although anecdotal evidence suggests that most pretextual stops are non-public safety stops. Next slide.

And so we've actually already heard a lot about this as well as to why do police tend to conduct non-public safety stops.

The general reasoning is that they improve road safety. So there is a reason that those things that are violations are there, and they are for safety of vehicles, and then they also increase the probability that someone — that the police will find contraband that may be used in a more serious crime. So generally

that's thought to be guns, drugs, other weapons.

And so being able to conduct these stops may
increase the probability of finding those items
and then removing them from the neighbor -- the

neighborhood.

There's obvious costs to this, so enforcement is uneven by race and income as you'll -- you've heard tonight, and as you will hear more about. It decreases trust in law enforcement in communities where trust is crucial for solving other crimes. The fees and costs of fixing minor vehicle violations caused significant financial distress upon the communities that they are affected by. And so they can lead to a cycle of poverty. And there is officer and motorist safety risks to conducting traffic stops in general. And so people have spoken about those.

Turn it over to JJ.

DR. NADDEO: Yeah, I'll jump in. Thanks for having me. So this figure is just showing you the number of stops per month -- so the average number of stops per month in vehicle violation stops, so the light blue, the dark blue is moving

violations, and then there is the small orange sliver that says other stops or uncategorized stops. And this really is just to show you right around that red dotted line, September 2021, the — when the policy in St. Paul or in Ramsey County took place, that first St. Paul Police Department, right, vehicle violations basically disappeared. So this was just sort of showing you visually that policy.

Can you go to the next slide, please?

So kind of our job and what we were tasked with doing is getting the best guess at like what impact this policy had.

So just comparing before and after means can -- right, sort of lead you astray in a lot of -- in a lot of ways, which I won't spend too much time getting into, but our kind of -- our job or what we first -- our first stab at this was to try to forecast into the future what we thought the outcomes, that I'll talk about, were -- would have been if this policy didn't take place. So it basically takes all of the data before the policy happens, and we try to use

it to forecast into the future, so think of it like a weather forecast. Hopefully we do better than that.

This is showing you just for vehicle violation stops what are forecast, so that's sort of the black dots with the -- with the gray sort of uncertainty -- measure of uncertainty would have been if, right, the policy hadn't taken place. And then the sort of red hollow dots after the policy show you sort of the average of what actually happened. Okay. Next slide.

So this is just taking what I just showed you and sort of putting it into a succinct sort of panel, and so you can see that top left, this is the percentage change in our forecast between -- so this is going to be a percentage change in what we forecasted versus what actually happened.

So you can see vehicle violation stops, almost a hundred percent decrease. Moving violation stops interestingly, right, don't really change -- or decrease a little bit in the beginning, and then over time increase to sort of replace the vehicle violation stops, and then we

have sort of outcomes of interest. So this is citizen calls for service, 911 calls for service, gun seizures, reported criminal incidents by SPPD, and then traffic incidents. And what you can see there is that for none of these you see a very statistical -- statistically significant increase or decrease that is sustained.

And so this is sort of our main takeaway is, well, you see a hundred percent decrease in vehicle stop -- traffic stops or vehicle violations, and you don't really see a corresponding increase in things that measure crime or also decreases in gun seizures, which we've talked a lot about already.

I should also point out, right, that the gun seizures per month is around 43, and that, right, compared to that 1500 to 2000 mark of number of stops, it is a small percentage of time that guns are being seized, so that's important to sort of note.

Very, very quickly here, because I don't have much time, sort of recapping what I've just said. We eliminated, right, of all stops for vehicle violations. There's no rebound that

we saw -- that we observed. There's no sustained increase in crime or traffic incidents or real decrease in gun seizures. And then something that's been touched on, right, the change in stops for vehicle violations was much greater for Black motorists than white motorists.

And, right, this change was larger during the daytime than at night.

So I will sort of -- I will end there, because I think we're out of time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We will begin with a question from Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you so much for your -- for this presentation.

I just have a question a little bit to understand better about the trends that you kind of just walked us through.

So can you talk to us a little bit more about what kinds of -- so since you all had created this band for traffic violations, what strategies were law enforcement using for -- to continue to engage and make sure they are seizing these guns? Where were they finding them?

Also I wanted to know a little bit more about just like how did you arrive to a total band? And also what are the other enforcement mechanisms for road safety in this state?

DR. NADDEO: I think I'm probably not qualified to sort of -- I'm like the nerd looking at the numbers telling you -- giving you estimates. But I know John Choi's on this call, and he can probably speak much more eloquently about that. Yeah, I'll sort of -- I'll sort of leave it there. I don't want to waste time, you know, coming up with reasons why I think maybe the policy was implemented and leave it up to the experts.

COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thanks so much for the presentation, and you presented a lot of numbers, so I just want to kind of try to present the takeaways that I understand them and sort of make sure that I'm right. I'm a social scientist, too, so I understand kind of your caution with some of the numbers.

So my understanding is that basically what you found is that stops decrease a

lot in a way that -- like quite statistically 1 significant and not -- it's extremely not to be a 2 true effect, but that you found really no evidence that it impacted crime rates at all or 4 qun seizures at all. Is that correct? 5 6 DR. NADDEO: Yeah, that is correct. And we -- you know, this wasn't the only set of analysis 7 that we did. So I can direct you to a lengthy 8 paper with a lot of appendices, trying to really 9 tease out if this was a true sort of null effect 10 or if it was by chance. 11 12 So, yeah, I think you're understanding that correctly. 13 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thank you. 14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Any more Commissioner 15 16 questions? Thank you. 17 We will next -- next we'll hear from John Choi from the Ramsey County Minnesota 18 District Attorney's Office. 19 John Choi is a state and national 20 leader in progressive justice reform, working 21 22 with public officials and impacted communities to reimagine justice and the role of prosecutors. 23

Most recently, John worked with the county law

24

enforcement leaders to reduce reliance on non-public-safety traffic stops.

John, thank you for joining us.

MR. CHOI: Good evening, and thank you so much for allowing me to be a part of your special Commission hearing today on non-public safety traffic stops.

For the people who are in law enforcement that are listening in the room, I want to tell you that I used to be a prosecutor that used to believe that these types of traffic stops actually could make a difference around public safety because -- and it was legal. And I have evolved by looking and studying research and data. There's so much research and data out there. And also most importantly, listening to my community, especially the aspect of our community that has been most impacted by crime and victimization, and listening to their perspective, and they are asking for this change.

And so in Ramsey County, we made
this -- it was over a long period of time in
terms of a conversation that I had with my police
chiefs. But I came to this realization that I

was perpetuating an unjust police practice by opening my front door to say bring those cases in, and to make it into an analogy. I mean I don't think anywhere in -- on any basketball team would we ever allow for a player who only shoots 2 percent of their shots that go in and not think about all those missed shots and continue to perpetuate playing that particular player over and over again.

In fact, we would probably tell that person that we need to make a change and move to something different.

And so these are the conversations that I had with my law enforcement leaders in Ramsey County. Ramsey County is home to St. Paul and its surrounding suburbs. We have nine police agencies. We're a population of about 540,000 people, and we made the change to -- with these conversations I said that I wanted to have my policy saying that I'm not -- if there's a case that emanates or stems from a non-public-safety traffic stop, that the general rule will be that we are not going to prosecute that case, as well as having a general rule that I don't want to

have cases sent to me based solely on a consent search without some articulable suspicion.

Go to the next slide. And luckily for me, there was -- and this is the definition of what we have as a non-public safety traffic stop. And then the next slide, please. And I was lucky that we had partners in all of this.

My largest police agency, St. Paul Police Department, and then the Roseville Police Department, and the Maplewood Police Department are my two largest suburban agencies, as well as St. Anthony Village Police Department, and we made this change together.

So in Roseville, they actually enacted a written policy. In St. Paul, they did an email directing their police to prioritize moving violations, the things that really mattered to public safety, like speeding, careless driving, impaired driving, and Maplewood did the same in terms of guidance to their police officers. And so we did this together, which I think is really critical.

And if we go to the next slide.

And you heard some of the results. But we were

also very intentional. We said that -- you know, we said when we announced this in September of 2021, we'd like to see more emphasis on moving violations, the public safety stops that actually matter. We would like to see these non-public-safety traffic stops dramatically reduced. And also to intentionally address the racial disparity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We knew going into this work that Black motorists were four times more likely to be subject to a non-public-safety traffic stop, and 9 times nor likely to be subject to a search. And so we leaned in and specifically said -- and I think this is how we build trust and legitimacy of our criminal legal system, as well as in policing, that we are listening to our communities, and we're actually taking action, and we are actually trying to affect the -- the racial disparities that we have in our systems. And we also knew that just because there's so much research and data out there. You'll see Frank Baumgartner's research out there, but they have -- people have researched this to no end for the past 20 years, and what they have found is

that this practice is ineffective, and it recovers very small amounts of guns, and when we knew this would be a -- no discernable impact on crime rates. That's what the Justice Innovation Lab, the two researchers that you just heard from, JJ and Rory, talk about. And so those were the results that we've had.

So to the next slide. And we also said that we need to have an alternative, and that alternative was to partner with a foundation in our community, Lights On!, which is a partnership that grew out of Minnesota in the wake of the killing of Philando Castile. And at that time Lights On! was an organization that distributed coupons or vouchers to police agencies so they could hand them out to help people with financial assistance to get their brake light fixed or whatever that might be.

We expanded that partnership so that instead of pulling people over, what we do now is we can put into the -- our CAD system the information of what the equipment violation was, a missing tab or left rear brake light out or whatever it might be. That information is sent

to a 911 center, and then that information the next day is sent to our police departments, and then they will generate a letter, and then that letter will instruct them that if they need assistance to fix this defect -- first of all, that they have to fix it, and then secondly, if they need assistance, that we have funding available to do that. And we've had hundreds of people that have called, and the response has just been wonderful. We also help people with their license tab expirations and pay -- get themselves good in the system. And the positive feedback that all of the police departments who have participated in this has been just enormous. And I think when we do this, when we build trust, and we build relationships, build alternatives -- and we built out this alternative because we were working also and listening to the police perspective and also listening to that perspective if there was a law on the books that says you need to have tabs, well then we need to probably figure out a way to build out this alternative, and thanks to the foundation, we were able to do 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

But I think when you do these things -- when you actually put intentional leadership at the forefront and make decisions and make these changes, we can make a difference. And I think you'll see improved homicide clearance rates and improved clearance rates on non-fatal shootings --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Time. Can you hear me?

MR. CHOI: -- and so the results on the alternatives.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We will now move to questions from Commissioners, beginning with Commissioner Terry.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you to all the presenters, first and foremost, and thank you,
Mr. Choi. My question is rooted in what -- was this just a departmental policy, or were there other factors put in place to address this decrease? Like was the county or the state involved with changing certain rules, or was this just a departmental policy that passed, and if you can be more specific about what that entailed?

MR. CHOI: I think this is all about

collective impact. When we all decide to pull in the same direction, we can make a lot of change.

So I as a prosecutor had my own prosecution policy. Four of the police agencies of my nine had some sort of directive or guidance or a policy to de-emphasize these stops. We brought the foundation -- our community foundation to the table, built out an alternative, and we got everybody pulling in that same direction.

And, ultimately, I think someone talked about this issue about, you know, we had policies, but also, too, we had the will and the culture change there, because culture will eat policy for lunch any day. And I think it's so important for the leaders in law enforcement to really lean in if they want to see these changes happen.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Any other Commissioner questions? Wortham, Minor, Presley?

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Hi. Good evening.

Thank you again for your time. And I'm not sure if I misheard you, and I don't want to misquote you. When you were explaining how it started in

your office, did I hear you say that you decided the general rule would be you would not prosecute cases if they came in on what I think you described as like the non-public-safety stops, so what we're talking about stops for municipal code violations. So my question to you is two-fold.

One is that -- was that a bright-line rule?

Understanding prosecutors always have prosecutorial discretion, right? Like that's part of your job. Did you make a bright-line rule in the office that you would never? Or did you look at the evidence and then decide on a case-by-case basis generally that you would not prosecute?

And as a related note, I will just ask mine really quickly together, I understand where you were going with the basketball analogy. But realistically we're not talking about basketball, right? Specifically we're talking about recovery of guns. Even if it is a very small amount, one gun, as you know, can cause, you know, mass devastation for many, many families. And so how did you square that conversation in working with community and law

enforcement as you enacted your policies? Thank you again.

MR. CHOI: So my policy is very specific to cases that emanate or stem from a non-public-safety traffic stop; so it could be a gun case, it could be a contraband, right, drugs, guns, whatever it might be. Now, we do have a public safety exception. And we've been very transparent with that. So we've had like 20 some cases that have been presented that implicated this policy from one of the nonparticipating agencies. And in 16 of those cases out of, I think, 22 or 24, we declined to prosecute.

Also, too, with regard to -- true, we're talking about guns, but I really think the key to reducing gun violence is actually solving crimes.

And I don't know what your clearance rate is in Chicago, but like in many big cities, it's not probably very good for non-fatal shootings. We should be paying attention to that. If we can't solve those crimes, the shooters who want to kill other people will continue to do that.

If we can't solve homicides, that will continue as well.

And so I think putting more emphasis actually on the investigations, things that matter I think to our public safety -- and also traffic enforcement matters, too. But let's focus on DWI. Let's focus on people who are driving carelessly. Since the pandemic, I feel like there's -- people are driving much more recklessly these days and speeding in neighborhoods where there are children present. Those are the things that I think the public wants. And that's where we have scarce resources in law enforcement and in prosecution. So we should focus on the things that really matter. And, again, let's solve crimes.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: We need to move on to our next question. Sorry to cut you off.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you so much for this presentation. I have to start with a brief anecdote, because the Lights On! program lit me up with excitement. So when we first began having these conversations about pretextual traffic stops, I talked about my best -- I'm a

commuter. My best friend loves to drop me off, 1 and she was just moving back to the City from Oklahoma. And I often joke that her tints are so dark that it's always night inside of her car. 5 And in Oklahoma, you don't have to -- you can have dark tints, she's legally compliant, but 6 since she moved to Chicago, she is no longer 7 legally compliant, but she doesn't have the funds 8 to lighten up her tints. So I love the 9 innovation that comes from this Lights On! 10 program that will replace traffic tickets with 11 12 repair vouchers. Can you talk to me a little bit 13 more about how did you create a sustainable 14 funding stream for this program? 15 16 And can you also talk a little bit 17 about like stakeholder negotiations, and what did partnership -- what was the path to creating 18 partnership with various law enforcement agencies 19 for this program as well? 20 MR. CHOI: So we -- the St. Paul Minnesota 21 Foundation really stepped up very big, and I 22 helped raise some of the money, but we created a 23

Ramsey County Public Safety Traffic Stop Fund,

24

which to this day -- we raised about \$150,000 at the very beginning, and to this day it still funds many of those vouchers, so working with, I think, the foundation community. It also brings in -- it buys in, I think, a broader set of people to be involved in this initiative, and community foundations are, I think, a good place to go to, and maybe the public entities there in Chicago have some resources to devote to this, and I think that's -- there's a public purpose there.

I also think that it's really important that we are thinking about this as to kind of building a coalition. And this coalition has to include the police. There has to be allies within police leadership. It seems to me like the police leadership in Chicago with chief or Commissioner Snelling wants to move in this direction, so building relationship with him.

To be honest with you, this conversation with my police chiefs occurred over a two-year period, and I will also tell you that there have been so many -- the most tragic things

in my community resulted because of some aspect of the -- of pretextual traffic stops.

Philando Castile in my jurisdiction who was killed was pulled over because of mistaken belief that somehow this type of policing would make all of us safer.

And we also had George Floyd across the river and Dante Wright. And I think those experiences help us recognize what is really important and that we can address not only the safety of motorists, but also the safety of police officers as well.

And so it's a long conversation, but I think we have to just keep at it and recognize that we need everybody at the table and providing grace to each other as well.

Sometimes we show up in rooms, and we think that we have all of the right answers, and the truth is, we all don't. We need to listen better to one another. But, ultimately, have a goal of wanting to have a better version of public safety and actually better outcomes.

So look at those crime statistics that you have, the clearance rates, and improve

them.

COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Thank you, Mr. Choi.

Kelly Presley, one of the Commissioners, also an attorney, and I was hoping that you could explain a little bit about the significance of a prosecutor saying do not bring me this, I will not prosecute that, and how you were able to make that general rule and maintain a relationship with the police department?

MR. CHOI: Well, I think historically we have police leadership in St. Paul and in Ramsey County that is really committed to listening to our aspect of community that has been probably the most impacted by crime. And so there's, I think, that opportunity there to recognize that addressing racial disparities and listening to the perspectives of those who have been most policed need to have a voice at the table.

So I think that was already present.

But, again, a big part of this is just talking and building out relationships.

I mean, quite frankly, this is the most controversial thing that I have done in my

long tenure as the elected county attorney here in St. Paul, Minnesota. But it would have been even more controversial had I not been able to bring along some of the police leaders and agencies.

We also have to recognize how hard this is for our police leaders. It takes a tremendous amount of courage, because everybody in policing has been raised to believe that anything that wouldn't use this type of strategy is heresy.

And there is this strong culture within these organizations, and our leaders need, I think, support to try to help them be the leaders that they need to be, and it's not -- it's just not easy.

But I commend my police chiefs who made this hard decision and went to the roll call trainings and explained why they were doing this. And their message was very simple, that we need to focus on things that really matter to our public safety and this type of policing has not worked. Our community is asking for a change, and we're going to lean into it and monitor the

results. And we also said out loud, we won't do 1 this if it has negative impacts to our public safety. But the research that we had, the 3 Justice Innovation Lab proves that I think there 4 5 was absolutely no impact. 6 In fact, you could argue those nonparticipating agencies in my jurisdiction, 7 they actually had an increase in crime. 8 So, you know, I think there's just 9 -- focus on the data and the research and pulling 10 together, building relationships, keeping 11 12 everybody together, we can --PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. 13 MR. CHOI: -- building together --14 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Can we mute him? Thank 15 16 you. Thank you. 17 I apologize for cutting you off. I don't know if you are able to hear me. We are on 18 a tight timeline and need to move on to our next 19 speaker. 20 The next speaker we'll hear from is 21 22 Charmin Leon from the Center for Policing Equity. Charmin Leon is the Co-Director of 23 Law Enforcement Initiatives at the Center for 24

Police Equity. Over the last two years, she has testified in state houses across the country in support of legislation that seeks to deprioritize low-level traffic infractions which disproportionately affect Black and Brown motorists. She is a former sergeant with the Cleveland Division of Police in Ohio, working patrol and serving as an investigator in the Office of Professional Standards. Thank you for joining us.

Before she speaks, can we also -I also remind Commissioners that we have a
timeline to be out of this building, so if we
can, please, please be brief in your
question. Thank you.

MS. LEON: Can you hear me?

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Yes, we can hear you.

MS. LEON: Very good. Okay. I will stick to my written statement then.

Good evening, and thank you for having me. I'd like to take my allotted time to speak from my perspective as a former patrol officer and certified instructor for the City of Cleveland division of police here in Ohio. I'm

currently with the Center for Policing Equity, also known as CPE. CPE has worked with dozens of law enforcement agencies across the country who seek our assistance to improve their data collection practices, because they know that data can help them pinpoint the core issues, driving inequity and assess the effectiveness of their policies and practices.

We have a number of publications available regarding traffic safety on our website, and I will put that link in the chat.

During my time on patrol, which was in Cleveland's 4th District, one of the ways officers were considered productive was in connection with the amount of citations they generated. That practice leaves fewer officers available to answer calls for service.

Additionally, it increases the time off radio as they're spending more time in court, which was often times a point of contention for those left to pick up on more calls.

We weren't connecting the dots that we were overimposing on economically depressed communities and causing more harm to a greater

number of people, most of whom were not involved in criminal activities. Causing that type of distress in our residents served to undermine our legitimacy and cooperation with solving more serious crimes.

Officers need direction when going out for their shift. Too much discretion without goals or objectives from shift bosses is not intelligent policing or smart policing, which is the trajectory of this profession.

Cleveland is under a Consent Decree and the DLJ cited a lack of close and effective supervision as part of our problem.

We need supervisors taking a close look at what their officers are doing, where they're doing it, and why, and determine whether or not it aligns with your deployment strategies and departmental goals.

If your officers cannot speak to what those things are, that is problematic, and increases the risk of officers going on ineffective fishing expeditions, which a lot of the speakers today have spoken to.

When we frame these measures as

handcuffing our officers, we are doing a grave disservice to our residents and officers alike.

Avoidable use-of-force incidents and other officer injuries justify a pivot in our approach to public safety.

You also want to look at whether or not your officers are issuing non-moving violations at a higher rate in economically depressed areas than your more affluent areas.

We train officers on dispensing procedural justice to our citizens, and this has to be measured and monitored. If the justification for those types of stops is that it's in a high-crime area, you have to look at the hit rates for those stops. It seemed intuitive that you would make more stops in high-crime areas to discover crimes, but you have to you collect and analyze your data to confirm or dispel that theory.

Other jurisdictions have implemented constraints on low-level stops and did not see an increase in crime but rather a decrease in racial disparities and traffic crashes, which earlier was in my speaking points, Fayetteville, North

Carolina, deprioritized non-safety stops and saw racial disparities decline by 21 percent and traffic fatalities dropped by 28 percent.

Leglislators can assist in these efforts by allowing grace periods for motorists to update registrations. If they are looking to collect fines for expired tags and fees for registrations, they can take on those administrative tasks themselves with mailed alerts and relieve patrol officers of that duty that takes them away from addressing more serious crimes.

Finally, CPE's data brief on racial disparities in use of force at traffic stops published new data from other jurisdictions as well nationwide finding that Black drivers are not only stopped for non-safety violations more often than white drivers and searched -- and searched once stopped, but these stops are more likely to end in force than safety-related stops.

This underscores the real risk that non-safety stops carry for Black drivers.

Ultimately, you cannot manage what you do not measure, and if you are not collecting and

analyzing your data, what information are you using to manage your workforce?

Look at your numbers. Look at your hit rates. Look at your enforcement practices across neighborhoods.

Look at crashes and the specific moving violations that are tied to those crashes. More tickets do not equate to more safety. These practices help to elevate -- changing those practices helps to elevate the profession and reduce the harm we do not want to inflict on communities. We can do this better and more equitably. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Begin with our questioning from Commissioner Presley.

COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Thank you so much for being here. I really want to focus on the equity piece of what you had to talk about.

Can you talk a little bit more about the significance -- can you talk a little bit more about the significance of pulling pretextual traffic stops and what are identified as high-crime areas relative to areas that are not identified as high crime and the risk that

that may place on those neighborhoods that aren't identified as high crime?

MS. LEON: Sure. So you said -- so your question is the -- say that again, the importance of it or the relevance?

COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: The significance to the areas that are not identified as high crime or the risks associated with ignoring such areas and focusing heavily on other areas.

MS. LEON: Well, that's what you would like the deployment strategies within departments to define. Right? What are our goals? What are we seeking to -- again, Dr. Choi talked about building cases. Right? Doing more -- how did he put it? Oh, no. That was Baumgartner. Do some detective work. Right? Have -- build a case for the stops. If you are in a high-crime area, if you're patrolling that area, you get to know who the players are. Right? The majority of crimes are committed by a small number of people. We know who those folks are. So just randomly pulling people over for minor infractions, again look at your hit rates.

The Free2Move presentation earlier,

when they showed the percentage, the low percentage of confiscation of drugs or weapons, you have to look at that and balance it on -- with the harm that is done, especially the economic harm that we are causing in economically depressed communities. Things that can change the trajectory of a family with 400, 300, \$750 fines. Right? And it doesn't map onto safety, and that's what these different jurisdictions are finding when they are constraining those and deprioritizing them. If they are still on the books, sure, they're a legal reason to stop.

But is that a part of what your departmental goals -- is that part of your departmental goals, just to stop anyone who has any kind of violation and burden them with this kind of economic burden? I hope I answered your question.

COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We will now move on to our last speaker who is Max

Carter-Oberstone. He is an attorney specializing in appellate litigation and serves as a commissioner on the San Francisco Police

Commission which recently passed a traffic stop reform policy.

In 2021, Max was an Orrick Justice
Fellow at the Policing Project at NYU Law School,
a nonprofit think tank focused on police reform
and democratic accountability. There, he drafted
model legislation on a range of policing-related
topics. He also designed and implemented the
Policing Project's Fourth Amendment impact
litigation strategies.

Max, thank you for joining us.

MR. CARTER-OBERSTONE: Good evening. Thank you so much, everyone, for having me. Delighted to be here.

I realize I'm batting cleanup, so I will not repeat anything that others have already spoken to or at least try my best.

Really just want to maybe focus on two aspects around the passage of our pretext policy here in San Francisco. And just by way of background, our policy just became effective last month. It enjoyed broad support, including support by the chief of police. Every commissioner who at one point or another voted

for it, and hundreds of community organizations, including San Francisco's leading traffic and pedestrian safety organizations.

So the two things I might just focus on are the process by which we received public input during the drafting process and the way that we used data here in San Francisco.

So around the public input process, we probably had the most robust public feedback process that the commission has ever had in its century-long existence. And this was important because, you know, allowing for public participation, I think, adds to the legitimacy of any policy when people are heard and can actively participate, but we actually also just received a lot of really valuable feedback that ultimately made its way into the final policy that was adopted.

And so I really recommend to any jurisdiction that undertakes a policy like this to think about how to hear and solicit feedback from the public.

So a few different prongs of our process were working groups. So this was a

convening of about 20 or so individuals who were all subject matter experts, so we had a lot of people from law enforcement, a lot of folks from the legal community, non-legal community organizations, traffic safety experts, et cetera.

We went over the policy line by line over the course of four meetings. Every single recommendation that was made by anyone in that room was compiled and made public on our website. We also had a series of town hall events, a dozen or so, all across the city that, you know, were kind of scheduled after 5:00 o'clock where folks could come after work and learn about the policy and provide their feedback. Folks could come either in person or appear by Zoom, and there was also an online survey that folks could fill out and provide their views on the policy and related traffic issues.

We also did town halls specifically for line-level officers in which command staff were not invited, so that officers could feel free to give their unbridled views on the policy, and we received a lot of excellent and unbridled feedback during those sessions.

We also did something that may not sound like a big deal but is pretty radical in San Francisco, which is at the very outset, we published a rough draft of the policy so that everyone involved could have something concrete to respond to.

Typically, our policy-making process can be a little bit opaque and the public only finds out about it at the very end. And what this allowed was -- we just received public comment via email, and every single comment that we got was posted in real-time to our website so that folks could see what others were saying about the policy.

And then we also invited a series of expert guest speakers to come to our commission meetings, not unlike the hearing that you all are holding tonight, so that we could receive their wisdom and guidance.

The second piece that I wanted to touch on is how we used our local data here. So I think one of the big reasons jurisdictions have implemented policies like this is because they want to do data-driven and evidence-based

policing, so it is critical that any stops you're deemphasizing, it's supported by the data that they actually don't lead to arrests or discovery of contraband at a high rate.

And so we were able to get that data and make sure everything that we're deemphasizing in San Francisco, you know, you see arrest rates at a tiny fraction of a percent. And we also worked with our local traffic agency to overlay traffic data on top of that. So every single stop that we're deemphasizing has resulted in zero deaths, zero injuries, and zero crashes on our roadway, and that really ensures that you really limit any potential downside that you could see as a result of a policy like this, so that there should be no kind of negative public safety implications associated with it.

I see I'm at my one-minute warning.

I will stop there, and I welcome any questions

from the Commission.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Commissioner Terry.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you so much for this presentation. So I had a question,

everything that -- I want to know is how everyone worked together to get some of these things accomplished. What were the other -- was there specificity around the policy that you all pass? What changes needed to be made to the traffic code, et cetera, to stop a lot of what you were seeing in terms of the number of traffic stops?

The other piece I would like to know that no one really spoke about in terms of we know that these don't help the crime, but have you seen or --

MR. CARTER-OBERSTONE: I'm sorry to cut you off. My audio just came back on. I wasn't able to hear anything you said before this point, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER TERRY: No worries. I'll try to make it quick. I want to know about the policies that you all had to pass to make the work that you all were doing successful, whether that was just again departmental, was it municipal, what have you?

The other piece I wanted to know is, we know that these things aren't yielding what we say the -- addressing crimes issues.

What has -- has there been a decrease in crime in San Francisco as you implore these things? And what led to that that they did not have to use the traffic stops, and what has been the response from community?

MR. CARTER-OBERSTONE: Sure. So I'll answer your second question first. We don't know yet what the results are, because the policy just went into effect about a month ago, so we won't have data on outcomes probably until the last quarter of this calendar year.

In terms of your first question, how is the policy implemented, so just -- so a couple of things on that.

You know, the way our policy works is -- or I should just say -- let me back up.

In San Francisco, the police commission has pretty much plenary authority over police policy, so it was done in writing, not like an email or other more informal directives that we've heard about tonight.

The policy calls out nine categories of low-level traffic infractions which are deemphasized. It also restricts the usage of

consent searches and investigatory questions.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think it's really critical to have a policy in writing that is binding.

A big reason that you have pretext stops is because we as a general matter give officers in the field so much discretion in how they do their job. And in this particular context, that broad discretion is not yielding public safety results, and so I think you do need something in writing. It's optimal at least to have something in writing. And it's also just out of fairness to the officers to give them and the public clear notice about what's allowed and what's not allowed, because I don't think it's fair to after the fact -- after a stop's been made that may have been in a gray area, you know, just kind of second-guess what the officer did after the fact. I think just saying upfront, Here's what's allowed, here's what's not allowed, and everyone is really clear about that at the outset, I think that's the optimal way to do this.

COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: I just want to know in the policy, do you outline any kind of clear

consequences for officers if they were to engage with a traffic stop with the outline deemphasize infraction?

MR. CARTER-OBERSTONE: Yes, so with all of the Commission's policies, officers are subject to discipline if they violate the policy, so that could be anything from an oral reprimand, a written reprimand, all the way up to unpaid days of suspension and even termination, and we have a separate document that governs kind of the range of penalties that could be applicable given the nature of a violation and has to do with also kind of whether the officer has committed violations in the past, other factors like that.

But, yes, so the main and immediate consequence would be -- would be discipline.

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

With that, I would like to thank all of our panelists for their diligence and presentations and for joining us today.

Before I read the closing statement, are there any -- any Commissioners that would like to make any comment before I read the last

statement and adjourn the meeting? Okay. I have something to say, so I guess I'll close.

One, just wanted to like thank you all for being here today. Thank you to Impact for Equity, the Free2Move Coalition, all of the folks who are part of that for submitting those petitions and getting the ball rolling on having this hearing.

Thank you to our panelists. This is very informative for me as far as us trying to figure out how do we move forward in a way that is productive. And also just wanted to lift up the human aspect of this. I think the only person who I remember saying it in public comment was Councilor McGill, where he talked about our job is to build trust and what some of this stuff can do to erode trust.

I personally am a person who had been struggling with this issue particularly, in a sense as a person who, one, is charged with oversight, but, two, who frequently gets pulled over. And I think it was mentioned a few times, and I did want to comment on it, that it's not just an inconvenience when you get pulled over.

The processing that you go through -- that I go through, I'll speak for myself, as a person who's been pulled over four times in -- since April of this year. It's not just, you know, an inconvenience for me in the hopes that somebody found a gun.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Every time I get pulled over, I go through a whole process of trying to figure out how to make myself smaller, how to make myself more less threatening, I should say. And, you know, I've said this multiple times before, I firmly believe that there are really good police officers, and I've met a lot of them since being a part of this Commission. But prior to that, my only interaction with police officers were either being stopped on the street or being stopped in the car. So that was the perception that I had of the police department. I never got a chance to meet people like Angel Novalez or other folks who I truly in my heart believe have my best interest, but that was my gateway into understanding what policing was, was being pulled over and not getting a ticket and not understanding what that is.

So I did want to lift up the 1 2 comments that he made. And then I'll close with, I would like to also thank all members of the 3 public who came out to lend their voice to this 4 process. We look forward to working with 5 Chicagoans to get this right. You have received 6 a lot of information tonight, and the Commission 7 is interested in hearing the public's thoughts 8 and reflections. As you can see here, there's a 9 OR code behind me. Please scan that code and 10 provide your feedback on the information shared 11 12 in tonight's meeting. Also, as always, you can submit your 13 feedback at 14 CommunityCommissionPublicComment@CityofChicago. 15 16 org. 17 We will keep you all informed as the Commission moves forward with its work in 18 addressing traffic stops. Thank you all. And 19 with that, the special meeting of the CCPSA is 20 now adjourned. 21 22 (WHEREUPON, the proceedings were adjourned at 8:40 p.m.) 23

24

STATE OF ILLINOIS) SS: COUNTY OF C O O K) MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, C.S.R., being first duly sworn, says that she is a court reporter doing business in the City of Chicago; that she reported in shorthand the proceedings had at the hearing of said cause; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of her shorthand notes, so taken as aforesaid, and contains all the proceedings of said hearing. REEN A. WOODMAN, CSR License No. 084.002740