UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff,)
v .)) No. 4:16-CV-180-CDE
CITY OF FERGUSON, MISSOURI,)
Defendant.)

STATUS CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CATHERINE D. PERRY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APRIL 3, 2019

APPEARANCES:

Special Master: Natashia Tidwell, Esq.

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

For Plaintiff: Jude J. Volek, Esq.

Charles Wesley Hart, Jr., Esq.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For Defendant: Aarnarian (Apollo) D. Carey, Esq.

LEWIS RICE LLC

REPORTED BY: Gayle D. Madden, CSR, RDR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

United States District Court

111 South Tenth Street, Third Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102 (314) 244-7987

(Produced by computer-aided mechanical stenography.)

(Proceedings commenced at 3:04 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. We are here in the case of the United States of America versus the City of Ferguson, Case No. 4:16-CV-180. We are here for a quarterly status hearing in court, and there are some members of the public here, I see. This is one of the hearings where we are not scheduled to hear comments from the public, but we do have with us the Monitor, Ms. Tidwell. From the United States

Department of Justice, we have Mr. Volek and Mr. Hart. And then for the City of Ferguson, we have Mr. Carey.

All right. So as we've done in the past, I'll start by asking the Monitor to tell me where we stand on things and how things have been going until the -- you know, hear any report you wish to make. Obviously, there have been things going on, I know. So . . .

MS. TIDWELL: Thank you, Your Honor, and good afternoon. I will leave to the parties sort of some of the specifics with regards to developments in policy. I know they've had -- they have some policy forums scheduled. They've done -- some public comment periods have expired. I believe one is ongoing now. I believe there are some staffing issues, some openings and application processes that I think Mr. Carey can speak to.

I -- in keeping with the duty of the Monitor to provide periodic status updates, we are currently preparing a

status report for the spring of 2019, a status report which will cover the period ending March 31st, 2019. We hope to have that to the parties by the middle of this month for their review, and then we will file it with the Court at the end of this month or the first week of May depending on how the back-and-forth goes with the review period.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the things that's been really helpful in terms of putting the status report together is having the work plan and the City's willingness and cooperation in filling it in and letting us know where they -- how things are progressing in certain discrete tasks. So we received an update from Mr. Carey yesterday, and we are sort of working through that so that we can incorporate their comments into the work plan. We'll have to get back to them on some things, some issues that we're unclear on, but what we've also asked -- in addition to the items that are coming due or are past due in some instances, we've asked the City to also provide us with the -- some indication of their forward thinking on things that may come due that are earmarked for June or July of 2019, to sort of let us know that they're working incrementally on those things as well. So, hopefully, with this new process, we'll be able to update the Court in a more timely manner and also work together to -- to get everything accomplished within the year as is outlined in the work plan.

Some of the specific items that are in the work plan

that I just wanted to highlight for the Court. With regards to training, the work plan asked the City to identify, to designate the members of the Training Committee, as is required under the Consent Decree, and we asked that those names be provided to us by December 31st, 2018. The City responded that the Training Committee was established in the winter of 2017 and that it includes members of the police department as well as members of the public.

So given that the Training Committee appears to be a functioning unit, the Monitoring Team will move up auditing of the work of the Training Committee probably to sometime this spring so that we can see what has been done in the past and hopefully sit in on a meeting or two and ask Mr. Stewart to come down to see what the work of the Training Committee is.

In addition, the training schedule is something that the City is -- I think it was -- we had asked for that by the end of March or, perhaps, the end of April. We did receive some -- a schedule from the City that appeared to be courses that were available statewide for state certification in other areas. We're hoping to get something that's a little bit more centered around the Consent Decree and sort of what the plan is for training in those areas, and I think the work of the -- I think the Training Committee can be really helpful in that.

The City is also working on a training plan and has reached out to our subject matter expert, Bob Stewart, for

some technical assistance on that. They provided him with a draft sort of outline of what they intended to do, what -- you know, their thoughts on the training plan. I know that he provided them some comments to their draft, and I believe he's just waiting to hear back from them on that.

So I think once we get sort of all of these different pieces, whether it's the Training Committee, get the training plan, and get sort of a cohesive, more collaborative effort, we can then move to get the schedule so that it's not just a schedule of available courses throughout the state; it's actually a schedule that speaks specifically to what officers in Ferguson will be attending and how those training sessions comport with the Consent Decree and meet with the requirements of the Consent Decree.

One other piece of the work plan that was -- that we had staggered in the -- for the City -- because our view with regards to community engagement was that a staffing plan and a shift schedule, a deployment plan, needed to be put in place before a community engagement plan could be fully developed. So in order to know how neighborhood policing was going to work or how you're going to deploy officers to fulfill your community engagement plan, the issue of the shift schedule and how officers are going to be deployed in patrol areas needs to be -- needs to be settled, and so we're hoping -- the concern is that the City is putting the cart before the horse in some

ways. So they're working on the community policing plan, and it looks like they maybe are starting to work on the community engagement plan, but it is part of the deploy — the deployment issue needs to be worked out, and the shift schedule issue needs to be worked out before a really — a community engagement plan that has specific goals and targets and incorporates problem—solving policing — before it can be fully developed, there has to be some sort of settlement on the shift schedules and how officers are going to be deployed and how communication is going to flow from community meetings down to — from the higher levels of the department down to officers every day.

THE COURT: Right. And this has to do partly with if people -- if the shift -- if the staff -- if the shifts are always shifting, there's no continuity of people to be involved with the community; right?

MS. TIDWELL: Right. And having specific officers in specific areas or the challenges of a 10-hour shift to implementing community policing is something that we've talked about since the beginning, and so I think we've reached a point now that we -- we have a community policing policy, but now we need to get from sort of the general -- the community policing policy talks about the philosophy of community policing and sort of some of the ideas, but getting to the specific of how are you going to do it requires some sort of

confirmation or cementing of where officers are going to be deployed and how communication is going to flow with regards to problem-solving and other community engagement initiatives. The City has designated a community engagement coordinator, and so we're hoping that with that we can start to -- to put all these different pieces in place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One other part of the upcoming status report will include a report on the September municipal court audit. So I believe I gave the Court a summary of that in the immediate aftermath of that audit last September. Ms. Aghedo, from our firm, was here in Ferguson last week to do the March municipal court audit, and I will just touch on some of the pieces of that for the Court in a moment, but in terms of other audits that are scheduled for this -- for the winter of 2019 within this reporting period, we are going to send notice to the City of the use-of-force audit, and I think what we -- the notice will just include our request for all of the use-of-force reports. I think we had asked the City to provide us with a I believe it was 78 for the period that we had looked number. So we'll be looking for all of those. We will provide the parties with sort of a review sheet or a review instrument that we'll use that Mr. Stewart developed that will indicate what we're looking for with each use-of-force report, with the understanding that with the new use-of-force policy and the new reporting form, that some of the things that the Consent

Decree requires will not be reflected on the existing use-of-force reports that were filled out, but the idea is just to look at what they have now so we can develop that sort of baseline for moving forward, and I think it's a good time to do that now that the use-of-force policies have come down from the public comment and are now being the subject of roll call training. So we'll start that audit, hopefully, in the next few weeks or so, but we will get the notice to the parties within the next couple weeks.

We had a -- we were on schedule, according to the work plan, for an audit in Internal Affairs, but we're still awaiting the tracking sheet from the City, which has been the subject of some discussion. So we'd like to just get a better idea of what exists in terms of complaint investigations within the City so that in our audit this spring we can -- I anticipate that we'll be asking for the entire population. I don't know how far back we'll go. We just want to get a sense of what they actually have in-house before we make a formal audit request in that area.

With regards to the recent court audit, which

Ms. Aghedo completed last week, there are a couple of items

that the parties have indicated or at least the City has

indicated in their response to the work plan that they will be

seeking additional guidance or additional discussion with the

department about. One is paragraph 329 which requires the

City to publicize by means other than the website certain activities of the municipal court, and I think there was some discussion of what the Consent Decree intended by that, what kind of measures the City can take to fulfill that requirement to educate the public about what the -- what's happening at the court and how people can resolve their cases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another area where the parties are going to -- are engaging in some discussions, as my understanding, is about the good-cause criteria, specifically, number two, which is the available witness or victim who is willing to assist in further prosecution of one of the pre-2014 cases. During the last -- during last week's audit, Ms. Aghedo reviewed roughly 10 percent of the cases that were identified as being left open under criteria number two. We did -- she did not observe, with the exception, I think, of one case, any notations or anything that indicated that there had been activity on that, on the cases in the last couple of years. So we would -- but there were cases that she noticed that could possibly be kept open under the catchall criteria, which permits the prosecutor to keep a case open under the good-cause criteria if it's in the interest of justice to do so. So some of these cases might fall within those, but that would require sort of a separate writing by the City prosecutor to reflect that. So we're still in the absence of an agreement from the parties as to what criteria -- what will

become of criteria number two. We will continue to report as we see in our audit that these -- that the second prong of criteria number two, specifically, the witnesses' willingness to continue prosecution, has not been met.

The City -- the court has made great progress in keeping updated contact information for defendants who appear in court, which will hopefully lessen the amount of default warrants and things of that nature.

We would be remiss if we -- I know Mr. Carey will talk about staffing issues during his time up here, but we would be remiss if we did not thank Judge Brown and Ms. Lanfersieck for their hard work. We know that they are soon departing, if not already departing. So we are -- the Monitoring Team is very grateful. I know Ms. Aghedo is truly grateful, and she speaks very highly of their hard work, and they will most certainly be missed in this process.

And, finally, Your Honor, with regards to the community survey, we just have been making some final edits, cosmetic edits, to it. We anticipate that it will be live and ready to be completed by anyone willing and able to do so via the online portal, which will be up and running, we hope, by the close of business today, if not tomorrow morning. The plan after that will be to have paper copies made available at three locations within the city. That's the library, City Hall, and the Urban League. So we will have paper copies

available there. There are public computers available at the library and at the Urban League for people who want to fill out the survey there. We have a flyer that we have developed that our community engagement coordinator, Mr. Parish, will put up at various locations throughout the city. But the survey will ask for perceptions and experiences with both the police department and the municipal court, and we're going to -- the plan is to leave it open until after the 4th of July weekend. So the Police Foundation has the ability to sort of check in to see, you know, where -- based on one of the questions which asked the survey takers to identify which ward in the city they're from, we can hopefully sort of target specific areas that don't -- where we don't see a lot of responses and maybe amp up advertising or promotion of the survey in those areas. The parties --THE COURT: Yeah, so you -- in terms of the

THE COURT: Yeah, so you -- in terms of the promotion, you have a flyer telling people how to find it, where it is, and what the time period is, I assume?

MS. TIDWELL: Yes, that's right.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TIDWELL: And then we'll also -- we'll send that message out via our listserv. We'll ask the parties to do the same. The City has agreed to promote it via their social media account, and we've also had discussions with the Youth Advisory Board to hopefully -- given parental consent issues,

if we can iron that out, that they would host, you know, maybe sort of an evening where their population can take the survey as well. So we'll be able to, in real time, see how many respondents, how many responses are coming in and, hopefully, sort of look to specific areas to increase it where necessary.

And that's it for me, Your Honor, unless you have some questions.

THE COURT: I think that's -- I think I do not right now, but I'll wait and see if any arise after I hear from the parties.

MS. TIDWELL: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. And I would just add I know that the -- the -- we're -- I know that Judge Brown is leaving, and I want to thank you for your service on this and as well as the court -- other court officials.

Yes, Mr. Volek or Mr. Hart, whichever of you wishes to speak.

MR. VOLEK: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll provide just a supplement to Ms. Tidwell's update to the Court. We look forward to reviewing the results of the spring -- of the last audit in the spring audit report.

I'll start by talking about the Ferguson Municipal
Court because it is one of the areas that has had the most
progress of Consent Decree implementation. To begin, as we've
talked about in the past, the court policies are almost

entirely done that are required by the Consent Decree. policies range from ensuring that people who are unable to pay have an adequate ability-to-pay determination and understand the right to have that ability-to-pay determination be made and that they have other options besides paying fines that they owe if they can't afford to pay them for resolving their cases. These policies are finalized. They will soon be up on the Court's website after some final proofreading. There are a few outstanding policies that still need some work. We had a very productive conversation with Judge Brown and Ms. Lanfersieck from the court on a policy to address paragraph 359, which is about diversion of individuals with -individuals with mental health issues from the court and from the criminal justice system, and so we're going to work on a policy to address that. But we are extremely pleased with the progress that's been made at the court through the hard work of Judge Brown and Ms. Lanfersieck and others, including Mr. Carey. There has been a real transformation inside of the court on paper, and from the audits of the Monitoring Team, it appears in practice as well. We will continue to work together to finalize those last remaining policies.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other aspect that has occupied a lot of time is the amnesty provisions of the Consent Decree. Happily, we are nearly done with that process as well. All in, as I reported at the last quarterly status conference, there have been

44,000 cases dismissed. This has taken a lot of work to identify the cases that fall within the amnesty provisions of the Consent Decree, and we are grateful to the City officials who have done that work. The remaining items under the amnesty provisions involve cases that were initiated before January 1st of 2014. If you remember, there were 7,900 such cases. About 6,400 still remain. Of those, 1,500 or so, 500 fall within good-cause criteria number two, which provides some mechanism to continue prosecution if there is an identified victim who is identified and willing to assist with the ongoing prosecution of the case. We've been approached by the City to address that good-cause criteria and to possibly modify it. We're in talks with the City about that. We sent an email response on March 8th regarding their proposal, and we welcome further discussions on that to try and address that. We hope that those discussions will -- will result in some good outcome. At the end of the day, we are nonetheless impressed that there have been so many -- so much progress in this area of the Consent Decree, and we're very pleased that we have the universe of outstanding work narrowed down to those 500 or so cases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the occasion of Ms. Lanfersieck and Judge Brown's departure, we do want to take an extra moment to thank them.

As we have been saying for the last several quarterly status conferences, this is one area of the decree that has been very

15

successful, that there has been a lot of progress made. There is still work to be done, to be clear. Nobody would deny that, but we really appreciate their diligent effort. We understand that there's an interim judge who has been identified, and we look forward to working with him, and we are hopeful to continue this work with whoever -- whoever is in place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On to the police department specifically, we really want to commend those within the Ferguson Police Department as well. We've been working very closely with Acting Chief McCall and Lieutenant Dilworth in particular who have been extremely dedicated to the work at hand. I'll start by talking about the policy review process. As Your Honor is aware, due to community feedback, we modified the policy review and revision process. At the beginning, we had an occasion for public input at the front end, where we had policy forums to solicit ideas about what should be included in policies, and based upon feedback, including feedback received during these quarterly status conferences, we added a public comment period at the end. After the policy forums, after we work with the City to identify policies and to revise those policies, we publish the policies and receive feedback and then try to incorporate those comments where appropriate and then finalize the policies themselves. That process has been going really well. It's a highly effective process, and

I'm pleased to report that the force policies are now finalized and have been approved by the Monitoring Team.

They've been issued to officers. They are not in effect yet until roll call training can happen, of course, but they will be made public very soon as well. We really want to extend our appreciation to all the members of the public who took the time to weigh in on these policies. Their comments were thoughtful, insightful, and extremely helpful towards making the force policies reflect not only what the law requires and best practices in policing but also community concerns.

Just to hit some highlights to underscore how important this is, the force policies now require the provision of emergency medical care if there is a use of force. The force policies include extensive de-escalation tactics including, per community feedback, requirements that de-escalation be deployed early in an encounter and throughout the encounter. The force policies also include a duty to intervene. So if an officer witnesses another officer using force, they have a duty within policy to intervene to stop that unlawful use of force or that force that's out of policy. And there's a prohibition against using force against verbal confrontation alone. These are just a few of the key provisions that are now cemented into Ferguson Police Department policy. This is a very significant step forward.

In other policy areas, we've also received some very

meaningful and helpful comments. Community policing -- that was developed in tandem with -- in consultation with the Neighborhood Policing Steering Committee. We also made that -- the Ferguson Police Department also made that policy public to solicit more community feedback. We received those comments. We've worked with the City to incorporate those, and that policy should be made public very soon and finalized.

Next, the body-worn camera policy. We opened that up for a public comment period, and we received a number of very helpful comments, and we're in the process now of working with the City to incorporate those comments appropriately.

The public comment period for the accountability policies is technically over, but the policies are still up on the Ferguson website if anybody wants to continue to comment. We'll leave those up until the next suite of policies, the stop, search, and arrest policies, are put up for public comment. Those should be posted soon. One thing to note about the accountability policies — they include the policies regarding mediation, and as we noted last time, the Community Mediation Services of St. Louis has very generously agreed to help the City comply with those portions of the Consent Decree that relate to community mediation, and as soon as those policies are finalized, that mediation program will be ready to get underway, which is going to be a big step forward.

Finally, as Ms. Tidwell mentioned, we do have a

policy forum scheduled in the next couple of weeks. On April 14th and 15th, there will be a series of policy forums on the bias-free policing policy. After that policy forum, we will follow the same path, work with the City to revise the bias-free policing policy, and then solicit public comments at the end of that process. All in, we're very pleased with this new process, and we've adhered to it quite well due, in large part, to the efforts of members of the Ferguson Police Department.

I'll next turn to training. Now that there have been finalized force policies, roll call training is critically important. That training has begun. In-service training is still needed, and as Ms. Tidwell reported, we're waiting on a few different things — a training plan, a training schedule. Hopefully, in the next few months, working with the Training Committee, there will be some meaningful progress there, but Lieutenant Dilworth has been extremely helpful in putting those roll call trainings together.

A lot of our focus in the last few months has been on data collection. The department is working very hard with our team. We've dedicated a lot of attorney hours ourselves to try and help the department by creating a template for each area of the Consent Decree. That template basically goes through the different data collection requirements for, say, use of force and says here's what's needed, is this piece of

information collected now, and if so, where is it collected; if it's not collected yet, where should it be collected? Figuring out what data is required by the Consent Decree, figuring out the answers to those questions is a very time-consuming process, and Lieutenant Dilworth has been at the helm of that for the department and has done a really admirable job, working a lot of extra time to get that done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Where we are now is we are through filling out that template for the force section and we've begun revising the force reporting forms to make sure that they accurately capture the data that's needed by the -- required by the Consent Decree. We've now started to turn to the stop, search, and arrest and bias-free policing sections as well. Lieutenant Dilworth has begun going through those templates and filling out those key indicators. This is a really arduous process. It is complicated by the fact that there are two different systems that FPD is using. It's also complicated by the fact that there's no real data expertise within the department, and while the Monitoring Team is trying to give technical assistance with Ms. Goodrich while we are trying to do what we can by devoting a lot of attorney hours to this, Lieutenant Dilworth is doing a lot as well and taking on the lion's share of the work. This is a very difficult process, and it would be streamlined with a bit of technical assistance. That's what we've been spending a lot of our time working with the City and with the department on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We do have some enduring concerns that we've addressed in the past. One relates to the Civilian Review Board vacancies. This has been a discussion at several of our last status conferences. As far as we understand it, there are still three vacancies on the Civilian Review Board, but I understand that the last Civilian Review Board meeting couldn't happen because there wasn't a quorum. To its credit, the City Council filled one position, but there was a further resignation after that. So we're back to three vacancies. We've asked for information about does the council have applicants; we received a list of 19 people who had applied to serve on that board. We asked for follow-up information as to whether there was any information about any of those folks pulling out of the process, and there wasn't any, and so we hope to meet with the council about this. We requested a meeting. Before the holidays, we requested a meeting and had a meeting on the calendar for March 26th. That got postponed. We tried to meet this week. That wasn't possible either. But we now have a meeting, hopefully, later this April, and so at that point, you know, we really hope that this issue can be resolved. This seems manageable, and it's obviously of critical importance for the CRB to be able to function, and so we look forward to meeting with the council to address these and some of the other issues.

The second area of concern is the key positions that are vacant that Ms. Tidwell alluded to. As the Court's aware, there is an interim city manager, an interim police chief, a departure in the court clerk position, and now a departure in the municipal judge position, and because the Interim Police Chief was the Consent Decree Coordinator, there is no consent decree coordinator. As the City's recognized, without these positions filled, with no consent decree coordinator, progress on the decree has slowed and will continue to slow. We understand that the City's advertised for that position, and we appreciate the City providing us with the advertisement so that we could provide comments on that. We urge the City to move quickly with that. It's a really key position, as all of them are, and as those positions are filled, we -- we hope that the City recognizes the importance of ensuring that the people who fill those positions are committed to the Consent Decree and this process since we are right in the heart of this process, but until those positions are filled, we're trying to do the best that we can with the resources that the City has -- has provided to the police department, but it is creating heavy burdens on officers. It is detracting from police work because a lot of this work is falling on the shoulders of supervisors within the department.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The third issue is transparency. We want to be sure that the City continues to strive towards being more

transparent, and there have been some meaningful strides in 1 2 that respect. One of the areas that we would like to see the City turn to is fulfilling the reporting requirements of the 3 Consent Decree. There are reporting requirements both to the 4 5 public and to this Court that have not been fulfilled. 6 understand that there are staffing challenges at this moment. 7 At the same time, this is a critical part of the decree. 8 Its -- one of its stated goals is to make policing more 9 transparent because transparency is key to constitutionality, 10 and so that's something that we are certainly happy to work 11 with the City on going forward, but it's something that only 12 the City can do. 13 All in, we are really grateful for the work of those in the municipal court, those in the police department, and we 14 15 look forward to working with members of the City more broadly 16 on these outstanding issues. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I don't have any 18 questions right now. 19 I'll hear from Mr. Carey and then, perhaps, may have, 20 you know, some questions or want to hear some responses. 21 MR. VOLEK: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 MR. CAREY: Thank you, Your Honor. As is customary, 23 I'd like to kind of start out by introducing the folks from

I'd like to kind of start out by introducing the folks from
the City of Ferguson who have taken time out of their day to
kind of come and be present with us, you know, as we report to

you.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.

MR. CAREY: Absolutely. And so you'll see here who you've seen pretty much almost every time, our Councilwoman Ella Jones. Of course, you recognize Judge Brown, who will be departing us soon, and our new Interim City Manager, Mr. Jeff Blume. He was our former Finance Director, and he has been promoted to the Interim City Manager position. Behind Jeff is Christine Lanfersieck, who, again, is leaving us, and we were -- as a matter of fact, we've been in the interview process, you know, in the last day or two to try to -- you know, try to get that going.

THE COURT: And, again, I want to -- I couldn't remember your name before, but I do know how much work you've done. So thank you very much for the work you've done.

MR. CAREY: Absolutely. Absolutely. She's --

THE COURT: I was looking at her. I knew who it was, but I didn't -- I couldn't -- I was blanking on the name. So thank you.

MR. CAREY: Right. Yeah, I mean I think Mr. Volek hit -- he hits it right on every time he says it, that we are as far along as we are because of Chrissy and Judge Brown.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CAREY: And her leaving almost made me want to cry because she's just -- she's that important to us.

So then next to Chrissy is Ms. Octavia Pittman. She's our City Clerk. She doesn't come out to all of them, but she is here today to support us. And then behind Octavia is Lieutenant Dilworth, our training coordinator who Mr. Volek kind of talked about and so did the Monitor kind of talk about, and I don't know if Lieutenant Dilworth is -- if you've seen him before, but that's the face to the name. Behind Lieutenant Dilworth is our Lieutenant Colonel Al Eickhoff. Не is our new community liaison appointee in the department. He's been to a lot of these status hearings before. And then, of course, next to him is our Interim Chief Frank McCall. And one other person I do want to recognize here -- one of our newly elected council members, Ms. Fran Griffin, is sitting right there. She just last night won the election, and so congratulations to Fran for that.

(Applause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAREY: We're looking forward to working with her if, you know, the election results are confirmed, but she's also sitting over there. And, of course, you know the members of the public who you probably have seen several times, you know, at the hearings.

THE COURT: And I do appreciate the continuing interest. I mean some of you, I do recognize from every hearing, but others, I know, come when they are able to, and I do appreciate the continuing interest of the public. It's

very important.

MR. CAREY: Right.

So, Your Honor, I'll be, you know, pretty brief in my comments. You've heard Mr. Volek talk about -- and also the Monitor talk about the progress as well as the challenges that we are facing, and of course, you know those firsthand because of our, you know, regular communication with the Court.

I did want to take some time and provide you with a couple of documents, however, one of which -- may I approach, Your Honor?

11 THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. CAREY: Okay.

THE COURT: If you'll just hand things here to

Ms. Berg.

MR. CAREY: One of which is a copy of our work plan, our work plan that we provided to the Monitor, which what this work plan -- you have one already. Okay. What this work plan does, Your Honor, is it keeps the City sort of on track. The Monitor was -- you know, we're fortunate with the Monitor that we have now who has kind of put together this -- kind of this work plan, which kind of summarizes, you know, where the City needs to be all in one document.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CAREY: And so we're able to kind of go through this document and focus on, you know, figuring out what the

next task is, when the deadline is. By updating this document, we're able to communicate with the Monitor as well as -- and I don't know. I can't remember if DOJ has been in on those communications. If not, we will -- one of the things we would love to do is to put them in on it so that they, you know, have the opportunity to kind of see where we are because they've asked, and rightfully so, they've been concerned with some of the personnel issues we've had, concerned with the slowness of the progress, and they want to -- you know, want to know where we are. So we'll start including them on the emails that go back and forth between us and the Monitor in terms of updating the status. But you can kind of see how this work plan is kind of broken down into the various different categories, and then you can kind of see how the Monitor has laid out what the tasks are, what the scheduled completion date is, what the City's response is. So that's --I thought that would just be kind of a good tool for you to kind of see on paper what you're hearing from, you know, the parties and the Monitor as it relates to where the City is in its progress. And so despite the challenges that we recently faced with staffing and, you know, attrition and those kinds of things, the work still continues, and it may not be at the pace that everyone would like it to go, but at the same time, the folks that are in it and the folks that are doing it are very dedicated and are working very hard to move the pace

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

along.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So in addressing some of the areas of concern that were raised by the Department of Justice, I wanted to be specific as it relates to -- to just kind of give you the City's perspective. May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. CAREY: Okay. What you're looking at, Your Honor, is a copy of the Comprehensive Amnesty Program's good-cause standard, and this is the -- kind of the standard that we've been referencing the last couple of hearings that we've had in front of you that the parties are in discussions as it relates to standard number two. The standard number two -- as you can see, as it reads, the offense originally charged involves an identified victim who is available to assist in further prosecution of the pre-2014 cases. So, essentially, what it is is, you know, we've gone through these cases and from the City's perspective -- and I've heard the DOJ say and I've also heard the Monitor say that we're trying to assess the willingness of the people to assist, but when we look at this, we don't see willingness; we see availability; right? And so -- so, practically, Your Honor, what most of these cases are are petty theft cases, theft under \$500, that were filed by, you know, a Walmart or a QuikTrip or, you know, something of that nature. And so the prosecutor's perspective, when he reads this language -- the victim is a

corporate citizen, you know, someone, some business that exists in our community. So from the prosecutor's perspective, he goes through the case and he can identify that there's a corporate victim that is still, you know, existing in the -- in the community, still with a business that's up and running. He's saying that he believes that he's identified a victim who is available. Now, whether or not there is somebody that's willing to testify is another matter. We -- the City doesn't believe --

THE COURT: Well, if there's not, how are they considered available?

MR. CAREY: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: If there's not anybody who would testify or know anything about it, how do you think they're available?

MR. CAREY: Well, so the issue is -- so, essentially, what we've been relate -- what we've been asked to do was, essentially, call like a Walmart and say, "Okay. This particular event happened in 2013. You know, there's a warrant. We're not quite sure where this person is. We haven't caught this person, but if and when we catch this person, you know, will you still be willing to assist us?" And so there's a lot of contingencies in there and a lot of -- we don't know. First of all, we don't have a -- we don't even have a defendant. Secondly, we don't know when we'll catch that person because they're in warrant status, and if we do,

```
you know, then at that point, you know, who from Walmart or
 1
 2
     QuikTrip is going to be the person, you know, that comes forth
 3
     and testifies? So availability was -- from the prosecutor's
 4
     perspective -- was making sure that the business was still up
 5
     and running in the community and that there was an
 6
     identifiable business where that -- so by the -- when we
 7
     got -- when we actually caught somebody or when we actually
 8
     were able to arrest someone on the warrant, that then we could
 9
     actually contact them and have them decide whether or not they
10
     still want to -- to prosecute.
11
              THE COURT: Let me ask you this. In the -- so how
12
    many of these are there total?
13
              MR. CAREY: There's about 550, 560.
14
              THE COURT: And of that, how many of them are this
15
     kind of business victim that you're discussing?
16
              MR. CAREY:
                          367.
17
              THE COURT: So a little over half?
18
              MR. CAREY:
                          Yes.
19
              THE COURT: Maybe two thirds?
20
              MR. CAREY: Yes, closer to two thirds.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
22
              MR. CAREY: And so we think we're close to working
23
     this out. There's been a proposal put forth to us by the
24
     Department of Justice that relates to kind of equating or not
25
     equating but using number five here as a way to kind of keep
```

the case open. I've been kind of waiting on the prosecutor to respond to me as it relates to their proposal, but I just kind of wanted to give you what the City's perspective was as it relates to this criteria, and I think we're pretty close to -- to working it out as the Department of Justice has said, but it's just, you know, the prosecutor's perspective on it was that by identifying the victim as a corporate victim that was up and running in the -- in the community, the availability piece was a part of that and not -- he didn't necessarily read that as a willingness standard. So . . .

THE COURT: So what about the other third?

MR. CAREY: I'm sorry? The other third?

THE COURT: What about the other third?

MR. CAREY: Those are cases that are trespass cases. Most of them similar to -- the victim would be a similar victim as there are in the cases where there was petty theft. There's probably about 50 or 60 cases that are individual victims, where somebody has come in and filed a report, and those cases probably, rightfully, should be -- you know, we should probably reach out to those victims because those are situations where you have individual victims and you don't know if those people are still in the city, whether or not they were ever actually residents of the city or not. So those are ones that I think the prosecutor understands that, you know, we'd probably like to go through those and sift

through those and eliminate those if he can, if he can't find a victim that's available to assist in the prosecution. But the corporate victim cases presented a little bit of a different take for the prosecutor. So . . .

THE COURT: Well, I hope you will continue to work with the -- with the Department of Justice and the Monitor on this issue.

MR. CAREY: Sure.

THE COURT: I am concerned that, you know, this was a Comprehensive Amnesty Program that was contemplated and that the position is "We're going to, if we're ever able to, execute these warrants and deprive accused of their liberty, and then we'll go try to figure out if we can actually prosecute them," and I'm not sure that was really the intention.

MR. CAREY: Right. And I agree with you, and I don't think that was. The other side of that, though, Your Honor, is, you know, most of these cases are cases that involve what, you know, the prosecutor would consider serious crimes. A theft -- that's a serious crime, and we don't want to send the message to the community that, hey, if you come into our community and you steal something and there's a complaint filed against you, all you've got to do is wait five, seven years; it will go away. And so the prosecutor, from his perspective -- the other side of that coin is, you know, we

1 should be able to impose those moral standards of our 2 community, you know, because a lot of these are young kids, 3 you know, probably stealing from the store, young African-American kids. You've got an African-American 4 5 prosecutor who, you know, wants to say, "Hey, listen. Not in 6 our community." And so we don't want to send the message 7 that, you know, if you just wait long enough, you can steal 8 and get away with it, and so that's kind of the 9 prosecutor's -- that's the prosecutor's kind of moral dilemma 10 as it relates to how he's interpreting this amnesty provision. 11 So -- but with that said, like I said, I think we're close as 12 it relates to resolving that, and so the ball is in the City's 13 court because the DOJ did send an email with a proposal, and 14 we've got to get back to them. So that's that issue. 15 May I approach again, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. 16 17 MR. CAREY: Okay. Thank you so much. I've got three for you. All right. Thank you. 18 19 All right. Your Honor, what you have in front of you 20 are documents that are marked CRB-1, CRB-2, CRB-3. So this 21 addresses the concerns of the Department of Justice as it 22 relates to the Civilian Review Board. 23 If you look at CRB-1, that is, basically, a roster of 24 CRB members; right? And so you'll see two from Ward 1, two 25 from Ward 2, two from Ward 3, and there are three at-large

positions. One of them is filled. And you'll see that it's the Ward 2 position, the first Ward 2 position, that has resigned. So you can kind of see on paper when they say there's three vacancies, this piece of paper kind of shows you where that -- how that works.

CRB-2 shows you the list of applicants that we provided to the Department of Justice on request. I think this was sometime in mid -- mid March, which shows you -- you'll see, at the top, at-large, there have been no applicants. Ward 1, you'll see there are about 11 applicants. Ward 2, there are eight applicants. Ward 3, there are no applicants. And you'll also see that beside the names of the applicants under Ward 1 and Ward 2, some of those folks have acronyms next to their name, and I'll explain to you why that's important as we talk about CRB-3.

so if you look at CRB-3, that's -- this is our excerpts, relevant excerpts, from the CRB ordinance and also just our general Ferguson Municipal Code. I've highlighted for you on the first page some language under section 2-381, subparagraph (b) where it says, "Further, no person shall serve on more than one board or commission at the same time, and no member of any board or commission may be transferred to any other board or commission during that member's term."

So if you go back to CRB-2 and you look at the number of folks that have the acronyms next to their names, those are

folks that are serving on -- those acronyms represent boards that they're serving on, and so to the extent that someone has a parenthesis with an acronym on it, those people, per our ordinance, cannot also -- are serving on a board, and so they cannot also serve on the CRB. So that takes the list of 19 down to 12.

Further, if you turn to the second page of CRB-3, you will see our CRB ordinance, section 2-441, which talks about the board consisting of nine members -- two residents from each of the city's three wards and three at-large members to be appointed, and then you'll also see some highlighted language there which talk about -- which talks about the council's requirement to make appointments that reflect the diversity of the community and then some disqualifying or ineligibility criteria that you'll see down there.

So I give you all this to say to you that, you know, while we understand the Department of Justice's position regarding, you know, filling the CRB positions, number one, we have a quorum of folks on the CRB. We've got six. There takes — the quorum is five. So we've got six members. So they're able to function. Now, there may be occasionally an occasional time when, you know, two or three people can't be there and they may not have a quorum and they have to reschedule the meeting. I think that has happened recently, but that's also happened with the City Council as well and

other groups. So it's a normal thing when you have a group of people. Maybe not everybody is available, you know, at one time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But as you can kind of see, we have a -- we have a process by which we actually appoint these people, and if you can -- you can kind of see what we're really missing is the -the two at-large positions. Of course, we do need to -- you know, we do need to appoint this Ward 2 position. I think that's a pretty easy lift because we do have some Ward 2 folks here. So I think that position appointment should be coming shortly. But the at-large position is a little bit different because we have to be careful how we do that. The council's preference has been stakeholders in the community who aren't necessarily residents in any particular ward to try to avoid having, you know, Ward 3 with more than Ward 2 and Ward 2 with more than Ward 1. So the thought process was, you know, the at-large folks -- we want them to be stakeholders in the community -- business owners, clergy, educators, but people who aren't necessarily residents of the community, to avoid the political optics when you stack a board with more folks from one ward than the other. That's a real thing in the city of Ferguson that you have to be aware of.

So the process in finding these people -- as you can kind of see, we've had no at-large applications -- has been kind of tedious. You know, the council has gone out to the

meetings that they attend in the public, and we've announced 1 2 it at many council meetings that we're looking for more applications. Just recently, the Interim City Manager came up 3 with the idea of soliciting applications at our Ferguson 4 5 Special Business District meetings, at our West Florissant 6 Special Business District meetings to try to drum up support 7 for folks who -- in the at-large community -- who might want 8 to be a part of the CRB. But, you know, that's just -- it's a 9 hard lift, you know, to try to get people interested in that 10 kind of thing, and we have to kind of follow the structure 11 that we have here in our ordinance. 12 THE COURT: Well, your ordinance, though, allows residents to be there. What you're saying is, as a political 13 14 matter, you don't want to take --15 MR. CAREY: Correct. 16 THE COURT: You've got all these applicants from the 17 other wards --18 MR. CAREY: Correct. 19 THE COURT: -- and you don't want to put them in it 20 as at-large even though they could be under your ordinance; 21 right? 22 MR. CAREY: They could be, and if we had an emergency 23 situation where we needed to do that, I could see the council 24 doing that, but right now, since we're not in an emergency 25 situation, the preference is to avoid the political optics of

37 1 stacking this board. So that's where we are. 2 THE COURT: Okay. So, hopefully, that addresses the "why." 3 MR. CAREY: THE COURT: Let me ask you this. 4 5 MR. CAREY: Sure. 6 THE COURT: I see that the Ward 3 person's term is 7 scheduled to expire in a couple of months, at the end of June of this year, but I assume that was the first term, and is the 8 9 contemplation that that person would be reappointed? You 10 pointed out that there were no applicants from Ward 3. 11 MR. CAREY: Yes 12 THE COURT: Is there a process underway to try to 13 generate more applicants? MR. CAREY: Thanks for asking, Your Honor. So 14 15 everybody that has -- whose initial term expires in 2019 has 16 committed to stay. So Mr. Terry Burton, you'll see, has 17 committed to stay. Ms. Brenda Young has also committed to 18 stay. She's the chairperson. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. CAREY: And so those are just, you know, 21 informational at this point, just so that you kind of saw what 22 the terms were. 2.3 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. CAREY: Outside of that, Your Honor, you know, we

25

continue to work hard as a group.

I'd like to kind of switch to start to kind of maybe address -- so I know the Court's probably interested in where we are on the personnel issues.

THE COURT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAREY: So we did recently just close the posting for the police chief. I think we have a total of 12 applicants. We had six from the last process that we went through and then six additional applicants for a total of 12, and so the Interim City Manager just sent an email in the last couple of days to let us know that where he is is he sent out a questionnaire. So our process is we collect the applicants and then we send out -- we collect the applications and we send out a questionnaire to the applicants with further -requesting further information from them that then we will use in the evaluation process to kind of pare down the number, and I think those applications have been sent or those -- yeah, those surveys have been sent to the applicants, and so we are, you know, in that process earnestly to find the replacement police chief. I think that's the number one priority right now for the City is finding that police chief because our citizens have been, you know, on edge about that as well as, you know, obviously, the department and the Monitor, rightfully so.

As it relates to the Consent Decree Coordinator, we have posted that position. I think that position closes in a

week or so. We have about 49 applicants for that position.

We are very pleased at the response that we got from the folks who were interested in that position. So we're cautiously optimistic. The Consent Decree Coordinator position is a very special position. It involves project management skills, communication skills. So we know that we're looking for a pretty special person, you know, to kind of take us to that next level, and so we're cautiously optimistic because we know that the qualifications were specialized, but we think with the number -- we hope that with the number of applicants we got we can find that needle-in-the-haystack person who's, you know, going to come here and help us move to the next level. So that's where we are with that.

With -- I mentioned earlier with the Court Clerk position, Chrissy -- with Chrissy leaving, she was kind enough to stay around and to help us evaluate folks for her -- to replace her, and so like I said, yesterday, we were in interviews yesterday for that particular position, and that process is ongoing.

And then we have also identified a replacement judge for Judge Brown, you know, who will be an interim judge until the council is able to find a new one. So all in all, we -- you know, even --

THE COURT: Who is the Interim Judge, if that's public?

JUDGE BROWN: It's Will Goldstein.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAREY: Will Goldstein is his name.

THE COURT: Yeah. He's practiced in this court for a long time.

MR. CAREY: Okay. Good. Okay. Good. So he will be, you know, our Interim Judge, and, you know, Judge Perry, you know, sometimes, this can be a difficult thing. It's a hard lift sometimes in the city of Ferguson. You know, with the turnover and with the attrition and, you know, politicians getting elected, coming and going, it's sometimes hard to kind of know who's coming and who's going, but when the Monitor and the Department of Justice tell you that the people who are working on this are working hard, they're working overtime, you know, blood, sweat, and tears trying to make this process happen, it's true. So I hope you believe that, and I know you appreciate that, and I know the department appreciates it as well as the Monitor, and I hope the citizens appreciate it because it's not hard. I know there's a lot of things we could do better. There's a lot of things we could do better, and hopefully, when we can get folks in the right place with some permanency and we're not dealing with changeover and loss of institutional knowledge and trying to bring people up to speed and that kind of thing -- those are all the kinds of things that help to slow down the progress, and unfortunately, it's a reality of what you have to deal with when you're

```
1
     running a city. People are going to leave. People are going
 2
     to find better opportunities. But, you know, at the same
     time, we have a core, a really good core of people who, you
 3
     know, continue to try to lead the charge. So it's really nice
 4
 5
     to hear that, you know, the Department of Justice, the
 6
     Monitor -- of course, I know, Your Honor, you know,
 7
     appreciates what's going on because I'm in the trenches with
 8
    my client and a lot of the folks who are doing it, and I know
 9
     sometimes the public don't -- they don't always understand
     what -- you know, what the -- the job entails and how
10
11
     difficult it can be, but we -- we do what we can to try to
12
     keep this train moving forward and implement this document
13
     that, you know, the community wanted, that the politicians
     wanted, and the reforms that, you know, are necessary. So
14
15
     that's pretty much all I have. I don't -- you know, unless
16
     you have any questions for me, I'm --
17
              THE COURT: I think you've answered most of them.
18
             Let me see if Mr. Volek wishes to make any further
19
     statements or responses or tell me anything I should be asking
20
     if you think there is something.
21
             MR. VOLEK: I'm happy to talk very quickly about two
22
     issues.
23
              THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you do that, and then
24
    Mr. Carey will --
```

MR. CAREY: Sure.

MR. VOLEK: Thank you, Your Honor. I just want to address a couple of issues that came up in the interest of clarity. One, the good-cause criteria. Hopefully, we are able to continue discussions and work out a solution to this issue. Our plain reading of good-cause criteria two is that there is both a requirement there is an identified victim and a requirement that that victim be available to assist in further prosecution of the case. Without that second clause, which is what the proposal was from the City, good-cause criteria two would really be devoid of its meaning.

At the same time, we are extremely cognizant that there are cases that in the interest of justice should continue. We are -- have always been, throughout this amnesty process, very careful to strike that balance appropriately, working closely with the City to strike that balance. That's why we created good-cause criteria number five, which says that if the City Prosecutor reasonably believes that in the interest of justice and public safety the case should proceed, that gives the prosecutor the opportunity to do so.

When the City raised these concerns about these cases and the prosecutor wishing to signal the importance of adherence to the law, that for us made it clear that this was really in good-cause criteria five's domain, and so rather than devoid good-cause criteria two of its meaning, that was our response. Like I said, we proposed that on March 8th.

Hopefully, we can come to an agreement with the City about that provision, but I just wanted to clarify sort of where things stand, and we're certainly cognizant of those interests, but we do not believe that good-cause criteria two is the best suited for that.

The other issue is under good-cause criteria five there would need to be some sort of justification as to why the case was left open. That has been invoked a few times already, which the Monitoring Team has -- has reviewed those, those short memos as to why the case should be left open.

Just going to the Civilian Review Board, you know, we're meeting with the council later this month, hopefully, to address this issue. In reviewing the materials that Mr. Carey provided, we are still concerned about the vacancies. These materials show that there are applicants who are eligible to fill the positions, including the at-large positions, including the Ward 2 open position, per the ordinance that Mr. Carey provided. We understand that, at the bare minimum, there might be -- there might be the bare minimum for a quorum, but it is reasonable to say that if there's only six, there will be occasions, like the last meeting, where the quorum won't be met. This is severely impeding the CRB's ability to do its work. So we look forward to working with the council to address this issue. We still have a significant number of concerns about this.

I think the deeper problem, however, is that this has been an issue that we have raised concerns about since July of 2018. The CRB has raised concerns to us since before then. We've raised these issues with the City. We've raised these issues here in this court. We've tried to seek answers from the City about this. This is the first information we've ever received about this issue. It's taken almost an entire year. Well, eight months. And in that respect, we don't really understand why it requires so long to respond to this. If this is the City's -- if this is the holdup, we're happy to work with the City to try and address any concerns, but we think that this reflects a real need for deeper communication, more meaningful communication between the City Council, between the City itself and the Department of Justice and the Monitoring Team given how long it's taken to get this basic information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Finally, about the vacancies, we're encouraged to hear that there's been so much interest in both the Chief position and the Consent Decree Coordinator position. Those are obviously key positions, and we look forward to working with the City throughout that process. Whoever is put into those positions is going to really need the support of the City to do their job. We're seeing that right now with -- with people who are in positions that we're working with directly -- Acting Chief McCall, Lieutenant Dilworth, Chrissy,

1 the Judge. They need more than the support that they are 2 currently getting from the City, and so we think that this process coming to completion will really help, but we also 3 hope that the City increases its support for the hardworking 4 5 men and women of the Ferguson Police Department and the Court. 6 Unless you have anything further, Your Honor . . . 7 THE COURT: No. Thank you. 8 MR. VOLEK: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Ms. Tidwell, do you wish to add anything 10 at this point? 11 MS. TIDWELL: No, Your Honor, but thank you. 12 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Carey, anything further 13 you wish to add? MR. CAREY: I do. Just one point made. 14 15 The CRB ordinance, Your Honor, was a -- you know, 16 Mr. Volek represented to the Court that, you know, it's taken 17 so long to get basic information to the Department of Justice as it relates to the CRB. The Department of Justice has been 18 19 to CRB meetings, and so they know who the members of the CRB 20 are, but the CRB-1, the document I gave you, is just a list of 21 the members of the CRB. So they know who those members are. 22 So they've known that for a long time. 23 Two, about a month ago or so, when Mr. Volek asked me 24 about the list of applications that were sent, that we had, we

sent that information to him. There may have been a little

25

bit of a delay in sending it, but he asked me about a month ago. Maybe it took me maybe a week or two to send it, and so I sent it to him. So the CRB-2, he's had that, you know, within a reasonable time of asking it.

CRB-3 is our CRB ordinance. That ordinance was approved by the Department of Justice before we were able to pass it, and so that -- you know, what's being represented as, you know, the City is not giving basic information to the Department of Justice -- they knew about that ordinance. They know what the criteria is. We had to get their approval in order to decide what the criteria in that ordinance would be.

So I just want to make the record clear that the City has not been holding back information from the Department of Justice as it relates to the CRB.

THE COURT: I think the issue -- and I think we've talked about that before -- was just not understanding why --

MR. CAREY: Sure.

THE COURT: -- you weren't proceeding, and I think what you've told us today is because -- because of the perception of unfairness, you don't want to load up multiple people from wards in the at-large positions and you want to find other people, and even though the ordinance allows you to put residents in those positions, you've chosen not to do that, and you haven't been able to find other people. I mean that's actually information I didn't understand --

1 MR. CAREY: Sure.

THE COURT: -- as to why it was taking so long.

MR. CAREY: Sure.

THE COURT: I mean it's a long time not to have filled those positions. I understand that there's a lot of work to be done, but that's -- I think that is new; I mean at least it's new to me.

MR. CAREY: Right. No. And I get that. Just for record purposes --

THE COURT: Yeah, I understand.

MR. CAREY: -- you know, what was said was it's taken a long time to get this basic information. I agree that the "why" in understanding what the council's reasoning was for selecting or not selecting -- that has been, you know, a challenge in getting that information, and that is something that they have been waiting for for a good time.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's all I was saying.

MR. CAREY: But I just wanted to make sure the record was clear that the information in terms of the documents that I provided -- that's all information that everybody should be aware of and that the Department of Justice should be aware that they've had for a very long time. But no arguments from me as it relates to, you know, the rationale that the council is going through in selecting folks because they have been asking for that. So . . .

THE COURT: Okay.

2 MR. CAREY: Okay.

THE COURT: Well, yeah, I'm not -- I do -- I am concerned that I have heard the same things, you know, over and over. On the other hand, I'm -- I'm very pleased still with the progress that has been made, and I know it's been difficult with these vacancies. I do hope that the vacancies can be filled, you know, expeditiously. I also hope -- I think this -- the idea that, apparently, you all have agreed upon that the representatives from the Department of Justice can meet with the council -- I think that's an excellent thing, and I want that to happen, and I hope that will happen as you've scheduled it. And I would tell you all to keep working. I mean it's a lot of work. I -- you know, there are -- I can't -- I should know by heart now how many paragraphs there are in the Consent Decree.

Ms. Tidwell, do you know by heart? You should too. It's over 300 obviously.

MS. TIDWELL: Over four.

THE COURT: Over 400, yeah. So it's a lot of paragraphs to comply with, and they're all very specific, and the City has complied with many of them, and others are taking longer than we expected. Others are just now being scheduled to move forward. And so I think we are -- you know, I think progress is being made, and I do appreciate what -- you know,

I think on behalf of all of the parties -- and I know that sometimes the citizens disagree with this, but what I've seen appears to be good faith on behalf of everybody in trying to comply with this, and I hope that will continue because it's essential to the process. And, you know, that's what I would say. So thank you for your reports.

Yeah, Mr. Carey, one more thing?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAREY: There are 464 paragraphs.

THE COURT: 464. I should have that number memorized. We all should have because we've been over them so many times, but didn't work this time, but -- so I do appreciate the hard work everyone's doing, and I guess what I would say is keep up the work, and we will keep moving forward as -- as we are, and hopefully, some of the things that have been lingering -- the policy development, although we didn't talk about it a lot here except for the report, has really been -- I know it's been difficult, but I've been -- I've been very pleased with how that's worked, and so getting the training out is essential also, of course, which you all know, and getting everything implemented and then continuing with the further policy developments. I think some of these policies were very difficult, and so I appreciate how you've done on that.

So let's just keep up this work, and we'll keep

pushing. It's not -- you know, it's a work in progress, but

```
50
     we need to keep moving in the positive direction, and I am
 1
 2
     optimistic that that's what everyone here will be doing.
              So thank you, all, very much, and court is in recess.
 3
          (Proceedings concluded at 4:15 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Gayle D. Madden, Registered Diplomate Reporter and Certified Realtime Reporter, hereby certify that I am a duly appointed Official Court Reporter of the United States

District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

I further certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings held in the above-entitled case and that said transcript is a true and correct transcription of my stenographic notes.

I further certify that this transcript contains pages 1 through 50 inclusive.

Dated at St. Louis, Missouri, this 24th day of May, 2019.

/s/ Gayle D. Madden

GAYLE D. MADDEN, CSR, RDR, CRR
Official Court Reporter