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

JULY 2, 2019

APPEARANCES:

Special Master: Natashia Tidwell, Esq.

Courtney A. Caruso, Esq.

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

For Plaintiff: Jude J. Volek, Esq.

Amy Senier, 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.)

INDEX

Statement by Ms. Tidwell Page	4
Statement by Ms. Senier	14
Statement by Mr. Carey Page	28
Public Comments:	
Rory Porter	41
Mildred Clines	44
Angelique A. Kidd Page	47
Melanie Randels	50
Cassandra Butler Page	53
Annette Jenkins Page	57
Emily Davis	59
Keith Rose	63
Fran Griffin	67
Katurah Topps	72
Blake Ashby	72
Felicia Pulliam Page	77
refreta fulfiam	, ,
Statement by the Court	80
	83
	87
Statement by Mr. Volek	-
Statement by Ms. Tidwell	87
Statement by the Court Page	87

(Proceedings commenced at 1:06 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. We are here in the case of United States of America versus the City of Ferguson. This is Case No. 4:16-CV-180. This is the -- as everyone knows -- the Consent Decree case, and we're here for a status hearing and report from the Monitor about -- and as well as the parties about the progress under the Consent Decree. This is a hearing where we have agreed to hear comments from the public, and so a number of you have signed up to speak, and we will do that, but I think it's appropriate to hear from the Monitor initially, and then we can hear from the public.

Is that acceptable, Ms. Tidwell, or would you rather do it the other way around?

MS. TIDWELL: No. That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And so I would ask the lawyers to please stand and introduce themselves for the record.

Before you do that, Jeanette, I just left that piece of paper with the list of the signups in my office. Thank you.

All right. I have the list of people who are going to speak.

So if each of you -- I guess, let me start with you. For the United States, would you please state your names?

MR. VOLEK: Jude Volek for the United States.

Δ

MS. SENIER: Amy Senier for the United States. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. And for the City? MR. CAREY: Apollo Carey, City of Ferguson. 3 THE COURT: And for the Monitor? 4 5 MS. TIDWELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Natashia Tidwell along with Courtney Caruso. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, all. 8 All right. Ms. Tidwell, I know you filed your 9 report. 10 I did want to mention to the public someone had 11 called about the websites, and our court website did have 12 the -- as well as the Monitor's website did have the notice of 13 this hearing. I'm not sure the City's did, but it's in two of 14 those places. Also, the Monitor filed a status report, a 15 quarterly status or the semiannual status report, last week, 16 and that's not yet gone up on our Court's website, but it will 17 be posted before you leave the building today. It's going up 18 right now, so if people wanted access to that as well. 19 So, Ms. Tidwell, I'll hear your comments. 20 MS. TIDWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 So as you mentioned, Your Honor, last Friday, the 22 Monitoring Team filed its semiannual report to the Court 23 reporting on activities from the period of October 1st, 2018, 24 through March 31st, 2019. It was posted to the Monitor's

website last Friday. We've also brought some hard copies that

25

we left on the table for where the public comment sign-up is.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yeah.

MS. TIDWELL: If you would bid my indulgence, I just want to thank Ms. Caruso for her hard work on the report, on getting it out and getting everybody's work and comments in. So, hopefully, that outlines, hopefully clearly, sort of the state of affairs. So I don't want to recap the report in its entirety, but I did want to highlight and sort of reiterate a few points, beginning with the work plan, Your Honor.

So, in December, along with the fall semiannual report, the Monitoring Team published a work plan outlining the tasks and goals towards implementation for year three. As is required by the Consent Decree, the parties were given 30 days in which to review the work plan and its timelines prior to publication. We also met in -- met here in advance of publication to discuss some of the -- discuss the timetable.

Appendix A to the semiannual report we just filed details the progress on each of the tasks identified for completion during year three, and as you read it, you'll see that many are incomplete, and as we approach the end of year three, which is the end of this month, it will be time for the Monitoring Team to begin drafting a plan for year four, but what do we do with the incomplete items from year three? Do we just cut and paste them into year four? It seems like more needs to be done to communicate the need to prioritize and

ensure a feasible path to full implementation, and the City has to engage its enhancement -- has to enhance its engagement in the process.

As I mentioned, a year ago, once we moved out of the policy development phase, which we are largely done with on the police side and the court side, it would mean that DOJ could no longer drive the progress towards implementation.

Once we get to training and putting officers out to implement the policies, the City has to take the lead on that. So a first step, a crucial first step in that, is the appointment of a Consent Decree Coordinator, which is a position that's been open and is long overdue for filling.

The work plan serves many purposes, one of which is to serve as this road map to implementation; however, it's just words on the paper without the City's acceptance of the tasks and the timelines that are outlined and a commitment to completing those tasks on time.

One way in which the City could communicate its commitment is through regular communication with DOJ and with the Monitoring Team as to its progress towards completing each task. Right now what we have is a system where the Monitoring Team or the Department of Justice will prompt the City and say, "Well, you know, what's the status of this?" or we'll ask for the City to fill in the work plan on its progress, where it feels it lies on certain tasks within the work plan.

And if something is due on April 30th, if the time -if the work plan calls for completion by April 30th, on
March 30th, that shouldn't be the first time that people are
thinking about how we're going to implement that. April 30th
shouldn't be the first time that people are thinking about
implementing it. It should be -- there needs to be somebody
in place who's forecasting and has the vision to think about
deadlines to come and not just the work that is immediately
due, and that's been absent throughout this process in many
areas of the police department's implementation.

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

This is yet another reason why the Consent Decree Coordinator position is so vital. Without a person serving in that role, tasks are left incomplete or without the foresight needed to envision mode of completion ahead of time. For instance, the community engagement plan and the neighborhood policing plan. The Monitoring Team has, in past reports, in meetings with the parties, and in this courtroom, emphasized the need for the City, in compliance with Consent Decree paragraphs 29 through 30 and 256 to 258, to undergo a staffing study and revise its shift schedules and patrol boundaries to better support the engagement plan and community policing more broadly. It is the foundation upon which the community engagement plan rests. The work plan, which the City approved, called for the staffing study to be completed by March 31st, 2019, and for the neighborhood policing engagement

plans to follow. That layering was purposeful by the Monitoring Team. The Monitoring Team can't approve the policies that are now in development without the staffing study if we don't have a staffing study that tells us how the shift schedules and deployment of officers is going to be changed to meet with the plan as outlined. We've said that repeatedly, but despite that, the City has moved along with -- has moved forward with development of the plans.

A Consent Decree Coordinator would, hopefully, do as the job title suggests and coordinate the City's implementation efforts so as not to have anyone's efforts expended in vain, and although the Consent Decree expressly calls for a Consent Decree Coordinator, we are now heading into year four, and the role has yet to be filled as envisioned by the Consent Decree. Interim Chief McCall has served nominally in that role, but it's clear that throughout his tenure he has been stretched very thin by other responsibilities. Without a dedicated Consent Decree Coordinator, the Monitoring Team cannot undergo the effort of drafting a year four work plan, one that has a plan, a feasible plan, for implementation of the Consent Decree's provisions by the end of year five.

This absence of forward thinking and planning is also evident in other subject areas. Training: The Monitor -- the work plan calls for the completion of a training plan and

schedule consisting of the City's plan and timeline for delivery of all the training required under the Consent Decree. In response to this action item in the work plan, the City provided a spreadsheet detailing the general availability of statewide police training courses. The courses didn't list a corresponding Consent Decree provision, nor did the City provide lesson plans or other explanatory details which would identify if and how the state-sponsored training would address the Consent Decree.

Data collection: Another area marked as incomplete relates to data collection. The City was to complete and provide to the Monitoring Team by March 30th a worksheet listing the various data elements required under the Consent Decree in three specific subject areas — use of force; stop, search, and arrest; and bias—free policing. A worksheet detailing the remaining subject areas was scheduled for completion by June 30th, 2019, just a few days ago. We don't have either.

Those are just a few of the subject areas in the most recent -- that are outlined in the semiannual report that contains the list of tasks from the work plan and their current status. There's not much else that we can -- that we can do as the Monitoring Team. We can report out. We can press. We can give ideas as to how we think different provisions should be grouped together or how they should be

implemented together. We can offer to give technical assistance where we can. We can try to advise. But the City has to take -- take on more of a role and more responsibility in these areas.

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

I'll briefly outline or detail some of the activities of the Monitoring Team during the reporting period, beginning with the court audit which was conducted by Ms. Aghedo in -most recently, in March, but the semiannual report details the results of the audit from September of 2018. The municipal court made significant progress in most areas. The one area of concern continues to be the Comprehensive Amnesty Program, specifically, good-cause criteria number two, which provides that there is a good cause to continue prosecution of a pre-2014 case if there is an identifiable victim who is available to assist in further prosecution. We understand that the parties are working to either revise good-cause criteria number two or to implement a process by which the review of these cases can be completed, and the Monitoring Team looks forward to resolution from the parties, but in the meantime, the provision remains out of compliance.

In the area of training and audits, we had -- the use-of-force policies were the first to complete the public comment and full policy development process, and so roll call training on those was completed last week. Subject matter expert, Bob Stewart, from the Monitoring Team, was in Ferguson

last week, and he was able to attend one of the trainings. He reports that it was thoughtfully presented by Lieutenant

Dilworth, who has done great work in the area of training for the police department. Mr. Stewart reported that he was pleased that a number of sergeants were there because we recognize the importance of first-line supervisors to the success in use-of-force reporting and implementation of the policies as a whole. Mr. Stewart also was able to conduct a pre-baseline review of use-of-force reports now that the policies are in the implementation phase. He made some general observations about the -- the scope of reporting as it existed before the policies were implemented, and we hope to report on that in our next report.

And, finally, Your Honor, just moving to the community survey, as you know, we opened a community survey in April, early April, and we had indicated that would close on July 8th. One of the things that the Police Foundation permits us to do with regards to the surveys is to track in real time the demographic information of survey takers so that we can better assess what areas of the city people are representing to make sure that the populations that the Consent Decree speaks to specifically -- that we're hearing from folks within those communities, and we haven't been, and so one of the things that we've discussed -- and our subject matter expert, Mr. Parish, has taken the lead here -- has been

in talking about and strategizing on ways to enhance participation, and so to that end, we are going to take a hard look at some of the community events scheduled for the summer in and around Ferguson to think about ways to engage folks who might already be out at these places but also to go into places where people might be to try to see if we can somehow enhance participation in those particular -- whether it be the neighborhood associations or some of the other places to see if we can get more involvement, and so we've decided to keep the survey open for at least another 30 days and possibly up until Labor Day just to -- so we can look at the full calendar and figure out a plan. It will probably involve us hiring some folks to help with handing out surveys or doing some in-person survey taking at community events or whatever, but we're trying to put a plan together to get -- hopefully, to get the numbers up by the end of summer.

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 COURT: Yeah. I was going to ask you about that because I think before, the deadline had been next Monday -
MS. TIDWELL: That's right.

THE COURT: -- a week from yesterday, and so, you know, to the extent anybody here can get the word out, we've got people who are interested here, but you know who the other people are, and certainly, if the press can assist in getting the word out that this is an important community survey that we'd like to -- we need to have people fill out, it's online,

it's available, and we need to hear from the community and from all facets of the community, which is what you're pointing out. So I appreciate that you're going to work on some of the summer events and try to see that, but I would just make a plea to everybody here, because the fact you're here means you care, that you ask people to fill out the survey.

MS. TIDWELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

And one other sort of informal feedback mechanism that we're starting to explore a little bit more is with the youth of the city. We had -- there was some questions that the Police Foundation raised about the informed consent process of getting children under 18 to take the survey, and so in lieu of sort of trying to figure that out or hash that out, we had our first meeting last night with the Ferguson Youth Initiative, and we're starting to think about ways that we can bring sort of small focus groups of Ferguson youth together to try to get maybe not through a formal survey but just sort of an informal means as part of the outcome assessment role of the Monitor.

And finally, Your Honor, just in terms of policy development, I'm sure the parties will speak to the remaining areas for policy development. I know that there was recently a First Amendment policy forum. Before that, there was a bias-free policing forum, and it was great that our subject

14 matter expert on that area, Professor Norwood, who is here 1 2 today -- I didn't mention when I mentioned Ms. Caruso -- was 3 able to assist and attend that, and she'll be waiting for the draft policy from the parties. 4 5 And so that's it for me, Your Honor, unless you have questions, but I will --6 7 THE COURT: I appreciate that, and I did -- I mean 8 your report is very comprehensive. It's actually the report 9 as of the 30th of March. So some things have happened since, 10 but also you're supplementing here today of the things that 11 have not happened. 12 MS. TIDWELL: That's right. 13 THE COURT: And so I think that's important. 14 All right. Thank you. 15 Mr. Volek, I'll hear from you next or Ms. Senier. 16 MR. VOLEK: Ms. Senier will report for the United 17 States. THE COURT: Ms. Senier. 18 19 MS. SENIER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Thank you 20 very much for this opportunity to brief the Court and the 21 public on recent activity in terms of implementing the Consent 22 Decree. We're also grateful to the Court for affording the

I am going to provide some updates on the policy review and revision process, focusing really where the

public the opportunity to address the Court directly.

23

24

25

parties' energies have been devoted over the past several months, which is on the solicitation and incorporation of public feedback in a number of policy areas.

The first is stop, search, and arrests. Last

Wednesday, FPD was able to post online for public and officer

comment the first suite of stop, search, and arrest policies.

These include general orders on investigatory stops, search

warrants and warrantless searches, citations and warrantless

arrests, and Miranda as well as the attendant forms and

appendices that go with those policies. Those will remain

open for public and officer comment until August 2nd.

As the Monitor mentioned, last week, Monday and Tuesday evening, the parties hosted to two policy forums.

THE COURT: Let me back up and just go through this in case the public doesn't know how you all are doing these policies. The City makes proposals of the policies, sends them to the Department of -- I may get this wrong. So you may need to stop me if I miss some steps. The City develops their proposed policies. They send them to the Department of Justice. You all have a dialogue between yourselves, and once you think it's -- and you have an informal dialogue, I believe, with the Monitor and the subject matter expert people, but then -- then you're putting it up on the -- online for this 30-day comment, including from both the police and members of the community. Everyone can comment. And then

implement -- incorporating whatever, you know, what you can from the feedback into the policy that then goes to the Monitor. Have I got the steps right?

MS. SENIER: You have all of the steps right, Your Honor, with the one exception being that at the front end of this process, the parties hold a policy --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. SENIER: -- forum, which before the policy has even been drafted by the department, we elicit input from the community on the front end that informs the first draft that FPD creates, and then the process as you described continues.

THE COURT: And I would just -- part of why I wanted to focus on that is I want the members of the public -- again, I know we have interested members here today, but members of the public to know that they are a part of this process, and in fact, we -- during -- as it went on, you all, with my approval, sort of changed the steps to make sure that the community feedback was being incorporated before the Monitor, you know, made final approval, and that's been very helpful as well as these policy forums. And so I would encourage members of the public to participate in those to the extent -- you know, to the fullest extent possible because I think it's been a very good process in making sure that the community's concerns were addressed, you know, to the extent this is something everyone does.

So if you'll go back to -- now you were talking about the next forum or the next policy forum, I think.

MS. SENIER: Yes, Your Honor. Last Monday and Tuesday evenings, the parties hosted two forums on the First Amendment policy, and this will be a policy that will govern how FPD can protect or to police First Amendment protected activities in Ferguson, and to echo --

THE COURT: And when you're talking about First Amendment protected activities, again, explain to the -- explain briefly what you mean, what kinds of things.

MS. SENIER: Absolutely, Your Honor. The Consent Decree covers three. That's the right to criticize one's government without fear of retaliation. It's the right to observe and record law enforcement activities. And it's the right to protest. Those are the three buckets of First Amendment policy -- activities that this policy is going to cover.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. SENIER: And the policy forums were incredibly helpful to the parties. The members of the public who attended both events were able to provide their expertise and insight, oftentimes, based on their personal experiences in Ferguson and in the areas surrounding Ferguson, and the breadth and the depth of their feedback is really going to be invaluable in the development of the policy which, again, is

in its very early stages.

The parties also held forums on the bias-free policing policy. Those were in April, and as the Monitor mentioned, that policy is currently being drafted with assistance, technical assistance, from the Monitoring Team's subject matter expert Professor Norwood.

Just a final update on the use-of-force policies.

The final versions of those policies were posted online and distributed to officers on June 7th. They do not take effect until officers have undergone roll call training on the entire suite of policies. Lieutenant Dilworth has been working very hard on putting together a comprehensive set of roll call trainings on the entire suite of policies. It started last Monday. We understand that it's off to a very good start, and it is now scheduled to run all the way through January, but, again, that's the entire suite of policies, including all of the weapons policies, reporting and investigation, all the way through the Force Review Board. So once those roll call trainings are finished, the policies will be in effect.

The recruitment plan: We do not have a further update. We are where we were the last time we were before Your Honor. We are waiting on the City's plan for coming into compliance with paragraph 283(a) of the decree, which is the provision that requires the City to provide salaries that place it amongst the most competitive with similarly sized

agencies in the region. We understand that the City has some numbers that they're considering. We're waiting to get those numbers, again, with the all-important analysis that underlies those numbers, showing that it is a competitive agency in St. Louis County.

The SRO Program: As Your Honor knows, the FPD now has a final MOU in place with the Ferguson-Florissant School District, and in the last reporting period, they were able to identify a new point of contact in the school district with whom they can work to move towards drafting the program manual, and they have a number of steps that they still need to overcome in order to draft that manual, including getting time during O-Week, which is the week before classes start, where SROs can get in front of faculty and staff and go over the MOU so that everyone is clear on exactly what the expectations are of SROs in the school.

THE COURT: And the MOU, as I understand it, or the Memorandum of Understanding is between the Ferguson Police

Department and the school district, setting out what the school resource officer is expected to be doing and how the school district will facilitate that; correct?

MS. SENIER: That's correct, Your Honor. That's correct. And then we're hopeful that the SROs can get some time with the school counselors, the district counselors in early fall, and then, hopefully, to have some sort of a forum

in October or November at the schools with students and parents so that it will operate similar to the policy review process that Your Honor laid out earlier in the hearing.

report that all the slots have been filled. They are now operating with a full complement of nine members. The City moved very swiftly since the last status conference and, in fact, since April. On April 23rd, DOJ had the opportunity to meet directly with the City Council, and we expressed our concern about the three vacancies at the time. The council moved very quickly thereafter and filled the two slots that were open in Ward 2 and the one slot that was the at-large slot, and they even were able to reopen the process and make sure that they were able to get a representative of the Ferguson business community. So we're very excited that they are now up and running, and we believe that the only thing that remains to happen is that those three new members get trained, and then they will be up and running full speed.

The community policing policy: The parties have received input from the community as part of that policy review process that the Court laid out earlier. The Monitor has approved it, and it should be ready for public posting very soon.

The community policing plan: The Monitor mentioned it earlier during this hearing. We understand that it's

pending the staffing study. It was our understanding that FPD wanted to wait until there was a final chief in place.

Knowing that they have appointed a permanent chief, which I'll get to in a few minutes, we're hopeful that that staffing study can be completed in short order because, as the Monitor

6 mentioned, it really is the backbone for so many of these

7 community policing activities.

And then finally, accountability and body-worn cameras. Those policies were both posted for public and officer feedback. We have — the parties have gotten that feedback, and they are now — we are now working on implementing and incorporating that feedback into both body-worn cameras, in-car cameras, and the full suite of accountability policies. Once those are done, they will go to the Monitor for approval and then hopefully for officer and public observation on the website.

So the parties have made significant progress in the area of policy development. This isn't to suggest that we disagree in any way with the Monitor's assessment of where things are. Much remains to be done.

I did want to update the Court on the amnesty, the court amnesty discussion. As the Monitor mentioned, the last time we were before the Court, there was some discussion about where the parties were in terms of implementing the good-cause criteria, and for the benefit of those in the audience,

paragraph 326 of the Consent Decree required the City to dismiss pre-2014 cases unless there was good cause to hold those cases open. In November 2018, the parties agreed and filed with the Court on the public docket five criteria by which the prosecutor could determine whether to hold a pre-2014 case open. The City has made tremendous progress in dismissing cases under those criteria, but there was a discussion as to the precise process in place for implementing good-cause criteria number two, and good-cause criteria number two says that the prosecutor can hold open a pre-2014 case if the offense originally charged involves an identified victim who is available to assist in further prosecution of the pre-2014 case, and the question was exactly what is the process by which the parties are going to or the City is going to determine availability. We believe we've reached an agreement with the City. It's going to be an opt-in letter. The City is going to mail letters to all of the victims in the approximately 560 cases that remain open under good-cause criteria number two. The recipients of that letter have 30 days to respond. They will respond to either say, "I'm available, and I want the case to continue" or if the City -in which case the case will continue. Or if the City gets no response or hears that the victim is not interested in pursuing prosecution, the case will be dismissed. DOJ thinks that this is the most efficient and equitable way to implement

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

good-cause criteria number two, and we're grateful that we've reached agreement with the City on this.

THE COURT: And I know that these -- of these 563 or however many are remaining, there are a variety of offenses, but many of them may be offenses where the victim is a business in the community, and so knowing whether the business wishes to proceed, I mean, is important because if they don't have someone who's willing to come to court and testify, then the City has agreed that they're not going to keep moving forward on that. I mean they'll dismiss that if there's nobody who could come and be available to actually prosecute that.

And these are not -- there's another good-cause criteria related to dangerousness or violence. These are mostly property crimes or other types of offenses. They're not victimless. That's the whole point of this category, but they are cases where the need to see if a victim is coming forward and willing to come testify about whatever, if it's a shoplifting or something similar, whatever it is. So okay.

MS. SENIER: Yeah. Absolutely, Your Honor. Yes, there is still the good-cause criteria number five --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. SENIER: -- which is that a case can remain open if public safety or the interests of justice demands it.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. SENIER: I did want to mention the data issue, which you know we raised this repeatedly before the Court and with the City, and we really feel -- DOJ continues to think that we have done all that we can at this point by way of providing FPD with templates that they can fill out as to how they're collecting data, reviewing the various forms that our officers have to require to capture that data, but we're really bumping up against a wall here with the various systems that the department is using to collect data and also the lack of expertise in-house.

And, again, in that April 23rd meeting with the City Council that was so valuable, we had an opportunity to really impress upon the council face-to-face that DOJ doesn't think it's feasible any longer to place the many demands that the decree places on the department in terms of data collection on a sworn officer with supervisory duties who's also carrying a lot of the training burden under the decree. We believe that it's past time for the City to engage an external consultant. We made that case to the City Council. We recommended a candidate, and it's our understanding that the City has at least talked to that individual, and we're hopeful that we will hear in short order that there is either an engagement of that individual or someone else to help the City begin the all-important task of getting in place the systems and processes it needs to start collecting data to demonstrate

compliance with the decree.

THE COURT: Right. Because unless there is accurate data that's reviewable in some form of what kind of stops and searches and other events are happening that are -- you know, that we wish to track and the Consent Decree requires tracking and knowing about, we can't track it. We don't know what it is without the data. So, yeah. Okay.

MS. SENIER: Absolutely, Your Honor. It's so critical not only for Consent Decree compliance but just for good policing, for FPD to have some clarity on these data systems. So we're hopeful that we'll see movement on that very shortly.

Final two points. We understand that the City has selected a permanent chief. We understand that it is Captain Jason Armstrong who was with Forest Park in Georgia, and DOJ looks forward to speaking with incoming Chief Armstrong at his earliest convenience so that we can discuss ways that FPD can maintain and, indeed, accelerate its progress in implementing the Consent Decree.

We do want to take this moment to recognize the many contributions of Interim Chief McCall during this process.

For nearly three years, the Interim Chief has worked tirelessly to implement the Consent Decree. He has worked hand in hand with us on policy review and revision. He has been the public face of the decree in the community. He has

worked to identify resources within the department that can go towards implementation. So we are very, very grateful to Interim Chief McCall for his many contributions towards implementing the Consent Decree.

THE COURT: Yes. And I'm very grateful too. I know how much he's done, and I know Mr. Carey has certainly expressed that to me as well.

MS. SENIER: And then, finally, Your Honor, I've mentioned several times our April 23rd meeting with the City Council. It was an opportunity that DOJ had to meet directly with key decision makers in the City, and we found this an invaluable opportunity to engage directly with the City Council and update them on the successes to date and the extensive work that remains, and I've mentioned two areas already. First was the CRB vacancy situation, and to their credit, the City Council moved very swiftly after that meeting to fill those vacancies. I've mentioned data. We're very hopeful that we will see swift action on the data requirements of the Consent Decree as a result of that meeting.

There are three other areas that we raised with the council, and they really go to the Monitor's concerns echoed or raised earlier today in this hearing. The first is training. There are many, many training requirements under the Consent Decree, and really, all of the policy development and all of the progress that the parties have made to date on

policy development will be for naught if there's not a robust training program in place, and to be clear, the roll call trainings that Lieutenant Dilworth is designing right now are not a substitute for the comprehensive, scenario-based, in-service training that officers need to get under the Consent Decree. So it's really imperative that the department develop that training expertise either in-house or drawing upon external resources so that it can get the training that it needs and really operationalize the policies under the Consent Decree.

The second area that we expressed concern to the City Council was community engagement, which the Monitor has also raised today. We understand that Assistant Chief Eickhoff, who was the community liaison most recently, he is moving on. So that's a position that remains vacant, and we think that there's much room to grow in improving the relationship between the community and FPD.

And then, finally, we raise concerns about the transparency requirements under the Consent Decree. Paragraph 415 of the decree requires the City to file an annual report on the activities that FPD and the municipal court have made in implementing the decree, and paragraph 456 requires FPD to file similar reports every six months. These reports are not getting filed. I don't think anything has been filed since the fall of 2016, and these reports are different from the

Monitor's reports. They're different from updating the work 1 2 plan. They're different from the status hearings. reports have their own specific requirements under those 3 4 provisions of the Consent Decree, and it's really critical 5 that FPD and the City take these requirements seriously and 6 file those reports as a matter of transparency to the Court 7 and to the public and as kind of an internal barometer in terms of gauging their own success. It's another way for them 8 9 to take ownership of the process. So that's another area that we raised with the City Council. 10

We're hopeful that we'll have more opportunities to dialogue with them. We found it very, very useful, and we look forward to our next meeting with them.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. SENIER: Do you have any questions for me?

THE COURT: I don't think so. Not at this time.

Mr. Carey.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SENIER: Thank you.

MR. CAREY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. CAREY: So as is customary, I'd like to introduce some of the folks from the City that are here today to help participate in the hearing. We have our Interim City Manager, Jeff Blume. Sitting next to him is Councilwoman Ella Jones. Behind those folks is our City Clerk, Octavia Pittman. And

then behind Ms. Pittman is Lieutenant Dilworth, who is the City's Training Coordinator under the Consent Decree. And then also, obviously, sitting next to him is Interim Chief McCall. And then to my right is Fran Griffin, our newly elected councilwoman. So we -- we do have a pretty good contingent here representing the City, which, you know, we typically have here.

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 what I'll do is just start by addressing some of the areas of concern that were raised both by the Monitor and the Department of Justice. The first one, obviously, being the elephant in the room, is the Consent Decree Coordinator. I think the Monitor made really good points about, you know, where the City is falling behind as it relates to that particular position. You know, I liken it to, you know, having folks on a football field playing football but without a coach. You know, we have no -- you know, with no coaching staff and nobody to kind of direct us as we, you know, go play by play. So, believe me, the people that are playing on each play are playing very hard, and that analogy goes to, you know, Chief McCall, Lieutenant Dilworth, myself, the Interim Chief or -- excuse me -- the Interim City Manager. At each play, we're playing real hard, we're doing what we need to do, but we do -- I mean we just don't have that coordinator position filled yet, and it's been about a year or so, maybe a little bit more than a year, that we've been warned, I guess,

so to speak, that, you know, this particular time was coming, but I will say, you know, during that time frame, we've also needed a police chief, a city manager, an HR coordinator, a court administrator, a judge, more police officers. So, you know, it -- it -- you know, we've got to have a city. You know, we have to have people in place to be in compliance, you know, in order to move forward. So, you know, we have had some personnel struggles that have made us -- you know, have had us falling behind.

We did here recently -- I'm sure you saw on the news that we do have the new police chief in place, and I think I -- at the last hearing we had, I kind of gave you a priority list in terms of where these positions were from the City's priority, and the police chief was our first priority, and as soon as that person was hired, then all efforts and attention from the City would be turned to the Consent Decree Coordinator. So that's where we are now.

THE COURT: I understand you already -- I mean a long time ago, you wrote the job description and everything; right?

MR. CAREY: Yes. Yeah, we did, and we've got -- and

21 | we have --

THE COURT: And you've posted the position; right?

MR. CAREY: We've posted the position. We have applications to review. We've got people still, you know, calling us, asking us about the position. The very next step

is to go through the applications and start that selection process or that vetting process, so to speak, but, again, given the, you know, multiple personnel issues we've had, we had to prioritize what we have, and I think that's -- you know, that's the only real reason that we -- that I stand here today telling you that, you know, I don't disagree with anything that the Department of Justice said or the Monitor said about how much work there is needing to be done. You know, we've just been behind the eight ball.

THE COURT: So what's your -- what's your expected timeline on being able to fill this position and doing the work that needs to be done to do that?

MR. CAREY: I would imagine that by the next status hearing -- you know, I would hope that by the next status hearing we would have an identified candidate, somebody who would, you know, accept the position. We have enough to start that -- to start that process in earnest. In other words, the only thing we need to do is start sifting through the information that we have and start interviewing and vetting the candidates. So I'd imagine by the next status hearing I would have a good update for you on that.

THE COURT: Which will probably be sometime around the end of September?

MR. CAREY: September, yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CAREY: So that's -- that's where we are with that particular position. You know, it does -- you know, it just puts us behind the eight ball. There's really no other way to put it because there are so many requirements and so many things under the Consent Decree that require that person who's doing the 30,000-foot planning, and we just -- we just don't have that, and that's just where that is.

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

This issue of data collection that was raised by the Department of Justice and also, obviously, the Monitor several times -- and the Department of Justice actually put the City in connection or in touch with a potential contractor, a guy by the name of Ben Horwitz, who was the data collection analyst or expert in the City of New Orleans for their consent decree. The City has reached out to him, has had meaningful discussion with him regarding a potential engagement; however, because we are a public entity, we do have to go through some So there will be an RFP process that the City does go through just to make sure that we aren't missing any potential experts in this market that might, you know, be able to provide that. My thought process, though, is that given Mr. Horwitz's background, his skill set, and the fact that he just came from another city with a consent decree doing this, that, you know, we may not find anybody as qualified as him, but we do have to go through the process that we're required to do under state law in terms of the RFP and just making sure we advertise and that kind of thing, but it's looking promising there with the data collection expert. I would -- as far as time frame is concerned -- and I know that's probably your next question you were going to ask -- I would imagine by the next status hearing we would have that; we would have some sort of engagement already going forward with the data collection person. We'd be able to accelerate our progress in that area.

2.3

Other than that, the Department of Justice did mention our recruiting plan, and we are -- the last conversation we had with the Department of Justice -- the ball is in the City's court. We do have some numbers that they asked us for as it relates to police salaries, and we have to do a comparative analysis, and then we also have to do some analysis of, you know, our compensation package to include, you know, benefits and health insurance and those kinds of things, to kind of give an idea of what the City offers as it relates to some of the competing jurisdictions around the St. Louis Metropolitan area. So that ball is in our court, and that analysis is ongoing now, and I would expect in the next maybe two weeks or so to have something to the Department of Justice in that regard.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this.

MR. CAREY: Sure.

THE COURT: What about the staffing study that was

supposed to have happened?

MR. CAREY: Right. And I think what you heard the Department of Justice mention was that it was the City's hope that we could get our new police chief in place before we undertook to do that, and we have hired him, and I believe his first day is Monday, the 8th, and so that will be one of his very first — one of the very first things that he's tasked with is completing this staffing study so that we can get ourselves in a position where, you know, we're in compliance with, you know, so many other parts of the Consent Decree that we are now out of compliance with.

THE COURT: Well, one of the -- one of the things that I know the Monitor's mentioned in the past --

MR. CAREY: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- is that the Consent Decree does have provisions about shift schedules --

MR. CAREY: Right.

THE COURT: -- and having a plan so that -- so that there can actually be some form of community policing and community involvement; right?

MR. CAREY: Right.

THE COURT: Because without the shift schedules that say -- I mean if you have the person working different times, you know --

MR. CAREY: Right.

THE COURT: -- nights one week and afternoons the next -- I don't know. It's hard to have consistent community involvement with the police force unless you have shift schedules that will accommodate that.

MR. CAREY: Yeah. I think the City would agree with that. I mean there's -- you know, it's -- you know, we just need a -- you know, we need a chief. We need somebody who -- because that entire concept starts from the top down, and we just, you know, since October of last year, have been without one, and so I think that's -- well, obviously, we've had an interim chief, but the Interim Chief has been spread so thin as the Monitor mentioned. So now that we have a permanent chief, I think that process will begin in short order.

Other than that, Your Honor, I don't have any specific -- any other specific things to reference. I know we have comments from the public.

THE COURT: Yeah, I do want to hear from the public and the people who have signed up, but I do also want to -- I did have -- I mean I guess the other thing that the -- that the Monitor mentioned that is important that we haven't touched on -- I mean, first of all, what about the training? And I know the roll call training sounds like it's very good --

MR. CAREY: Right.

THE COURT: -- but that's not the end of the story,

```
and there is a requirement for more training and a schedule of
 1
 2
     training, not just "Here's the stuff that people can go to for
 3
     the state requirements."
             MR. CAREY: Yeah, I think this is related to the idea
 4
 5
     of not having a quarterback as it relates to the training
 6
     piece of what we're doing. We do have -- and Lieutenant
 7
     Dilworth has worked diligently to try to put together the roll
 8
     call training that we have --
 9
              THE COURT: Sounds like he's done a very good job at
10
     that --
11
             MR. CAREY: Absolutely. Absolutely.
12
             THE COURT: -- but he --
13
             MR. CAREY: But we need somebody at that --
14
             THE COURT: He can't do it all.
15
             MR. CAREY: -- higher level --
16
             THE COURT: Yeah.
17
             MR. CAREY: -- you know, coordinating things with
18
     forethought and kind of putting things together, and
19
     hopefully, when we get the Consent Decree Coordinator in
20
     place, we can get Lieutenant Dilworth and the Consent Decree
21
     Coordinator together to come up with --
22
              THE COURT: Well, you also have a training committee;
23
     right?
24
             MR. CAREY: We do.
25
              THE COURT: And so they are also part of this
```

process.

MR. CAREY: They are. And they meet, I believe, once a month.

THE COURT: Okay. So that really does need attention, I think. I hope to hear from you by the next hearing to show there's real progress on that.

And then the other issue was just -- and, again, this -- I hope with the Consent Decree Coordinator you would start providing the updates to the Monitor. I know some of the things listed in the report recently talked about, you know, they're having -- and Ms. Tidwell indicated too they're having -- they or the Department of Justice are having to say, "Where are you on this? Where are you on this? Where are you on this?" when really you should be telling them, "Here's where we are," not waiting for them to ask you specific questions on everything.

MR. CAREY: Yeah.

THE COURT: And so that's something you envision a coordinator would be facilitating also; right?

MR. CAREY: I agree. I agree 100 percent. I do think it's worth noting that, on a daily basis pretty much, the Department of Justice and, most of the time, the Monitor are involved in our communications as it relates to what we're doing on a daily basis, but as it relates to the work plan itself and particular deadlines that may be coming up, to let,

you know, the Monitor or the Department of Justice know that someone is thinking about these things, someone is putting something together as it relates to these things, I think that's where the coordinator piece is missing, and we haven't had the initiative of someone in that particular position to do that thing, but on a daily basis, in terms of, you know, the policy review, you know, my interactions with, you know, various folks that are helping with Consent Decree compliance or, you know, whether we're dealing with consultants or we're dealing with, you know, other folks, the Department of Justice and the Monitor are typically, typically, cc'd on those communications, but, again, you know, the overall 30,000-foot view from the planning perspective is where we're lacking.

THE COURT: The other -- there's a couple of other points too. The -- the -- your community engagement person is no longer in that position, so there's now a vacant place for --

MR. CAREY: A vacant -- yeah.

THE COURT: And that's a crucial part of this whole Consent Decree. So what is the plan for that?

MR. CAREY: It is -- the plan is to hire someone immediately. I mean, you know, we -- you know, as I just mentioned to you, we've just been hit; I guess, the last year has been pretty devastating for the City as it relates to personnel, and this was just the latest issue that we've had.

He was doing, you know, a pretty good job in that role, and then he got offered another position, and so he went and he took that. So, you know, the City takes community policing very seriously, obviously, and so we think that's a very crucial role and that's one that we'll look to fill in short order.

THE COURT: And then the annual reports and the semiannual reports?

MR. CAREY: Again, another function. Well, you know, another function of our Consent Decree Coordinator that we don't have. I mean they've -- you know, there's no secret to it, and I think it's on record that it's been pointed out several times here, you know, both here in this hearing as well as to the council, and the Department of Justice met with the council that we need to get that going, and we're hopeful with this Consent Decree Coordinator position we'll accelerate our progress in that particular area.

THE COURT: Well, I know your new chief who is starting next week --

MR. CAREY: Monday.

THE COURT: -- has a lot on his plate, but this has got to be a high priority, doing all of these things with the Consent Decree, and I assume when you went through the hiring process you made that clear as well as all the other things that a chief of police has to do, but this is really important

to pay attention to these functions, which I think looks like a matter of organization and hiring people --

MR. CAREY: I think that's it.

THE COURT: -- so that you can really start complying with these things because it's going to be really crucial to have this happen.

MR. CAREY: I think that's fair, Your Honor, the way you just characterized that as a matter of just organization, leadership, and having someone at the top, you know, to make those decisions. You know, there are many things that the new police chief will have to do, but the City of Ferguson would not have hired a police chief that it did not believe would make the Consent Decree a primordial concern and compliance underneath the Consent Decree a primordial concern moving forward. It just would not have happened. So I know he was vetted in that way by many different stakeholders in the community, and so I believe the council felt very, very comfortable with his commitment to that, and so I can express that to you here today, that that's going to be a top, top priority of the police chief.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you.

All right. We do have a number of members of the public who did sign up to talk, and I think there were a couple of late arrivals, and we indicated they would also be allowed to speak. So let's start with the -- I think you all

- 1 have on numbers. So, Ms. or Mr. Porter, I can't quite read.
- 2 | So, number one, whoever that -- oh, yes, sir. Come on up.
- 3 | Sorry. I just couldn't quite read the handwriting.
- 4 MR. RORY PORTER: It's doctor's handwriting.
- 5 THE COURT: Doctor's handwriting. Yeah, it looks
- 6 like it. So if you'll just step up and state your name, sir,
- 7 | and then I'll hear anything you wish to say. And you remember
- 8 our numbering -- our timing system so that you know your time
- 9 | limits?
- MR. RORY PORTER: Absolutely.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- MR. RORY PORTER: First of all, good afternoon, Your
- 13 | Honor. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak
- 14 | before you and the community this morning. I'm wanting to
- 15 | reiterate and support concerns of the Human Rights Commission.
- 16 THE COURT: Could you tell me your --
- MR. RORY PORTER: And, once again, my name is Rory
- 18 Porter.
- 19 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 20 MR. RORY PORTER: And I'm a member of the Ferguson
- 21 | Human Rights.
- 22 THE COURT: All right.
- MR. RORY PORTER: We have serious reasons to believe
- 24 | that the Ferguson council has continued to undermine the
- voices of the people under the leadership of Mayor Knowles.

For instance, the community rallied around the choosing of the new police chief, which you know we had two candidates,

3 Mr. McCall and Mr. Armstrong. One with experience. The other

had not even read the Consent Decree. So I call him a novice.

5 For instance, the community did rally around there, and they

6 | voiced their concern for Chief -- Interim Chief McCall to be

7 | police chief, but once again, it fell on deaf ears.

Also, we -- as the Ferguson Human Rights Commission, we have budgeting issues to mention. We were denied a merely \$600 budget for each year to carry out our mission and to ensue within themselves. That is the big issue. A measly \$600 to carry out bringing the community together. And how can we do it if we're not funded properly? And the community can't heal in this way.

But we can get budget to do things like printing. Ferguson said they would print the programs or anything that we need, and we're still out for lunch on that. I don't know about that too much.

But recently, we spent \$46,000 to a private marketing company to rebrand Ferguson, and in the rebranding of Ferguson, what better way to rebrand a community that's in distrust and feel disproportionate in places by bringing the community together.

Secondly, I would like to -- to add that this should be up under data collection reporting and transparency.

Secondly, the need to streamline the process and protocols for complaints for both the CRB and the HRC is evident. Recently, the HRC filed a complaint regarding a civil matter that ended up involving two -- involving the police. We completed our due diligence and filed the complaint so that it could be finalized by the CRB. It was a police-involved issue; however, we were then advised to go back to the complainants and have them redo the complaint form because it was not on a CRB form. The Human Rights took the form. So we saw that it was a CRB complaint, so we filed it with the CRB. So I don't see why it's in limbo right now. This is not only an inconvenience to the parties involved, but it's also time-consuming and would make people not want to go through such a tedious process in the future. This may be why few complaints have been filed with the CRB to date in a city that was full of police-involved corruption, and many of my people in my community say, "Is there any wonder?"

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 I'm asking the Court this morning to help us along the lines of streamlining the process and the protocols for both the CRB and the HRC so that we can have the data collection, the reporting, and the transparency down to a science.

Thank you, Your Honor, and have a good afternoon.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. The next person is Ms. Clines. And,

again, if you'll just state your full name before you begin, and then I'll hear anything you wish to say.

MS. MILDRED CLINES: Mildred Clines. I apologize for my dress. I actually came right over from work.

THE COURT: That's fine, of course, yeah.

MS. MILDRED CLINES: But thank you for hearing the public today. We definitely want to take our opportunity because we don't get to speak as often as we would like at these status hearings, but thank you for hearing us today, Your Honor.

And I'm a part -- my name is Mildred Clines, and I am a member of the Ferguson Collaborative, but -- and I have certain points that I'm supposed to make because we all kind of divided up the areas, but I would be remiss if I didn't mention my frustration, my disdain for the City Council appointing the Acting or Interim City Manager. If you all -- if you might not know this, but -- and I don't have anything against Mr. Jeffrey Blume, who is our Acting City Manager, but when the DOJ came to Ferguson to do an investigation, you know, because of the uprising and all the complaints,
Mr. Jeffrey Blume was our financial -- our Finance Director, and he is actually mentioned in the Department of Justice report in reference to the budget, and there was a conversation, because I actually read it myself, about a shortfall, a budget shortfall, and there was a conversation

about increasing the tickets in order to bring that budget up, and Mr. Blume was in that conversation. So for the City to appoint him to run the City is really like a slap in the face to me as a citizen of Ferguson. I just want to say that. I don't have anything against him, but I just think that decision -- it's like a conflict of interest. I don't see how he could even be in that position.

So the reason I'm -- today, I'm supposed to talk about the CRB, and I before talked to you before, Your Honor, and told you that I was a member of the Civilian Review Board Task Force, and it was a group of citizens that came together to put together what we -- what we thought a CRB should look like for the City of Ferguson. Put all our input. We met like every week, like three or four hours a day, once a week, for like a whole year. We put our blood, sweat, and tears into that to produce a product for the CRB.

So there's about three points I just want to touch. The Ferguson Collaborative has submitted a letter. So I just want to touch on about three points of the CRB. There's a failure to include the CRB on the FPD hiring and promotional panels. And in the Consent Decree, it actually mentions that members of the CRB should be on the hiring and promotional panels when you're hiring police officers, and that is not happening. That's in paragraph 405 of the Consent Decree.

I'm not going to even read it, but it's in the Consent Decree.

The second thing I would like to mention is the failure of the CRB to review or hear citizens' complaints. So a few of us attended the meeting last night where we found out that -- we found out, as the public, along with the CRB, that there were like six complaints. They had no idea that there were any complaints out there, and that's just not acceptable either.

The third -- third point is a failure to educate the community about the CRB. Members of the community -- most members of the community don't even know the CRB even exists, and we think the City should do a better job, can do a better job of informing the community that this particular board exists and how they can reach out to them.

I remember reading in the Consent Decree that a person should be able to file a complaint either with the CRB or with the police department. They should be able to go online, you know, to submit a complaint, and I know online it doesn't, and last night, members of the CRB were saying that there's nothing on their website about a form about filling out a complaint; there's nothing on the Ferguson Police Department's website about filling out a complaint. So the City can do a better job with that.

Also, independence. The CRB needs to be -- needs to show the community and the public that they're operating independent of the police department, and if you attend these

meetings, you don't really see that. You know, you feel like the members -- of course, they're all new and are community members, but they look too much to the police department for answers. It's basically, "What about this? What about that?"

And, of course, you know, Chief McCall, who should really be our chief -- the community -- that's what we really wanted, but, you know, the council said different, but he would -- he would give them answers, but we're trying to tell them that you have the authority; you are -- you are -- they don't realize what power they have, and they always look to the -- to the police department for their answers. So that's just not a good look. They need more training. You know, they say that they need -- they need more training. They're nervous about what they can do and what they can't do. So, to me, all of that comes with additional training.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. MILDRED CLINES: So that's all I'm going to say.

THE COURT: Thank you. Your time is up. I appreciate it, Ms. Clines.

All right. Angelique Kidd.

MS. ANGELIQUE KIDD: Hi. My name is Angelique Ayaan Kidd. Thank you, Your Honor, for allowing me to comment. I'm a Ferguson resident, and I also was on the Civilian Review Board Task Force, and I apologize if a lot of what I have to say is redundant to what other people have already spoken to,

but it's what I feel is most important regarding the Civilian Review Board.

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

First, I wanted to make sure that you are aware that there's still confusion, that the Civilian Review Board is still confused as to when they actually receive complaints from the Ferguson Police Department. At last meeting, at last night's meeting, it was mentioned -- and I'm sorry; I can't remember if it was by the City Attorney or if it was by the Interim Chief, but they quoted from the CRB Code of Ordinances, which is -- which is also stated the same way in the Consent Decree that -- that's under duties and responsibilities -- the FPD shall notify the board when any departmental investigation of misconduct is preliminarily completed. But I also wanted to point out, as a task force member, when you go to the City website, to the Civilian Review Board page, and then you click under "Steps to complete the Civilian Review Board Complaint Resolution and Appeal Process," the task force consensus was that the CRB and FPD immediately notify each other of a complaint, and that's because a citizen should be able to file a complaint with either/or. So the -- the -- there's some confusion there as to when they actually get to receive complaints from the Ferguson Police Department.

I also did also want to speak on the six complaints that came up last night at the meeting. And I'm not -- and I

apologize. I'm not exactly sure what word he used, but it was something to the effect of this: The Ferguson Police

Department discovered six complaints. Then the month of April was mentioned, but I wasn't able to get clarification on whether or not that's when the complaints were filed or if that's when the complaints were discovered. When I asked for clarification about how it was possible that the police department had six complaints filed against them and were unaware, I received no information. Not one person from the City would answer my question.

So I then asked the Civilian Review Board if they were aware of the complaints. Only one member was aware of the complaints, and that was the current chairperson. They did do elections last night. So she's now the vice chair, but she was chairperson, you know, the previous five minutes before, what have you, and she said that she's known for three weeks, but the other board members were not aware, and neither — neither were the public aware of these complaints that had been filed. When I asked her how come, she stated that she was waiting to go into a closed session because she didn't know if that was sensitive information for us to be aware of. So when I — I tried to explain to her that that would not be considered sensitive information as she didn't have to tell us the nature of the complaints, just that they actually existed.

1 So, Your Honor, I did want to make sure that you 2 understood -- that you knew that our Civilian Review Board doesn't even understand what's sensitive information and 3 4 what's not sensitive information when it comes to the 5 complaint intake process. 6 And then lastly, I did also want to let you know that 7 when you attend -- when the public attends these meetings, at 8 the actual table is the Civilian Review Board members. 9 it will be the Interim Chief of Police. Sometimes, the City 10 Attorney. Sometimes, the Interim City Manager. So the City 11 is not ensuring that the Civilian Review Board remains 12 independent from the Ferguson Police Department and the City 13 itself. Did you have any questions for me? 14 THE COURT: No. I appreciate that. Thank you. 15 MS. ANGELIQUE KIDD: Okay. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. The next person that signed 16 17 up. Melanie Randels. MS. MELANIE RANDELS: Hello, Your Honor. I'm going 18 19 to read a statement that I was hoping to be included as an 20 exhibit for written testimony today. It is endorsed by the 21 Human Rights Commission. I am a Third Ward resident as well 22 as the Ferguson Human Rights Commission Chair. 2.3 THE COURT: And your name is Melanie Randels?

THE COURT: And your name is metanice kanders:

MS. MELANIE RANDELS: Melanie M. Randels, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

24

25

MS. MELANIE RANDELS: I am writing to bring attention to concerns I have regarding some misconduct and egregious comments that were made by the Mayor during our council meeting on 5-27-19. Myself and other commissioners had been requesting both a budget and the specific criteria to receive an allocated amount annually based on the fact that we are supposed to sponsor and initiate programs that propel our mission according to section 21-32 in our duties.

Upon completion of our statements, as the community began to chatter amongst themselves, the Mayor yelled, "Hey, hush. You're not making too many friends up here since you are making requests to the budget." This was totally unprofessional and out of line as it leads us to believe that funding allocations are being given not based on the ordinances or our assigned tasks but instead by the mercy of a personal relationship with the Mayor, and that is not okay.

Over the past two years -- I've only been chairwoman for about 30 days, but over the past two years, we have been given verifying information as to why we are denied the mere \$600 request. Reasons have included we've asked too late, no other commission has received a budget since the Mayor has begun his term, and et cetera. This year, we did exactly what the City Manager has requested in the past and were denied yet again seemingly because, to our dismay, this is not even an option according to the Mayor. Now, if that is the case, why

have we been getting the runaround for two years trying to apply? This would not be at all possible had we been included in the Consent Decree in 2014 or had some say in any matters thereof. Hopefully, there is something that we can do to address 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

25

We also went nearly a year without our appointed liaison, Councilwoman Toni Burrow, coming to one meeting. After several unctions, we were recently appointed a new liaison, newly appointed Councilman Byron Fry, who unfortunately did not know what the acronym "HRC" even stood for or what our agency was supposed to do when he came to our meetings. Although we are grateful he at least showed up, we have concerns about how he was appointed in the first place. As the community expressed during council meetings time after time our support of Fran Griffin, he was selected anyway without ever being consistent at community and council meetings. Having been dishonest on his affidavit indicating he did not owe taxes when in fact he did, he was given time to rectify that after the fact. He had also made disrespectful and quite heinous comments on social media about Mike Brown, Jr., his family, and the community whom supported him. truly question the integrity of the decisions being made here.

We are requesting an apology from the Mayor for his unprofessional comments regarding our request. We would also like to have in writing the appropriate protocol which the

commission should be following to request funding going forward. We also want processes streamlined for complaints filed between the CRB and HRC.

Lastly, we are wanting to review the way in which our council meetings in the city of Ferguson are held. As it is currently written, the community voices our concerns; then the council responds at their discretion; then the dialogue is over. This is not a humane or inclusive way to relate to the community. You are elected to serve.

Please respond to us at your earliest convenience as we are eager to begin making necessary changes to ensure that we can continue to be a respected entity within the city of Ferguson.

Again, this is Melanie Randels, Ferguson Human Rights Commission Chair, endorsed by the Human Rights Commission.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Randels.

MS. MELANIE RANDELS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Cassandra Butler.

MS. CASSANDRA BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

It saddens me to say this, but it appears that the City of Ferguson has shown clear signs that they are in fact de-emphasizing and devaluing the Consent Decree. I ask you to pay close attention to their actions. Of course, the City never really wanted to enter a consent decree in the first

place, but they did finally sign it. I believe with the change in administration at the federal level they have taken some bold actions that indicate -- that are indications of their de-emphasis of the Consent Decree. I will specifically outline some of those actions to help make this point.

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

As -- the council has spent the last year and a half consolidating power in the hands of the Mayor. Melanie Randels mentioned that somewhat. The Mayor who told the world that Ferguson doesn't have a racial problem has actively worked to replace independent council people through his active support of other black candidates to replace them and one of which told us at the December council meeting that she serves at the pleasure of the Mayor. And the other one that Melanie mentioned, Byron Fry, didn't even know he was in the Third Ward. And my council person who selected him or went along with the Mayor told me that her kids are happy because he's a gym teacher, not really telling me whether the Third Ward people supported him, which they did not. So as it's placed -- so as a result of this consolidation of power in the council, he was able to appoint Jeffrey Blume as Interim City Manager. We were all shocked by this, as Mildred Clines has mentioned so, but I would say that that right there is an assault on respecting the Consent Decree because of -- of him being mentioned in the report but now you hire him to be the Interim City Manager. So that's the first -- that's a

devaluation.

Next, I'm asking why would you use an interim city manager? Why wouldn't you replace the interim city manager before you hire a permanent police chief? So not only did he hire a new permanent police chief, but he's also in place to hire a new human resource person and also this Consent Decree person. He's doing the permanent hiring as an interim. When I asked him to announce the city manager position, I get excuses about why it's not a good idea to do that right now, and I cannot get them to indicate how long he will be in this interim position.

Also, this whole police chief search is an indication of -- of their devaluation of the Consent Decree. They could -- there was lots of times they could have chosen to do the right thing, but they haven't. Chief McCall was -- was -- he interviewed originally for the police chief position when Delrish Moss was hired, but he was a finalist for that position. Delrish Moss asked Chief McCall to come over about six months after he's been on the job to do that interim -- I mean to do that Consent Decree Coordinator position at the level of a commander within the police department. So actually that position was filled, and we had a police chief that had experience with a consent decree from the Miami Police Department, and we had a person who was given responsibility to administer this Consent Decree at the level

```
of commander within the police department. So now the
 1
 2
     de-emphasis happens with -- well, they could have just
     promoted police Chief McCall because Moss and McCall worked
 3
     hand in hand. Together, they were like hands in glove, and so
 4
 5
     the transition to administration, to knowing the department,
 6
     knowing the needs, knowing the personnel was really there. It
 7
     would have been a really smooth transition, and the Consent
     Decree could continue without missing a beat, but, no, no, no,
 8
 9
     didn't want to do that. So they put out a search, a police
10
     chief search, in December; applications due in December.
11
     sent out a survey to finalists, and then they scheduled
12
     interviews the first week in February. Then the first week in
13
     February, they find out that the City Manager is going to
14
     leave, and so they just squashed -- even though interviews
15
     were set up for that first week in February, they just
16
     squashed it and said, "We're going to reopen the search."
17
              THE COURT: And I -- you know, I am aware of all
     that. Your time is up, but if you have another point to
18
19
    make --
20
              MS. CASSANDRA BUTLER:
                                     Okay.
21
              THE COURT: -- I don't know if you can --
22
              MS. CASSANDRA BUTLER: Okay. The other point I
23
     want -- well, so I want to say I think I've heard the
24
     Department of Justice, I've heard the Monitor, everybody give
25
     kudos to the City for -- for finally putting this coordinator
```

position out there, but I just want to make the point do not 1 2 lose -- I mean who's this coordinator going to report to? 3 police chief. This police chief -- when they put out the 4 announcement for the police chief search in March, they did 5 not even have the word "Consent Decree" anywhere in the 6 announcement. That's another way they devalue that. They did 7 not look for a police chief with any consent decree 8 experience, did not even mention it in the announcement. 9 THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. The sixth person, you'll have to tell me your name because I'm having trouble reading it.

MS. ANNETTE JENKINS: Annette Jenkins.

THE COURT: Annette Jenkins?

MS. ANNETTE JENKINS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ANNETTE JENKINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

So much has been said up here today, and I don't want to be redundant, but this is a statement that needs to be understood and made clear. Okay. I attend most of the council meetings. I work in the events, I go to the outreach, and I am a member of the Neighborhood Police Steering

Committee; however, I am very concerned and troubled with the hiring of Jason Armstrong as Ferguson Chief. Mr. Armstrong's experience and knowledge does not compare to Chief McCall.

Mr. Armstrong would have to start over from scratch. Although

he has some experience, a lot of the community does not want him to be our chief for the first time. Chief McCall has been with Ferguson ever since 2016. He has acted as the liaison for the Consent Decree between the City of Ferguson and also with the residents. Our council -- we had a council on the 25th. All but one member, Fran Griffin, voted no for Mr. Armstrong. The citizens of Ferguson expressed our support for Chief McCall through our votes and at the candidate interview and the town hall meeting, through petition, through verbal comments at the council meeting. With no respect to the residents, the council voted for Jason anyway.

Your Honor, this is the council that we have in Ferguson. As has been mentioned, one of the council members, Toni Burrow, says she is there to serve the Mayor, and Alderman Byron Fry said on his Facebook page he would love to bust protester's head and watch it bleed. He was appointed by Ward 3 and by the Mayor and other council members. Your Honor, I find this very disturbing. This is the kind of thinking that got Ferguson in what we're in from 2014, the killing of Mike Brown.

The council is made of people who do not take the people of Ferguson serious because if it were true, they would not have went to Atlanta and hired Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Armstrong stated in his interview that he wanted to get away from Atlanta because he was having problems with the

administration, and he also said that he will have more officers write more tickets. Funny. That's how we got into the situation we're in now. As a 30-year resident, I am tired of Ferguson looking outside for qualified men and women when we have a qualified man, Chief McCall, who has been with us ever since 2016. He has been through everything we have been through. The residents have been -- since then, we have had three chiefs, three city managers, two HR. Your Honor, I am tired. I have been -- they have been putting us through this search after search after search when we've got qualified people right here.

I would like for -- Your Honor, I would like for you to make them, the City of Ferguson, make public to us -- because they said all these chiefs and all the city managers was a personal conflict, and they're saying the same thing about Chief McCall. We need to know as citizens of Ferguson; what is this personal conflict?

Again, thank you for your time, Your Honor, and I beg and pray that you will listen to the people. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Davis, Emily Davis.

MS. EMILY DAVIS: Hello, Your Honor. My name's Emily Davis. I am a longtime Ferguson resident of Ward 1. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak today, and I, like several others before me, will apologize for being redundant,

but we do have a serious problem.

As noted in court repeatedly today, the lack of leadership and organization is a significant issue and is a direct result of the City's distaste for the intervention of the federal government in Ferguson and the Consent Decree.

The introduction of the Consent Decree states that the purpose of the agreement is to protect citizens, enhance safety for officers and the public, and increase a very broken public trust and confidence in the community. Ferguson continues to work against the spirit of this agreement both actively and passively in many important aspects.

Evidence of this, in one part, is that we are now on our seventh police chief in the last five years. We had Jackson, then Eickhoff. Police or Acting Police Chief. We had Jackson, Eickhoff, Anderson, Eickhoff, Moss, McCall, and now we're on Armstrong. So we're averaging one chief every eight to nine months. Ferguson's policies and procedures are broken, and the expectations of the Consent Decree are at odds with the City's leadership and their resistance to change, resulting in a near constant turnover at the highest level of the police department.

But, perhaps, the most compelling evidence is

Ferguson's -- the Ferguson Mayor's appointment of Jeffrey

Blume as the Acting City Manager. The last city manager left

when our last chief left. Jeffrey Blume was previously

Ferguson's Finance Director who was directly responsible and noted more than 10 times in the investigation into the Ferguson Police Department for creating the scheme and pushing the police department's leadership to abuse citizens and violate the rights -- their rights for profit. The investigation specifically states, "The evidence shows that the discriminatory intent is part of the reason for these racial disparities. Over time, Ferguson's police and municipal court practices have sown deep mistrust between the parts of the community and the police department, undermining law enforcement legitimacy among African-Americans in particular. The City budgets for sizable increases in municipal fines and fees each year, exhorts police and court staff to deliver those revenue increases, and closely monitors whether those increases are achieved. City officials routinely urge Chief Jackson to generate more revenue through enforcement. In March 2010, for instance, the City Finance Director" -- Jeffrey Blume -- "wrote to Chief Jackson that 'Unless ticketing writing ramps up significantly before the end of the year, it will be hard to significantly raise collections next year. Given that we're looking at a substantial sales tax shortfall, it's not an insignificant issue.' Similarly, in March 2013, the Finance Director" -again, Jeffrey Blume -- "wrote to the City Manager, 'Court fees'" --

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 COURT: If you're going to read, ma'am, you have to slow down a little bit when you read because the court reporter is taking down what you're writing. Everybody reads too fast when they talk. So just talk at a normal speed. Thank you.

MS. EMILY DAVIS: "The Finance Director wrote to the City Manager, 'Court fees are anticipated to rise about 7.5 percent. I did ask the Chief if he thought the PD could deliver a 10 percent increase. He indicated they could try.' The importance of focusing on revenue generation is communicated to FPD officers. Ferguson police officers from all ranks told us that revenue generation is stressed heavily within the police department and that the message comes from City leadership. The evidence we reviewed supports this perception. The City's emphasis on revenue generation has a profound effect on FPD's approach to law enforcement."

Appointing Blume to the highest position of City leadership is an egregious violation of the public trust and confidence and completely at odds with the purpose and spirit of the decree. Blume needs to be removed immediately, and the City needs to initiate a transparent process for hiring someone who is willing to follow and implement the Consent Decree in all good faith.

As the investigation notes, "The City must replace revenue-driven policy (sic) with a system grounded in the

principles of community policing and police legitimacy in which people are equally protected and treated with compassion regardless of race."

This cannot happen with Blume at the helm.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Davis.

Mr. Rose, Keith Rose.

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. KEITH ROSE: Keith Rose. I'm a member of the Ferguson Collaborative. Thank you, Your Honor.

This afternoon, I'd like to speak a little bit about First Amendment protected activity, and as we heard earlier, that's one of the components of the Consent Decree, but it's also an element to community policing because we've seen that so much of the community interaction with their police department in Ferguson over the years has been at public demonstrations. So it's important to take that in mind as well. And I want to lift this up because just next month will be the fifth anniversary of the killing of Michael Brown and the demonstrations that followed that, and I know that right now the Department of Justice and the City has been working on policies around First Amendment activity. I was fortunate enough to attend last weekend or last week a public policy forum where we discussed what we would like to see in that policy, and I was very appreciative of how Ms. Senier from the Department of Justice led that conversation. I do wish more people had attended, but I do know that that process is long

and it will not be in a place for next month.

So I want to talk a little bit about these anniversaries because we've seen that in the past they've been flash points for political demonstration. So on the first anniversary, we saw around 130 people arrested in different municipalities. We saw the use of tear gas in Ferguson. We saw one armed protester participant who was shot by police, and we saw one independent journalist who was detained by a Ferguson Police Department officer and had his phone seized because he filmed that person being shot, and I'm unfortunate to inform the Court that the officer who arrested and detained him is actually now the one training, as we heard today, Lieutenant Dilworth. He's now the one training the other officers, and so I find that to be unfortunate.

Now, on the second anniversary of Michael Brown's killing, we saw a handful of demonstrations around. We saw maybe 10 people arrested, and we saw an officer seize a clergyman's phone and take it as evidence even though my understanding was he made no effort to arrest that clergyman.

So knowing that on these events there is a higher likelihood that there's going to be First Amendment activity and there's going to be violations of people's rights, I think it's important that the City proactively take steps to ensure that those rights are going to be protected just in this coming month, even though I know that the long process will

not be able to go into effect, that this policy will not have had all the reviews that we would hope to see in a policy.

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

Now, my experience with Ferguson policing more recently would come from what I believe were the two most recent arrests at demonstrations in the city of Ferguson. of those was, I believe, October 13th of 2017, where I, myself, and maybe four other people were arrested by the Ferguson Police Department, and while I actually have no complaints about how those arrests took place, I will say that one thing I found troubling was the way they housed arrestees after people were arrested. I know that the practice has been to take them to St. Ann's facility, but what happened with us was we were put in a garage behind the Ferguson Police Department for quite some time, and while we were in there, we weren't shackled to any furniture or anything like that. We were kind of just free to roam, and in that space, in that garage, were allowed to come some people who I believe were Police Explorers, some young people, and other members of the community who said they were there to bring support -- cookies and cakes and bottles of water -- to the officers, and I found it very confusing that these people were in there interacting with us, some of them jeering my fellow arrestees. So I would like the City of Ferguson to create some policy for next month. If there are any arrestees, how are they going to handle people between the time that they are taken into

custody and transported to St. Ann.

The most recent arrest at a Ferguson protest, I believe, took place about 18 months ago in the Walmart parking lot, where a very active community member was arrested for asking a question of an officer, and the takeaway from that that I had was she complained to the department. I actually heard a recording of a phone call she had with then Chief Moss the next morning where he said he was going to take care of it, but what ended up happening is no complaint was filed that she understands. So she believed her conversation was itself a complaint, but she's been told since then that no actual complaint was filed and that no steps had been taken to remedy whatever happened. So I would like there to be some kind of formal complaint process that people understand to be the complaint process in place in case there are any interactions next month.

And additionally, while I understand that there is no community engagement officer in place, I believe that to dramatically reduce tensions, one thing that the City could do today is find one or two officers to be designated as the community liaison, someone who can go out during these demonstrations and help understand what the demonstrators are wanting to see out there on the streets so that they can de-escalate the tension because what we've seen in the past is when the demonstrators go out to protest and they're met only

with silent officers in body armor, they do not feel like there is any -- any give or take. And so what we've seen at previous demonstrations, both in the county and in the city, is that when there is one officer or two who are interfacing with them, they feel much more free -- not more free. They feel much more at ease, and tensions de-escalate rather than escalate. So it would be very good if the City could appoint one or two and then train them in de-escalation techniques between now and mid August.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

MR. KEITH ROSE: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Fran Griffin.

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: Good afternoon. I just wanted to touch on a few things. I was able to read over the federal status report, and I've noticed a few things that I just wanted to touch on. So in regards to the final copies of policies being published, there have been people in the community who have been waiting to see what has been accepted and what has not for a long time, and we were told that the reason why they hadn't been published was because the roll call training had not taken place and there wasn't -- they didn't want any kind of confusion to come about where the public was thinking that these were things that the police were already trained on. That is understandable; however, when you've got people in the community who are actively

engaged, they need to have some follow through. They need to 1 2 know what has been accepted and what hasn't. This can be done in a few ways. It can be done through the NPSC. We have 3 monthly meetings all the time. There has been at least one 4 5 session where DOJ was able to come back and explain to us -- I think it was the recruiting and hiring policy -- where they 6 7 were able to come to the NPSC and they were able to explain 8 what was accepted, what wasn't. I appreciate the 30-day 9 process for accepting additional recommendations, but in the 10 idea of just being transparent, it would be good to have a 11 process set up so that people won't be waiting months and 12 months at a time for the training to finish to see what their 13 work -- what part of their work actually got implemented into 14 the policy.

THE COURT: Can I just -- I'm going to stop you right there, and we'll stop your time for a minute. Let me just ask the Monitor. I thought the final policies had been published.

Ms. Nor -- sorry -- Ms. Tidwell.

MS. TIDWELL: Yes, that's my understanding, though, but I'm not sure if Councilwoman Griffin is referring to from the public comment period what was accepted --

THE COURT: And what wasn't. Okay.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TIDWELL: -- and what was not and why -- you know, why the finished product is the finished product.

THE COURT: All right. Is that what --

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: Yes.

THE COURT: So you can start the time again.

Is that what you're talking about?

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: Yes.

THE COURT: It's not that -- because the actual policy has been published, but you want to see something more talking about what was accepted and what wasn't and why?

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: Yes, because right now, now that we have this 30-day period, the people that are actually working on it don't get to see what all has been recommended. So just because one individual recommends it doesn't mean that -- we don't know if it's the police that the recommendation that the DOJ is accepting -- if it's their recommendation, if it's the community's. Like there's no way of us being able to know what has been accepted and what hasn't. So we actually appreciated the opportunity that the DOJ took to come out to the NPSC and explain that process to us so we would know out of -- out of the people's work what was actually implemented into the policy.

In regards to the scheduling of community forums, it's been expressed on a few times, on a few occasions, that we try to make sure that those community forums are not being held at the same time as, say, a City Council meeting or a neighborhood association meeting so that we are not overlapping and giving the residents -- making the residents

choose between which meeting they want to attend. For instance, this most recent one that we had in Ferguson with the DOJ in regards to the First Amendment were scheduled on a Monday and Tuesday. Well, Tuesday was City Council meeting. Our City Council meetings are every second and fourth Tuesday of the month at 7:00 unless we have a holiday or something around that time. So that's something that DOJ was well aware of beforehand. Now, granted, we did have two days, but we also have other neighborhood association meetings, other things going on throughout the community. So just knowing that ahead of time and then planning it on a day when people would like to attend both things just makes it very compromising for people to attend, and I think the whole goal is to maximize on community participation. So I would hope that —

THE COURT: Is there some master calendar about neighborhood association meetings or other community meetings?

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: Not so much neighborhood association meetings, but definitely the City Council meetings, yeah.

THE COURT: I know that, but the others -- I mean, yeah, I understand your point, but it's -- you know, they have to schedule them sometime, and if there's a meeting every night, they're going to conflict with something. I don't -- unless there's some -- I understand your point about the City

Council meetings. Okay. Go ahead.

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. FRAN GRIFFIN: Community surveys. So we had talked about that. We had actually talked about that during the City Council meeting. It was suggested that those surveys be put at the Urban League and at the library, and that is very appreciative. We talked about that. We also -- there was also a suggestion made to have them at the municipal courts building because those -- that's an opportunity where we can maximize on people actually filling out the surveys. During the municipal courts, the residents have to sit there; they cannot speak, you know, out loud; they have to sit and wait for their turn to be called on so they can interact with the judge. So we -- I personally thought that was a good opportunity for people to be handed the survey when they come in the door, and they can fill it out and drop it in a drop box. From what I understand, there was a concern that there would be bias because, you know, people were in the process of going through municipal court, and I pushed back on that idea because just because you're getting a ticket doesn't mean that you had a negative experience with a police officer, and that's one place that we do know where community and police have at some point engaged with one another. So it would be really interesting to have that, and so I don't think that it actually tilts the data. I think it would actually support it. So I just wanted to make notice of that. Let me see.

1 | Municipal court.

THE COURT: Yeah, so your time is up, but if you have one more point, we can --

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: That's pretty much it for now.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. FRAN GRIFFIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Topps.

MS. KATURAH TOPPS: Actually, I won't be speaking today.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

And so then the next person is -- that signed up late -- yes, sir. If you'll step forward, Mr. Ashby.

MR. BLAKE ASHBY: Hi. My name is Blake Ashby. I'm a resident of Ferguson. I am here to request that the Court suspend monitoring of the Consent Decree for one year. Not suspend the Consent Decree. Just suspend the Monitor. From the start, the monitoring has been one of the challenges of this Consent Decree. I understand that what happened in Ferguson was really more of a national event than just a Ferguson event, and I understand that this has caused attention from around the world, around the United States to be focused on what's happening in Ferguson, but at some sight — at some point, we have lost sight of the fact that there are actually people that live in Ferguson and have to continue to live in Ferguson.

And just to give you one example of what I'm talking about, we recently completed our community policing vision document, and it's -- nothing wrong it; right? The document was written by an art teacher, art professor, from Portland, Oregon, who relocated to University City, Missouri, to work for Washington University. Is there any credible reason why we have somebody from Oregon writing about what's happening in Ferguson, Missouri?

The fact of the matter is that we are trying to move forward as a city but the cost of the Monitor is overwhelming us. Our City spent \$300,000 last year not on improving the city, just on paying the Monitor for the quarterly reports and also paying, you know, so our attorney. But so the problem we have is that is two percent of our budget. Two percent of our budget. If you were to take two percent of Chicago's budget, that would be \$7 million. And so we have slipped into this crazy loop where we don't have enough money to pay police officers to build up the police force to implement community policing. That —

THE COURT: So if we didn't have a Monitor, then how would I know whether the Consent Decree was being followed?

We'd wait for the Department of Justice to file motions for contempt of court and the City to pay more money to the lawyers to come and litigate and fight over it? Is that what you're suggesting?

MR. BLAKE ASHBY: No, no. Let the City self-report to the DOJ for just one year. The fact of the matter is that the City actually collects most of the information and provides it to the Monitor already, provides it to the DOJ. If we had an extra \$300,000, we could give every police officer a \$5,000 raise. And, you know, I have to say, as a resident of Ferguson, there is some frustration with this. When we started this process, we were told that it was the Monitor's responsibility to analyze data. I actually took the time to find a computer program being used in Dallas/Fort Worth that is just an amazing transparency platform. We would have had better ongoing transparency than any police department in the United States of America. I presented that to the Monitor. The Monitor said, "Sorry. That's something we're going to do." Now we're being told the Monitor is not doing that; the City is going to have to pay an extra \$75,000 for it.

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

You know, if you look at the issue of the surveys, the surveys should have been done three years ago. At one point, we had a lot of residents that were working on this. We did a series of events in Canfield and Nesbit-Newton, and we collected over 200 surveys. The surveys were designed by an academic, in part by an academic at UMSL. They were credible. Two hundred surveys. The problem with the surveys was they uniformly said the residents in that neighborhood

want more policing, not less, and so the whole thing just kind of went away. You know, for whatever reason, people didn't want to hear from residents that liked the police department or wanted more policing; right? You know, and so all these things are just really frustrating. We've got this issue. We don't have enough money to hire police officers. We are having a hard time keeping anybody hired.

The reason we hired Jeffrey Blume is because there's almost nobody left with institutional knowledge in the City. It's just killing us; right? And when we first did this process, every Ferguson City Council member, black and white, voted not to accept the Consent Decree because of the cost, and the Department of Justice did a side letter that said, "We are not trying to bankrupt your city. If this is overwhelming you down the road, we will deal with it. We will figure something out."

We did a side letter because you said you weren't trying to wipe Ferguson off the map.

THE COURT: You're speaking to me here, sir.

MR. BLAKE ASHBY: Sorry. My apologies.

But we were -- you know, we did that side letter, right, and every City of Ferguson City Council member, white or black, signed that side letter because we were worried about the cost of all this stuff. And now we're in the situation where everybody in this room knows that we will only

make nominal progress on the Consent Decree for the next year.

We're going to get our City Council or City Police Chief. You know, lots of things will happen this year. It will be nominal progress for the Consent Decree, and we're still going to pay \$300,000 toward that Consent Decree monitoring.

When this all was going on, there was a protester whose favorite phrase was, "What is the cost of racism?"

And I will be over very soon. I apologize.

"What is the cost of racism?"

And we always had to chuckle, right, because Ferguson is a mostly African-American city, and, you know, we used to laugh that Ferguson was an opportunity for progressives that lived outside of St. -- out of Ferguson to make themselves feel better by increasing the taxes on African-Americans in Ferguson, and that's it; right? This is a financial penalty.

The question we need to ask ourselves is what is the cost of revenge, and part of this feels like revenge. Part of this feels like they want to keep on tearing things down in the city and making it so we can't meet the Consent Decree and the only option is for us to dissolve as a city.

So that is my request to you. If you look at the hard math --

THE COURT: Thank you. Your time is up.

MR. BLAKE ASHBY: Thank you.

THE COURT: I understand your point.

2.3

Ms. Pulliam.

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Thank you for this opportunity.

First, I'd like to say that we are deeply appreciative to Ms. Tidwell and the Monitoring Team as well as the DOJ for sticking in here and doing this good work with us, providing resource and leadership. I know that you've heard a lot this afternoon about the lack of leadership in the City, but I have a few more things that I'd like to share.

Jeffrey Blume being appointed as Interim City Manager is actually a targeted, intentional insult to the community. As we approach the fifth anniversary of the murder of Michael Brown, having the architect of the black body ATM who structured, advocated, and sustained the extraction of scarce resources from a community of color to support a long-understood, an identified structural default in the budget is beyond an insult. It's actually a threat. I received it as a threat that "We will do exactly what we intend to do the way that we've always done it, and we're going to put Mr. Blume in charge."

Since the time that he's been there, he's cleaned house. We were making some progress. The previous city manager hired some folks, diversified the expertise, ethnicity, and perspectives of the appointed officials and administrators, employees in the City. Since Mr. Blume has

been there, people have been running away. That's because he's not interested, obviously, in implementing the Consent Decree or providing resources for the work to get done.

So -- and the lack of leadership -- Mr. Blume understands the structural deficit that was in the budget, how they filled the budget, how he created this community and culture of oppressive, predatory policing and unconstitutional municipal courts, and he's back in place to do the same thing as we approach the fifth anniversary. Your Honor, this isn't an insult. It isn't an oversight. It's a threat, and I believe that something needs to be done.

I appreciate Mr. Rose talking about the First

Amendment training, the forum and policy, but I don't think

this administration has given any consideration to what might

occur next month, nor are they prepared. What I think they're

prepared to do is to -- is to go back to the practices that we

saw in 2015. We don't have training. We don't have

consistency of leadership. They will not allocate resources

to any of the commissions. The policies still are not in

place. The city's voice has not been polled other than by the

DOJ to any consideration of policies. And, Your Honor, I'm so

disturbed, I'm so disturbed that the City would take this

action, structure themselves again against the will of the

people, and I view this as a threat. We don't have anything

in place to assure that it won't happen again, nothing in

place to assure that it won't happen again. So, for me, it's beyond an insult, and it's actually a threat.

I also would like to say that while they talk about the inability to afford implementation of the Consent Decree, with having — with having Mr. Blume there, he has obviously no interest in implementing the Consent Decree. It's moved over to Mr. Carey, who is a competent person, but everyone working on it is stretched so thin, and what we need is from the top to the bottom, a grass roots meeting grass tops with a transformation of understanding of the legacy and history of racism and what it has done to the community. When you put him back in place, what you're saying to the community is "Do not come to the forum. Do not come and participate. We're not willing to change. You're not welcome here. In fact, you may not be safe here."

So with all of this effort that's going on, when we look around and we see 15 or 20 people gathered to do this very good work, it's because they've been disenfranchised and marginalized for so long and they don't believe that we can do this transformative thing. I happen to think that we can do it. I happen to think that we can do it.

And so, Your Honor, why is it that elected and appointed officials not only in St. Louis but in the St. Louis metropolitan area believe that black people are the only people that must bear the cost and burden of racism? We

didn't structure the institutions. We don't advocate for them nor sustain them, but when it comes time for a very specific intervention to bring systems that have been out of balance historically and done tremendous harm, they want to cry and whine about the cost of intervention, transformation, and correction. This is the cost of racism. This time we're sharing the cross — the costs against the population, and I think that they have the responsibility and the duty to pay their due portion.

THE COURT: All right. I have your point,
Ms. Pulliam. Thank you.

All right. I do -- I'm going to ask Mr. Carey to respond to some things, but I do -- I mean I -- I appreciate hearing what you all have said, and obviously, I've heard a lot of really passionate things, and I -- and I do -- I wanted to try to come up with a -- make a few general comments, and I don't want this to sound like I'm not hearing what you're saying because I am, but I -- I understand how disappointed many of the people who spoke here today and, I suspect, many other people were that Interim Chief McCall was not selected as your chief, and I think Ms. Tidwell mentioned and I can say too that he's done great work since he's been there, and I'm aware of that, but this Court isn't going to select the new police chief, and this Court can't select the city manager. That's not my -- you know, I don't have the jurisdiction to do

that, frankly, and I also wouldn't anyway because the people of Ferguson need to do that. You don't like the way it's done, and I understand that, but I hope that your political process can -- can help the next time around if you think that's not the right way. I -- you know, that's up to the people of Ferguson, but I do -- and I do -- I do hear what you're saying.

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 other hand, Ms. Pulliam just said we can do this, and I believe that the city of Ferguson can do this and can achieve it, and I believe you're making those steps. There's a lot that needs to be done, but, you know, I -- I guess I just need to say one thing, and I am not -- I'm not disagreeing with anything anybody said except for one thing, and that is that the way these municipal courts throughout the region have been run and the way that cities have enforced ordinances to generate revenue is -- wasn't invented by Mr. Blume. It was invented by lots of other people, and it was also -- maybe he had -- I read the report, believe me. understand your points, but it's -- it's a -- it's been an issue, frankly, in this country as long as -- as long as we've had municipalities and municipal courts, I think, but I think that the State of Missouri, in some of the reforms they've put in for municipal courts as well as what's happening in this city, has -- there's great progress being made, and the one area of the Consent Decree that I think the parties involved,

the Monitor and the Department of Justice and the City, agree where there has been huge progress made is in the municipal court system. That's the part that I'm the most pleased with. We're still working hard on the police policies, but I think that in Ferguson the municipal court system as it operates now -- and I know there have been more changes with the clerk and the judge and all those things, but I believe that the progress that's been made is very substantial. So I just want to say that, and I'm not -- I'm not trying to minimize what you're saying.

The other issue that I had not really focused on -and I appreciate your bringing this up -- is the issue of the
anniversary once again coming up and having the concerns
raised by the community when the anniversary does come up and
whether there will be unrest and whether the City is prepared
to deal with it. So I hope very much that the City is putting
into practice and use the things I hope the City has
learned -- and I believe they have -- about, you know,
de-escalation and appropriate policing in protest situations
and First Amendment rights. I am very hopeful, based on
things, discussions with Mr. Carey, that that is something
that's going on and that the City is very well aware of this
and will be working hard to do it, but I had not focused on
that before today, and I just want to appreciate -- tell you
all I appreciate your bringing that up as an issue for this

moment.

But, Mr. Carey, let me just ask you if you wish to make any comments with regard to these things, and I'm not asking you to defend the hiring of your new police chief or your interim city manager because, frankly, that's not what this Consent Decree -- you know, I'm not in charge. I'm not a personnel department, but I would hear any other response you'd like to make with regard to any of the other issues, and you don't need to cover them all because --

MR. CAREY: Right.

THE COURT: -- that would take all day.

MR. CAREY: Yeah. No, Your Honor. You know, I appreciate what you just said to the public. You know, I, for one, certainly have respect and appreciate folks who take their time out of their day -- I mean this is like work hour time right now -- to come here and participate and talk to you about how they feel about, you know, the City of Ferguson and where we're at and what we're doing. You know, it's -- there's a lot to be done. You know, one of the things that you kind of see here today is that, you know, if you're a -- if you're in the City of Ferguson and you're a City official, you face a lot of scrutiny, right, a lot of scrutiny and a lot of negativity. Those are the types of things that affect morale, you know, employee morale, and it affects folks, you know, who -- you know, whether or not they want to stay, you

know, in the City of Ferguson. As you know, we've had a lot of turnover recently. You know, folks, rightfully so, are angry about things that have happened in the City in the past, and we've turned over a lot of employees. We've turned over, you know, 80 percent of our police force. We've turned over city managers. We've turned over leadership in the police department, but we're still facing the demons from the past, and, you know, it's just a tough job. So I don't envy folks. I respect any -- even though I -- whether or not I agree or disagree with what folks have to say, I certainly respect their right to get up here and say it.

One of the concerns I would maybe address with the Court is just, you know, I'm not quite sure if we've gotten to a place here where, you know, this public comment session is just kind of a free-for-all bash the City type situation. A lot of comments are being made that are not relevant to the Consent Decree and Consent Decree compliance. And just out of respect for the folks that are coming here to, you know, express their support for the City, elected folks, you know, people that are, you know, kind of sitting here, you know, being bashed about things that are not, you know, relevant to the Consent Decree, you know, I don't know if we -- you know, do we need to -- do we need to address the topics that are going to be spoken about here in court? And, again, I don't -- you know, freedom of speech is a thing, right, but

this is more of a time, manner, and place type thing because
we do -- what I'm hearing here is pretty much the same thing I
hear at almost every council meeting that we have, and so the
citizens definitely have an avenue with which to -- to voice
this kind of thing, but, you know, it just -- it gets to a
point to where, you know, I'm just kind of wondering, you
know, how productive we're being with our --

THE COURT: Let me just say this, Mr. Carey.

MR. CAREY: Yeah.

said -- although many of it does have to do with things that, as I said, are not part of my jurisdiction under the Consent Decree, I understand how they are related to the Consent Decree process, and I don't think it's inappropriate, and so I understand that it may be difficult and that some of it may be venting, but I think that, you know, I intend to continue the process of every six months having the citizens speak, and I'm not going to tell them the topics ahead of time. I hope it will be relevant to the Consent Decree, and I'll keep with the five-minute rule, but I will -- I'm still going to hear what they say. I understand your -- what you're expressing about this.

MR. CAREY: Yeah.

THE COURT: I also will say that, you know, today was a little tough because there are people in the court waiting

for my 3:00 docket, but we'll -- they'll wait. So keep going
and --

MR. CAREY: No. I figured, Your Honor, you'd say that, but I'm, of course, paid to ask.

THE COURT: Yeah, I understand. I understand what you mean.

MR. CAREY: So I have to ask, right, but, you know, at the same time, you know, some of the comments about Consent Decree compliance -- you know, that stuff, I think, is fair game. You know, folks have a right to -- to feel however they feel about that. You know, again, there are areas where the City, you know, is -- is falling behind and out of compliance, and there are areas where the City, you know, is exceeding the expectations.

So, you know, at the end of the day, you know, I don't want to stand here and reply to individual comments. I mean, you know, again, I don't begrudge people the way they feel about the City of Ferguson. All I can say to you is that, you know, I'm happy to answer whatever questions you might have. I know some of the folks might have raised some overarching concerns that you might have, and so if you have any specific questions of me based on what the folks from the audience said, I'm happy to answer them.

THE COURT: I don't. I will have some comments when we're concluded, but I don't think I -- I just wanted you to

have a chance to say what you wanted.

Mr. Volek, do you wish to make any statements at this time before we conclude the -- or Ms. Senier?

MR. VOLEK: The Department of Justice just wants to thank people for coming out to speak today. You know, the very first line of the Consent Decree says that the parties recognize that the ability of the police department to protect the community and serve is only as strong as the relationship it has with that community, and I think that the best way to build that relationship is to continue to hear from the community, both concerns and positives, and we certainly welcome the comments and look forward to addressing the specific concerns going forward in cooperation with the City.

THE COURT: And, Ms. Tidwell, do you wish to make any comments at this time? And I -- obviously, I want you to feel free to do that if you wish to.

MS. TIDWELL: No, thank you, Your Honor. I just echo what the department and Mr. Volek had to say. I thank the community members who took the time to come out and talk. We would like to just express on behalf of the Monitoring Team, once again, our thanks to Interim Chief McCall for all of his hard work, and we hope to see more of him in the future, and that's it. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. I -- I do -- so, you know, and I appreciate that. I want to say that I do -- I think

everybody here should know that these lawyers in front of me have been working very hard -- Mr. Carey; the Monitor,

Ms. Tidwell; Mr. Volek; and Ms. Senier; and the other

Monitoring Team members -- and are doing, in my opinion, a good job at trying to move this process forward.

There's no doubt that there are limitations, and I think we are, you know, sort of getting to the point where the -- the City really does need to step up its game, and you've got the new chief now, and I do hope that by the next hearing in a quarter, you know, at the end of September, that we can have some firm progress on the issues that are still big concerns, such as, you know, having -- you know, the issues of a dedicated consent decree coordinator, having a robust training program. It sounds like what's been done so far in the roll call training has been very good, but the rest of it needs to be put into place and using the resources available, including the training committee as well as the others, to have a training coordinator and a plan.

The data collection process is really important because until we can measure what's happening to know how the City is complying, we're not going to get this done, and I do want to -- I appreciate what one of the members of the public said about maybe let's just stop monitoring this stuff, but that's not what we're going to do. We're going to follow the Consent Decree. It's the Court Order, and the parties have

agreed to it, and we're going to keep moving forward, but data collection is important because without it there's no way to know, you know, what is -- whether goals are being met.

That's true of everything.

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 I know the City is working on, with the Department of Justice, the recruitment plan and talking about the staffing survey. So that's another one of the issues that I hope we will have some concrete reports from the City by the next issue. So training, the community engagement liaison, and the transparency, how are you going to get these reports put in as required, and these are things that I really do hope the City can move forward on. I'm comfortable you can. I think that it's been hard to get moving, but we do need -- we need to keep moving on the work plan. The City needs to really, I guess I would say, step up its game, although I understand the personnel issues, but I think you're now at a point where this ought to be moving forward, and I think that the people who have been doing the work on this have been doing -- have worked very hard, but the resources have to be -- have to be there. We have to have people who -- who can do this, and I hope that -- I believe -- and I'm not -- I choose to believe that the City is intending fully to comply with the Consent Decree that it agreed to, and that is the Order of this Court. I mean even if the Department of Justice and the City said, "Oh, we're just going to walk away from

it," I would have to be convinced. That's not going to happen unless I'm convinced, and that's partly why we have the Monitor. This is my Consent Decree. They agreed to it, but it's my Court Order, and so I do expect these things to happen, and I do -- I mean I think there have been a lot of steps that we haven't discussed here today, although they're in the Monitor's report, including things like amnesty and others, that have taken a great deal of work on the City's part, and developing these policies has not been an easy process. I think that they're really moving well on their way to get them developed, and obviously, we need the full training to get them implemented, but just the use-of-force policies alone were something that was really essential, and I think the prioritization of the way they're developing these policies has been the right way: To deal with the big issues first, like use of force and working on stops, arrests, and seizures.

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 I think that the policy development is proceeding, and, you know, on the one hand, I still feel like we're moving in the right direction. On the other hand -- and I say to -- I tell Mr. Carey this, but really, I'm telling his clients this -- we're moving in the right direction, but you've got to keep it up. This is the order you are living under, and, you know, when we first had the very first hearing I had to see whether to approve this Consent Decree, the members of the

public really -- there weren't really any comments saying,
"This is a horrible thing. You shouldn't approve it." Most
of the comments from people from Ferguson who were not just
saying, yes, approve this Consent Decree, were saying, you
know, there are other municipalities who have problems too;
we're not the only ones with problems, and we've all
recognized that forever, but I do think that the City needs to
know that it's really important that this continues to move
forward the way as set out in the order, and those are all -you know, there's a lot of things that we need to see working,
and I hope they will.

And, obviously, I -- you know, because I'm not a law enforcement officer and I'm not a protestor, I didn't think about -- I don't anticipate when protests are going to happen, and just so you know, I don't follow social media to figure out when there's going to be a protest even here at the courthouse. I don't -- it's like -- that's not -- I'm not a law enforcement officer. I know that that's something the City must be dealing with and planning, and I hope that it is -- you know, that going forward, that even in the absence of having our written policies about First Amendment activities, that everyone has learned a lot of lessons from what's been going on the last few years and that there will be appropriate policing, as I believe there has been -- you know, I think there's been a great deal of progress made, and also

that, you know, we all recognize that that doesn't mean there's a free hand for anarchy in the streets; right? I mean there's laws, and that's what everyone follows, but that includes the law that First Amendment rights need to be protected, and things like confiscating cameras and other things is not -- you know, there's a right to film police.

I was in a totally unrelated municipality awhile back and was reading in the paper that someone was arrested because they were filming the police, and, you know, that's not supposed to happen in today's world, and you would think that people knew that by now, but I hope that Ferguson will be, you know, preparing for what, if any, protests that -- you know, obviously, the people have a right to First Amendment expression on anniversary dates and things like that, and that everyone is preparing that these things go peacefully and appropriately so that people's voices can be heard.

And then beyond that, I will say we'll have another hearing in approximately three months. This one was a little delayed for some -- because of my schedule, but by the end of September, I expect we'll have the next one scheduled, and -- and we'll hear reports, and in particular, I'll be looking forward to hearing the City tell me -- you know, and meeting the new police chief, I assume, and hearing how the City is progressing on all of these issues.

I want to thank the citizens. I do -- as I said at

the beginning, I know the fact that you're here means you're 1 2 the ones who are concerned, and you're probably the ones showing up at the forums and the meetings and the public 3 4 issues, but I would urge you to do what I suspect you've all 5 been doing all along, including the council people, which is talking to your neighbors, talking to your friends, and 6 7 saying, "Go to this forum. Go talk about it. Don't just 8 complain to me over a cup of coffee. Go -- go tell the 9 Monitor; tell the Department of Justice; tell the City what 10 you want to have happen" because active involvement is how our 11 democracy works, and I know you all -- the fact you're here 12 means you believe that. So I hope you'll continue doing that, 13 and I do appreciate all the work everyone's done. So we've got to keep moving. There's a lot of work still to be done. 14 15 Right, Mr. Carey? 16 MR. CAREY: Absolutely, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, all. 18 So court's in temporary recess. Thank you. 19 (Proceedings concluded at 3:20 p.m.) 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 93 inclusive.

Dated at St. Louis, Missouri, this 19th day of July, 2019.

/s/ Gayle D. Madden

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