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 VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CATHERINE D. PERRY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 22, 2020

APPEARANCES:

Independent Monitor: Natashia Tidwell, Esq.

SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP

Courtney A. Caruso, Esq.

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

For Plaintiff: Jude J. Volek, Esq.

Amy Senier, Esq.

Charles Wesley Hart, Jr., Esq.

Megan R. Marks, Esq. Nancy Glass, 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	the	Court .	•					•	•	•				Page	3
Statement	by	Mr.	Carey .	•					•		•				Page	6
Statement	by	${\tt Ms.}$	Barton							•		•			Page	6
Statement	by	Mr.	Carey .	•				•	•	•	•	•			Page	17
Statement	by	Ms.	Marks .	•				•	•	•	•	•			Page	19
Statement	by	Ms.	Tidwell	l				•	•	•	•	•			Page	28
Statement	bу	the	Court .	•					•	•	•				Page	37

(Proceedings commenced at 11:00 a.m.)

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: All right. Good morning. We are here in the case of United States of America versus the City of Ferguson, Case No. 4:16-CV-180, and we're here for a regular status conference in this case involving the Consent Decree between the Department of Justice and the City of Ferguson, and we are doing this by videoconference, and this court is now participating in a pilot program that's been approved by the Judicial Conference to study the practice of livestreaming audio of civil proceedings. Under the pilot guidelines and with the parties' consent, a judge may allow audio of certain civil proceedings to be livestreamed to the court's YouTube channel where it will be accessible to the public. parties to this proceeding have consented to audio of the proceeding being livestreamed to the court's YouTube channel, and so I know all of the participants on the video. Who we have on the video participants are the attorneys in the case, the Monitor, as well as, I believe, Mr. Carey is going to have his -- the Consent Decree Coordinator speaking as well.

We did not send out a lot of publicity about this

YouTube stream -- it is only audio -- because we didn't have

time. It just got set up very recently, although I hope there

are some people of the public listening, but I know we did

tell everyone who normally listens to this hearing and sent

out in the order the telephone connection. So there are two

different ways people could be listening to this proceeding, and I hope that members of the public will take advantage of that and have done so.

I do need to remind everyone, however, no matter whether you're listening on the telephone or you're listening on the YouTube channel, that no recording, broadcasting, reproducing, or posting of the audio of this proceeding is allowed, and that's under the rules of the United States

Courts. So that is the reminder about not recording, and then I will start by calling on the lawyers to introduce themselves for the record. Counsel for the United States.

MR. VOLEK: Hello, this is Jude Volek for the United States.

MS. MARKS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is
Megan Marks for the United States, and appearing by phone, we
also have Charles Hart, Amy Senier, and Nancy Glass.

THE COURT: Thank you. And for the City of Ferguson.

MR. CAREY: Good morning. Good morning, Your Honor.

19 It's Apollo Carey with the City of Ferguson. City Attorney.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Carey, you also have some of your clients who I said could be on the Zoom so they could watch, and at least one is going to be speaking as well; is that correct?

MR. CAREY: We do, Your Honor. We have -- I believe our mayor, Ella Jones, is either on Zoom or the call. I know

our city manager is there. Of course, normally, our police chief is there and also our Consent Decree Coordinator as well. I'm not aware of any other. There may be some other council members, but I was not made aware of it.

THE COURT: Yeah, and obviously, they can be listening on the telephone, and we're not keeping track of who's on the phone. Anyone can listen.

And then for the Monitor, Ms. Tidwell, would you identify yourself for the record?

MS. TIDWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. Natashia
Tidwell appearing for the Monitoring Team, and I'll let my
colleague introduce herself as well.

MS. CARUSO: Good afternoon. Courtney Caruso, also on behalf of the Monitoring Team.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

So we are here for the status hearing. I wish we could have this in person, but we are still constrained by the COVID pandemic and, therefore, are having this remotely and by videoconference, and because of that, we have not allowed — have not had citizen participation as we have done in the past when we were live in the courtroom. I'm hopeful that the next hearing we have, we will be able to do that, at least with some social distancing guidelines still in place, but we'll have to see how things proceed before we know for sure.

But in terms of the report on the Consent Decree, I

would first like to call on Mr. Carey on behalf of the City to make any report that he believes is appropriate at this time from -- from the City's point of view. Mr. Carey.

MR. CAREY: Thank you, Your Honor. As you know, as we discussed, we're going to -- you know, obviously, we've -- you know, for those who have attended these hearings in the past, typically, you know, the Monitor will go and then the Department of Justice and then the City, but obviously, we've all agreed to switch that up, but we've also agreed to allow the Consent Decree Coordinator to give a more in-depth update, which I think is only right, for the public. I mean I think the Consent Decree Coordinator is on a daily basis, you know, you know, pretty much implementing the Consent Decree and has her ear to the ground. So I think the public deserves, you know, to hear from her in terms of where she believes we are in terms of our compliance. So without further ado, I'll introduce to the Court Ms. Nicolle Barton.

MS. BARTON: Thank you, Your Honor, for the opportunity to report an update on the progress that the City of Ferguson has made in the last year. I just recently celebrated my one-year anniversary with the City of Ferguson, and it has been both an honor and a pleasure serving the citizens of Ferguson. During year four, I worked with the Monitor Team on setting goals and deadline dates on the work plan for the courts and the police department that were lofty

yet achievable. During this year, we have faced many unexpected challenges from pandemic to protests; however, even with the pandemic, we still met the majority of all of our year four work plan deadline dates and goals with the exception of two, and I will start with those.

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

Paragraph 19 of the Consent Decree states the City will begin to host and participate in a series of small-group structured dialogues arranged by a neutral facilitator between police officers and community members. This year, the City partnered with Community Mediation Services to be the neutral facilitator for those dialogues. I began working with CMS, the Department of Justice, and the Monitor Team to develop a plan for these structured dialogues. These dialogues were slated to begin in April; however, due to COVID, they had to be postponed. We worked together to come up with ideas on how to move forward with those dialogues during this challenging time. Collectively, we decided to schedule a pilot Zoom call with community members and FPD, and we were able to kick off the first meeting on September the 15th. I would like to mention at the last minute we had an officer out sick and Chief Armstrong volunteered at the last minute to fill in for his officer. This was not planned, but we really appreciated his leadership, candidness, and willingness to always assist his department in times of need. Feedback from both FPD officers and community participants regarding this dialogue

Q

has been great thus far, and we are excited to discuss how to continue having these dialogues moving forward.

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

Second, the City worked very hard to put together a teen summit, and we collaborated with all of our local colleges and universities to be vendors at the summit. several quest speakers coming to our youth events. One of the items we planned was to hold a roundtable discussion with our youth on getting input on our bias-free policing policy. The summit was slated for March, and due to COVID, we had to cancel the summit. Since that time, I have been working with the Ferguson-Florissant School District and collaborating on ideas of how to gain the students' input on the fair and impartial policing policy. I worked with the Department of Justice and the Monitor Team to come up with questions for our youth, and during the first week the students were back to school, the Ferguson-Florissant School District placed our questions on an assignment on the Canvas platform. deadline date for feedback is actually September the 25th; however, I am pleased to say that as of this date we have over 120 responses from our high school students. I will be working with the DOJ and the Monitor Team over the next few weeks on how we can incorporate the youth input into our fair and impartial policing policies.

I would just like to take a few minutes to explain the process of developing and implementing policies as I get a

lot of questions on this process most of the time. The first step in this process is for FPD and the Department of Justice to work together to research, develop, and write draft plans of these policies. Once both parties have agreed on a draft policy, it is then submitted to the Monitor Team for review, suggestions, and comments. Revisions are made if needed, and the next step is to place these policies online for community input. The most recent suite of policies, which was our First Amendment policies, were online for community input for 60 days. Our community input is received, and FPD and DOJ work together again to incorporate the community input and suggestions into these policies. The Monitor Team will review a final time, and once all parties are in agreement, these policies are then finalized. All final Consent Decree policies are currently on the FPD website.

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

Next, I would like to discuss the goals and deadline dates that we set and achieved during the year four work plan. First, regarding the Ferguson municipal courts, our last audit was in November of 2019, and we are currently awaiting feedback from that audit. However, we've done a lot of work on the Comprehensive Amnesty Program, and thousands of cases with fines and fees have been dismissed since the implementation of the Consent Decree, and I can tell you that as of December of 2019 we worked -- I'm sorry. We worked specifically during this previous year on good-cause criteria

10

number two, and I can tell you as of December of 2019 the City has dismissed over 500 of those cases under the amnesty program related to that good-cause criteria number two. Only nine of those cases remain to date.

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

During the year four work plan, we were to develop a community engagement plan and a crime prevention plan per paragraphs 20, 26, and 27. Since February of 2020, I have been working with both the Neighborhood Police Steering Committee community engagement subcommittee and the Civilian Review Board community engagement subcommittee on developing the community engagement plan. Over the course of drafting and revising this plan, the community has decided to call this plan the Ferguson Community Policing and Engagement Plan. This plan incorporates community engagement efforts, problem-solving policing, and police community partnerships. During COVID, I continued to meet biweekly via Zoom with our committee to draft and develop this plan. The draft plan was submitted to the Department of Justice and the Monitor Team on July 31st. Both the NPSC and CRB are planning on reviewing this plan with their general groups during the month of September and providing some final suggestions, comments, and feedback to me in October so we can incorporate those suggestions into our final draft plan for submission to the DOJ and Monitoring Team for review. I would like to take this time to thank all of our community volunteers that have worked on this plan with me. This could not have been done without them. Our draft crime prevention plan was also due July 31st and has been submitted to the DOJ and Monitor Team. I want to thank Assistant Chief McCall for all of his hard work in researching and developing this plan. In year five, I will be working with Assistant Chief McCall in incorporating community input and engagement efforts as both of these plans work collectively together.

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

Recently, FPD requested assistance to enhance its community engagement efforts. Chief Armstrong and I have collaborated with CRI-TAC, the Collaborative Reform Initiative Technical Assistance Center. They will provide resources to FPD to guide and build upon the current community engagement program. Prior to delivery, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Office of Community Oriented Policing, otherwise known as the COPS Office, will review and approve all resource material. We had our kickoff call to begin the work with CRI-TAC on September the 10th, and we look forward to working with them to help us advance a culture of cohesion and trust between the police and the communities that we serve. During this phase, the City has worked on developing a policy for responding to the Neighborhood Police Steering Committee's recommendations, and that draft was submitted to the DOJ and Monitor Team on April the 30th, 2020. I am currently working with the NPSC on incorporating the

general group's final comments, suggestions, and feedback to finalize this policy during year five.

Per paragraph 25, we have established neighborhood associations in each of our apartment complexes. FPD was regularly attending these neighborhood meetings, and we were working to establish problem-solving policing and crime prevention goals with our residents. Due to COVID, we have not been able to meet in person for the last several months; however, we have had regular Zoom meetings with the apartment complex managers and owners to assist with neighborhood needs and goals. I also want to take this time to thank all of our apartment complex managers and owners who have partnered with us in helping our residents in these neighborhoods.

Per paragraphs 29 through 30 and 256 to 258, the City is to develop and implement a staffing plan. In November of 2019, the City initiated an agreement with AH Datalytics in order to develop analytical support in compliance with the data elements of the Consent Decree. I will speak about this further in detail later. I worked closely with AH Datalytics to update the 2019 data for our 2020 staffing plan. I then took the data from 2019 to revise and summarize the staffing plan that was submitted to the Department of Justice and Monitor Team on July 31st.

During year four, we have increased our efforts with the Civilian Review Board. The CRB has been given all of 2019

complaints for review and all of the completed 2020 complaints for review. During this year, Chief Armstrong and I created a checklist to ensure that all evidence, including audio and video footage, police reports, witness testimony, and all evidence relevant to the underlying misconduct complaint would be included in the file for CRB's review of investigations. This has enhanced the CRB's process for reviewing complaints. In addition, CRB members have been participating in the hiring and promotion panels for FPD candidates. This year, we also drafted a Memorandum of Understanding between the FPD and CRB to enhance the process of reviewing complaints and finalizing the review process. FPD is currently working with the CRB to finalize this process and work on streamlining the logistics.

During year four, I worked closely with Community
Mediation Services to finalize a neighborhood mediation plan
that would promote resolutions to disputes among community
members and reduce the need for involvement with the criminal
justice system. In addition, this plan also provides a
community-centered mediation program as an alternative to
misconduct investigations for certain civilian complaints. I
am pleased to inform the Court that we had our first
successful citizen/police mediation in July of 2020.

On July 31st, a draft plan for reassessment and revision of the municipal code was submitted to the DOJ and

the Monitor Team for review. This plan will be presented to the City Council during year five for their approval and budget allocation.

Per paragraph 67, FPD and courts developed policies to address timely and meaningful access and services for limited-English-proficiency individuals. These policies were submitted on July 31st.

During this phase, we also worked closely with the DOJ and Monitor Team to finalize the investigatory detention policy and to revise the field interview report.

Paragraphs 83 through 89 refer to our search policies. FPD has worked closely with the Department of Justice and the Monitor Team to finalize this suite of policies. The following policies have been approved to date: Stops and detentions, warrantless searches, Miranda, and search warrants. We are awaiting final approval for citations and arrests.

During this year, FPD has been working closely with the Department of Justice on our First Amendment policies.

These policies were placed on the FPD website for public comment during this phase, and we are working with the DOJ on incorporating those comments and suggestions. We plan to have those policies finalized and conduct training during year five.

In March of 2020, the City of Ferguson entered into a

contract with Benchmark Analytics to provide a software system for FPD that would provide FPD with a means of a computer tracking system to track our data, our use-of-force reporting, and complaints instead of paper files. FPD is currently working with Benchmark on developing its use-of-force forms, use-of-force review, and vehicle pursuits. We are in the final stage of this process and getting final approval from the DOJ and Monitor Team before going live with these forms. During year five, we will be working with Benchmark on the early intervention and warning systems, Internal Affairs intake and managements, and performance evaluation.

Recently, with the Department of Justice and Monitor Team approval, we have finalized our body-worn/in-car camera policies as well as footage sharing policy. During year five, we will be developing and rolling out our roll call training and in-service training in this area.

On July 31st, FPD submitted our salary study, which was the last component to finalize our recruitment plan.

Regarding data collection, as I stated earlier, the City initiated an agreement with AH Datalytics in order to develop analytical support in compliance with the data elements of the Consent Decree. Our kickoff with AH Datalytics began in November of 2019 as they came to Ferguson to do a site visit and begin discussions on how to gain compliance in this area. Since this time, AH Datalytics

completed the gap analysis to evaluate how data is used in FPD, what data points were needed to achieve our goals, what data sets and reports were missing, how data would be accessed, and finally, how these reports could be accessed and utilized. Since that time, FPD has added specific signals in our crime analysis data system that would allow FPD to track our community policing and engagement efforts. AH Datalytics helped develop our crime dashboards that report crime statistics in our community. This dashboard is live and is located on our Ferguson Police Department webpage. As I stated above, AH Datalytics helped pull reports from our current systems to update all of our 2019 data that we needed to submit our staffing plan. During year five, AH Datalytics will be providing FPD with support in the areas of collected data related to First Amendment protected activities. After we have finalized our use-of-force reporting forms, they will help provide assistance in retrieving data for annual reports and they will provide advice on how to best achieve compliance with early intervention systems requirements. Essentially, AH Datalytics will create all data products to support public reporting of the data as required by the Consent Decree, and if needed, AH Datalytics will create internal versions of data visualizations to satisfy detailed needs of FPD that are not appropriate for public release.

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

With the hard work and dedication of our staff and

Captain Dilworth who helped develop all of the roll call trainings, the following roll call trainings were approved and completed during year four: Critical incidents, investigatory stops and detentions, field interview reporting, professional standards and disciplinary guidelines, warrantless searches and seizures, and consent to search. Also during this phase, FPD has submitted the Crisis Intervention Training Manual, PowerPoints and lesson plans for crisis intervention for approval. FPD has also submitted the police training officer program for approval. On April 30th, we submitted our draft supervisor training plan. During year four, FPD has conducted roll call trainings on all of its use-of-force policies, and during year five, we will be working to see how we can incorporate in-service training in this area.

And finally, during year four, both Assistant Chief McCall and I worked closely with the NPSC training plan committee to develop a draft training plan. We all worked together to identify gaps between what St. Louis County Police Academy offers and what FPD will need to develop for their own in-service trainings. The draft plan was submitted to the DOJ and Monitor Team on April the 30th. Finally, we will be working on how to develop and implement in-service trainings for year five. Thank you.

MR. CAREY: So, Your Honor, this is Apollo Carey. I just wanted to sort of add a little bit of context to

Nicolle's past -- her last comment about training. the parties just recently had a conversation about the training piece. You know, the training piece of the Consent Decree is an ever-evolving -- an ever-evolving piece of it, and it's starting to grow to a point to where I think the City is going to have to consider hiring a different -- you know, a training coordinator. I think under the Consent Decree we have the City agreed to hire a training coordinator. We've had one of our current police officers, Lieutenant Dilworth, serving in that capacity up until now, but simply the size and girth of what the training coordinator is becoming under the Consent Decree probably warrants the City considering, you know, having a dedicated person to that who has no other -you know, no other responsibility. So we're actually -- we had the conversation with the Department of Justice about that particular thing a week or so ago, maybe a week, maybe two weeks ago, and we'll be discussing that with the council tonight, as a matter of fact, to figure out how the City, you know, addresses this need for the training coordinator position. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention as That is something that we've been discussing. you've heard the Monitor bring that up in the past, and the City -- you know, just to be clear, the City -- you know, we have made progress under the training piece. I think Ms. Barton's -- Ms. Barton's testimony here today can

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

certainly inform the Court and the public that the City has made progress, but it's similar to the situation when we had the Consent Decree Coordinator, which is, you know, you can only go so far before you have to address this particular issue, and I think we're fast approaching, if not already there, to that point where we need to have a dedicated person in the training coordinator's role because it has just become such a robust part of what it is we're doing in this phase of the Consent Decree. So I just wanted to bring that up and let the Court know that the parties have been working toward that and the parties just recently discussed that at its last meeting.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Carey, and I -- I'm encouraged both by the report but also by the -- your -- what you just said about the training coordinator. It seems to me that you are at that point where it's necessary, and obviously, it sounds like you recognize that, and I hope that -- I hope that can move forward.

Mr. Volek, I would hear next from the Department of Justice to see what else you wish to say or add, and then after that, we'll talk to the Monitor.

MR. VOLEK: Thank you, Your Honor. Ms. Marks will present to the Court and to those calling in.

THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Marks.

MS. MARKS: Thank you, Your Honor. I'd like to begin

by thanking the Court for making it possible to move forward today with this status hearing despite the restrictions in place due to COVID-19. While we too wish we could be there in person, we're grateful for the opportunity to update the Court and the public as these hearings are a critical opportunity to provide transparency on the status of Consent Decree implementation.

We extend our thanks to everyone who called in today and thanks also to those who submitted written comments in advance of the hearing. As always, we very much appreciate the community's sustained engagement and commitment to this process as well as the thoughtful comments provided, which are very helpful to us as we continue to push forward. We look forward to reviewing those in further detail.

And thanks also to Ms. Barton, the Consent Decree

Coordinator, for that detailed update on the City's behalf.

Since Ms. Barton has come on board as the Consent Decree

Coordinator just over a year ago, we have seen renewed

momentum. We appreciate her efforts to track all of the

moving pieces and to further implementation of the Consent

Decree over the last several months as well as her willingness

to provide that substantive update for today's hearing. She

covered a great deal, so I'll just plan to fill in any gaps

and then comment on a couple of topics in particular -
community engagement, the recent protests in Ferguson, and

then policies and training.

So starting with community engagement, this remains a critical aspect of the Consent Decree. As Ms. Barton noted, unfortunately, this is one area where the ongoing pandemic has had an impact, delaying the structured group dialogues, but we're pleased that the virtual pilot that she described involving officers and members of the larger community has now taken place, and while that virtual group cannot fully replace in-person communication, we're glad that it was successful and offers a viable format for the short term. The next steps there will be to develop a schedule for more dialogues, including some in-person dialogues if it's determined that that can be done safely, and to recruit community members to participate.

A couple of other updates on the community engagement front. As Ms. Barton mentioned, FPD has submitted the first drafts of the community engagement and community policing plans, which will be reviewed by DOJ and the Monitoring Team. Additionally, DOJ's COPS Office is now in the process of providing technical assistance to FPD on community engagement. They will be providing guidance on how to continue to reorient policing in Ferguson towards community policing, and that process will continue through the next several months.

Finally, some of the letters that were submitted for today's hearing on community engagement touched upon this

issue. For example, we received a submission from Ferguson's new mayor, Mayor Ella Jones, calling for a community engagement coordinator who would develop a community enforcement strategy and train volunteer community resource workers with the support of the local university. We support any efforts that will improve the City's ability to communicate effectively and engage the community. We've long thought that the City would benefit from having someone on board with this expertise and very much look forward to learning more about this.

The next topic I'd like to address are the recent protests in Ferguson. During the June 4th status hearing, we reported that we were monitoring the response to demonstrations that took place in May and June of this year following George Floyd's death. While we had no firsthand information about those demonstrations, as we have not been able to be on the ground in Ferguson since the onset of COVID-19, we have monitored news reports and stayed in communication with Chief Armstrong and members of the community, and we expressed appreciation to enabling people to peacefully protest at the last hearing. Since that status hearing, we have received an after-action report from FPD summarizing its response to the May and June protests. We have since requested the use-of-force reports and arrest reports that are underlying that after-action summary, which

FPD agreed to provide. FPD also offered to provide body-worn camera footage from the protests, and we are reviewing all of these materials with an eye towards if and how any of the lessons learned can be incorporated into the First Amendment policy review process. As Ms. Barton noted, we received a great deal of community feedback on the First Amendment policies since the last hearing, and we're working on incorporating those now. Because we continue to monitor FPD's response to protest activity, we also requested after-action documentation following the protests that took place in early August, around the sixth anniversary of Michael Brown's death. When we receive those materials, we will review them for the same purpose. So as we said in June, despite the pandemic, we continue to monitor the situation with the information available to us and appreciate FPD's cooperation in providing the information that we seek.

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 Court may recall, at the last status hearing, the City alerted us to its concerns that the decree is inhibiting FPD's ability to retain control and command of outside law enforcement agencies that respond to Ferguson to provide mutual aid under what is called a Code 1000.

According to the City, these agencies do not want to police their officers under FPD command during [audio cutout], and the City also raised concerns regarding its ability to fulfill the officer wellness requirements of the decree if it is

underresourced due to a shortage of mutual aid. Since that status hearing, we have spoken directly with the chief about this issue, and he provided us with an updated Code 1000 plan. The parties are discussing this issue so that we can identify a path forward by which FPD can enlist the mutual aid that it needs while fulfilling the terms of the Consent Decree by protecting individuals' rights to peaceful protest and by providing for officer safety. We want to reiterate to members of the public listening in today that, as always, we would welcome any information from those with firsthand knowledge of recent protests. Of course, there are processes we'll undertake to ensure that -- you know, to verify this information that we receive, but to the extent that members of the public have any information that they'd like to share, that's always helpful to us.

So turning to policies and training, the parties have been working hard to incorporate public feedback across the policy areas to finalize the remaining policies and to conduct roll trainings to inform officers about changes in the new policies so that those policies can be implemented.

Ms. Barton has covered almost everything on this front, so I'll provide just a very brief supplement here. On the court side, things are moving. The policy on fines and fees is now with the Monitoring Team for final review, and we just sent that over yesterday morning -- yesterday afternoon. The

policy on court proceedings and trials is almost ready to send to the Monitor for her final review and approval. The policies have finished working on that or the parties have finished working on that policy and are just finalizing one last attachment to it before that's ready to send over, and I'd like to thank the court administrator, Ms. Courtney Herron, for her help pushing those policies across the finish line.

On the police side of things, as Ms. Barton mentioned, since the last hearing, we've finalized the body-worn camera and in-car camera policies, and we want to just thank everyone again who provided such thoughtful, detailed feedback during the public comment window for those. Those policies are now available on the website and, as with all policies, won't be implemented until the roll call training has taken place, and the parties are working on that roll call training now.

So now that the policies are close to being complete, training has been an essential area of focus for us. Roll call briefings are just the first step. FPD will also be creating a training program consisting of trainings that use adult learning techniques, incorporate feedback from community members and officers, and are constantly being revised and improved. We recently had a productive meeting with Chief Armstrong, Ms. Barton, and Mr. Carey to discuss the status of

training, and as Mr. Carey mentioned, this is an area where FPD's limited personnel capacity has hindered progress from moving forward as quickly as possible. We believe FPD's decision to hire a training coordinator will significantly aid the City's compliance efforts and are glad to hear about that. In the meantime, over the next few months, we'll continue to work with existing staff to help FPD identify trainings from other departments that FPD can adopt and to expand its current capacity in training, including by strengthening the training committee.

The last area I'll touch upon just briefly is the Comprehensive Amnesty Program. As Ms. Barton mentioned, the parties have done a lot of work on the Comprehensive Amnesty Program. As we've said in the past, this is an area that has really had a significant impact already. The program has led to the dismissal of thousands of cases and the forgiveness of a significant amount of outstanding fines and fees, and so we're now awaiting the Monitor's assessment of the remaining charges, and to the extent there are any next steps that arise from that review, we'll undertake those at that time. We hope to be able to provide a more fulsome update about this program soon and think we're in a good place with the amnesty program and hope to be able to close it out in year five.

So to conclude, we're now at the beginning of year five. While in past years we focused on policy development

and roll call trainings, in year five, we'll be shifting to measuring and assessing implementation of the Consent Decree.

We'll be focusing on the new data systems and forms and the development of this robust training program. We'll hope to see additional auditing, and even outside of the scope of normal audits, we'll be requesting more documentation from the City about its implementation efforts. We'll continue to think about the ways that we can conduct outreach through this process even in the face of COVID-19, and we'll be keeping a close eye on the community engagement efforts. Overall, we're optimistic that we can continue with the current momentum as we enter year five and shift into this next phase. Unless Your Honor has any questions, I'll leave it there. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sorry. I did have one question.

Actually, this is really just something I'd ask you to clarify for any of the members of the public who are listening on the -- listening to this hearing. Would you just clarify or remind everyone how -- if the public wishes to make input to the Department of Justice with, as you suggested, firsthand knowledge about the protests, the recent protest activity -- how people would do that? If you could just remind the public of the method that that should -- you know, where they should direct those things.

MS. MARKS: Of course. So one good way is to email us at our dedicated line, dedicated email for this case, which

is community.ferguson@usdoj.gov. So one more time, that's community.ferguson@usdoj.gov.

THE COURT: All right. And I know they can also -people can also contact -- the Monitor has also an email line,
and so I -- but I just did want to clarify that.

I think -- I think I'll -- I'll hear from the Monitor at this point, and so, Ms. Tidwell and Ms. Caruso or whichever of you wishes to present.

MS. TIDWELL: Thank you, Your Honor. I won't add too much to the policy and training development updates you received from the parties except to highlight the work of our team members, Maggie Goodrich, Bob Stewart, and Dr. Leigh Anderson, who have been assisting the parties in moving things forward by making themselves available for conferences with vendors, timely review of policies and other materials, and substantive and, hopefully, helpful feedback on those policies and other materials. As always, Ms. Caruso has provided logistical, technical, and management support to me and our subject matter consultants, and I thank her too for her diligence during this challenging time.

When we last met, the country, the Monitoring Team, and the parties were still reeling from the killing of George Floyd and the resulting renewed calls for police reform along with the pandemic's impact on each of us personally and professionally. Through it all, everyone kept working, and I

applaud the City's efforts, particularly, Ms. Barton, to persevere and adjust to this new normal by implementing innovative strategies to achieve the Consent Decree's goals.

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

While things have not progressed with the speed that everyone envisioned or would have preferred, the Monitoring Team continues to believe that it is not for lack of commitment from the parties in this case. To echo Ms. Marks' remarks, we are heartened by Ms. Barton's involvement in this matter. As her detailed update indicates, she has more than fulfilled the point guard type role that is so crucial to successful implementation of a consent decree. We are also pleased to hear that the City is reevaluating the need for a training coordinator. We would be remiss, of course, under the category of pushing our luck here, Your Honor, if we did not renew our recommendation that the City similarly revisit the community engagement coordinator role as well. These key positions, when coupled with Ms. Barton's demonstrated project management skills, would drive implementation forward and really put us on the homestretch towards substantial compliance.

Moving forward, in keeping with the process we established at the start of year three, the Monitoring Team, specifically, Ms. Caruso, is working with Ms. Barton on a work plan for year five, the release of which will coincide, as it has in years past, with the release of the Monitoring Team's

semiannual report. The report, which we expect to file with the Court later this fall, will include an update on the progress of the Comprehensive Amnesty Program, which, as the Court knows, is long overdue, and although Ms. Barton stole most of my thunder on this topic, I will soldier on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

By way of some explanation and not as an excuse for the delay, the Monitoring Team lost a key member to a medical emergency late last year. At that time, the November 2019 municipal court audit had been completed, but a report of the results was not generated before the team member's departure. We hoped that our teammate would return in the spring and held off on reporting on the audit with that expectation. it did not work out as we planned, meaning that the remaining team members and I, with the invaluable assistance of Ms. Marks from the DOJ and Ms. Herron, the court administrator, have essentially had to reconstruct the November 2019 audit remotely to develop a clearer picture. are near completion of that endeavor and, as I mentioned, will provide a full update in the forthcoming semiannual report; however, I wanted to provide a preview, with the Court's -begging the Court's indulgence, of what we think will come out of our review or encapsulation of the amnesty program's progress to date.

As you know, Consent Decree paragraph 327 calls for complete implementation of the Comprehensive Amnesty Program,

including the elimination of all relevant charges, fines, fees from pending cases as set forth in paragraph 326. Paragraph 326 has four components, two of which -- 326(b) and (c) -- were implemented and completed prior to that first audit.

The remaining two components of paragraph 326 were the focus of our first audit in August 2017 and all the audits that have since followed. 326(d) requires the City, in all cases in which a defendant has made total payments that exceed the amount of the initial fines and fees imposed, to stay the remaining fine amounts and close the case without further action. From the start, the municipal court has tracked the amounts waived pursuant to 326(d), and the Monitoring Team, as part of its biannual audits, has reviewed one out of every 10 of those cases to confirm that the fines were reduced or cases were dismissed in the amounts indicated. We hope to have a total dollar figure to report in the upcoming semiannual report, but as previously mentioned, we believe it is well into the tens of thousands of dollars and probably higher.

The last component of paragraph 326, which has required the most work by the Monitoring Team and the parties is paragraph 326(a), which requires the City to decline prosecution in open cases not yet adjudicated that were initiated prior to January 1st, 2014, and elimination of warrants associated with those cases except where the prosecutor finds good cause to continue prosecution. A few

notes about 326(a). The requirement that the City decline prosecution in these cases only applies to cases not yet adjudicated, meaning that the defendant had yet to appear in court to contest the charge or to enter a quilty plea and pay the fine or implement a payment plan. In the initial audit in August 2017, the City and the Monitoring Team identified nearly 8,000 pre-2014 cases that fell within the Comprehensive Amnesty Program. Today, that number is roughly 1,100, meaning that more than 6,500 cases have been removed from the court's docket through the City's efforts and DOJ's assistance. overwhelming majority of the eliminated cases were a result of the city prosecutor's decision to nolle pros the matter. Some were the result of guilty pleas, outright dismissals, or the discovery of duplicate entries. We are working to clearly define that breakdown and will finalize it in the semiannual report. In that first audit where the 8,000 cases were identified, it became clear that the concept of good cause could not be left in the eye of the beholder, and the parties began working to develop a set of criteria to guide the city prosecutor's review --

SIRI: Here's what I found.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. TIDWELL: Sorry. Siri is yelling at me.

-- the city prosecutor's review of those 8,000 cases as well as to provide a mechanism by which the court, via the Monitoring Team, could assess compliance. The parties agreed

upon and implemented the five good-cause criteria around the spring of 2018.

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

Applying the criteria, the City reported during the fall of 2018 audit that there were 1,744 cases it identified as falling within the good-cause criteria. The Monitoring Team requested a breakdown of how each of these cases were categorized. Criteria number one, which involves assaultive behavior or reckless endangerment, there were 316 cases or charges identified. Criteria number two, involving an identified victim who is available to assist in further prosecution, 563 cases were identified. Criteria number three, involving driving while -- with a license suspension or a revoked license, 857 cases were identified. Criteria number four, involving a defendant who since January 2014 has been convicted of an additional offense involving assaultive behavior, there were zero cases classified under that criteria. And, finally, criteria number five, where the city prosecutor reasonably believes that the case should proceed in the interests of justice and public safety, there were eight cases identified.

During that audit, the Monitoring Team reported a review of 10 percent of the cases in categories one through three and all of the criteria number five cases. At that time, we reported our concern that the cases categorized as meeting criteria number two did not contain any notation in

the file of recent attempts to contact the identified victim and assess his or her availability. At the time, we noted that many of the offenses were shoplifting and similar offenses where large retailers were listed as identifiable victims. In response, the parties set out to develop a protocol for assessing availability of victims pursuant to good-cause criteria number two. That process involved the mailing of letters to identified victims, asking that they indicate their preference to continue the case or not within a finite time period. Where there was no response, the case was disposed of.

During the November 2019 audit, the Monitoring Team requested and received a breakdown of the process for addressing whether the 563 cases should be kept open under good-cause criteria number two. In short, the City reported to us that there were 428 cases where there was no response from the victim to the letter. In eight cases, the victim indicated a desire to continue with the prosecution. In 13 cases, the victim responded to the letter by stating that they did not wish to proceed with the prosecution. One case was kept active without a response from the victim based on a companion charge in a domestic assault case that prompted the city prosecutor to continue that case. Between the time of the letters being sent out and the identification of the cases in good-cause criteria number two, roughly 25 cases were

closed due to a guilty plea. Today, there are nine good-cause criteria number two cases that remain open, down from 563.

We estimate that there are an additional 225 cases or charges left open pursuant to good-cause criteria number one.

Good-cause criteria number five remains at eight.

Many of these cases are related to yard maintenance or public works cases that were brought. So we may need some follow-up on that front with the City to determine whether that -- whether that meets the criteria of public safety or interests of justice.

And then, finally, the remaining cases, roughly 700 or so, are categorized as good-cause criteria number three, which relates to driving with a license revocation or suspension.

Before the Monitoring Team can report that the Comprehensive Amnesty Program has been successfully implemented, we would need to confirm that these cases fully meet the criteria as stated in the good-cause criteria the parties agreed to. It is a multipronged and somewhat nuanced analysis, which I believe will require some additional attention. We hope to have some further details in the semiannual report, but it's unclear at this point as to what the review of those cases will entail and how we will accomplish that in this remote environment.

But, again, I would reiterate, Your Honor, and thank

the court staff, the City, and DOJ on their work in getting the Comprehensive Amnesty Program to where we are today. Down from nearly 8,000 to about 1,100 is where we are now. We're not at the finish line yet, but we're close, and I think that it's really commendable that as much work and attention to this important project has been undertaken.

And, finally, Your Honor, just a few additional points. The community survey. Dr. Leigh Anderson, our lead on community engagement for the Monitoring Team, has connected with Dr. Nyron Crawford, a professor at Temple University, who is assisting us in developing and implementing methods to boost participation in this year's survey given the public health constraints. Dr. Crawford has contacts at St. Louis University who have already done survey work in the greater Ferguson area, and we hope to leverage that and build from that to administer our survey in the coming weeks. We are working through some budget and logistical issues but anticipate that the survey will go live by mid October.

A virtual town hall. Building from the City's pilot program and the structured community dialogues and other creative uses of Zoom to connect with the community, the Monitoring Team and the parties are working collectively to plan a virtual town hall event for sometime next month that will be timed with the release of our semiannual report, and we'll report details on that as they become available through

our collective listservs.

And then, finally, as mentioned, we have completed implementation on several policies, and since we're moving into year five, the Monitoring Team has several audits cued up for next year, first, in the municipal court area to finalize the Comprehensive Amnesty Program but also in the use-of-force area and in accountability. Our subject matter consultant for training and use of force, Bob Stewart, has developed a protocol for an audit in use-of-force reporting that we are finalizing and fine-tuning. We will submit a notice to the City in the coming weeks detailing the documents and reports we need for the review, and we'll report back to the Court with the results. Similarly, we will conduct an audit of the accountability measures in the Consent Decree to include the City's engagement with the -- with the CRB as well as its investigation of its own internal complaints.

And with that, Your Honor, I'll conclude. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

THE COURT: The -- thank you. And I appreciate the comprehensive reports that we've gotten from each of you all.

We did receive some -- the Monitor received and then passed on to me some of the comments from the public that were sent in because that was the mechanism we provided so that people could make comments even though they weren't able to be here, you know, be doing it in person, and most of those

comments have been addressed. At least most of the ones that I considered -- well, most of the comments that were specific comments. Several of the comments did reflect frustration with the slowness of the progress of the work, and I think everybody here shares that frustration, but those who have been working on it closely, as the parties and Monitor have been, have seen a huge turnaround in the pace of completion of what we need to complete since Ms. Barton came online, and I think that's been a very positive -- you know, positive development, and so I do appreciate the, I think somebody said, renewed engagement or, you know, really pushing forward the progress, and I think she has done that, and I, you know, appreciate the City doing that, and I think it's, frankly, exciting to think that the City could hire someone to do the same thing for training, and it would be, of course, wonderful if the City could find a way to do that for community engagement. I understand that there's only so much the City can do at this point, but I would encourage everything they could do.

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

There were concerns -- I guess this is really for the City. One of the concerns was that the Civilian Review Board had complained about not receiving all the reports that it thought were necessary, and I believe Ms. Barton said that those are now -- that has been worked out and those are now being provided. Mr. Carey, is that -- is that your

understanding?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAREY: Yes, Your Honor. In particular, what has been expressed by the Civilian Review Board is they have requested that they have access to disciplinary records, prior disciplinary records of all officers that, you know, arrive on the scene at a complaint, at an incident that resulted in a complaint, and the City's position with that has been, you know, we -- you know, you have to balance the, you know, providing them information that could be prejudicial as to whether or not something actually happened and then also giving them enough information to make a decision. So what the City has done is that they've taken the position that, you know, prior disciplinary records will be provided once the CRB has made the decision as to whether or not the act actually happened that's being complained about, and then at that point, when the CRB is in the phase of deciding punishment or -- excuse me -- recommendation for training or recommendation for discipline, then prior disciplinary records would be provided to the CRB at that time. I think, you know, there's been some disenchantment with that position by -- you know, by the City, but, you know, as you can imagine, you know, providing certain records about people's pasts or officers' pasts could potentially be prejudicial as to whether or not they actually did what's being complained about in the actual complaint. And so that's sort of the basis for what it is you're getting from that letter, and, you know, we've been working with the CRB to try to explain to them that, you know, you can have what you need; it's more of a matter of timing and when are you -- you know, when should the City provide that to you. So that's kind of where we are in that discussion, and you can kind of see from that letter what their position is as well.

THE COURT: Yeah. Does either -- anyone else wish to comment on that, either from the Department of Justice or from the Monitor?

Okay. I do -- I do recognize what the City is saying. It's analogous to the Federal Rules of Evidence that when someone is charged with wrongdoing we try to decide whether they did something wrong at that time and not based on something they may have done before. It's a basis for why, in most criminal cases, for example, we don't put prior convictions into evidence when the jury is trying to decide that --

MR. CAREY: Right.

THE COURT: -- particular case. There are exceptions. I would encourage the City and the CRB to continue working on that and try to see if there are cases where you believe there may be an issue that it should be presented, and certainly, if -- you know, if it has -- if the CRB believes that an incident did take place, that makes --

it's a little different than when they're trying to make their decision, and so I do hope that the City will make sure that they get what they legitimately need, and I don't -- I can't take a position on what's right or wrong on this because I don't know enough about both sides, but I do think that you all should continue working. I think that there has been -- I'm pleased to see that the CRB is really functioning now, which took awhile to get up and running for a variety of reasons, and I think that that is -- you know, I would encourage as much cooperation between the police department and the CRB as can possibly be given.

The other -- I do have another question. Well, let's see. From the letters, I believe most of what -- you did talk about evaluating the August incident and getting use-of-force reports and -- or -- I'm sorry -- post-action evaluation, and I think that's important. I think Ms. Tidwell has addressed that.

And I do understand the other citizen comments, and I would encourage you to keep making your comments. You know, the Monitor is sharing with me when there are things that should be shared and before each hearing, and I hope that at the next hearing we'll be able to have people making live comments if we can figure out a method to do it. We actually -- we actually have started having jury trials in our courthouse as of September, but they have -- they're very

limited and -- because we have to limit the number of people who can come into the courtroom at any given time. Our courtrooms aren't big enough for everyone, but I'm hoping that, perhaps, we could do some kind of limited in-person hearing, perhaps, in January, but we do have to wait and see how things go. It's really a -- it's a -- it's a slow speed to figure out how things are really going to work, and we obviously need to protect everyone from the spread of this disease, and that's -- that's just essential.

I believe -- let me just see if I have other questions. Yeah. The -- the Code 1000 issue, I think, is a continuing concern when there are outside police departments brought in. That was mentioned in some of the letters as well, in particular, and I knew that the Department of Justice and the Monitor are looking at that. It's not something that is being ignored, and they're on the ground, trying to see if there are problems and see what kind of changes should be made, and so I just wanted to make sure the public knows that this is not something that's not being looked at, but right now -- especially with regard to what happened in August, and so recently, there hasn't been resolution, but it's -- the parties are really working on it.

I guess the other thing I would say is I have been really impressed in the last few months when we've had all these limitations with the pandemic that people cannot, you

know, get together; I've been impressed with the efforts that everyone in this group -- both the City, the Department of Justice, and the Monitoring Team -- with all the efforts that they've been doing to try to make sure that we can have progress even during this time. One of the sayings we have here at court is that everything takes three times as long now that we have the -- under the pandemic as it did before.

Even, you know, everything we used to do is much more difficult, and I know that is true for the City and the police department and the Department of Justice and the Monitoring Team, and so I do appreciate how much you have been able to achieve even during this time, and the community engagement piece -- I think it's great that you're figuring out virtual ways to do that because that is so important, and I hope it can continue and can improve as time goes by.

You know, I -- I too share the frustration that many people have that things have not moved as quickly as we had all contemplated four and a half years ago when we approved this. It's not quite four and a half years but close to it, and -- and I -- but I think that it has not been for lack of trying, especially in recent times, and so the -- I am reassured that everybody is pushing this and being -- handling it and taking it very seriously, and I would want to again tell the public, members of the public, that although I know that there are times -- well, I know it's never perfect, and

it's not. I'd like it to be perfect, but this is human beings 1 2 doing what human beings do, and they're working hard, and I believe everyone does have their heart in the right place and 3 are trying to do this, and I know that, you know, I've not 4 5 seen any reluctance on the part of the City to stop complying 6 with the Consent Decree, and that's what my job is -- is to 7 see whether there is noncompliance and, of course, relying 8 heavily on the Department of Justice and the Monitor because 9 this is an adversarial process, and so -- but I do want 10 everyone to -- you know, I'm very pleased with the progress we 11 are making now, and although I wish, you know, it had happened 12 yesterday, that's -- that's just how things are, and I think 13 we're doing -- people are doing as much as they can under all 14 of these difficult circumstances, but we're not going to stop. 15 I don't want anybody to think we're letting things up. 16 So anything further from any of the parties? 17 Anything further, Ms. Tidwell, from the Monitoring Team? 18 Okay. I see you shaking your head. 19 MS. TIDWELL: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Okay. And from the Department of 21 Justice, anything further? 22 Thank you, Your Honor. MS. MARKS: No. 23 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Marks, thank you. 24 And, Mr. Carey, anything further from the City? 25 MR. CAREY: No. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Again, I want to thank everyone for all the efforts they've put into this, and this will conclude this hearing. I will consult with the lawyers, and we will come up with a time for the next hearing. I'm, right now, inclined to think it will be in early January just because we usually do it every three months; obviously, we're not going to do it over the holidays, but I think that -- I don't know. We're all looking at the end of the year, hoping that we'll have some progress to report with the pandemic. Then we'll know when we can start getting together again. But I'll talk to the parties about that, and we will send out an order.

I will tell everyone, including the people who are listening on the phone, that the -- the pilot project I mentioned at the beginning of the hearing that the federal courts are engaging in to livestream some of the civil proceedings -- I believe that these public hearings do qualify and will continue to qualify.

We've been approved; our court has been approved as a pilot. In fact, today, just so you all know, this is the first one in the federal judiciary. So we've -- the staff who put it all together worked very hard on it, and I appreciate what they've done, but I expect fully that we will continue that, and so for the next public hearing, I would hope that we could continue to have both the call-in line like this but

also a way that people could watch it on YouTube. It can't be recorded on YouTube. It's simply a livestream. So it's really just a question of what -- which venue people want to use and also our assumption that the members of the public who do listen will follow the rules and will not use other means to record or broadcast the proceeding, and in court, we rely on lawyers following the rules because they do, and so we're hoping also that the members of the public will follow those rules because we appreciate the ability to make this available as we have.

So with all of that said, then court is in recess. Thank you, all, very much. That concludes this hearing.

(Proceedings concluded at 12:08 p.m.)

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 46 inclusive.

Dated at St. Louis, Missouri, this 24th day of September, 2020.

/s/ Gayle D. Madden

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