Public Board Meeting
of the Civilian Complaint Review Board
Wednesday, August 13, 2014
10:21 a.m.
100 Church Street, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10007

RICHARD D. EMERY, ESQ., CHAIR

TRACY CATAPANO-FOX, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA:

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Adoption of the Minutes
- 3. Report from Chair
- 4. Report from Executive Director
- 5. Committee Reports
- 6. Old Business
- 7. New Business
- 8. Public Comment

STENO-KATH REPORTING SERVICES, LTD.

139 MAMARONECK AVENUE

MAMARONECK, NEW YORK 10543

212.95.DEPOS (953.3767) * 914.381.2061

FACSIMILE: 914.722.0816

EMAIL: stenokath@verizon.net

		2
1	BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT WERE:	
2	Richard D. Emery, Esq., Chair	
3	Bishop Mitchell G. Taylor	
4	Tracy Catapano-Fox, Esq.	
5	Toscano J. Simonetti	
6	Joseph A. Puma	
7	Youngik Yoon, Esq.	
8	Alphonzo Grant, Jr., Esq.	
9	Jules A. Martin, Esq.	
10	David G. Liston, Esq.	
11	Rudolph Landin, Esq.	
12	James Donlon, Esq.	
13	Dr. Mohammed Khalid	
14	Daniel M. Gitner, Esq.	
15	Janette Cortes-Gomez, Esq.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIR RICHARD D. EMERY: Good morning. Let's get everybody seated and let's call the order, the August Board Meeting of the Civilian Complaint Review Board and start with adoption of the minutes. I guess we have the minutes in our folder. You know what, let's hold off on the adoption of the minutes because I haven't had the chance to review these minutes from last -- are these the minutes from the July meeting or from the special meeting?

MS. TRACY CATAPANO-FOX: July.

CHAIR EMERY: From the July meeting. Let's hold off on that for a minute because I'd like to give people a chance to look at them before we vote on that, all right? Good.

And then we're starting with a report from the Chair. I guess that would not be the new business. But let me report on a few things and then we'll get to new business with some interesting developments, I think.

The main report I want to give at this point is that we have created subcommittees consistent with our discussions at last week's special meeting. And these subcommittees are made up of a chair from the board, some Board Members and some staff members.

And they are a refinement of prior existing

subcommittees that will address some of the initiatives that we talked about in the last meeting hopefully coming up with specific policies, rule changes and initiatives to implement these ideas.

And the subcommittees are as follows -- and we're trying to keep these subcommittees on a relatively tight schedule where they have deadlines for themselves that they will set for themselves and be approved by me and the executive director. And we'll facilitate this process so it moves quickly because I really am anxious to make the changes that we are looking forward to and hopefully can make. As within a couple of months, I'm really aiming for a couple of months to have policies in place that are going to dramatically change the way a lot of aspects of this agency that work is handled.

So the first committee is the Mediation

Committee and that committee is going to be chaired by Jules Martin, and the members will be Janette

Cortes-Gomez and Jim Donlon from the Board, and Lisa

Cohen and Rosemarie Espinal will be the staff people who will be working on that committee. Is that satisfactory to everyone? Are you okay with that committee? Everybody's agreed? I hope I haven't drafted people without their consent, but now's the

time to speak up if you don't want to do it.

MS. JANETTE CORTES-GOMEZ: Well, I don't think there's a problem per say with ours, with the Mediation. But if it's okay with Jules, I would love to run this group.

CHAIR EMERY: If Jules wants to defer --

MR. JULES A. MARTIN: I'm a soldier. I'll defer. Let me just say that Janette and Jim and I have worked together for quite some time so I know her skill set. She's extremely smart and she knows the subject matter.

CHAIR EMERY: Good.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MARTIN: And I would be happy to be a part of the committee and I would work just as hard as if I was the head.

CHAIR EMERY: I really appreciate your stepping up and saying that you'd like to do that. That's great. Thanks a lot. Great.

MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Absolutely. Thank you.

MR. JAMES DONLON: I'll join in what Jules said.

I think that's a good idea.

CHAIR EMERY: Well, you were just a soldier anyway. But thanks, Jim.

(Laughter.)

MR. TOSCANO J. SIMONETTI: Mr. Chairman, I may

be ahead of you a little bit, but in looking at the members on each of the committees, I don't think we have one from each of the three classifications that we come from; in other words, police representative, City Council, and mayoral. I think on some of these, and I could be wrong, but I think they have --

CHAIR EMERY: You're right.

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. SIMONETTI: Was that done on purpose?

CHAIR EMERY: No. It wasn't done on purpose. This was done -- these committees were selected by people who either volunteered or because we thought that they would be good and we asked them. And I do think that for these purposes, for development of policy and rules, we don't need to have the usual composition of Panels. We just are doing this by availability, by inclination and by volunteerism. And everything in this that comes out of this is going to be a subject for each board member to comment on before anything is implemented. Nothing is going to happen here until everybody gets a chance to either go along with it or object or refine or be constructive about it. So I think in that vein, in that spirit, we don't need to reconstruct them consistent with the way the Panels

are constructed. If that's all right, Tony.

MR. SIMONETTI: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: And Tony, in totality, all of the board members are on a subcommittee. Some are on more than one. But the entire Board is constituting the makeup of the committees.

CHAIR EMERY: So the second is the Complaint Priority Intake and the subcommittee chair is Al Grant. Members are Tony Simonetti and Bishop Taylor from the Board. Staff members are Jayne Cifuni, Jon Darche, Marcos Soler, Denis McCormick and Roger Smith, all of whom are very much in the -- this is a very important committee and it seems to me there is a lot of subtlety to that process. And I think it's going to take -- and by the way, for these committee meetings I really don't think everybody has to be there. I want to move this forward. If somebody can't be there, the chair should move these committees into action. People can participate whether by phone or by Skype or they can follow up with e-mails and learn what was done in the committee and catch up. But I don't want this held up because of scheduling problems. I want to move the process of this. Obviously the end of August is a tough time to get things started, but certainly

R

early September we can have a very lockstep process to get this thing done.

What we've called Copstat, that is the evaluation of types of complaints by geography, by nature and by precinct or member by special command or other subcategory of the Police Department. That subcommittee is going to be chaired by Tony Simonetti. The members will be Dave Liston and Joe Puma. And the staff will be Marcos Soler and Denis McCormick.

MR. SIMONETTI: Mr. Chair, would we consider another title for that committee?

CHAIR EMERY: You know, that's all in play. What do you want to the call it?

MR. SIMONETTI: Well, I haven't decided yet but I got a lot of people looking at it for me.

CHAIR EMERY: The New York Post didn't like it.

MR. SIMONETTI: Excuse me?

CHAIR EMERY: The New York Post didn't like it.

MR. SIMONETTI: I don't like it because it kind of implies we're looking at negative things about cops.

CHAIR EMERY: My view is I'm agnostic on the name as long as it conveys what you're doing.

MR. SIMONETTI: And we'll bring it back to the

Board.

CHAIR EMERY: Sure.

The next one is the CCRB Compstat; in other words, the internal evaluation of processes within the CCRB and where resources have to be focused in order to avoid backlog, avoid any roadblocks in the processes of investigations and adjudications. That subcommittee is chaired by Rudy Landin. The members are Dr. Khalid and Dan Gitner and the staff is Brian Connell, Denis McCormick and Laura Edidin.

Public Reports, subcommittee already exists, Jim Donlon. Members are Youngik Yoon, Tony Simonetti. Staff is Marcos Soler and Linda Sachs.

The Investigations Committee already also exists and they're going to do work on reformulating, redesigning the investigations process and it's going to have a lot of overlap I think with number two, Complaint Priority. And for instance, also, I think Intake and Complaint Priority's going to have a lot of overlap with Opt-out Mediation or Mediation and also probably what we may or may not call Copstat. So there's going to be a lot of overlap. In fact, there may be times when the committee chairs believe that joint meetings should take place depending on how the actual writing of the policies

and rule changes are taken into effect.

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

Investigations is the current subcommittee, which is Dan Gitner. Members are Al Grant and David Liston. And the staff is Denis McCormick and Nina Mickens.

Outreach Committee is chaired by Bishop Taylor. Members are Joseph Puma and Dr. Khalid. The staff is going to be Carlmais Johnson and Jessica Long.

MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: And, Chair, I will speak to Bishop, but if in fact Bishop needs someone in particular, since I'm primarily in the Bronx, to assist with either the Bronx or in general --

CHAIR EMERY: Do you want to be on that committee?

MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: I would absolutely assist in that as well.

CHAIR EMERY: Do you want to be formally on that committee?

MS. CORTES-GOMEZ: Yes.

CHAIR EMERY: Okay. Let's add you to that committee, Janette. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: If you can turn the page back one, I would also like to be on the Investigations Committee.

CHAIR EMERY: Let's do that. Good. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

11

And then we're going to also create a committee we didn't talk about last time that came out of a conversation that I had with Dan Gitner, which we're going to call a Sanctions Guidelines Committee, where we're going to try and rationalize to the extent possible and even perhaps coordinate with the PD where appropriate, to determine where that may become appropriate what kind of predictions -- we're not going to call it sentencing guidelines because that's not what it is. But I think some sense, Dan, is of where -- what kinds of things deserve what kind of responses from us and especially that also I think will overlap to some degree with what we've called Copstat so far because I think guidelines change in response to conditions and circumstances. So that's going to be a very interesting and difficult, I think, committee but a very rewarding one, I hope, if we can come up with something that gives Panels a sense of how they should operate once they decide there's a substantiation.

MR. DANIEL M. GITNER: Right.

CHAIR EMERY: That committee will be Dan chairing. Members will be Joseph Puma and Rudy Landin. And the staff will be Tracy and Denise Alvarez.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So that's the idea of trying to structure some significant changes. In that regard, I want to follow through -- I didn't ask you this, Tracy -but we had basically all agreed that we're going to have rotating Panels for looking at cases once they've been fully investigated. And what I want to do is refine that a little bit and I think it's the only way it makes sense. I didn't mean to imply that Panels would be random for each case. Panels will be random for each month so that a Panel can sit and talk about a number of cases. But every month there will be a new set of Panels so that those cases assigned to a particular Panel will be handled by a different group that comprises that Panel each month. But the whole set of cases will go to a particular Panel each month. I think that turns out to be just as random as what may have been implied by my harebrained approach initially.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: That's perfect.

CHAIR EMERY: The other thing that I think we're going to do very quickly and immediately, and this is more in the nature of an experiment and it goes along with the committee on Investigations and Intake, is Denis and internally with any input from the outside from anybody who wants to try and tell

us what they think the best ideas are, they're going to try and reform and redesign the intake form so that intake is described, when a complaint comes in, described in much more detail and categories of alleged misconduct and alleged activity are noted on the intake form and can be checked off as part of the information. This is very important for, ultimately, for data gathering. It's important for evaluating the priorities stuff when we get to that committee. It's important that we get this information.

Right now we're not capturing the information that I believe we should be capturing. And there's no reason for a committee to design this in its initial phases. There's a lot that can be done along the lines of the breakdown of various categories of alleged misconduct in the Executive Director's report. We could start with that template and work from there as to all the things that are alleged by a complainant as to the events that led to the complaint.

So Denis is going to take a primary role in pushing that, and I think we do this internally at this point with Tracy and Denis and whoever they want to bring into it. It would be great if Roger

Smith was in on this as well and whoever else inside is appropriate. Tracy, you can decide that. But it strikes me that we should be changing that quickly.

And I, again, emphasize, if people have ideas, Chris and others have ideas, about specifics of what we should be capturing in the initial complaint, I would like to have those so that we begin to redesign this intake form in ways that are helpful to refining what we know about the initial complaint at the earliest possible stage so that evaluation and resources can be devoted appropriately to the complaints that warrant them right from the beginning.

Also, that initial complaint, in my view, probably not right now but very shortly when we can figure out where the resources are going to come from, should have a process for describing mediation and scheduling mediation on the first call. Maybe that schedule will hold. Maybe it won't. But we're going to do our darnedest, especially when the police officer is identified, to schedule mediation upfront and have the resources to hold to that schedule so that mediation can be undertaken within literally two or three weeks. And there are ideas about capturing information for mediation that we

have, but we'll talk about that separately.

So I can also just report that the chokehold -and maybe Tracy will talk about this more -- the
chokehold study is in progress. I hope to have it
for distribution by the first week in September.
And I think prior to that, we should have the video,
bystander video, the video discussion -- the report
ready for distribution hopefully by the last week of
August or thereabout. And Tracy may want to say
more about that.

I think that's all I have before your report.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good
morning, everyone.

In July of 2014, the CCRB received 442 complaints within its jurisdiction. This is 68 fewer complaints than in the same period in 2013 when the Agency received 510 complaints. The total intake for the month of July in 2014 was 1,218 cases. The Board closed 465 cases in July, a total of 2,907 year-to-date. In the first seven months of this year the Board closed 1,078 full investigations, including 155 substantiated complaints. Year-to-date the substantiation rate is 14.4 percent.

In July, civilians and officers mediated

14 cases. Year-to-date, the Agency has mediated 95 cases. In July, the Agency closed 18 cases as mediation attempted and for this year the Board has closed 101 cases as mediation attempted.

The numbers for June 2014 were adjusted, as we've reported in the past. We initially reported 517 complaints and now we can report 488 complaints. The numbers in total for the year were also adjusted to reflect this. The total number of complaints received from January through June is 2,703, not 2,739 as originally reported. And again, the reason for that is that when a complaint comes in initially, we act on the allegations as we see them at that time. Sometimes when a complainant comes in and gives a full statement, we determine that it is not within the agency's jurisdiction, but there are changes reflected in our numbers because of that.

The detailed monthly statistical report includes two forms of reporting, as we've been doing for the past few months. The first report on page 8 is the truncation rate and the second report on page 9 is the case resolution rate. And again, the significant difference in those two is that the complaint withdrawn cases are included within the case resolution rate, where as the truncation rate

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

17

they are separated out. From January through July, the amended truncation rate excluding cases closed as complaint withdrawn, as I said, was 47 percent. Within the same period in 2013, the truncation rate was 57 percent. And from January through July of 2014 the case resolution rate was 44 percent whereas for the same period in 2013 the case resolution rate was 33 percent.

The Agency's docket at the end of July 31st of 2014 was 2,605 cases. This is a 2-percent decrease from June of 2014 when we were at 2,662. by the date the CCRB receives a complaint, 94 percent of our open investigations stem from complaints filed within the last year and 66 percent were filed within the last four months. Out of the 2,605 five open cases, 548 cases are awaiting Panel review; that's 21 percent of our docket; 1,834 are being investigated, that is 70 percent of our docket; and 223 cases are in the Mediation Unit, which is 9 percent. By date of the incident, 12 cases in the CCRB's open docket were 18-months or This is .5 percent of our open docket and 1 older. fewer than we had in June of 2014 -- I'm sorry, 2013.

The breakdown for July of 2014 of the statute of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

limitations cases is as follows: 5 cases are currently pending Board review. Out of these cases, 1 case was previously returned by the Board for further investigation, 1 case was reopened, and 2 cases were filed late. The statute of limitation crime exception applies in 3 of these cases. Of the remaining 7 open investigations, the statute of limitations crime exception applies to 6 out of the 7, 3 cases are currently on DA hold, 3 cases were filed months after the date of the incident, and 1 case was reopened months after it was originally closed.

In June of 2014, the NYPD closed 3 substantiated cases involving 4 officers. Of these 4 officers, 1 was found guilty and lost 3 vacation days, the Department declined to prosecute 1 case against one officer, and the statute of limitations expired in 1 case involving 2 officers.

In June, the Department's disciplinary action rate was 25 percent, and year-to-date it's 58.5 percent. I'm sorry, in June the rate was -- yeah.

In July of 2014, the Board substantiated 12 cases with a recommendation of charges and specifications. These cases have been forwarded to the Administrative Prosecution Unit and at the end

of July, the open docket for APU was 215 cases. In 1 case, the Police Commissioner disapproved a plea agreement and we're awaiting the final disposition on that case; in 25 cases, pleas have been entered and were awaiting final approval by the PC; in 3 cases a trial verdict was rendered and is awaiting approval by the Police Commissioner; in 25 cases trials were completed and we're awaiting verdicts from the Deputy Commissioner of Trials; in 9 cases we've had trials commence but not completed; 43 trials were scheduled; 29 cases are calendared for court appearances; 44 are awaiting initial court appearance after charges have been served; in 13 cases charges have been filed but awaiting service; and 23 cases are awaiting the filing of charges.

The Police Commissioner finalized 2 APU pleas in July of 2014. In the first case, the Police Commissioner was consistent with the plea agreement and imposed a forfeiture of 15 vacation days. In the second case, the respondent entered into a plea agreement with APU in which he agreed to plea nolo contendere to their unlawful stop of a person and accept the forfeiture of 5 vacation days but the Police Commissioner disapproved the plea and dismissed the charge against the respondent. The

2.2

APU statistics also reflected 1 additional plea finalized by the Police Commissioner in June of 2014 but was not previously reported. In that case, the Police Commissioner accepted the respondent's plea of guilty but increased the penalty from 8 to 10 forfeited vacation days.

In July 2014, the Police Commissioner retained

1 APU case and declined to take any disciplinary
action against the respondent. Last month we
reported that the Police Commissioner had retained

2 respondent APU cases but we did not report the final
determination with regards to the penalty. We now
can report that the Police Commissioner had ordered
both respondents to receive formalized training from
the Department's legal bureau regarding automobile
searches.

In terms of an update on the studies, the chokehold study is continuing. There are a number of cases that are being reviewed by staff and I have to highly commend our staff for the hard work they're doing. They are virtually reviewing all audio, all statements made, to provide us with a full and complete report to the Chair. We're hoping, as the Chair indicated, to have that by the first week of September, if not, the last week of

August. The video bystander report is almost completed. I have to thank Sarah Peterson for the tremendous amount of work that she's done on this to put together an excellent report with regard to the cases we found, and at this point we will have a draft for the Chair's review by the end of the day and we will be able to show it to the Board so the Reports and Recommendations Committee can make its discussions and comments so that we will have something for the Board for certain by the end of this month.

CHAIR EMERY: Any comments or thoughts on anything so far in the meeting?

(No response.)

2.4

CHAIR EMERY: Okay.

Next, committee reports. Are there any committee reports? We're redesigning this whole committee process so I understand, if there are none, it makes perfect sense. I think the committee reports section in future meetings is going to be probably a very active portion of our public meetings in the future. But anybody have anything to say about current committees? Yes, Bishop?

BISHOP TAYLOR: Does the APU Unit still exist, the committee for APU?

CHAIR EMERY: It does. It just wasn't part of the changes; although, I'm about to say something, make a proposal, that I'm hoping the Board will adopt which directly affects APU, although it wasn't subject for the committee.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay.

CHAIR EMERY: But it may be that the committee will have a lot of say in the wake of what we're about to talk about.

BISHOP TAYLOR: No, I just didn't see it on the list.

CHAIR EMERY: Yes, you're right. It's not on this list. The APU Committee is a standing committee and it remains.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Okay, all right.

CHAIR EMERY: There's been nothing done by the Board to abolish it or change its composition. So I assume we are standing by the APU Unit.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: These are your subcommittees
I think that you wanted to start implementing and
you wanted the Board to approve. I think that the
committees that existed before such as Operations,
APU, the IT Committee, are still in existence and
there's been no change.

BISHOP TAYLOR: But Outreach is not a

1 subcommittee. 2 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: No, it's a regular committee. 3 BISHOP TAYLOR: Yes, so it's listed as well. 4 CHAIR EMERY: Because there's some new -- I 5 mean, Dr. Khalid and others had very strong ideas 6 about that and so we want to activate that Outreach 7 Committee. But you're right. 8 Just as a point of BISHOP TAYLOR: clarification, subcommittees are committees. 9 10 know, that's all. 11 CHAIR EMERY: The terminology, I think, is not 12 that critical here because all of these committees 13 or subcommittees are going to be acting on policy 14 and trying to change the way we are to become more

BISHOP TAYLOR: Exactly. Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you.

Well, in that vein, are there any committee reports from the standing committees that have not been discussed as subcommittees prior to earlier in the meeting?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: Nothing? Okay.

DR. KHALID: Mr. Chair, do we have to vote on these

committees as a board?

effective.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIR EMERY: These subcommittees? I think -- Well, yes. Let's make a motion to adopt the subcommittee structures that we announced earlier.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Point of information, I think that the chair has the authority to appoint committees and there's no need for a vote.

CHAIR EMERY: Well, if there's any question about it, I don't want anybody to -- if anybody has any doubts about it, they should express them now. Otherwise, I take it we have a unanimous agreement that these subcommittees should be constituted. And for the record, they are as comprised as previously discussed.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Mr. Chair, you can have a motion made to create the committees knowing that you have the authority to put on who you wish to on the committees.

CHAIR EMERY: I don't think it's necessary at this point -- well, let's do it as a matter of formality. Anybody want to move the subcommittees?

MR. GITNER: So moved.

MR. DAVID LISTON: I think it's an important power that the chair has and I'm not so sure you want to create a precedent where every time you want to create a committee you have to go to the Board.

And I think so long as it's understood that these subcommittees exist but they don't necessarily replace existing standing committees, as we said, to my view that that's well within your discretion.

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

CHAIR EMERY: All right. Let's leave it that way and not do it. I don't want to set a precedence that dilutes my power.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Mr. Chair, I just want to mention two things. The Chair, we met with the Deputy Commissioner of Trials, Rosemarie Maldonado, myself, the Chief of APU, Laura Edidin, and the Deputy Chief Jon Darche. We met last week with her and her Staff Captain Muglia. It was a very productive meeting and we discussed different ways that we can work to create a more formalized and efficient process within the courtrooms at 1PP. The Chair also met with the executive staff, with the new IG Phil Eure. So we want to discuss that. But we did have a meeting with the IG and his deputy in order to discuss the agency operations, to inform them of the goals of the agency and the direction that we're moving, and I believe that was a very collaborative productive meeting as well.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR EMERY: I think, actually, isn't it, if I'm not mistaken, under Local Law 70, the creation of the IG there's a mandate to cooperate, but we don't need a mandate. We are going to be completely transparent with the IG. We're going to be supportive in every way possible. We'll figure out ways that he has access to our data as long as it doesn't compromise individuals' privacy interests. And he will have and his office will have complete and utter cooperation from every aspect of the CCRB.

So new business. The first thing that I want to discuss under new business, maybe the only thing --I don't know -- we'll see how this develops.

So I had a 2-hour meeting last night, yesterday evening, with the Police Commissioner and the entire upper-level staff that handles disciplinary processes in the Police Department. All of us agreed that this system is broke -- I guess would be a word that you could use -- it's too complicated, too crazy, too confused, and not by definition because it's so complicated and so -- the word is messy and unpredictable in certain ways. But we all agree that it needs change and reform.

And to that end, the Police Commissioner agreed and the staff agreed that they're going to put

2.7

together a small group and we're going to put together a small group that would be a group of Dan Gitner, myself and Roger Smith who will meet together to look at trying to rationalize the entire interaction between CCRB and discipline so that it is understood that CCRB discipline is first-class discipline, not second-class discipline, as compared to discipline within the Department and the IAB discipline and that we are trying to figure out ways that are going to be much more transparent to everybody and clear to everybody how the decisions are made with respect to discipline. That's going to be a project that I hope will go parallel to all these other projects that we've got underway.

But it's going to be, I think, an incredibly important communication so that the CCRB can begin to get the kind of respect from the Police

Department that in my view it has not had in the past with respect to its decisions on the facts and its sanctions recommendations. And the whole point here is to try and have the Police Department ultimately give much more deference to the processes of this agency because the processes of this agency are worthy of that deference. So that goes along with all the reforms within this agency we hope,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that will create credibility in the Police Department, and the Police Department will then views us not as an adversary but as a viable and collaborative form of discipline that comes from the citizenry, that comes from the community, and that's fair to cops and fair to complainants. And that therefore, it will be a change of attitude towards the recommendations that come across the street from us to the PD.

I think it was a -- the spirit of the meeting was great. Let's see whether it will translate into meaningful change. But I do think that Commissioner Bratton feels that this whole disciplinary process is broken and is bent on fixing it and making it more, first of all, transparent and more rational at every level. He wants to serve the purpose of making sure the community gets its due response when it makes complaints, when people make complaints, that they get appropriate responses. And he also wants to make sure cops are treated fairly so that morale is not destroyed by what cops sometimes believe is an unfair disciplinary process. Obviously this will never be perfect but it's something that I think can be improved immensely.

In that vein, any comments about that first

before we --

MR. LISTON: Mr. Chair, just a question. It seems to me at least it would be important to have someone from the APU at these meetings, our Prosecutions Unit. They're very much part of the sanctions. They'll be making plea negotiations related to them. It's just a suggestion respectfully.

CHAIR EMERY: Yes. That may be right. That's a very good suggestion, David, and let me think about it. I'm trying to keep the meetings as small as possible. Roger is a fount of information, which is probably unequaled, as far as I can tell, in this agency. So I'm kind of relying on him to bring to the table the APU interests. But you may be right. It may require some more specific APU presence.

Any other thoughts?

(No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: All right. At this point I wanted to introduce a proposed resolution for the Board.

That is something that came out of the meeting last night and I think it's an important and significant and immediate reform within the context of what we've just been talking about; namely, transparency,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

rationalizing sanctions and getting respect through the CCRB. And the thrust of it, I'll read it in a minute but let me try and explain it in advance.

Currently, typically when there are charges voted by a Panel and they go to the APU Unit to be brought over to the trial room at NYPD to be prosecuted, there has not been any negotiations of significance on reducing charges when that may be appropriate for reasons that are not necessarily apparent to the original Panel that voted charges. And in fact, the process -- the APU Unit has felt itself restricted and the Police Department has viewed it as restricted from negotiating prior to trial results in the nature of plea agreements.

When there have been plea agreements, those plea agreements for vacation days or whatever the disposition is, have been routinely altered by the Police Commissioner when he reviews them subsequently; and, therefore, there's this entire process which takes place between the respondent and this agency, which then is sabotaged, if you will, or undermined or thrown out by virtue of the Police Commissioner's final ruling with respect to his final responsibilities on dispositions.

That presented to me an opportunity, actually,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for change. And the opportunity presents the following proposal that we believe -- we don't have final commitment from the Commissioner yet but I do believe we will get final commitment from the Commissioner to undertake the following process: The process will be that when there are cases that are appropriate for pleading circumstances, and that can be informed by all kinds of factors that the prosecutor takes into account when he or she brings the case over to the trial bureau, and there are negotiations about pleas between APU and the If they can reach some kind of an respondent. agreement on an appropriate disposition of case and if the Department advocate office can also approve that agreement, then that agreement will be approved within the Police Department before there's a final plea agreement and will be approved within the Civilian Complaint Review Board by review of the Executive Director and the Chair at a minimum, and we may have a subcommittee created for review of And if both sides ultimately agree on a plea that. to dispose of a particular set the charges, that will be final. There will be no vacating of that plea or changing of that plea by the Police Commissioner later. In other words, the Police

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commissioner's approval will be front-loaded for a final plea. In other words, as a simple proposition, APU prosecutors will be treated like normal prosecutors. Grand juries vote indictments, charges are given to prosecutors to prosecute, along the way prosecutors negotiate with defense counsel, they make a deal, and the judge approves the deal and it's finalized.

The analogy here will be charges are issued by our grand jury, if you will, to use the metaphor, namely, the Panel, the charges will be given to APU, APU will take them over to the Police Department, and the respondent and APU will negotiate an agreement. If the agreement is one that is acceptable to the Department of Advocate's Office, running up their chain to make sure their approvals are all in place, and it's acceptable to our chain running up its approvals and those approvals are in place, then the deal will be final and there won't be any subsequent review by the Police Commissioner and all that work that now goes into cases, as I saw last night at the meeting, is for no -- under current situations is for not -- that whole process is going to be eliminated of Police Commissioner reducing deals that have been agreed to by

respondents, which I find to be extremely undermining of the CCRB function. The integrity of the CCRB function is, in my view, supported by this process which results in binding agreements on deals to the extent they can be made. If they can't be made, charges will go forward and the normal processes will take place. And of course the Police Commissioner will have final review under those circumstances. But we have a good faith commitment, I believe, and we will have it for this process from the Police Department so that we can finalize resolutions with APU deals with the respondent and DAO.

Any questions or thoughts about this before I read the resolution and ask for a motion? Make sense to everybody?

MR. DONLON: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR EMERY: It's something that I know that this board has wanted to do for a long time and sought this kind of -- I would call it power. And I'm glad that there seems to be receptivity for it and I think having previewed it a little bit with members of the board and there's certain context that there's a lot of support for it.

So what I propose is a resolution which says:

David.

"The Administrative Prosecutions Unit shall have the authority to negotiate pleas before trial, including the dismissal of charges with the offering of reduced dispositions including but not limited to instructions, command discipline and a negotiated penalty." And it's understood that to the extent that they have this power now to negotiate pleas that will be a final plea because it is approved by the Police Department and approved by this agency.

MR. LISTON: Just one thing, and I think it's a detail that can be worked out. But I take it there'll be some sort of oversight, if you will, on our end. In other words, do you want to leave this entirely up to the prosecutors themselves or does it go to the Chair and the Executive Director and perhaps the head of the APU, I would think, for the three of you perhaps to sit down and actually approve these? In other words, what's the -- we can figure that out but I think it's important.

CHAIR EMERY: I think the theory here is in the same way that on the police side the Police Commissioner's office is going to have to approve, we're going to have to approve. And the way I perceive it now, the Executive Director will bring

it to either me as Chair or some committee that the Board agrees on to approve so that every deal that is going to go forward has the same parallel kind of up-the-chain approval process on either side of the deal. That is DAO. I mean the respondents, that's up to them and their lawyers obviously. But it's the same with respect to the discipline that's going to be agreed to by the Police Department and that we're agreeing to potentially reduce charges to some approved final disposition. That will go up the ladder and we will -- my sense is is that that's a discussion we can have but it doesn't undermine the actual principle of this change.

MR. LISTON: No. Agreed. Right.

MR. SIMONETTI: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR EMERY: Yes?

2.0

MR. SIMONETTI: The provision of that proposal where you talk about it being reduced to command discipline --

CHAIR EMERY: A or B.

MR. SIMONETTI: That's my question. They're going to specify A or B? Because the level of penalties is different in both.

CHAIR EMERY: Yes, five days, or up to ten and up to five, right? Yes.

MR. SIMONETTI: So that will -- they're going to be able to specify the type of --

CHAIR EMERY: Right. The plea will be specific. And of course it will have to be done in open court, in a trial room, when it's finalized.

MR. LISTON: I think with the understanding and the details we worked out, there'll be some, as you mentioned, some level of internal review --

CHAIR EMERY: Right.

MR. LISTON: -- and some, I think, transparency in reporting is the hallmark of what you're trying to accomplish. And I think it will be important that we hear back as to what the stats are on this.

CHAIR EMERY: Of course. And your point that when we talked about this individually, the Panel getting the information is also, I think, very important because, as you say, as a learning experience, the Panel will get the information as to what the disposition is just as they do now when it's reduced. Now, I don't know whether there's a process for individual Panels to get their individual reductions. I know we report on reductions.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: We can do that. That's not a problem.

37 1 CHAIR EMERY: We should do that since it's not 2 being done now, apparently. 3 So I have a motion? 4 MR. SIMONETTI: (Makes a motion with the wave of 5 a hand.) 6 So moved. Second Tony's motion. MR. LISTON: 7 CHAIR EMERY: Okay. Second Tony's motion. 8 All in favor? 9 (Chorus of Ayes.) 10 CHAIR EMERY: Any opposed? 11 (No response.) 12 Thank you. I think that this is CHAIR EMERY: 13 going to create a sense of action on our part that 14 is going to be communicated in very positive ways 15 to the NYPD and it's going to get us, I hope, a 16 level of respect, which we haven't necessarily 17 enjoyed in the past. 18 DR. KHALID: I think it's going to add more 19 teeth to the CCRB. 20 CHAIR EMERY: Well, in some form. I mean, 21 ultimately they have the right to not agree to a 22 plea even if the respondent wants it, right? But at 23 least it will be final. It won't be this charade of 24 having a deal that is not a deal. Right?

ultimately just up to the Police Commissioner to

25

either decide is a deal or not. And we shouldn't be subject to higher authority once a deal is a deal.

MR. LISTON: If I may, Mr. Chair?

CHAIR EMERY: Sure.

MR. LISTON: I think this is a testament to the prosecution unit that we have and the prosecutors that we have giving them the discretion and recognizing that they have the good judgment and they're hired for their good judgment and they've got the experience coming out of DA's offices for the most part and U.S. attorneys' offices to make these sorts of calls. And I think it's a testament to our confidence.

CHAIR EMERY: I totally agree. The notion of putting a prosecutor in and not letting him or her have the discretion to make a deal which does justice but pursues the highest charge seems to be silly, and we're trying to do exactly what you're saying.

MR. SIMONETTI: Mr. Chairman, as a point of information, does anyone know or have a ballpark figure for how many negotiated pleas there are coming out of the five district attorneys' offices percentage-wise or the federal prosecutors in New York?

CHAIR EMERY: Those statistics are published all the time and it varies a lot by county. But it's always over 50 percent but it's usually in the 80s and 90s. I think some counties are -- Bronx for a while was a little lower. But my recollection of just reading this stuff is that pleas are the norm rather than the exception.

MR. SIMONETTI: And this will become part of our semiannual and annual reports?

CHAIR EMERY: Absolutely. I mean, this is going to be certainly a significant subcategory, that is, pleas not subject to Police Commissioner approval as something that we are tracking.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Mr. Chair, I also think this may be a precursor to cases that are not given to the APU, if there's some kind of mechanism that can be developed or devised to finalize determinations on cases that are not recommended for charges so they're not kicked back.

CHAIR EMERY: I completely agree with you, and that's hopefully what Dan Gitner, Roger Smith and I are going to accomplish when we go over there and meet with them. I was trying to get an overall sense. This is just a tiny little piece as I see it of an attempt. The parameters of which I haven't

conceived or -- and I'd love to hear other people's ideas about how this process should work. I haven't figured out how it should work even in my own mind for purposes of discussion. I'm completely at sea on this because it's so ridiculously complex and there's so many factors sort of playing into this. And then there's this ultimate overriding authority which makes everything, all this work, kind of meaningless.

So we have to come to a system where discipline is discipline and it's not just some kind of recommendation to a higher authority. That's the goal. Now, how you do that exactly, when that higher authority clearly has the statutory right and the underlying right to do that, it means that Commissioner Bratton or any police commissioner has to buy into a different process. But that seems to me to be something that we're going to try and explore. You know, that's the idea of looking at this thing. It's the old right. It's the very regrettable Vietnam metaphor, "Sometimes you have to destroy the town to save it," which is terrible. But it's kind of, like, maybe we should be starting from the ground up.

MR. ALPHONZO A. GRANT, JR.: Mr. Chair, I think

this is excellent and definitely in the right direction. And along the same lines of us making a board resolution, just so that, for posterity sake, we have something binding the two groups together, is there something that can be added to the MOU amended in some form or way?

CHAIR EMERY: It may be. When we get their version of agreement, right, then I think we determine how it should be memorialized. And it may be the MOU, it may be just in the memorandum of understanding, but it has to become part of the culture for it to really work, right? I mean, we're not going to be here forever and we want these kind of changes to be here as an institutional change so the prosecutors get the responsibility they deserve, and that they should exercise as a matter of justice.

MR. GRANT, JR.: Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: Any other thoughts at this point? (No response.)

CHAIR EMERY: So now that we've put all this out on the table, let's hear from the people here in the room. I'm going to go by the list if I can and then if other people want to be added on the list at the end, we'll certainly allow that to occur.

Jose LaSalle is the first person that wanted to talk.

MR. JOSE LASALLE: Hi. My name is Jose LaSalle. I'm the co-founder of Copwatch Patrol Unit. We've been active for approximately three years and we patrol -- well, I have guys patrolling all five boroughs and now we are patrolling the 120th Precinct because of the issue of Eric Garner, so I put a lot of the guys that I do have available there.

Basically, our problem and our issue is and has been with CCRB is we ourselves, we file complaints. We walk around with patrol guys and whatever we see officers doing that they're not supposed to be doing, they're using a phone or doing what they target people for outside in the street, for spitting. Basically everything they target people out there, we also file complaints against them. We file with the CCRB and let CCRB send it to whatever area that they need to send it to that's going to deal with it.

I myself filed close to 30-something complaints. A lot of them, it takes 3 to 4 or 5 or 6 to almost a year before they even come out with any type of decision the majority of times. Everything we

2.2

basically have, we have videos, we document it with videos. So it's not like we don't have videos to show and prove that what we're saying is exactly what happened. And a lot of times it's even overlooked by the CCRB. I'm hoping that now that Emery's here maybe y'all take a different position on making sure that these things are evaluated a little more closer than it has been evaluated.

Another thing that we have is that nothing has stopped within the community of color. People are still being harassed every single day. When they file a complaint to the CCRB, CCRB calls these people back and a lot of them feel like they're being interrogated over the phone because they're asked, like, a thousand questions. If there is another method, invite them down here, have them come with whatever evidence they have, and let them speak to y'all here instead of over the phone because it's becoming -- it's pushing a lot of people away, because we get a lot of those brothers and sisters out there coming to us telling us about that.

And another thing that I want to talk about is dealing with now -- dealing with your position, or your new position now, a lot of us in the community

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

44

and a lot of police brutality activists, we feel that since you and Commissioner Bill Bratton had a relationship in LA, you as his lawyer, we feel kind of uncomfortable of how independent you're going to be in making your decision, especially since you and Bill Bratton had some type of relationship in the past. So we are very, very, very, very afraid that there ain't really much going to change because of that. That's one.

And also dealing with how about signing, making, creating some type of committee that involves the community that's really affected. I mean, it's sad for me to be here. And I don't see nobody in the community that's affected here. This is supposed to be a public meeting. Maybe the timing is wrong or maybe it's purposely done so people in the community won't come. I don't know. You know what I'm This is just me just putting it out there. So maybe somewhere along the line y'all should have these type of meetings taking place at a time where people in the community can actually come, because people have to work and it's hard for a lot of people, especially in poor communities, that are affected by police brutality, police harassment, that are dehumanized every single day, left

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

45

traumatized every single day, for them to come and be part of this because they have kids and they have to work. So there's somewhere along the lines y'all have to be flexible enough to allow the people in the community to be part of this because early in the morning at 10 o'clock, you're not allowing the people in the community to be part of this.

And one last thing that I do want to emphasize is, that -- another thing is the district attorneys in these precinct community meetings, they send a district attorney there to sit among these meetings, because I go to these meetings, and I go -- I'm trying to change the environment and have the people in the community come and complain about issues of dealing with police harassment, things of that Maybe you could have someone from your board or assign someone to also be at these committees so if people have an issue they can come and talk to one of y'all. You know what I'm saying? So if y'all was to do something like that, I think it will start changing the environment of how the relationship between CCRB and the community is, because the relationship with the CCRB and the community is not as you believe it is. People do not trust y'all. People believe that you're

truthless because everything that y'all actually have has not really put the fear of -- let these officers know that, "If you do something wrong, you're going to be held accountable and there's no ifs or buts about it." Y'all do not send that message out there. So when we have police officers -- we recorded hundreds of videos and every single day we record videos, police officers say to themselves, "CCRB, they're a joke. I ain't worried about them." These are all things that's capturing on video. I mean, I can give y'all my website with all these videos and the YouTube and you could see for yourself that it's not something I'm making up.

So there's got to be somewhere along the line where y'all have the strength and power or the ability to show these officers that you're not playing around, that y'all actually got the people's back, that you're not just here creating some Hollywood type of scene just so people could know that y'all exist, but actually something that will produce actual -- that will produce actual -- that people will feel comfortable to say, "I believe in the CCRB." But in reality, ain't nobody in the community have no faith in y'all. So somewhere along the line you have to correct that and give us

that faith that we need to have that faith in y'all. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR EMERY: Let me just say a couple things.

Obviously we want to have the faith of the community and earn it. And a lot of the things that I think we've been talking about, making changes, are addressing that sort of hope that we can establish and earn faith in people in the complaint process.

MR. LASALLE: Time will tell.

CHAIR EMERY: Yeah, exactly, time will tell. I agree with you. A lot of what you said is about Outreach and I really do think that Outreach is a huge opportunity for this agency to do much more than it has in the past. The idea of being at committee meetings in the precincts is a very good one. Having availability to take complaints and interview people not only here, because it's hard to get down here and it's a lot of dislocation, people complain about having to come all the way down here -- but having in the boroughs and throughout the city, having the opportunity to make complaints as well as do interviews is important.

Interrogation is, I'm afraid, a bit of a necessary evil because you've got to get the facts

and a vague description doesn't get us anywhere. So there's going to be an element of interrogation to the interviews that gather information. And I can understand why people won't particularly like that but if they want to pursue something that's effective, that's part of what a witness has to go through.

MR. LASALLE: I meant over the phone.

CHAIR EMERY: I understand. Over the phone you have to get as much data and information quickly so that we can figure out that it's an important complaint or one that's less important, or if it's that resources have to be focused.

The whole intake in priority process I think is going to be critical to you. If you have things that are, a video that are part of something compelling, and a part of the intake in priority process is going to be when the evidence is really good, like with video, we want to emphasize those. We want to get rid of those cases quickly one way or the other because we have good evidence. And that is something that hasn't necessarily happened in the past. That's one of the priorities, really good reliable evidence.

So you're right, time will tell. And my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

49

relationship with Brat- -- I mean, I've been a civil rights lawyer for my entire career. commitment -- I've handled many hundreds, maybe thousands, many hundreds at least, police cases against police officers. So that has to speak more loudly than my relationship with Bratton. relationship with Bratton, which is well-known, it wasn't from LA. I didn't have anything to do with him in LA. It was when he was back in New York previously, and crime was through the roof. And my relationship with him was friendly, and I'm counting on that relationship as an opportunity because as I said before, the Police Department has the final authority over discipline. So we want to make that work and so he's investing in us to make sure the disciplinary process is going to work in a way it never has before. But ultimately, time will tell.

BISHOP TAYLOR: Can Carlmais say something about Outreach? Because we've gone to a lot of these meetings that Jose just brought up.

CHAIR EMERY: Yes, please.

MS. JOHNSON: Hi. So I'm the Manager of
Community Outreach. So I actually just wanted to, I
guess, respond. So we have actually been at a
precinct council meeting. We went to the first

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

50

precinct council meeting. One of the issues is that we have limited resources. For the majority of the year, I was the only person in the unit. We now have another individual.

We've actually gone to the majority of the community board meetings and we've actually started a process that we call CCRB in the Boroughs. what CCRB in the Boroughs does is it actually gives a space in the community so people don't have to come to Manhattan. So they can actually go out in the community and file complaints, also learn about our agency. We have, actually, investigators that are present there during the CCRB in the Boroughs events so that people can file complaints or actually give a statement for another case without coming down to our agency. We've actually scheduled those times so that they're in the late afternoon so that they're usually around 3:00 to 4:00 up until 8:00 in the evening so that people who have jobs will be able to go to those events.

Just in this month alone we did two events. We did one in Queens with Immigrant Movement
International, and that's in Flushing, Queens. And we also did another one at the Council Member's office, Councilman Andrew Cohen in the Bronx.

So we actually have a space for people to come out. Right now we're in talks with Councilwoman Debi Rose in Staten Island and also Inez Barron in Brooklyn to have a CCRB in the Boroughs events there. And we're also speaking with clergymen in Brooklyn to be able to have events at some of the religious organizations as well.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you.

Chris, I think you're next.

MR. GRANT, JR.: Mr. Chair, before we move on, I don't know if the Board has ever considered this, but picking up on what the gentleman said, can we consider having an evening meeting, seeing if that works?

CHAIR EMERY: Absolutely.

MR. GRANT, JR.: A 6:30 meeting, or something like that.

CHAIR EMERY: I'd prefer it. I would like to do it, that way I think we can have meetings In the boroughs and other venues. I think Dr. Khalid is going to lead us in that regard and we're going to make -- my dream is to have -- I don't know if this makes any sense at all -- but my dream is to have CCRB vans where they go to the places where geographically we determine the most complaints are

coming from. And they're there and they can take complaints and they can have investigators taking actual investigative reports. You know, whether we can make that happen, whether the budget's there for that, I'd love to have a group of those. They can do mediations in the vans, they can do all kinds of things in the communities where people are and have difficulty getting here.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: There was a precedent for that in the court system as well. They courts have invested in what they call roving complaints and orders of protection and they have judges on call where people can come from the community right to these vehicles. And it's huge. But it's adapted to have the technological ability to contact judges and do orders of protection, get complaints and (inaudible).

CHAIR EMERY: You need one of those BlueTEC

Mercedes that goes around with the police escort.

Who's in that Tony? Who's in that Mercedes BlueTEC

van that goes around with the escort?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Not you.

MR. SIMONETTI: Unfortunately, no.

CHAIR EMERY: The cameras and (inaudible) didn't get to that?

1 MR. SIMONETTI: No. We didn't get to that. 2 CHAIR EMERY: Chris, sorry. 3 MR. DUNN: It's quite all right. A lot of 4 activity for an August meeting. It's nice to see 5 everybody here. 6 CHAIR EMERY: You know what we need? A podium. 7 I don't like Chris without a podium. I'm used to 8 Chris with a podium, not standing around. 9 For the next meeting, let's get a podium 10 where people could get up. 11 MR. LISTON: He's okay without a podium. 12 CHAIR EMERY: I know he's okay. It unnerves me. 13 MR. DUNN: Okay. So I'm going to skip a lot of 14 the usual stuff about the report, but I did have a 15 couple of questions. 16 You mentioned, Tracy, there was a recommendation 17 for 5 days and then the case was dismissed. On the 18 report, there's a report of a dismissal. Is this a 19 dismissal of an officer or your case being dismissed? 20 21 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: No, it's the case being dismissed. 22 23 Okay. You need to correct the MR. DUNN: 24 report. Everyone's going to think a cop got

fired arising out of a CCRB complaint, which would

25

be a very big deal.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Could you just tell me what page?

MR. DUNN: It's the last page, the back of it.

I got very excited there for a moment. I said,

"What did this cop do to get a 5-day recommendation
from CCRB and then got terminated?"

There was no committee report about this but the semiannual report?

CHAIR EMERY: The semiannual report is coming out shortly.

MR. DUNN: That's the report. I look forward to seeing it.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: It should be out by the end of this month. We have a draft, again, going with the video bystander to the Chair, disseminating it to the Reports and Recommendations Committee.

MR. DUNN: Richard, you have not heard this before but everyone else has, and I just want to say getting the reports out quickly is important. The Board did a great job this year at getting the annual report out much more quickly. So good for you. The resolution is fine. Richard, I worry a little bit that your moving chairs around in the process is not going to speed the process. I will

say I'm not excited about the notion of resolutions being floated from meetings that happened last night and get mentioned this morning, and there are perhaps significant changes to CCRB process without a little more deliberation. But hopefully it will all work out.

CHAIR EMERY: We're very good with (inaudible).

MR. DUNN: The disciplinary chitchat you're going to have with him, there's one additional person you should include in that.

CHAIR EMERY: You?

MR. DUNN: Yes, correct. All in favor, say --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: We're finally hiring you? Is that what you're telling us?

MR. DUNN: No, no, no. It's all part of inclusion.

So what I really want to talk about is I want to pick up on your presentation last week, Richard, about thoughts that you had about the CCRB. It is a new day with the CCRB. You are bringing new ideas to it. I'm happy to see that you're thinking of reorganizing things institutionally. I'm thinking about bigger less institutional thoughts.

How many of you will be here as we go forward I think remains to be seen. But assuming that

everyone will be here, I do want to say a few things which some of which you've heard before, but given that it is a new day, I want to remind you of some things.

First, and Richard, you touched about this -- and I have four things. One, there needs to be a cultural shift with the CCRB about its relationship with the public. If we went out today and interviewed a hundred New Yorkers and asked them, "What is the CCRB?," I guarantee you that 99, and perhaps 100 would say, "I have no idea," or some version of that. The CCRB is invisible. People do not know what it is, and that has got to be changed. And that starts everything from the top and this may be in the Charter, but starting with the name, "Civilian Complaint Review Board." You think that invokes anything in anybody? It does not.

I would like to see the word "police," in that somewhere. Community engagement. You have got to get out and be involved with the community. I know there's an outreach program. That is an outreach program that goes to high schools and organizations and meetings and talks about what the CCRB does. That is not getting to the community of people who are having bad interactions with the Police

Department. And you need to think about this from the start and you need to say to yourself, "Okay, who's walking in my door with complaints about police misconduct and what am I doing to reach those people?"

The vans, that's a terrific idea, Richard.

That's the idea about getting things out. That's expensive. I'll believe it when it happens and I look forward to it happening. But you could put a table on a street corner in the 75th Precinct on a Saturday afternoon with some staff members and you would learn more about policing from that precinct in one day than you learn in a year of Outreach meetings going in and sitting in some building listening to people show up at 8:00 at night to talk to you about policing. You've got to get into the community in a real way.

In terms of getting your name out there, as seen on trucks, "Complaint or compliment? Call whatever." What about putting bumper stickers on police cars, every single NYPD vehicle. "You got a complaint or you got a compliment? Call Tony Simonetti at 311" -- or "1-800-CCRB." You got to think creatively about getting your name out there to places where you will be seen and you will be

heard and you will be remembered. And what you're doing is not doing that.

Department of Education, I have never heard any discussion about the CCRB working with DOE. A lot of complaints involve young people. The DOE might actually be able to play a significant role in helping young people understand they could come to this agency and get help, and that's important. It's all about public outreach.

Then on the complainant side. Richard, you mentioned the problem of how difficult is it to get down here. We've been talking about this for years. It's very, very difficult for people to get down here. We've got to cure that problem. Tracy, you talked at some point pursuant to a comment that I had made about videotaping, about some exploration. I've not heard about that since but I'm hoping that's still being considered; namely, creating a video link so people all across the city can sit in their living rooms or in a local office and give a statement that you consider to be a sworn statement so you can do an investigation.

CHAIR EMERY: You mean through an app?

MR. DUNN: It could be through an app. It could be through a million different things.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: We're working with the DOITT to do that.

MR. DUNN: When people come here, you got to make it easier to get in. And I encourage every single one of you to go sit in the public waiting area that you have here, which is a cell. Sit there for 10 minutes and say to yourself, "What message does this convey to a member of the public as a complainant of ours who comes in here, makes the trouble to get down here, and gets put in that thing and see how good you feel about what's going on.

Engagement during the investigation process.

You have got to look at everything that's happening in terms of the way you engage with people. This is a very paper-heavy process. The forms you have and the letters you have are very hard for people who are complainants to deal with. And, you know, it's a new world out there. People don't deal with paper. They deal with Facebook, they deal with Twitter, they deal with Instagram, they deal with e-mail. You've got to join the 21st century when it comes to dealing with your complainants.

And you got to, you know, I don't know what you do during your summer internships, but you got to get some 16-year-old in here. And say, "Okay, so,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if I were a 12-year old, even," and say, "If I want to be in touch with people who are complaining oftentimes, tell me the ten different things I should be doing to get in touch with those people." Because sending them letters is not the way to do it. It's just not the way people communicate anymore.

The second thing is the new culture with the Department. You have got to start recognizing, and, Richard, I know you do, this is an independent City agency whose mission is to pursue discipline where there is misconduct and to deal with policies and procedures to avoid future misconduct. You are an independent City agency and you have got to get much more aggressive in dealing with the Department. And I understand, Richard, the idea of having a good working relationship with people and I actually pride myself on having a good relationship with the Police Department most of the time. That doesn't mean we don't sue them. And you have got to be prepared to go to the mat on things when appropriate. You've got to issue subpoenas if people will not show up, and people have not shown up for an interview. You have got to say documents have to get here. You have got to be prepared to go

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

public. You also have to be prepared to work behind the scenes and you have to be prepared to say when they do something right, "You did it right." fine with you saying that publicly. I don't have a problem with that. But it's got to be both sides.

And on the press side, and I say this with respect to the public engagement also, Linda is terrific. You should cut her loose. She's got the ability to do enormously good work for all of you.

The third thing is speeding the investigation process. Investigations are way, way, way too slow. It takes too long to get people in, it takes too long to get documents, it takes too long to get officers in here, it takes too long for the Board to review cases. If someone walks in here, you ought to have them in for an interview immediately if you don't have them right then. You should have the documents within a week. You should have the officers in here within a month. Board review should be happening quickly. What I would challenge you to do is 90 days, 90 days is the amount of time it should take to complete the CCRB investigation; keeping in mind, you're not their final arbiter here. You're essentially making a probable cause determination that's then and going over to the

Police Department. And I don't see any reason why with the number of staff you have and the investigative resources you have with some real improvements to the process you can't get most of your complete investigations done in 90 days and over to the Department. You all know speed is essential. You want to keep people engaged and you want to get officer discipline. Going over there 18 months after the fact is a guaranteed way that things will not happen.

Final thing is policy reform. We have talked about this. Doing the policy work is essential, I would say perhaps the most essential thing, because churning through investigations and disciplining cops, I mean, there is benefit to that to be sure. What's much more important is changing policies over at the Department, in practice, so the misconduct does not take place. The best thing is, and, Richard, you said this last time, nothing would make me happier than for us to be put out of business. You know, we have vision zero. Maybe we should be aiming for complaint zero. Because if we could get cops to stop engaging in the practices that lead to misconduct, we're already way ahead of the game.

That is the greatest service that you could serve to the public. You need to have more policy resources, you have to have more of a policy commitment, you need to be talking about policy issues to the public and the Department hears you talking about this.

And frankly, if I were you, I would be looking at things that the Department is doing that are positive and that actually you think are cutting back on misconduct. I don't expect you to just be complaining about the Department. I think it is fine and good for you to say, "You know, we're seeing certain things in complaints and it tells us ten different things are happening over at the Department that actually we think are good things. It's good for the Department to hear that, it's good for the public to hear that, and it's good in terms of your role.

So those are the four things in terms of big-picture issues that I think you need to be doing and we look forward to supporting your work in that respect.

MR. GITNER: Can I ask you a question, Mr. Dunn? What do you mean when you say, in terms of investigations, speeding the investigations? Is it

your view that all we're doing essentially is probable cause investigation? I'm not sure that's accurate.

MR. DUNN: It's not technically accurate because these are not criminal cases.

MR. GITNER: Put aside whether it's criminal or not. What do you mean by "probable cause"?

MR. DUNN: What I mean is you are not the final arbiter of these complaints --

MR. GITNER: Right.

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. DUNN: -- you're making determinations to try to substantiate it or not whether or not it's more likely to happen or not. And then it's got to go to somebody and, for instance, (if we are talking about charges and specs), there's going to be a trial.

MR. GITNER: So by "probable cause," you don't necessarily mean -- you mean more likely than not?

MR. DUNN: Yes.

MR. GITNER: Thank you.

MR. DUNN: I'm sorry, Dan. You're right. Ι don't mean to calibrate a particular --

MR. GITNER: Standard.

MR. DUNN: -- standard. What I'm saying is you in substance are making a preliminary ruling that,

yes, you believe misconduct happened, such that a more formal process can take place.

MR. GITNER: You and I agree. I understand. Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: All right. We have -- sorry, I've got the list here -- Mr. Brown, John Brown.

MR. DONLON: He stepped out.

CHAIR EMERY: Well, let's go to the next person then. He can come back. We have Talya Arrington.

Is that Mr. Brown?

MR. JOHN BROWN: Yes.

CHAIR EMERY: Okay. Your turn. You're up.

MR. BROWN: How you doing? Hello to all the Commissioners. Mr. Emery, I got to come up here. I spoke to Ian Basset (phonetic) on the phone, to the Mayor, and also Ms. Fox and Rebecca Lynch (phonetic). To all the workers out here and everybody else, I just want to say hello. I haven't been down here in a few months.

This is my son, John Brown. Mr. Emery, you have never seen this. That's my son (showing pictures). This is my son after the police drug him on the ground in 2011. The reason that I'm here from 2011 is because the case was settled, the City settled it, of course. And we're not after money. The

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

66

reason that I did this was at the beginning, at the very beginning, was to find out who the police officers was that did this to my son. To this date, I have not gotten -- my son has never seen a picture yet. We have never seen pictures contrary to what anyone says of these officers that did this to my son. His arresting officer was Brian Glovell (phonetic) from the 23rd Precinct. We have never seen a picture, an up-to-date picture, of him, of his partner who arrested my son's friend. never seen a picture of him because we know that he's the one that punched my son first and then went on to my son's friend. So that's why they do that, police officers do that, when they want to confuse Okay? you.

What I'm saying is I was on the phone with Ms. Fox, Rebecca Lynch, Ian Basset from the Mayor's Office. They said, "Come down, tell the Commissioners that you want to reopen again because now there's supposed to be something in place that you could go back to the Police Department now and ask them for more pictures or ask them, 'Well, you didn't give us what we required.'" That's why I'm here, because I'm asking the Board to reopen. Let's get these pictures because there's supposed to have

been progress made. Let's get these pictures so that we can find out who did this to my son.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One thing that we have to do, there's a rule -and I'm nervous -- there's a rule that when I asked what happened to my son, this officer brought my son to the car to put him in, my son looked -- was beat up and everything else, what did this officer say? Mr. Emery, they can't tell me because there's something that's an act -- if you can help me, Mr. Dunn -- there's something legally that when you ask questions like this of City workers or people from the City that the Board can't tell me. I can't find out what did the officers say happened to -when you question them, the investigator, Ms. Ortero (phonetic), or whoever did it, "What did this officer say happened to your son?" "We can't tell you that." What kind of investigation is it that you go to somebody and ask them what happened to your son and they tell you, "We can't tell you that." Then you want to know why the public does not have confidence in something like this. See, I understand the provision because you want to maybe -- because they're undercover cops or police officers or City workers, whatever the rule is, but when they're accused of a crime such as dragging my

son on the ground and stomping and kicking him, shouldn't that go out the window? It should go out the window. It's obvious to everybody. You should have to answer this question. "What happened when you were the arresting officer and you had his son, how did his son's face get like that?" And you mean to tell me you can't answer that? Something has to be done about that. Any time a charge is brought against an officer that's a serious charge, then that protection that he has should go out the window. Otherwise, they're all going to hide behind that.

The other thing is I gave this case in April 30th, 2011. I have not seen pictures yet. My son has not seen pictures yet of these officers that supposedly were his arresting officer and the other officer. We have not seen up-to-date pictures because what I find is that y'all don't have them. Because when his investigator, Ms. Ortero, I asked Ms. Ortero, "Ms. Ortero, when was these pictures taken?" "I can't tell you, Mr. Brown." This is the investigator from the CCRB telling me, "I can't tell you when they were taken." The supervisor from that unit, I called him, "Do you know when these pictures were taken?" "I can't tell you. I don't know. The

Police Department provides the pictures." We're investigating the Police Department. They're providing the pictures that you see. There is no quideline, like.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then I found out later, two to five years, that's when pictures are taken. Are you kidding me? Do you know how much people change from two to five -- if you go from being a regular officer in the street, which the pictures that were shown to my son fourteen months later after this incident, fourteen months later they showed him pictures. The officer was genetic. None of them had no beard, none of them had no long hair. These were undercover officers, right? So you know how they They didn't look the way that the CCRB showed look. them to look. That's wrong. That's depicting people, you're looking -- how many people have come probably and looked and sat down to look at a photo array of police officers and the picture's not there because they don't look like that no more, because it's two to five years before you change pictures. That doesn't make any sense to me, Mr. Emery. This is a bad problem here that I found doesn't. here. I mean, we don't have actual -- we don't have accurate pictures of how police officers look. Thev change the way they look. When they become undercover, we know that they change the way that they look. So when you showed my son those pictures fourteen months, even fourteen months after the incident, how do you expect him to pick out somebody who's not there? Thank you.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you. We have Talya Arrington.

MS. TALYA ARRINGTON: Hello, everyone.

MR. BROWN: Do you all tell me if you're going to reopen the case or do I have to wait for a letter?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Mr. Brown, you have to put it in writing and then it will go to the Chair.

CHAIR EMERY: Just ask for it to be reopened in writing and then we'll look at it. I promise you, all right?

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I'm going to do that now.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

MS. ARRINGTON: As both men stated, nobody knows about the CCRB. How I found out about it, it was through Google and it was me basically being fed up with all the videos I saw on Facebook of cops beating up people. There's no trust when it comes

to people in neighborhoods with police. They don't feel safe. They feel if cops are going to stop them it's going to lead to something extra. I've watched videos where cops are putting people in chokeholds and people are fighting them, not because they want to fight the cops, but they're afraid of being put into that position.

I just feel that something needs to be done as far as discipline towards these cops. Vacation days is not enough. If somebody breaks a law regardless of your position, you should be held accountable for it. That's it.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you. That's the list.

Sir, this gentleman first and then you. Thank you. Sir, what's your name?

MR. ARTHUR MIMS: Arthur Mims.

CHAIR EMERY: You decided you just want to talk? That's fine.

MR. MIMS: Good morning, Board.

CHAIR EMERY: Good morning.

MR. MIMS: It's good to see many of you, or all of you. And, you know, you moved to a different place and you look well and you definitely made an improvement from the first place I ever came in contact with. It was Lafayette Street where they

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had, as I recall, pictures of Phil Caruso that hung around the building. In fact, some offices in that building had more pictures of Phil Caruso than the pictures of Jesus and the church. So I really commend the Board. I'm going to try to have faith in you. But I've heard a few things you said this evening -- this afternoon, that I want to talk about.

Mediation, I've mentioned one time before. Ι see you're up a little bit but mediations will always be low. Many of you on that board are lawyers. Lawyers tell their clients pretty much, "Do not bother with mediations. Mediations are a joke." So they don't go to mediations. That's why you had 18 or I look and I see 14. It will always be small. Your unsubstantiated numbers are a hell of a lot higher than your substantiated numbers. That will always be too, as this young man had mentioned earlier, about people being interviewed and the way the case is done. I believe the reason why the unsubstantiated cases are so much higher and will always be is because you're questioning people who for the most part, the victim, has been on the ground and has had cops standing over him like he was a prized animal. He's handcuffed, he or she.

The police are standing around with their little notebooks, they're talking to each other, what time I got here, what time you got here. And then you ask this person who basically, he's laying on the ground, he or she, they're looking up, how many officers or badge number, what was the name of the one who approached you? Victims don't know that. And if you turn around and you hear one of the officers say, "Tommy," well, you turn around and say, "Okay, Tommy." Badge number that I remember, 29 -- "No, that wasn't Tommy. That was Bobby." Unsubstantiated. You never put down race of complainant, and I looked in this book, or race of the officer. And both of them need to be in this book.

And then you said you wanted to study the chokehold. That's what I heard you say, you wanted to do more studies of the chokehold. Fellows, let's just put it like this, okay? Every time in this country when there's a riot or whatever, people are always, "Well, let's study it. What happened? Gee, how come this thing broke down? Gee." They've been doing it for years. They did it in the '30s, the Orella. They've done it in the '60s, Newark, and in California. I'm sure somewhere in the city there's

a couple of old guys sitting around doing a study on who's better, Sinatra in the '40s or Sinatra in the '50s?

So you do all the studies you want to do on the chokehold but let me tell you right now. They call it different names and under a different name it's still a chokehold. And people struggle because you're scared, as someone mentioned, you're panicked, and you're trying not to die. So do your chokehold.

But keep in mind, the only reason why
any of us in this room are talking about a chokehold
is because somebody took a video. The video is why
everyone's talking. So everyone else who turns
around and says, "A chokehold was put on me," "I'm
sorry, unsubstantiated. There's no video."

There's a lot of people out there who I know, black, Hispanic, whatever, who feel anger. Some of the stuff I'm saying right now, I pretty much came to the Board when you were at the other place you were, not Lafayette but afterwards, before 9/11, some of this stuff, and nothing.

So I want to see if you take some of what I said and as opposed to, yeah, whatever, throwing it out the window, maybe kind of give some of it some

thought.

CHAIR EMERY: Thank you. This gentleman.

MR. EPHRAIM CRUZ: Good morning, everyone.

CHAIR EMERY: What's your name?

MR. CRUZ: Ephraim Cruz. Excuse my informal appearance. I'm in season. Everyone is in suits and so forth. I'm born and raised in the South Bronx. I've also had the distinct privilege of patrolling out of the 52, the 46 and the 20, in the early '90s under Kelly 1 and Bratton 1. I went on to become a federal agent with DOJ and DHS, DOJ first because when DHS was created they took -- they came off the umbrella of the U.S. Border Patrol, which I was the senior border patrol agent.

I wanted to reiterate two points that Jose brought up, which is why I'm here. Even taking express trains and living in a 2-fare zone, it took me just short of two hours to get here this morning. The timing and the location of these meetings, suspect in our communities.

The larger point, speaking to integrity and credibility of this board is Mr. Emery's appointment, that he remains as Chairman and that the Board has not made a motion to ask him to step down speaks to the lack of credibility and integrity

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

76

of this board. We're in dire straights with the culture of violence in our police departments. And notice I said departments. This is a national epidemic. But here, with the NYPD, especially the Bronx, who files the most complaints, has the highest settlement claims.

Is it too late to make that motion right now, to ask this man to step down, because of his palling around and close relationship with Bratton? His own words, "having a first-class meeting," closed-door meeting with Bratton last night is highly suspect, sir. I feel very unsettled right now just even having to raise this issue to this board, the timing, closed-door meeting, the history between Bratton and Mr. Emery. You're very laid back, literally. And I watched the last meeting where a gentleman -- I think Michael Meyers, if I recall the name right -- spoke and addressed some points. called him bankrupt, you called him -- you said they had no merits. And here I was listening to this gentleman. I'm not sure what his history is attending these meetings. This is my very first before the Board as a Bronxite, but someone who understands the inner workings, the culture of the Police Department and also law enforcement, not just

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on a city level, but a federal level. When I went fed, I took with me the broken windows theory but applied it internally within the U.S. Border Patrol, because if you can't check what the Police Department considers small acts of corruption with its officers, you can't get to prevent the chokehold murders because of the ridiculous disciplinary actions that are handed down, a day suspension, a week suspension, ridiculous what's happening.

I can't stress it enough. Why can't we have As a New Yorker, as a citizen, not as that motion? a law enforcement officer anymore, make that appeal to the Board that you guys right now -- we're having a meeting -- who motions that? How can you guys do your work with integrity and credibility if you as board members allow the very head of your entity, who has a long-standing relationship with the people you're supposed to supervise or investigate and hold accountable, there's no credibility, folks, no credibility. Is that something that we can do? Because I can't go back to the community and tell folks you can take that body seriously. laughable. It really is. And I came here two hours one way to individually look you guys in the face and ask you, challenge you, how can you take the

Board seriously with a sense of integrity, never mind urgency, but I hear all this "subcommittee, committee," all this busy work. We can't address the fundamental issue that's anchoring your ability to be effective, his appointment.

This is right here what I'm going to explain to you as policing your own. I did it within the PD, I did it with the feds, policing your own. When you see something that doesn't look right -- and that's what it is, Mr. Emery, just the appearance that you're here undermines the work of the entire board.

Enough said.

CHAIR EMERY: Anybody else? Yes, sir.

MR. MATTHEW CHRISTIAN: Hi. My name is Matthew Christian. I'm representing an organization called BuskNY, which (inaudible).

I have a couple questions about the statistics on page 1 and page 9 of this report. So you state here that you had 465 total cases that were disposed of in some way, meaning an investigation or a mediation; that's correct?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes.

MR. CHRISTIAN: And those are detailed on page 9, where you say you have 177 full investigations of which 18 or 10.2 percent were substantiated; that's

correct?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Now, I'm curious -- and then there were some mediations, which I have no problem with. You then say you had 1,218 complaints that were taken in; that's true?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes. On page 9, just so you know, it's the allegations that were substantiated, the 18. So there's a difference between the complaints and the allegations because there can be multiple allegations in one complaint.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Sure. Now, on page 1 on intake, is this number, 1,218, complaints or allegations?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX:

MR. CHRISTIAN: Complaints. Of which 465 were disposed of --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes.

MR. CHRISTIAN: -- through mediation or investigation.

Now, I'm curious, when I subtract 465 from the 1,218 --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Well, no, the 1,218 is the number of cases we received but most of them would not be closed in that month. The 465 is the total that we closed but the 1,218 is what we took in in

1 that period. 2 MR. CHRISTIAN: Yes, I understand. 3 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: So there would not be --4 MR. CHRISTIAN: And they'd be dealt with later. 5 complaints. 6 MR. CHRISTIAN: MS. CATAPANO-FOX: С Correct. 7 MR. CHRISTIAN: Yes. Nonetheless, you maintain 8 a pretty safe backlog. Your backlog is not growing. 9 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: The backlog is not growing? 10 MR. CHRISTIAN: Your backlog of cases is not 11 increasing. If you take in 1,200 and you dispose of 12 465, it would imply that you have a backlog of cases 13 which is growing, which I saw elsewhere is not true. 14 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: No, it's not growing. It's 15 actually decreasing --16 MR. CHRISTIAN: I saw it, which is great. 17 MR. CHRISTIAN: Now, my question is, this 18 difference of 653 cases, this implies that you would 19 have a backlog that's growing by 653 unless these 20 653 intake in complaints were disposed of in some 21 other way. 22 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: You mean 753. You mean 753 23 because you're deducting the numbers. You don't 24 If you're just doing the math -mean 653.

MR. CHRISTIAN: Is it 753?

25

1 MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Well, just the subtraction.
2 I'm not agreeing with any of the --

MR. CHRISTIAN: I'm sorry. It is 753. I apologize.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: I just wanted to be clear.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I did not major in math. 753, are there any statistics on what happened to those 753 cases?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Yes, but they're pending.
There's two different categories of cases. The
1,218 are brand new cases that came in in the month
of July. The 465 are an entirely separate inventory
of cases that are within our total docket, totally
separate from the 1,218. So the 753 number is
not -- it's good math but it's not in any way
correlating those two numbers. If you look up our
total caseload, which is 2,605, and what we're
saying is that 2,605, out of that, 1,218 complaints
were received in July, we have a total caseload of
2,605 and that in the month of July the Board closed
465 cases. All of these numbers are entirely
independent of each other.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I understand that. Nonetheless, it is true that cases come in and they are then dropped in some other way than full investigation,

other investigation or mediation; is that correct?

CHAIR EMERY: Yes. There are three ways that

cases are disposed of -- correct me if I'm wrong --

they're fully investigated and disposed of through a

board process; they are mediated or they are

2.3

truncated -- there are some referrals, correct.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Those cases aren't part of investigation.

CHAIR EMERY: There are four methods of disposing of cases. One is that they go through full investigation and they go to Panels; two is that they are mediated; three is that they're referred, small number; and four is that they're truncated because for whatever reason the complainant doesn't proceed, takes too long or they give up or whatever. That's a whole area we have to focus on.

But I think you're focusing on the truncated cases. There is a definite cohort of truncated cases, which explains, I think, what you're describing as a backlog, which isn't a backlog. It's a truncated group of cases which in many respects is one of the focus of what we're trying to do with some of these changes.

MR. CHRISTIAN: The truncated cases, if I understand correctly, are on page 8 and those are

under the 465 that were dealt with in July.

CHAIR EMERY: I don't --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: It is on page 8.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I don't mean to bore you with statistics --

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: No. I like statistics.

MR. CHRISTIAN: -- and maybe I can just give you the concept here, which is that the impression that some of us have -- and I think Jose mentioned it -- is that calls come in or complaints come in and are then found to not really be worthy of an investigation and that they then -- essentially, I don't see any documentation of what happens. I see this very extensive documentation of the end process, where things go to APU, they go to trial, there's a maybe reduction or increase of the penalty by the Commissioner. But I don't understand why apparently the majority of all the cases that are telephoned in don't really appear in this report and we don't really see why most complaints coming in don't move through the process.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: So your question is what happens to the cases that don't go through the process and how many and why? Is that --

MR. CHRISTIAN: Yes. And whether there's

documentation in this report.

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: There is. I mean, all the statistics are there. We also do a semiannual report and an annual report that discusses the breakdown more extensively of why cases don't proceed. It would be a long conversation.

MR. DUNN: Tracy, can I just suggest something, what I think is the confusion here?

MS. CATAPANO-FOX: Sure.

MR. DUNN: Of the 1,218 cases they got, 776 were outside of the jurisdiction and left the CCRB and went someplace else. That's where the cases went. So the only actual intake the CCRB had was 442 cases.

MR. SIMONETTI: Right. They were referred out.

MR. CHRISTIAN: I see what you're saying.

MR. DUNN: So someone calls and says, "We don't like the hot dog vendor on the corner." They don't take the complaint, they send it someplace else.

MR. CHRISTIAN: It's referred, okay.

That's interesting to someone who's filed a CCRB report that was referred. One of mine was referred to Internal Affairs and I then never heard back from Internal Affairs.

That's the gist of my question, is why things

get telephoned in and then they apparently go nowhere. And I understand statistically what's happening. It's just troubling that things do come in and don't seem to progress. That's the gist of it. CHAIR EMERY: Okay. I think we are going to adjourn and go into Executive Session and discuss a couple of cases that need fill Board review. (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 12:06 p.m.)

	86			
1				
2				
3				
4	CERTIFICATION			
5				
6	STATE OF NEW YORK)			
7) ss.:			
8	COUNTY OF RICHMOND)			
9				
10	I, DANIELLE CAVANAGH, a Notary Public			
11	within and for the State of New York, do hereby			
12	certify:			
13	I reported the proceedings in the			
14	within-entitled matter, and that the within			
15	transcript is a true record of such proceedings.			
16	I further certify that I am not related			
17	to any of the parties to this action by blood or			
18	marriage and that I am in no way interested in the			
19	outcome of this matter.			
20	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set			
21	my hand this 14th day of August 2014.			
22				
23				
24				
25	DANIELLE CAVANAGH			

a.m (1) 1:4 ability (4) 46:16 52:15 61:9 78:4 able (5) 21:7 36:2 50:20 51:6 58:6 abolish (1) 22:17 absolutely (4) 5:19 10:15 39:10 51:15 accept (1) 19:23 acceptable (2) 32:15,17 accepted (1) 20:4 access (1) 26:7 accomplish (2) 36:12 39:22 account (1) 31:9 accountable (3) 46:4 71:11 77:19 accurate (3) 64:3,4 69:25 accused (1) 67:25 act (2) 16:13 67:9 acting (1) 23:13 action (5) 7:19 18:19 20:9 37:13 86:17 actions (1) 77:8 activate (1) 23:6 active (2) 21:21 42:5 activists (1) 44:1 activity (2) 13:5 53:4 acts (1) 77:5 actual (7) 9:25 35:13 46:21,21 52:3 69:24 84:13 adapted (1) 52:14 add (2) 10:20 37:18 added (2) 41:5,24 additional (2) 20:1 55:9 address (2) 4:1 78:3 addressed (1) 76:18 addressing (1) 47:8 adjourn (1) 85:7 adjudications (1) 9:7 adjusted (2) 16:5,8 Administrative (2) 18:25 34:1 adopt (2) 22:4 24:2 adoption (3) 1:15 3:4,6 advance (1) 30:3 adversary (1) 28:3 advocate (1) 31:14 Advocate's (1) 32:15 Affairs (2) 84:23,24 afraid (3) 44:7 47:24 71:6 afternoon (3) 50:17 57:11 72:7 agency (18) 4:16 15:17 16:1,2 25:21,23 27:23,23,25 29:14 30:21 34:9 47:14 50:12,16 58:8 60:11,14 agency's (2) 16:16 17:9

```
agent (2) 75:11,14
aggressive (1) 60:15
agnostic (1) 8:23
agree (7) 26:23 31:21 37:21 38:14
  39:20 47:12 65:3
agreed (9) 4:24 12:4 19:21 26:18
  26:24,25 32:25 35:8,14
agreeing (2) 35:9 81:2
agreement (11) 19:3,18,21 24:10
  31:13,15,15,17 32:14,14 41:8
agreements (4) 30:14,15,16 33:4
agrees (1) 35:2
ahead (2) 6:1 62:24
aiming (2) 4:13 62:22
ain't (3) 44:8 46:9,23
AI (2) 7:8 10:3
allegations (5) 16:13 79:8,10,11
 79:13
alleged (4) 13:5,5,17,20
allow (3) 41:25 45:4 77:16
allowing (1) 45:6
Alphonzo (2) 2:8 40:25
altered (1) 30:17
Alvarez (1) 11:25
amended (2) 17:2 41:6
amount (2) 21:3 61:21
analogy (1) 32:9
anchoring (1) 78:4
Andrew (1) 50:25
anger (1) 74:18
animal (1) 72:25
announced (1) 24:3
annual (3) 39:9 54:22 84:4
answer (2) 68:4,7
anxious (1) 4:11
anybody (7) 12:25 21:22 24:8,8,20
 56:17 78:13
anymore (2) 60:7 77:12
anyway (1) 5:23
apologize (1) 81:4
app (2) 58:23,24
apparent (1) 30:10
apparently (3) 37:2 83:18 85:1
appeal (1) 77:12
appear (1) 83:19
appearance (3) 19:13 75:6 78:10
appearances (1) 19:12
Applause (1) 47:3
applied (1) 77:3
applies (2) 18:6,8
appoint (1) 24:5
appointment (2) 75:23 78:5
appreciate (1) 5:16
```

```
approached (1) 73:7
appropriate (8) 11:7,8 14:2 28:19
  30:9 31:7,13 60:22
appropriately (1) 14:11
approval (5) 19:5,7 32:1 35:4
  39:12
approvals (3) 32:16,18,18
approve (6) 22:21 31:14 34:19,23
  34:24 35:2
approved (6) 4:9 31:15,17 34:8,9
  35:10
approves (1) 32:7
approximately (1) 42:5
April (1) 68:13
APU (27) 19:1,16,21 20:1,8,11
  21:24,25 22:4,13,18,23 25:12
  29:4,15,17 30:5,11 31:11 32:3,11
  32:12,13 33:12 34:17 39:16
  83:15
arbiter (2) 61:23 64:9
area (3) 42:20 59:6 82:16
arising (1) 53:25
array (1) 69:19
arrested (1) 66:10
arresting (3) 66:7 68:5,16
Arrington (4) 65:9 70:8,9,21
Arthur (2) 71:16,16
aside (1) 64:6
asked (5) 6:13 43:15 56:9 67:4
  68:19
asking (1) 66:24
aspect (1) 26:10
aspects (1) 4:16
assign (1) 45:17
assigned (1) 12:13
assist (2) 10:12,15
assume (1) 22:18
assuming (1) 55:25
attempt (1) 39:25
attempted (2) 16:3,4
attending (1) 76:22
attitude (1) 28:7
attorney (1) 45:11
attorneys (1) 45:9
attorneys' (2) 38:11,23
audio (1) 20:22
August (7) 1:3 3:3 7:24 15:9 21:1
  53:4 86:21
authority (8) 24:5,16 34:2 38:2
  40:7,12,14 49:14
automobile (1) 20:15
availability (2) 6:17 47:17
available (1) 42:9
AVENUE (1) 1:22
```

approach (1) 12:18

AGENDA (1) 1:12

avoid (3) 9:6,6 60:13 awaiting (8) 17:16 19:3,5,6,8,12,14 19:15 Ayes (1) 37:9 В **B (2)** 35:20,22 back (14) 8:25 10:22 36:13 39:19 43:13 46:18 49:9 54:4 63:10 65:9 66:21 76:15 77:21 84:23 backlog (9) 9:6 80:8,8,9,10,12,19 82:20.20 **bad (2)** 56:25 69:23 **badge (2)** 73:6,10 **ballpark (1)** 38:21 **bankrupt (1)** 76:19 **Barron (1)** 51:3 basically (6) 12:4 42:11,17 43:1 70:23 73:4 Basset (2) 65:15 66:17 **beard (1)** 69:12 beat (1) 67:6 beating (1) 70:25 becoming (1) 43:19 beginning (3) 14:13 66:1,2 believe (13) 9:24 13:13 25:24 28:22 31:2,4 33:10 45:24,25 46:22 57:8 65:1 72:20 benefit (1) 62:15 bent (1) 28:14 best (2) 13:1 62:18 **better (1)** 74:2 big (1) 54:1 big-picture (1) 63:20 bigger (1) 55:23 Bill (2) 44:2,6 binding (2) 33:4 41:4 **Bishop (17)** 2:3 7:9 10:6,10,10 21:23,24 22:6,10,15,25 23:3,8,16 24:4 39:14 49:18 bit (6) 6:1 12:7 33:22 47:24 54:24 72:10 black (1) 74:18 blood (1) 86:17 **BlueTEC (2)** 52:18,20 board (57) 1:1,2 2:1 3:3,4,24,24 4:20 6:19 7:4,5,10 9:1 15:19,21 16:3 18:2,3,22 21:7,10 22:3,17 22:21 23:25 24:25 29:21 31:18 33:19,23 35:2 41:3 45:17 50:6 51:11 54:21 56:16 61:14,19

Bobby (1) 73:11 body (1) 77:22 **book (2)** 73:13,15 border (3) 75:13,14 77:3 bore (1) 83:4 born (1) 75:7 boroughs (7) 42:7 47:21 50:7,8,13 51:4,20 **bother (1)** 72:13 brand (1) 81:11 Brat- (1) 49:1 Bratton (10) 28:13 40:16 44:2,6 49:6,7 75:10 76:9,11,15 breakdown (3) 13:16 17:25 84:5 **breaks (1)** 71:10 Brian (2) 9:9 66:7 bring (4) 8:25 13:25 29:15 34:25 **bringing (1)** 55:20 **brings (1)** 31:9 broke (2) 26:18 73:22 broken (2) 28:14 77:2 Bronx (6) 10:11,12 39:4 50:25 75:8 76:5 **Bronxite (1)** 76:23 Brooklyn (2) 51:4,6 **brothers (1)** 43:20 brought (5) 30:6 49:20 67:5 68:8 75:16 Brown (11) 65:6,6,10,11,13,20 68:21 70:10,13,18,20 brutality (2) 44:1,24 budget's (1) 52:4 **building (3)** 57:14 72:2,3 bumper (1) 57:20 bureau (2) 20:15 31:10 business (7) 1:19,20 3:16,18 26:11 26:12 62:21 BuskNY (1) 78:16 busy (1) 78:3 **buts (1)** 46:5 buy (1) 40:17 bystander (3) 15:7 21:1 54:16

C

C (3) 80:6 86:4,4 calendared (1) 19:11 calibrate (1) 64:22 California (1) 73:25 call (14) 1:14 3:2 8:14 9:21 11:4,9 14:18 33:20 50:7 52:11,13 57:19 57:22 74:6 called (6) 8:3 11:14 68:24 76:19,19 78:15 calls (4) 38:12 43:12 83:10 84:17

cameras (1) 52:24 Captain (1) 25:14 **capturing (5)** 13:12,13 14:6,25 46:10 car (1) 67:6 career (1) 49:2 Carlmais (2) 10:8 49:18 cars (1) 57:21 Caruso (2) 72:1,3 case (26) 12:9 16:22,25 17:6,7 18:3,4,11,16,18 19:2,4,17,20 20:3,8 31:10,13 50:15 53:17,19 53:21 65:24 68:13 70:11 72:20 caseload (2) 81:17,19 cases (72) 12:5,11,13,15 15:19,19 16:1,2,2,4,24 17:2,10,16,16,19 17:21 18:1,1,2,5,6,9,9,14,23,24 19:1,4,6,7,9,11,14,15 20:11,19 21:5 31:6 32:21 39:15,18 48:20 49:4 61:15 64:5 72:21 78:19 79:23 80:10,12,18 81:8,10,11,13 81:21,24 82:3,7,10,18,19,21,24 83:18,23 84:5,10,12,14 85:8 Catapano-Fox (39) 1:9 2:4 3:10 7:3 12:19 15:12 22:19 23:2 24:14 25:9 36:24 52:9,22 53:21 54:2,14 55:13 59:1 70:13 78:22 79:2,7,14 79:17,22 80:3,6,9,14,22 81:1,5,9 82:7 83:3,6,22 84:2,9 catch (1) 7:22 categories (3) 13:4,17 81:10 cause (4) 61:24 64:2,7,17 **CAVANAGH (2)** 86:10,25 **CCRB (44)** 9:3,5 15:14 17:12 26:10 27:5,6,16 30:2 33:2,3 37:19 42:12,19,19 43:5,12,12 45:22,23 46:9,23 50:7,8,13 51:4,24 53:25 54:7 55:4,19,20 56:7,10,12,23 58:4 61:22 68:22 69:15 70:22 84:11,13,21 CCRB's (1) 17:21 **cell (1)** 59:6 century (1) 59:21 certain (4) 21:10 26:22 33:23 63:13 certainly (3) 7:25 39:11 41:25 certify (2) 86:12,16 chain (2) 32:16,17 **chair (120)** 1:8,16 2:2 3:1,11,16,23 5:6,12,16,22 6:8,10 7:7,8,18 8:11 8:13,17,19,23 9:2 10:9,13,17,20 10:25 11:22 12:20 15:12 20:23 20:24 21:12,15 22:1,7,12,16 23:4 23:11,17,23,24 24:1,5,7,14,18,23

66:24 67:12 71:19 72:5,11 74:20

75:22,24 76:1,13,23 77:13,16

78:1,11 81:20 82:5 85:8

```
25:6,9,10,18 26:1 29:2,9,20
  31:19 33:18 34:16,21 35:1,15,16
  35:20,24 36:3,9,14 37:1,7,10,12
  37:20 38:3,4,14 39:1,10,14,20
  40:25 41:7,19,21 47:4,11 48:9
  49:21 51:8,10,15,18 52:18,24
  53:2,6,12 54:10,16 55:7,11 58:23
  65:5,8,12 70:7,14,15,20 71:13,17
  71:20 75:2,4 78:13 82:2,9 83:2
  85:6
Chair's (1) 21:6
chaired (4) 4:18 8:7 9:8 10:6
chairing (1) 11:23
Chairman (3) 5:25 38:20 75:23
chairs (2) 9:24 54:24
challenge (2) 61:20 77:25
chance (3) 3:7,13 6:22
change (17) 4:15 11:15 22:17,24
  23:14 26:23 28:7,12 31:1 35:13
  41:14 44:8 45:13 69:7,21 70:1,2
changed (1) 56:13
changes (10) 4:4,11 10:1 12:2
  16:17 22:2 41:14 47:7 55:4 82:23
changing (4) 14:3 31:24 45:21
  62:16
charade (1) 37:23
charge (4) 19:25 38:17 68:8,9
charges (16) 18:23 19:13,14,15
  30:4,8,10 31:22 32:5,9,11 33:6
  34:3 35:9 39:18 64:15
Charter (1) 56:15
check (1) 77:4
checked (1) 13:6
Chief (2) 25:12,13
chitchat (1) 55:8
chokehold (11) 15:2,4 20:18 73:17
  73:18 74:5,7,10,12,15 77:6
chokeholds (1) 71:4
Chorus (1) 37:9
Chris (5) 14:5 51:9 53:2,7,8
Christian (24) 78:14,15,23 79:3,12
  79:15,18 80:2,4,6,7,10,16,17,25
  81:3,6,23 82:24 83:4,7,25 84:16
  84:20
church (2) 1:5 72:4
churning (1) 62:14
Cifuni (1) 7:10
circumstances (3) 11:15 31:7 33:9
citizen (1) 77:11
citizenry (1) 28:5
city (11) 6:5 47:22 58:19 60:10,14
  65:24 67:11,12,24 73:25 77:1
civil (1) 49:1
```

```
civilians (1) 15:25
claims (1) 76:6
clarification (1) 23:9
classifications (1) 6:3
clear (2) 27:11 81:5
clearly (1) 40:14
clergymen (1) 51:5
clients (1) 72:12
close (2) 42:22 76:9
closed (10) 15:19,21 16:2,4 17:2
  18:12,13 79:24,25 81:20
closed-door (2) 76:10,14
closer (1) 43:8
co-founder (1) 42:4
Cohen (2) 4:21 50:25
cohort (1) 82:18
collaborative (2) 25:24 28:4
color (1) 43:10
come (27) 6:4 11:18 14:16 28:8
 40:10 42:24 43:17 44:17,21 45:1
 45:14,18 47:20 50:10 51:1 52:13
 58:7 59:3 65:9,14 66:18 69:17
 73:22 81:24 83:10,10 85:3
comes (9) 6:18 13:3 16:12,14 28:4
 28:5 59:9,22 70:25
comfortable (1) 46:22
coming (8) 4:3 38:10,23 43:21
 50:16 52:1 54:10 83:20
command (3) 8:5 34:5 35:18
commence (1) 19:10
commend (2) 20:20 72:5
comment (3) 1:21 6:20 58:15
comments (3) 21:9,12 28:25
commissioner (28) 19:2,7,9,16,18
 19:24 20:2,4,7,10,13 25:11 26:15
 26:24 28:12 30:18 31:3,5,25
 32:20,24 33:8 37:25 39:12 40:16
 40:16 44:2 83:17
Commissioner's (3) 30:23 32:1
 34:23
Commissioners (2) 65:14 66:19
commitment (5) 31:3,4 33:9 49:3
 63:4
committee (46) 1:18 4:17,18,18,22
 4:24 5:14 7:13,15,22 8:12 9:14
 9:23 10:6,14,18,21,24 11:1,4,17
 11:22 12:23 13:10,14 21:8,16,17
 21:18,19,25 22:5,7,13,14,23 23:2
 23:7,18 24:25 35:1 44:11 47:16
 54:8,17 78:3
committees (15) 6:2,11 7:6,19
 21:23 22:22 23:9,12,19,25 24:6
 24:15,17 25:3 45:18
```

```
communicated (1) 37:14
communication (1) 27:16
communities (3) 44:23 52:7 75:20
community (26) 28:5,17 43:10,25
  44:12,14,16,21 45:5,7,10,14,22
  45:24 46:24 47:5 49:23 50:6,9,11
  52:13 56:19,20,24 57:17 77:21
compared (1) 27:7
compelling (1) 48:17
complain (2) 45:14 47:20
complainant (6) 13:20 16:14 58:10
  59:9 73:13 82:14
complainants (3) 28:6 59:17,22
complaining (2) 60:2 63:11
complaint (25) 1:2 3:3 7:7 9:18,19
  13:3,21 14:6,9,14 16:12,24 17:3
  17:12 31:18 43:12 47:9 48:12
  53:25 56:16 57:19,22 62:22
  79:11 84:19
complaints (37) 8:4 14:12 15:15
  15:16,17,23 16:7,7,9 17:14 28:18
  28:18 42:12,18,22 47:17,22
  50:11,14 51:25 52:2,11,16 57:3
  58:5 63:13 64:9 76:5 79:5,10,13
  79:15 80:5,20 81:18 83:10,20
complete (4) 20:23 26:9 61:22
  62:5
completed (3) 19:8,10 21:2
completely (3) 26:4 39:20 40:4
complex (1) 40:5
complicated (2) 26:19,21
compliment (2) 57:19,22
composition (2) 6:16 22:17
comprised (1) 24:12
comprises (1) 12:14
compromise (1) 26:8
Compstat (1) 9:3
conceived (1) 40:1
concept (1) 83:8
concluded (1) 85:9
conditions (1) 11:15
confidence (2) 38:13 67:21
confuse (1) 66:14
confused (1) 26:20
confusion (1) 84:8
Connell (1) 9:10
consent (1) 4:25
consider (3) 8:11 51:13 58:21
considered (2) 51:11 58:18
considers (1) 77:5
consistent (3) 3:21 6:25 19:18
constituted (1) 24:11
constituting (1) 7:6
constructed (1) 7:1
```

communicate (1) 60:6

Civilian (4) 1:2 3:3 31:18 56:16

constructive (1) 6:23 contact (2) 52:15 71:25 contendere (1) 19:22 context (2) 29:24 33:23 **continuing (1)** 20:18 contrary (1) 66:5 conversation (2) 11:3 84:6 convey (1) 59:8 conveys (1) 8:24 **cooperate (1)** 26:3 **cooperation (1)** 26:10 coordinate (1) 11:6 cop (2) 53:24 54:6 **cops (13)** 8:22 28:6,20,21 62:15,23 67:23 70:24 71:2,4,6,9 72:24 Copstat (3) 8:3 9:22 11:14 Copwatch (1) 42:4 corner (2) 57:10 84:18 **correct (9)** 46:25 53:23 55:12 78:21 79:1 80:6 82:1,3,6 correctly (1) 82:25 correlating (1) 81:16 corruption (1) 77:5 Cortes-Gomez (7) 2:15 4:20 5:2 5:19 10:9,15,19 council (4) 6:5 49:25 50:1,24 Councilman (1) 50:25 Councilwoman (1) 51:2 counsel (1) 32:6 counties (1) 39:4 counting (1) 49:11 country (1) 73:20 county (2) 39:2 86:8 couple (7) 4:13,14 47:4 53:15 74:1 78:17 85:8 course (4) 33:7 36:4,14 65:25 **court (4)** 19:12,12 36:4 52:10 **courtrooms (1)** 25:17 courts (1) 52:10 crazy (1) 26:20 create (7) 11:1 24:15,24,25 25:16 28:1 37:13 created (3) 3:21 31:20 75:12 creating (3) 44:11 46:18 58:18 creation (1) 26:2 creatively (1) 57:24 credibility (6) 28:1 75:22,25 77:15 77:19,20 **crime (4)** 18:6,8 49:10 67:25 **criminal (2)** 64:5,6 critical (2) 23:12 48:15 Cruz (3) 75:3,5,5 cultural (1) 56:7 culture (4) 41:12 60:8 76:2,24

cure (1) 58:14 curious (2) 79:3,20 current (3) 10:2 21:23 32:23 currently (3) 18:2,9 30:4 cut (1) 61:8 cutting (1) 63:9

D D (3) 1:8 2:2 3:1 **DA (1)** 18:9 **DA's (1)** 38:10 **Dan (8)** 9:9 10:3 11:3,10,22 27:2 39:21 64:21 Daniel (2) 2:14 11:21 **DANIELLE (2)** 86:10,25 **DAO (2)** 33:13 35:5 **Darche (2)** 7:11 25:13 darnedest (1) 14:20 data (3) 13:8 26:7 48:10 date (4) 17:12,20 18:10 66:3 Dave (1) 8:8 David (5) 2:10 10:3 24:22 29:10 day (10) 21:6 43:11 44:25 45:1 46:8 55:20 56:3 57:13 77:8 86:21 days (11) 18:15 19:19,23 20:6 30:16 35:24 53:17 61:21,21 62:5 71:9 deadlines (1) 4:7 deal (20) 32:7,7,19 35:2,5 37:24,24 38:1,2,2,16 42:21 54:1 59:17,18 59:19,19,20,20 60:12 dealing (6) 43:24,24 44:10 45:15 59:22 60:15 deals (3) 32:25 33:4,12 dealt (2) 80:4 83:1 **Debi (1)** 51:3 decide (3) 11:20 14:2 38:1 decided (2) 8:15 71:17 decision (2) 42:25 44:5 decisions (2) 27:11.19 declined (2) 18:16 20:8 decrease (1) 17:10 decreasing (1) 80:15 deducting (1) 80:23 defense (1) 32:6 defer (2) 5:6,8 deference (2) 27:22,24 definite (1) 82:18 definitely (2) 41:1 71:23 **definition (1)** 26:20 degree (1) 11:13 dehumanized (1) 44:25

Denis (7) 7:11 8:9 9:10 10:4 12:24 13:22,24 **Denise (1)** 11:24 Department (35) 8:6 18:16 26:17 27:8,18,21 28:2,2 30:12 31:14,16 32:12,15 33:11 34:9 35:8 49:13 57:1 58:3 60:9,15,19 62:1,6,17 63:5,8,11,15,16 66:21 69:1,2 76:25 77:5 **Department's (2)** 18:19 20:15 departments (2) 76:2,3 depending (1) 9:25 depicting (1) 69:16 deputy (4) 19:9 25:11,13,21 described (2) 13:3,4 describing (2) 14:17 82:20 description (1) 48:1 deserve (2) 11:11 41:15 design (1) 13:14 destroy (1) 40:22 destroyed (1) 28:21 detail (2) 13:4 34:12 detailed (2) 16:18 78:23 details (1) 36:7 determination (2) 20:12 61:25 determinations (2) 39:17 64:11 determine (4) 11:7 16:15 41:9 51:25 developed (1) 39:17 development (1) 6:14 developments (1) 3:18 **develops (1)** 26:13 devised (1) 39:17 devoted (1) 14:11 **DHS (2)** 75:11,12 die (1) 74:9 difference (3) 16:23 79:9 80:18 different (12) 12:14 25:15 35:23 40:17 43:6 58:25 60:3 63:14 71:22 74:6,6 81:10 difficult (3) 11:17 58:11,13 difficulty (1) 52:8 dilutes (1) 25:8 dire (1) 76:1 direction (2) 25:23 41:2 directly (1) 22:4 director (6) 1:9,17 4:9 31:19 34:16 34:25 **Director's (1)** 13:18 disapproved (2) 19:2,24 disciplinary (8) 18:19 20:8 26:16 28:13,22 49:16 55:8 77:7 discipline (17) 27:5,6,7,7,8,9,12 28:4 34:5 35:7,19 40:10,11 49:14

deliberation (1) 55:5

60:11 62:8 71:9 disciplining (1) 62:14 discretion (3) 25:5 38:7,16 discuss (4) 25:20,21 26:12 85:7 discussed (3) 23:20 24:13 25:15 **discusses (1)** 84:4 discussion (4) 15:7 35:12 40:4 58:4 discussions (2) 3:22 21:9 dislocation (1) 47:19 dismissal (3) 34:3 53:18,19 dismissed (4) 19:25 53:17,20,22 dispose (2) 31:22 80:11 disposed (5) 78:19 79:16 80:20 82:3.4 disposing (1) 82:10 disposition (5) 19:3 30:17 31:13 35:10 36:19 dispositions (2) 30:24 34:4 disseminating (1) 54:16 distinct (1) 75:8 **distribution (2)** 15:5,8 district (3) 38:23 45:9,11 docket (7) 17:9,17,19,21,22 19:1 81:13 document (1) 43:1 documentation (3) 83:13,14 84:1 documents (3) 60:24 61:13,18 **DOE (2)** 58:4,5 dog (1) 84:18 doing (19) 6:16 8:24 16:19 20:21 42:14,15,15 57:4 58:2,2 60:4 62:12 63:8,20 64:1 65:13 73:23 74:1 80:24 **DOITT (1)** 59:1 **DOJ (2)** 75:11,11 **Donlon (6)** 2:12 4:20 5:20 9:12 33:17 65:7 door (1) 57:3 doubts (1) 24:9 **Dr (7)** 2:13 9:9 10:7 23:5,24 37:18 51:20 draft (2) 21:6 54:15 drafted (1) 4:25 dragging (1) 67:25 dramatically (1) 4:15 dream (2) 51:22,23 dropped (1) 81:25 drug (1) 65:22 due (1) 28:17 Dunn (22) 53:3,13,23 54:4,12,18 55:8,12,15 58:24 59:3 63:23 64:4 64:8,11,19,21,24 67:10 84:7,10 84:17

Ε **E (1)** 86:4 e-mail (1) 59:21 e-mails (1) 7:21 earlier (3) 23:20 24:3 72:19 earliest (1) 14:10 early (3) 8:1 45:5 75:10 earn (2) 47:6,9 easier (1) 59:4 Edidin (2) 9:10 25:12 **Education (1)** 58:3 effect (1) 10:1 effective (3) 23:15 48:6 78:5 efficient (1) 25:17 either (6) 6:12,22 10:12 35:1,4 38:1 element (1) 48:2 eliminated (1) 32:24 **EMAIL (1)** 1:24 Emery (98) 1:8 2:2 3:1,11 5:6,12 5:16,22 6:8,10 7:7 8:13,17,19,23 9:2 10:13,17,20,25 11:22 12:20 21:12,15 22:1,7,12,16 23:4,11,17 23:23 24:1,7,18 25:6 26:1 29:9 29:20 33:18 34:21 35:16,20,24 36:3,9,14 37:1,7,10,12,20 38:4 38:14 39:1.10.20 41:7.19.21 47:4 47:11 48:9 49:21 51:8,15,18 52:18,24 53:2,6,12 54:10 55:7,11 58:23 65:5,8,12,14,20 67:8 69:22 70:7,15,20 71:13,17,20 75:2,4 76:15 78:10,13 82:2,9 83:2 85:6 Emery's (2) 43:6 75:22 emphasize (3) 14:4 45:8 48:19 encourage (1) 59:4 enforcement (2) 76:25 77:12 engage (1) 59:14 engaged (1) 62:7 engagement (3) 56:19 59:12 61:7 engaging (1) 62:23 enjoyed (1) 37:17 **enormously (1)** 61:9 entered (2) 19:4,20 entire (6) 7:5 26:15 27:4 30:19 49:2 78:11 entirely (3) 34:15 81:12,21 entity (1) 77:16 environment (2) 45:13,21 **Ephraim (2)** 75:3,5 **epidemic (1)** 76:4 Eric (1) 42:8 escort (2) 52:19,21 especially (5) 11:12 14:20 44:5,23

Espinal (1) 4:21 Esq (12) 1:8,9 2:2,4,7,8,9,10,11,12 2:14,15 essential (3) 62:7,12,13 essentially (3) 61:24 64:1 83:12 **establish (1)** 47:8 Eure (1) 25:19 evaluated (2) 43:7,8 **evaluating (1)** 13:9 evaluation (3) 8:4 9:4 14:10 evening (4) 26:15 50:19 51:13 72:7 events (6) 13:20 50:14,20,21 51:4 51:6 everybody (9) 3:2 6:21 7:16 27:11 27:11 33:16 53:5 65:18 68:3 **Everybody's (1)** 4:24 everyone's (2) 53:24 74:14 evidence (4) 43:17 48:18,21,24 evil (1) 47:25 **exactly (5)** 23:16 38:18 40:13 43:3 47:11 excellent (2) 21:4 41:1 **exception (3)** 18:6,8 39:7 excited (2) 54:5 55:1 excluding (1) 17:2 Excuse (2) 8:18 75:5 **executive (9)** 1:9,17 4:9 13:17 25:18 31:19 34:16,25 85:7 exercise (1) 41:16 exist (3) 21:24 25:2 46:20 existed (1) 22:22 existence (1) 22:23 existing (2) 3:25 25:3 exists (2) 9:11,14 expect (2) 63:10 70:5 **expensive (1)** 57:8 experience (2) 36:18 38:10 **experiment (1)** 12:22 expired (1) 18:17 explain (2) 30:3 78:6 **explains (1)** 82:19 **exploration (1)** 58:16 **explore (1)** 40:19 **express (2)** 24:9 75:17 **extensive (1)** 83:14 **extensively (1)** 84:5 **extent (3)** 11:6 33:5 34:6 **extra (1)** 71:3 extremely (2) 5:10 33:1 F

F (1) 86:4

face (2) 68:6 77:24

Facebook (2) 59:19 70:24

facilitate (1) 4:10 **FACSIMILE (1)** 1:24 fact (5) 9:23 10:10 30:11 62:9 72:2 factors (2) 31:8 40:6 facts (2) 27:19 47:25 fair (2) 28:6,6 fairly (1) 28:20 faith (7) 33:9 46:24 47:1,1,5,9 72:5 far (4) 11:14 21:13 29:13 71:9 favor (2) 37:8 55:12 fear (1) 46:2 fed (2) 70:23 77:2 federal (3) 38:24 75:11 77:1 feds (1) 78:8 feel (10) 43:13 44:1,3 46:22 59:11 71:2,2,8 74:18 76:12 feels (1) 28:13 Fellows (1) 73:18 felt (1) 30:11 fewer (2) 15:16 17:23 fight (1) 71:6 fighting (1) 71:5 figure (6) 14:16 26:6 27:9 34:20 38:22 48:11 figured (1) 40:3 file (6) 42:12,18,19 43:12 50:11,14 filed (7) 17:14,15 18:5,10 19:14 42:22 84:21 files (1) 76:5 filing (1) 19:15 fill (1) 85:8 final (19) 19:3,5 20:11 30:23,24 31:3,4,16,23 32:2,19 33:8 34:8 35:10 37:23 49:13 61:23 62:11 64:8 finalize (2) 33:11 39:17 finalized (4) 19:16 20:2 32:8 36:5 finally (1) 55:13 find (5) 33:1 66:2 67:2,13 68:18 fine (4) 54:23 61:4 63:12 71:18 fired (1) 53:25 first (18) 4:17 14:18 15:5,20 16:20 19:17 20:25 26:11 28:15,25 42:1 49:25 56:5 66:12 71:14,24 75:12 76:22 first-class (2) 27:6 76:10 five (8) 17:16 35:24,25 38:23 42:6 69:5,8,21 fixing (1) 28:14 flexible (1) 45:4 floated (1) 55:2 Floor (1) 1:5 Flushing (1) 50:23 focus (2) 82:16,22

focused (2) 9:5 48:13 focusing (1) 82:17 folder (1) 3:5 folks (2) 77:19,22 follow (2) 7:20 12:3 following (2) 31:2,5 follows (2) 4:5 18:1 forever (1) 41:13 forfeited (1) 20:6 forfeiture (2) 19:19,23 form (6) 13:2,6 14:8 28:4 37:20 41:6 formal (1) 65:2 formality (1) 24:20 formalized (2) 20:14 25:16 formally (1) 10:17 forms (2) 16:19 59:15 forth (1) 75:7 forward (8) 4:12 7:17 33:6 35:3 54:12 55:24 57:9 63:21 forwarded (1) 18:24 found (6) 18:15 21:5 69:5,23 70:22 83:11 fount (1) 29:12 four (5) 17:15 56:6 63:19 82:9,13 fourteen (4) 69:10,11 70:4,4 Fox (2) 65:16 66:17 frankly (1) 63:7 friend (2) 66:10,13 friendly (1) 49:11 front-loaded (1) 32:1 full (6) 15:21 16:15 20:23 78:24 81:25 82:11 fully (2) 12:6 82:4 function (2) 33:2,3 fundamental (1) 78:4 further (2) 18:4 86:16 future (3) 21:20,22 60:13

G

G (2) 2:3,10 game (1) 62:25 Garner (1) 42:8 gather (1) 48:3 gathering (1) 13:8 Gee (2) 73:21,22 general (1) 10:12 genetic (1) 69:12 gentleman (5) 51:12 71:14 75:2 76:17,21 geographically (1) 51:25 geography (1) 8:4 getting (9) 30:1 36:16 52:8 54:20 54:21 56:24 57:7,18,24 gist (2) 84:25 85:4 Gitner (15) 2:14 9:9 10:3 11:3,21 24:21 27:3 39:21 63:23 64:6,10 64:17,20,23 65:3 give (11) 3:12,20 27:22 46:11,25 50:15 58:20 66:23 74:25 82:15 given (4) 32:5,11 39:15 56:3 gives (3) 11:19 16:15 50:8 giving (1) 38:7 glad (1) 33:21 Glovell (1) 66:7 go (39) 6:22 12:16 24:25 27:13 30:5 33:6 34:16 35:3,10 39:22 41:23 45:12,12 48:6 50:10,20 51:24 55:24 59:5 60:21,25 64:14 65:8 66:21 67:18 68:2,2,10 69:8 70:14 72:14 77:21 82:10,11 83:15,15,23 85:1,7 **goal (1)** 40:13 goals (1) 25:22 goes (6) 12:22 27:24 32:21 52:19 52:21 56:22 going (75) 4:15,18 6:19,21 7:15 8:7 9:15,17,19,22 10:8 11:1,4,5,9 11:16 12:4,21 13:1,22 14:16,20 21:20 23:13 26:4,5,25 27:1,10,12 27:15 32:24 34:23,24 35:3,7,22 36:1 37:13,14,15,18 39:10,22 40:18 41:13,23 42:20 44:4,8 46:4 48:2,15,18 49:16 51:21,21 53:13 53:24 54:15,25 55:9 57:14 59:11 61:25 62:8 64:16 68:11 70:11,18 71:2,3 72:5 78:6 85:6 good (31) 3:1,14 5:12,21 6:13 10:25 15:12 29:10 33:9 38:8,9 47:16 48:19,21,23 54:22 55:7 59:11 60:16,18 61:9 63:12,15,16 63:17,17 71:19,20,21 75:3 81:15 **Google (1)** 70:23 **qotten (1)** 66:4 grand (2) 32:4,10 **Grant (7)** 2:8 7:9 10:3 40:25 41:18 51:10.16 great (6) 5:18,18 13:25 28:11 54:21 80:16 greatest (1) 63:1 ground (5) 40:24 65:23 68:1 72:24 73:5 group (7) 5:5 12:14 27:1,2,2 52:5 82:21 groups (1) 41:4 growing (5) 80:8,9,13,14,19 **guarantee (1)** 56:10

guaranteed (1) 62:9 guess (4) 3:5,16 26:18 49:24 guideline (1) 69:4 guidelines (3) 11:4,9,14 guilty (2) 18:15 20:5 guys (7) 42:6,9,13 74:1 77:13,14 77:24

Н hair (1) 69:13 hallmark (1) 36:11 hand (2) 37:5 86:21 handcuffed (1) 72:25 **handed (1)** 77:8 handled (3) 4:16 12:14 49:3 handles (1) 26:16 happen (4) 6:21 52:4 62:10 64:13 happened (11) 43:4 48:22 55:2 65:1 67:5,13,16,18 68:4 73:21 81:7 happening (6) 57:9 59:13 61:20 63:14 77:9 85:3 happens (3) 57:8 83:13,23 happier (1) 62:20 happy (2) 5:13 55:21 harassed (1) 43:11 harassment (2) 44:24 45:15 hard (5) 5:14 20:20 44:22 47:18 59:16 harebrained (1) 12:18 head (3) 5:15 34:17 77:16 hear (7) 36:13 40:1 41:22 63:16,17 73:8 78:2 heard (8) 54:18 56:2 58:1,3,17 72:6 73:17 84:23 hears (1) 63:5 held (3) 7:22 46:4 71:11 hell (1) 72:16 hello (3) 65:13,18 70:9 help (2) 58:8 67:9 helpful (1) 14:8 helping (1) 58:7 hereunto (1) 86:20 Hi (3) 42:3 49:22 78:14 hide (1) 68:11 high (1) 56:22 higher (5) 38:2 40:12,14 72:17,21 highest (2) 38:17 76:6 highly (2) 20:20 76:11 hired (1) 38:9 hiring (1) 55:13 **Hispanic (1)** 74:18

Hollywood (1) 46:19 hope (7) 4:24 11:18 15:4 27:13,25 37:15 47:8 hopefully (5) 4:3,12 15:8 39:21 55:5 hoping (4) 20:24 22:3 43:5 58:17 hot (1) 84:18 hours (2) 75:18 77:23 huge (2) 47:14 52:14 hundred (1) 56:9 hundreds (3) 46:7 49:3,4 hung (1) 72:1

IAB (1) 27:8 lan (2) 65:15 66:17 idea (8) 5:21 12:1 40:19 47:15 56:11 57:6,7 60:16 ideas (8) 4:4 13:1 14:4,5,24 23:5 40:2 55:20 identified (1) 14:21 ifs (1) 46:5 **IG (4)** 25:19,20 26:3,5 immediate (1) 29:24 immediately (2) 12:21 61:16 immensely (1) 28:24 Immigrant (1) 50:22 **implement (1)** 4:4 implemented (1) 6:20 implementing (1) 22:20 implied (1) 12:18 implies (2) 8:21 80:18 **imply (2)** 12:8 80:12 important (17) 7:13 13:7,8,10 24:22 27:16 29:3,23 34:20 36:12 36:17 47:23 48:11,12 54:20 58:8 62:16 imposed (1) 19:19 **impression (1)** 83:8 improved (1) 28:24 **improvement (1)** 71:24 improvements (1) 62:4 inaudible (4) 52:17,24 55:7 78:16 incident (4) 17:20 18:10 69:10 70:5 inclination (1) 6:17 include (1) 55:10 included (1) 16:24 includes (1) 16:18 including (3) 15:22 34:2,4 inclusion (1) 55:16 increase (1) 83:16 increased (1) 20:5

incredibly (1) 27:15 independent (4) 44:4 60:10,14 81:22 indicated (1) 20:24 indictments (1) 32:4 individual (3) 36:21,22 50:4 individually (2) 36:15 77:24 individuals' (1) 26:8 Inez (1) 51:3 inform (1) 25:22 informal (1) 75:5 information (11) 13:7,11,12 14:25 24:4 29:13 36:16,18 38:21 48:3 48:10 informed (1) 31:8 initial (5) 13:15 14:6,9,14 19:12 initially (3) 12:18 16:6,13 initiatives (2) 4:2,4 inner (1) 76:24 input (1) 12:24 inside (1) 14:1 Instagram (1) 59:20 instance (2) 9:18 64:14 institutional (2) 41:14 55:23 institutionally (1) 55:22 instructions (1) 34:5 intake (13) 7:8 9:19 12:24 13:2,3,6 14:8 15:18 48:14,17 79:12 80:20 integrity (5) 33:2 75:21,25 77:15 78:1 interaction (1) 27:5 interactions (1) 56:25 interested (1) 86:18 interesting (3) 3:18 11:16 84:21 interests (2) 26:8 29:16 internal (4) 9:4 36:8 84:23,24 internally (3) 12:24 13:23 77:3 International (1) 50:23 **internships (1)** 59:24 interrogated (1) 43:14 interrogation (2) 47:24 48:2 interview (3) 47:18 60:24 61:16 interviewed (2) 56:9 72:19 interviews (2) 47:23 48:3 introduce (1) 29:21 inventory (1) 81:12 invested (1) 52:11 **investigate (1)** 77:18 investigated (3) 12:6 17:18 82:4 investigating (1) 69:2 investigation (14) 18:4 58:22 59:12 61:10,22 64:2 67:17 78:20 79:19 81:25 82:1,8,11 83:12

increasing (1) 80:11

history (2) 76:14,21

hold (6) 3:6,11 14:19,22 18:9 77:18

investigations (15) 9:7,14,16 10:2 10:23 12:23 15:22 17:13 18:7 61:11 62:5,14 63:25,25 78:24 investigative (2) 52:3 62:3 investigator (3) 67:14 68:19,22 investigators (2) 50:12 52:2 investing (1) 49:15 invisible (1) 56:12 invite (1) 43:16 invokes (1) 56:17 involve (1) 58:5 involved (1) 56:20 involves (1) 44:11 involving (2) 18:14,18 **Island (1)** 51:3 issue (6) 42:8,11 45:18 60:22 76:13 78:4 issued (1) 32:9 issues (4) 45:14 50:1 63:5,20

J (2) 2:5 5:25 James (2) 2:12 5:20

Janette (5) 2:15 4:19 5:2,8 10:21 January (3) 16:10 17:1,5

Jayne (1) 7:10 Jessica (1) 10:8

Jesus (1) 72:4

Jim (4) 4:20 5:8,23 9:11

job (1) 54:21 jobs (1) 50:19 Joe (1) 8:8

John (3) 65:6,11,20 **Johnson (2)** 10:8 49:22

join (2) 5:20 59:21 joint (1) 9:24

joke (2) 46:9 72:14 **Jon (2)** 7:10 25:13

Jose (6) 42:1,3,3 49:20 75:15 83:9

Joseph (3) 2:6 10:7 11:23 **Jr (5)** 2:8 40:25 41:18 51:10,16

judge (1) 32:7

judges (2) 52:12,15 judgment (2) 38:8,9

Jules (6) 2:9 4:19 5:4,6,7,20

July (20) 3:9,10,11 15:14,18,19,25 16:2 17:1,5,9,25 18:22 19:1,17 20:7 81:12,19,20 83:1

June (8) 16:5,10 17:11,23 18:13,19 18:21 20:2

juries (1) 32:4

jurisdiction (3) 15:15 16:16 84:11

jury (1) 32:10

justice (2) 38:17 41:17

keep (4) 4:6 29:11 62:7 74:11

keeping (1) 61:23 Kelly (1) 75:10

Khalid (7) 2:13 9:9 10:7 23:5,24

37:18 51:20

kicked (1) 39:19 kicking (1) 68:1

kidding (1) 69:6

kids (1) 45:2

kind (16) 8:20 11:8,12 27:17 29:14 31:12 33:20 35:3 39:16 40:8,11

40:23 41:13 44:3 67:17 74:25 kinds (3) 11:11 31:8 52:6

know (41) 3:5 5:9 8:13 14:9 23:10

26:13 33:18 36:20,22 38:21 40:19 44:17,17 45:19 46:3,19 51:11,22 52:3 53:6,12 56:13,20 59:17,23,23 60:10 62:6,21 63:12 66:11 67:20 68:24,25 69:7,14

70:2 71:22 73:7 74:17 79:8

knowing (1) 24:15 knows (2) 5:10 70:21

LA (3) 44:3 49:8,9 lack (1) 75:25

ladder (1) 35:11

Lafayette (2) 71:25 74:21

laid (1) 76:15

Landin (3) 2:11 9:8 11:24

larger (1) 75:21

LaSalle (5) 42:1,3,3 47:10 48:8

late (3) 18:5 50:17 76:7 laughable (1) 77:23

Laughter (1) 5:24

Laura (2) 9:10 25:12

law (4) 26:2 71:10 76:25 77:12

lawyer (2) 44:3 49:2

lawyers (3) 35:6 72:12,12

laying (1) 73:4

lead (3) 51:21 62:24 71:3

learn (4) 7:21 50:11 57:12,13

learning (1) 36:17 leave (2) 25:6 34:14

led (1) 13:21

left (2) 44:25 84:11

legal (1) 20:15 legally (1) 67:10

let's (17) 3:1,2,6,11 10:20,25 24:2 24:19 25:6 28:11 41:22 53:9 65:8

66:24 67:1 73:18,21 **letter (1)** 70:12

letters (2) 59:16 60:5

letting (1) 38:15

level (6) 28:16 35:22 36:8 37:16

77:1,1

limitation (1) 18:5

limitations (3) 18:1,8,17

limited (2) 34:4 50:2

Linda (2) 9:13 61:7

line (3) 44:19 46:14,25

lines (3) 13:16 41:2 45:3

link (1) 58:19

Lisa (1) 4:20

list (6) 22:11,13 41:23,24 65:6

71:13

listed (1) 23:3

listening (2) 57:15 76:20

Liston (13) 2:10 8:8 10:4 24:22 29:2 34:11 35:14 36:6,10 37:6

38:3,5 53:11

literally (2) 14:24 76:16

little (10) 6:1 12:7 33:22 39:5,24 43:8 54:24 55:5 72:10 73:1

living (2) 58:20 75:17

local (2) 26:2 58:20

location (1) 75:19

lockstep (1) 8:1

long (12) 8:24 10:8 25:1 26:7 33:19 61:12,13,13,14 69:13 82:15 84:6

long-standing (1) 77:17

look (20) 3:13 27:4 54:12 57:9 59:13 63:21 69:15,15,16,18,20 69:25 70:1,3,16 71:23 72:15

77:24 78:9 81:16

looked (3) 67:6 69:18 73:13

looking (9) 4:12 6:1 8:16,21 12:5 40:19 63:7 69:17 73:5

loose (1) 61:8

lost (1) 18:15

lot (29) 4:15 5:18 7:14 8:16 9:17,20 9:22 13:15 22:8 33:24 39:2 42:9 42:23 43:4,13,19,20,25 44:1,22

47:6,12,19 49:19 53:3,13 58:4

72:17 74:17 loudly (1) 49:6

love (3) 5:5 40:1 52:5

low (1) 72:11

lower (1) 39:5 Lynch (2) 65:16 66:17

M (2) 2:14 11:21 main (1) 3:20

maintain (1) 80:7 major (1) 81:6

majority (4) 42:25 50:2,5 83:18

makeum (4) 7.6				
makeup (1) 7:6				
making (12) 28:14,17 29:6 41:2				
43:7 44:5,10 46:13 47:7 61:24				
64:11,25				
Maldonado (1) 25:11				
MAMARONÈĆK (2) 1:22,23				
man (2) 72:18 76:8				
Manager (1) 49:22				
mandate (2) 26:3,4				
Manhattan (1) 50:10				
Marcos (3) 7:11 8:9 9:13				
marriage (1) 86:18				
Martin (5) 2:9 4:19 5:7,13 10:22				
mat (1) 60:21				
math (3) 80:24 81:6,15				
matter (5) 5:11 24:19 41:16 86:14				
86:19				
Matthew (2) 78:14,14				
Mayor (1) 65:16				
Mayor's (1) 66:17				
mayoral (1) 6:5				
McCormick (4) 7:11 8:10 9:10 10:4				
mean (25) 12:8 23:5 35:5 37:20				
39:10 41:12 44:12 46:11 49:1				
58:23 60:20 62:15 63:24 64:7,8				
64:18,18,22 68:6 69:24 80:22,22				
80:24 83:4 84:2				
meaning (1) 78:20				
meaning (1) 78:20				
meaningless (1) 40:9				
means (1) 40:15				
meant (1) 48:8				
Measured (1) 17:11				
mechanism (1) 39:16				
mediated (4) 15:25 16:1 82:5,12				
mediation (16) 4:17 5:4 9:20,20				
14:17,18,21,23,25 16:3,4 17:19				
72:9 78:21 79:18 82:1				
mediations (6) 52:6 72:10,13,13				
72:14 79:4				
meet (2) 27:3 39:23				
meeting (30) 1:1,12 3:3,9,9,11,22				
4:2 21:13 23:21 25:15,20,25				
26:14 28:10 29:22 32:22 44:15				
49:25 50:1 51:13,16 53:4,9 76:10				
76:11,14,16 77:14 85:9				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22 29:4,11 44:20 45:10,11,12 47:16 49:20 50:6 51:19 55:2 56:23				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22 29:4,11 44:20 45:10,11,12 47:16 49:20 50:6 51:19 55:2 56:23 57:14 75:19 76:22				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22 29:4,11 44:20 45:10,11,12 47:16 49:20 50:6 51:19 55:2 56:23 57:14 75:19 76:22 member (3) 6:19 8:5 59:8				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22 29:4,11 44:20 45:10,11,12 47:16 49:20 50:6 51:19 55:2 56:23 57:14 75:19 76:22 member (3) 6:19 8:5 59:8 Member's (1) 50:24				
meetings (19) 7:16 9:24 21:20,22 29:4,11 44:20 45:10,11,12 47:16 49:20 50:6 51:19 55:2 56:23 57:14 75:19 76:22 member (3) 6:19 8:5 59:8				

33:23 57:11 77:16 memorandum (1) 41:10 memorialized (1) 41:9 men (1) 70:21 mention (1) 25:10 mentioned (8) 36:8 53:16 55:3 58:11 72:9,19 74:8 83:9 Mercedes (2) 52:19,20 merits (1) 76:20 message (2) 46:6 59:7 messy (1) 26:22 met (3) 25:10,13,18 metaphor (2) 32:10 40:21 method (1) 43:16 methods (1) 82:9 Meyers (1) 76:17 Michael (1) 76:17 Mickens (1) 10:5 million (1) 58:25 Mims (4) 71:16,16,19,21 mind (4) 40:3 61:23 74:11 78:2 mine (1) 84:22 minimum (1) 31:19 minute (2) 3:12 30:3 minutes (7) 1:15 3:4,5,6,8,8 59:7 misconduct (9) 13:5,17 57:4 60:12 60:13 62:18,24 63:10 65:1 mission (1) 60:11 mistaken (1) 26:2 Mitchell (1) 2:3 Mohammed (1) 2:13 moment (1) 54:5 money (1) 65:25 month (13) 12:10,12,15,16 15:18 20:9 21:11 50:21 54:15 61:19 79:24 81:11,20 monthly (1) 16:18 months (13) 4:13,14 15:21 16:20 17:15 18:10,11 62:9 65:19 69:10 69:11 70:4,4 morale (1) 28:21 morning (8) 3:1 15:13 45:6 55:3 71:19,20 75:3,18 motion (10) 24:2,15 33:15 37:3,4,6 37:7 75:24 76:7 77:11 motions (1) 77:14 **MOU (2)** 41:5,10 move (6) 7:17,18,23 24:20 51:10 83:21 moved (3) 24:21 37:6 71:22 Movement (1) 50:22 moves (1) 4:10 moving (2) 25:23 54:24

multiple (1) 79:11 murders (1) 77:7 **N (1)** 86:4 name (11) 8:23 42:3 56:15 57:18 57:24 71:15 73:6 74:6 75:4 76:18 78:14 names (1) 74:6 **national (1)** 76:3 nature (4) 8:5 12:22 30:14 45:16 necessarily (5) 25:2 30:9 37:16 48:22 64:18 necessary (2) 24:18 47:25 need (16) 6:15,24 24:6 26:4 42:20 47:1 52:18 53:6,23 57:1,2 63:2,4 63:20 73:14 85:8 needs (4) 10:10 26:23 56:6 71:8 negative (1) 8:21 negotiate (4) 32:6,13 34:2,7 **negotiated (2)** 34:5 38:22 negotiating (1) 30:13 negotiations (3) 29:6 30:7 31:11 neighborhoods (1) 71:1 nervous (1) 67:4 never (11) 28:23 49:17 58:3 65:21 66:4,5,8,11 73:12 78:1 84:23 new (26) 1:6,6,20,23 3:16,18 8:17 8:19 12:12 23:4 25:19 26:11,12 38:24 43:25 49:9 55:20,20 56:3,9 59:18 60:8 77:11 81:11 86:6,11 Newark (1) 73:24 nice (1) 53:4 night (6) 26:14 29:23 32:22 55:2 57:15 76:11 Nina (1) 10:4 nolo (1) 19:21 norm (1) 39:6 normal (2) 32:4 33:6 **Notary (1)** 86:10 **notebooks (1)** 73:2 **noted (1)** 13:5 notice (1) 76:3 notion (2) 38:14 55:1 now's (1) 4:25 **number (11)** 9:17 12:11 16:9 20:18 62:2 73:6,10 79:13,23 81:14 82:13 **numbers (8)** 16:5,8,17 72:16,17 80:23 81:16,21 NYPD (5) 18:13 30:6 37:15 57:21 76:4 0

Muglia (1) 25:14

O (1) 86:4 o'clock (1) 45:6 object (1) 6:22 **obvious (1)** 68:3 obviously (4) 7:24 28:23 35:6 47:5 occur (1) 41:25 offering (1) 34:3 office (7) 26:9 31:14 32:15 34:23 50:25 58:20 66:18 officer (16) 14:21 18:17 53:19 62:8 66:7 67:5,7,16 68:5,9,16,17 69:8 69:12 73:14 77:12 officers (24) 15:25 18:14,14,18 42:14 46:3,7,8,16 49:5 61:14,19 66:3,6,14 67:13,24 68:15 69:14 69:19,25 73:6,9 77:6 offices (4) 38:10,11,23 72:2 **oftentimes (1)** 60:3 okay (20) 4:23 5:4 10:20 21:15 22:6,15 23:23 37:7 53:11,12,13 53:23 57:2 59:25 65:12 66:15 73:10,19 84:20 85:6 old (4) 1:19 40:20 60:1 74:1 older (1) 17:22 once (3) 11:19 12:5 38:2 open (7) 17:13,16,21,22 18:7 19:1 36:4 operate (1) 11:19 operations (2) 22:22 25:22 opportunity (5) 30:25 31:1 47:14 47:22 49:12 opposed (2) 37:10 74:24 **Opt-out (1)** 9:20 order (4) 1:14 3:2 9:6 25:21 ordered (1) 20:13 orders (2) 52:12,16 Orella (1) 73:24 organization (1) 78:15 organizations (2) 51:7 56:22 original (1) 30:10 originally (2) 16:11 18:11 Ortero (4) 67:14 68:19,20,20 ought (1) 61:15 outcome (1) 86:19 outreach (11) 10:6 22:25 23:6 47:13,13 49:19,23 56:21,21 57:13 58:9 outside (3) 12:25 42:16 84:11 overall (1) 39:23 overlap (4) 9:17,20,22 11:13 overlooked (1) 43:5 overriding (1) 40:7 oversight (1) 34:13

p.m (1) 85:9 page (12) 10:22 16:20,21 54:3,4 78:18,18,23 79:7,12 82:25 83:3 palling (1) 76:8 Panel (10) 12:10,13,15,16 17:16 30:5,10 32:11 36:15,18 Panels (9) 6:16,25 11:19 12:5,9,9 12:12 36:21 82:11 panicked (1) 74:9 paper (1) 59:19 paper-heavy (1) 59:15 parallel (2) 27:13 35:3 parameters (1) 39:25 part (17) 5:13 13:6 22:1 29:5 37:13 38:11 39:8 41:11 45:2,5,7 48:6 48:16,17 55:15 72:23 82:7 participate (1) 7:19 particular (5) 10:11 12:13,16 31:22 64:22 particularly (1) 48:4 parties (1) 86:17 partner (1) 66:10 patrol (6) 42:4,6,13 75:13,14 77:3 patrolling (3) 42:6,7 75:9 PC (1) 19:5 PD (3) 11:7 28:9 78:7 penalties (1) 35:23 penalty (4) 20:5,12 34:6 83:16 pending (2) 18:2 81:9 people (72) 3:13 4:21,25 6:12 7:19 8:16 14:4 28:18 41:22,24 42:16 42:17 43:10,13,20 44:16,21,22 44:23 45:4,7,13,18,24,25 46:19 46:22 47:9,18,19 48:4 50:9,14,19 51:1 52:7,13 53:10 56:12,24 57:5 57:15 58:5,7,13,19 59:3,14,16,18 60:2,4,6,17,23,23 61:12 62:7 67:11 69:7,17,17 70:25 71:1,4,5 72:19,22 73:20 74:7,17 77:17 people's (2) 40:1 46:17 perceive (1) 34:25 percent (15) 15:24 17:3,5,6,8,13 17:14,17,18,20,22 18:20,21 39:3 78:25 percentage-wise (1) 38:24 perfect (3) 12:19 21:19 28:23 period (4) 15:16 17:4,7 80:1 person (6) 19:22 42:1 50:3 55:10 65:8 73:4 Peterson (1) 21:2 **phases (1)** 13:15 **Phil (3)** 25:19 72:1,3

48:8,9 65:15 66:16 phonetic (4) 65:15,17 66:8 67:15 **photo (1)** 69:18 pick (2) 55:18 70:5 picking (1) 51:12 picture (4) 66:4,9,9,11 picture's (1) 69:19 pictures (21) 65:21 66:5,22,25 67:1 68:14,15,17,20,24 69:1,3,6 69:9,11,21,25 70:3 72:1,3,4 piece (1) 39:24 place (13) 4:14 9:24 30:20 32:17 32:19 33:7 44:20 62:18 65:2 66:20 71:23,24 74:20 places (2) 51:24 57:25 play (2) 8:13 58:6 playing (2) 40:6 46:17 plea (19) 19:2,18,20,21,24 20:1,4 29:6 30:14,15,15 31:17,21,24,24 32:2 34:8 36:3 37:22 pleading (1) 31:7 pleas (8) 19:4,16 31:11 34:2,7 38:22 39:6,12 please (1) 49:21 **podium (5)** 53:6,7,8,9,11 point (13) 3:20 13:24 21:5 23:8 24:4,19 27:20 29:20 36:14 38:20 41:19 58:15 75:21 points (2) 75:15 76:18 police (68) 6:4 8:6 14:21 19:2,7,16 19:17,24 20:2,4,7,10,13 26:15,17 26:24 27:17,21 28:1,2 30:12,18 30:22 31:16,24,25 32:12,20,24 33:7,11 34:9,22,22 35:8 37:25 39:12 40:16 44:1,24,24 45:15 46:6,8 49:4,5,13 52:19 56:18,25 57:4,21 60:19 62:1 65:22 66:2,14 66:21 67:23 69:1,2,19,25 71:1 73:1 76:2,25 77:4 policies (5) 4:3,14 9:25 60:12 62:16 policing (4) 57:12,16 78:7,8 **policy (7)** 6:15 23:13 62:11,12 63:2 63:3.4 poor (1) 44:23 portion (1) 21:21 position (5) 43:6,24,25 71:7,11 positive (2) 37:14 63:9 possible (4) 11:6 14:10 26:6 29:12 **Post (2)** 8:17,19 **posterity (1)** 41:3 potentially (1) 35:9 power (5) 24:23 25:8 33:20 34:7 46:15

phone (8) 7:20 42:15 43:14,18

practice (1) 62:17 practices (1) 62:23 precedence (1) 25:7 precedent (2) 24:24 52:9 precinct (8) 8:5 42:8 45:10 49:25 50:1 57:10,12 66:8 precincts (1) 47:16 precursor (1) 39:15 predictions (1) 11:8 prefer (1) 51:18 preliminary (1) 64:25 prepared (4) 60:21,25 61:1,2 presence (1) 29:17 present (2) 2:1 50:13 presentation (1) 55:18 presented (1) 30:25 presents (1) 31:1 press (1) 61:6 pretty (3) 72:12 74:19 80:8 **prevent (1)** 77:6 previewed (1) 33:22 previously (4) 18:3 20:3 24:12 49:10 pride (1) 60:18 primarily (1) 10:11 primary (1) 13:22 principle (1) 35:13 prior (4) 3:25 15:6 23:20 30:13 priorities (2) 13:9 48:23 priority (4) 7:8 9:18 48:14,17 **Priority's (1)** 9:19 privacy (1) 26:8 privilege (1) 75:8 prized (1) 72:25 probable (4) 61:24 64:2,7,17 probably (5) 9:21 14:15 21:21 29:13 69:18 problem (8) 5:3 36:25 42:11 58:11 58:14 61:5 69:23 79:4 problems (1) 7:23 procedures (1) 60:13 proceed (2) 82:15 84:6 proceedings (2) 86:13,15 process (38) 4:10 7:14,24 8:1 9:16 14:17 21:18 25:17 28:13,22 30:11,20 31:5,6 32:23 33:4,10 35:4 36:21 40:2,17 47:9 48:14,18 49:16 50:7 54:25,25 55:4 59:12 59:15 61:11 62:4 65:2 82:5 83:15 83:21,24 processes (6) 9:4,7 26:17 27:22 27:23 33:7 produce (2) 46:21,21 productive (2) 25:15,24

program (2) 56:21,22 progress (3) 15:4 67:1 85:4 project (1) 27:13 projects (1) 27:14 promise (1) 70:16 proposal (3) 22:3 31:2 35:17 propose (1) 33:25 proposed (1) 29:21 proposition (1) 32:3 prosecute (2) 18:16 32:5 prosecuted (1) 30:7 prosecution (2) 18:25 38:6 **Prosecutions (2)** 29:5 34:1 prosecutor (2) 31:9 38:15 prosecutors (8) 32:3,4,5,6 34:15 38:6.24 41:15 protection (3) 52:12,16 68:10 **prove (1)** 43:3 provide (1) 20:22 provides (1) 69:1 providing (1) 69:3 provision (2) 35:17 67:22 public (17) 1:1,12,21 9:11 21:21 44:15 56:8 58:9 59:5,8 61:1,7 63:2,5,17 67:20 86:10 **publicly (1)** 61:4 published (1) 39:1 Puma (4) 2:6 8:9 10:7 11:23 punched (1) 66:12 purpose (3) 6:9,10 28:16 purposely (1) 44:16 purposes (2) 6:14 40:4 pursuant (1) 58:15 pursue (2) 48:5 60:11 pursues (1) 38:17 pushing (2) 13:23 43:19 put (17) 21:4 24:16 26:25 27:1 41:21 42:9 46:2 57:9 59:10 62:20 64:6 67:6 70:13 71:6 73:12,19 74:15 putting (4) 38:15 44:18 57:20 71:4

Q

Queens (2) 50:22,23 question (9) 24:7 29:2 35:21 63:23 67:14 68:4 80:17 83:22 84:25 questioning (1) 72:22 questions (5) 33:14 43:15 53:15 67:11 78:17 quickly (8) 4:10 12:21 14:3 48:10 48:20 54:20,22 61:20 quite (2) 5:9 53:3

R (1) 86:4 race (2) 73:12,13 raise (1) 76:13 raised (1) 75:7 random (3) 12:9,10,17 rate (11) 15:23 16:21,22,25,25 17:2,4,6,7 18:20,21 rational (1) 28:15 rationalize (2) 11:5 27:4 rationalizing (1) 30:1 reach (2) 31:12 57:4 read (2) 30:2 33:15 reading (1) 39:6 ready (1) 15:8 real (2) 57:17 62:3 reality (1) 46:23 really (17) 4:11,13 5:16 7:16 41:12 44:8,12 46:2 47:13 48:18,23 55:17 72:4 77:23 83:11,19,20 reason (8) 13:14 16:11 62:1 65:23 66:1 72:20 74:11 82:14 reasons (1) 30:9 Rebecca (2) 65:16 66:17 recall (2) 72:1 76:17 receive (1) 20:14 received (5) 15:14,17 16:10 79:23 81:19 receives (1) 17:12 receptivity (1) 33:21 recognizing (2) 38:8 60:9 recollection (1) 39:5 recommendation (4) 18:23 40:12 53:16 54:6 recommendations (4) 21:8 27:20 28:8 54:17 recommended (1) 39:18 reconstruct (1) 6:25 record (3) 24:12 46:8 86:15 recorded (1) 46:7 redesign (2) 13:2 14:8 redesigning (2) 9:16 21:17 reduce (1) 35:9 reduced (3) 34:4 35:18 36:20 reducing (2) 30:8 32:25 reduction (1) 83:16 reductions (2) 36:22,23 referrals (1) 82:6 referred (5) 82:12 84:15,20,22,22 refine (2) 6:23 12:7 refinement (1) 3:25 refining (1) 14:9 reflect (1) 16:9 reflected (2) 16:17 20:1

R

reform (4) 13:2 26:23 29:24 62:11

reforms (1) 27:25 reformulating (1) 9:15 regard (3) 12:2 21:4 51:21 regarding (1) 20:15 regardless (1) 71:10 regards (1) 20:12 regrettable (1) 40:21 regular (2) 23:2 69:8 reiterate (1) 75:15 related (2) 29:7 86:16 relationship (14) 44:3,6 45:22,23 49:1,6,7,11,12 56:8 60:17,18 76:9 77:17 relatively (1) 4:7 reliable (1) 48:24 religious (1) 51:7 relying (1) 29:15 remaining (1) 18:7 remains (3) 22:14 55:25 75:23 **remember (1)** 73:10 remembered (1) 58:1 remind (1) 56:3 rendered (1) 19:6 reopen (3) 66:19,24 70:11 reopened (3) 18:4,11 70:15 reorganizing (1) 55:22 replace (1) 25:3 report (34) 1:16,17 3:15,17,20 13:18 15:2,7,11 16:7,18,20,21 20:11,13,23 21:1,4 36:22 53:14 53:18,18,24 54:8,9,10,12,22 78:18 83:19 84:1,4,4,22 reported (6) 16:6,6,11 20:3,10 86:13 reporting (3) 1:22 16:19 36:11 reports (11) 1:18 9:11 21:8,16,17 21:20 23:19 39:9 52:3 54:17,20 representative (1) 6:4 representing (1) 78:15 require (1) 29:16 required.' (1) 66:23 resolution (9) 16:22,25 17:6,7 29:21 33:15,25 41:3 54:23 resolutions (2) 33:12 55:1 resources (8) 9:5 14:11,16,22 48:13 50:2 62:3 63:3 respect (9) 27:12,17,19 30:1,23 35:7 37:16 61:7 63:22 respectfully (1) 29:8 respects (1) 82:22 respond (1) 49:24 respondent (9) 19:20,25 20:9,11 30:20 31:12 32:13 33:12 37:22 respondent's (1) 20:4

respondents (3) 20:14 33:1 35:5 response (7) 11:15 21:14 23:22 28:17 29:19 37:11 41:20 responses (2) 11:12 28:19 responsibilities (1) 30:24 responsibility (1) 41:15 restricted (2) 30:12,13 results (2) 30:14 33:4 retained (2) 20:7,10 returned (1) 18:3 review (16) 1:2 3:4,7 17:17 18:2 21:6 31:18.18.20 32:20 33:8 36:8 56:16 61:15,19 85:8 reviewed (1) 20:19 reviewing (1) 20:21 reviews (1) 30:18 rewarding (1) 11:17 Richard (12) 1:8 2:2 3:1 54:18,23 55:18 56:5 57:6 58:10 60:10,16 62:19 **RICHMOND (1)** 86:8 rid (1) 48:20 ridiculous (2) 77:7,9 ridiculously (1) 40:5 right (48) 3:14 6:8 7:1 11:21 13:12 14:12,15 22:12,15 23:7 25:6 29:9 29:16,20 35:14,25 36:3,9 37:21 37:22,24 40:14,15,20 41:1,8,12 48:25 51:2 52:13 53:3 61:3,3,17 64:10,21 65:5 69:14 70:17 74:5 74:19 76:7,12,18 77:13 78:6,9 84:15 rights (1) 49:2 riot (1) 73:20 roadblocks (1) 9:6 Roger (5) 7:11 13:25 27:3 29:12 39:21 role (3) 13:22 58:6 63:18 roof (1) 49:10 room (4) 30:6 36:5 41:23 74:12 rooms (1) 58:20 Rose (1) 51:3 Rosemarie (2) 4:21 25:11 rotating (1) 12:5 routinely (1) 30:17 roving (1) 52:11 Rudolph (1) 2:11 **Rudy (2)** 9:8 11:23 rule (5) 4:3 10:1 67:3,4,24 rules (1) 6:15 ruling (2) 30:23 64:25 run (1) 5:5

sabotaged (1) 30:21 Sachs (1) 9:13 sad (1) 44:12 safe (2) 71:2 80:8 sake (1) 41:3 sanctions (4) 11:4 27:20 29:6 30:1 **Sarah (1)** 21:2 sat (1) 69:18 satisfactory (1) 4:23 **Saturday (1)** 57:11 save (1) 40:22 saw (4) 32:21 70:24 80:13,16 saying (11) 5:17 38:19 43:3 44:18 45:19 61:4 64:24 66:16 74:19 81:18 84:16 says (4) 33:25 66:6 74:15 84:17 scared (1) 74:8 scene (1) 46:19 scenes (1) 61:2 schedule (4) 4:7 14:19,21,23 scheduled (2) 19:11 50:16 scheduling (2) 7:23 14:18 schools (1) 56:22 sea (1) 40:4 **searches (1)** 20:16 season (1) 75:6 **seated (1)** 3:2 second (6) 7:7 16:21 19:20 37:6,7 60·8 second-class (1) 27:7 section (1) 21:20 see (24) 16:13 22:10 26:13 28:11 39:24 42:13 44:13 46:12 53:4 55:21 56:18 59:11 62:1 67:21 69:3 71:21 72:10,15 74:23 78:9 83:13,13,20 84:16 seeing (3) 51:13 54:13 63:13 seen (11) 55:25 57:19,25 65:21 66:4,5,9,11 68:14,15,17 selected (1) 6:11 semiannual (4) 39:9 54:9,10 84:3 send (5) 42:19,20 45:10 46:5 84:19 sending (1) 60:5 senior (1) 75:14 sense (11) 11:10,19 12:8 21:19 33:16 35:11 37:13 39:24 51:23 69:22 78:1 **sentencing (1)** 11:9 **separate (2)** 81:12,14 separated (1) 17:1 **separately (1)** 15:1 **September (3)** 8:1 15:5 20:25 **serious (1)** 68:9

running (2) 32:16,18

seriously (2) 77:22 78:1
serve (2) 28:16 63:2
served (1) 19:13
service (2) 19:14 63:1
SERVICES (1) 1:22
Session (1) 85:7
set (7) 4:8 5:10 12:12,15 25:7
31:22 86:20
settled (2) 65:24,24
settlement (1) 76:6
seven (1) 15:20
shift (1) 56:7
short (1) 75:18
shortly (2) 14:15 54:11
show (5) 21:7 43:3 46:16 57:15
60:23
showed (3) 69:11,15 70:3
showing (1) 65:21
shown (2) 60:23 69:9
side (4) 34:22 35:4 58:10 61:6
sides (2) 31:21 61:5
significance (1) 30:8
significant (6) 12:2 16:23 29:23
39:11 55:4 58:6
signing (1) 44:10
silly (1) 38:18
Simonetti (23) 2:5 5:25 6:9 7:2,9
8:8,11,15,18,20,25 9:12 35:15,1
35:21 36:1 37:4 38:20 39:8 52:2
53:1 57:23 84:15
simple (1) 32:2
Sinatra (2) 74:2,2
single (6) 43:11 44:25 45:1 46:8
57:21 59:5
sir (4) 71:14,15 76:12 78:13
sisters (1) 43:21
sit (6) 12:11 34:18 45:11 58:19
59:5,6
sitting (2) 57:14 74:1
situations (1) 32:23
skill (1) 5:10
skip (1) 53:13
Skype (1) 7:20
slow (1) 61:11
small (6) 27:1,2 29:12 72:16 77:5
82:13 smart (1) 5:10
Smith (4) 7:12 14:1 27:3 39:21
soldier (2) 5:7,22
Soler (3) 7:11 8:9 9:13
somebody (6) 7:17 64:14 67:18
70:5 71:10 74:13
someplace (2) 84:12,19
son (18) 65:20,21,22 66:3,4,7,12
(,,,,,,,,

67:2,5,5,6,16,19 68:1,5,14 69:10 70:3 son's (3) 66:10,13 68:6 sorry (7) 17:23 18:21 53:2 64:21 65:5 74:16 81:3 sort (3) 34:13 40:6 47:8 sorts (1) 38:12 sought (1) 33:20 **South (1)** 75:7 **space (2)** 50:9 51:1 speak (4) 5:1 10:9 43:18 49:5 **speaking (2)** 51:5 75:21 speaks (1) 75:25 **special (3)** 3:9,22 8:5 **specific (3)** 4:3 29:17 36:3 specifications (1) 18:24 **specifics (1)** 14:5 specify (2) 35:22 36:2 **specs (1)** 64:15 speed (2) 54:25 62:6 speeding (2) 61:10 63:25 **spirit (2)** 6:24 28:10 spitting (1) 42:17 **spoke (2)** 65:15 76:18 ss (1) 86:7 staff (17) 3:24 4:21 7:10 8:9 9:9,13 10:4,7 11:24 20:19,20 25:14,18 26:16,25 57:11 62:2 stage (1) 14:10 standard (2) 64:23,24 standing (7) 22:13,18 23:19 25:3 53:8 72:24 73:1 start (6) 3:4 13:18 22:20 45:21 57:2 60:9 started (2) 7:25 50:6 **starting (3)** 3:15 40:23 56:15 starts (1) 56:14 state (3) 78:18 86:6,11 stated (1) 70:21 statement (4) 16:15 50:15 58:21 58:21 statements (1) 20:22 Staten (1) 51:3 **statistical (1)** 16:18 statistically (1) 85:2 statistics (7) 20:1 39:1 78:17 81:7 83:5,6 84:3 stats (1) 36:13 statute (4) 17:25 18:5,7,17 **statutory (1)** 40:14 stem (1) 17:13 **STENO-KATH (1)** 1:22 stenokath@verizon.net (1) 1:24 step (2) 75:24 76:8

stepped (1) 65:7 **stepping (1)** 5:16 **stickers (1)** 57:20 stomping (1) 68:1 stop (3) 19:22 62:23 71:2 **stopped (1)** 43:10 **straights (1)** 76:1 street (6) 1:5 28:8 42:16 57:10 69:9 71:25 strength (1) 46:15 stress (1) 77:10 **strikes (1)** 14:3 strong (1) 23:5 **structure (1)** 12:1 **structures (1)** 24:3 **struggle (1)** 74:7 studies (3) 20:17 73:18 74:4 study (5) 15:4 20:18 73:16,21 74:1 **stuff (5)** 13:9 39:6 53:14 74:19,22 **subcategory (2)** 8:6 39:11 **subcommittee (10)** 7:4,8 8:7 9:8 9:11 10:2 23:1 24:3 31:20 78:2 subcommittees (13) 3:21,23 4:1,5 4:6 22:19 23:9,13,20 24:1,11,20 subject (5) 5:11 6:19 22:5 38:2 39:12 subpoenas (1) 60:22 **subsequent (1)** 32:20 subsequently (1) 30:19 **substance (1)** 64:25 substantiate (1) 64:12 substantiated (6) 15:22 18:13,22 72:17 78:25 79:8 **substantiation (2)** 11:20 15:23 subtlety (1) 7:14 subtract (1) 79:20 subtraction (1) 81:1 sue (1) 60:20 suggest (1) 84:7 **suggestion (2)** 29:7.10 **suits (1)** 75:6 summer (1) 59:24 **supervise (1)** 77:18 **supervisor (1)** 68:23 support (1) 33:24 **supported (1)** 33:3 **supporting (1)** 63:21 supportive (1) 26:6 **supposed (5)** 42:14 44:14 66:20 66:25 77:18 **supposedly (1)** 68:16 sure (14) 9:2 24:23 28:17,20 32:16 38:4 43:7 49:15 62:15 64:2 73:25

suspension (2) 77:8,9 sworn (1) 58:21 system (3) 26:18 40:10 52:10 **T (2)** 86:4,4 table (3) 29:15 41:22 57:10 take (19) 7:15 9:24 13:22 20:8 24:10 32:12 33:7 34:12 43:6 47:17 52:1 61:22 62:18 65:2 74:23 77:22,25 80:11 84:19 taken (6) 10:1 68:21,23,25 69:6 takes (8) 30:20 31:9 42:23 61:12 61:12,13,14 82:15 talk (13) 11:2 12:11 15:1,3 22:9 35:18 42:2 43:23 45:19 55:17 57:16 71:17 72:7 talked (4) 4:2 36:15 58:15 62:11 talking (9) 29:25 47:7 58:12 63:4,6 64:15 73:2 74:12,14 talks (2) 51:2 56:23 Talya (3) 65:9 70:7,9 target (2) 42:16,17 **Taylor (14)** 2:3 7:9 10:6 21:24 22:6 22:10,15,25 23:3,8,16 24:4 39:14 49:18 technically (1) 64:4 technological (1) 52:15 teeth (1) 37:19 telephoned (2) 83:19 85:1 tell (22) 12:25 29:14 47:10,11 48:25 49:17 54:2 60:3 66:18 67:8 67:12,16,19,19 68:7,21,22,25 70:10 72:12 74:5 77:21 telling (3) 43:21 55:14 68:22 tells (1) 63:13 template (1) 13:19 ten (3) 35:24 60:3 63:14 terminated (1) 54:7 terminology (1) 23:11 terms (6) 20:17 57:18 59:14 63:18 63:19,24

76:21 79:12 84:9

suspect (2) 75:20 76:11

thereabout (1) 15:9 they'd (1) 80:4 thing (19) 8:2 12:20 26:11,12 34:11 40:20 43:9,23 45:8,9 59:10 60:8 61:10 62:11,13,18 67:3 68:13 73:22 things (31) 3:17 7:25 8:21 11:11 13:19 25:10 43:7 45:15 46:10 47:4,6 48:15 52:7 55:22 56:2,4,6 57:7 58:25 60:3,21 62:10 63:8,13 63:14.15.19 72:6 83:15 84:25 85:3 think (78) 3:19 5:2,21 6:2,5,6,14,23 7:14,16 9:17,19 11:10,13,14,17 12:7,16,20 13:1,23 15:6,11 21:19 22:20,21 23:11 24:1,4,18,22 25:1 26:1 27:15 28:10,12,24 29:10,23 33:22 34:11,17,20,21 36:6,10,12 36:16 37:12,18 38:5,12 39:4,14 40:25 41:8 45:20 47:6,13 48:14 51:9.19.20 53:24 55:25 56:16 57:1,24 63:9,11,15,20 76:17 82:17,19 83:9 84:8 85:6 thinking (2) 55:21,22 third (1) 61:10 thought (2) 6:12 75:1 thoughts (6) 21:12 29:18 33:14 41:19 55:19,23 **thousand (1)** 43:15 thousands (1) 49:4 three (6) 6:3 14:24 34:18 42:5 82:2 82:12 throwing (1) 74:24 thrown (1) 30:22 thrust (1) 30:2 tight (1) 4:7 time (21) 5:1,9 7:25 11:2 16:14 24:24 33:19 39:2 44:20 47:10,11 48:25 49:17 60:19 61:21 62:19 68:8 72:9 73:2,3,19 times (4) 9:23 42:25 43:4 50:17 timing (3) 44:15 75:19 76:14 tiny (1) 39:24 title (1) 8:12 today (1) 56:8 **Tommy (3)** 73:9,10,11 **Tony (7)** 7:1,3,9 8:7 9:12 52:20 57:22 **Tony's (2)** 37:6,7 top (1) 56:14 **Toscano (2)** 2:5 5:25 total (9) 15:17,20 16:8,9 78:19 79:24 81:13,17,19 totality (1) 7:3

totally (2) 38:14 81:13 touch (2) 60:2,4 touched (1) 56:5 tough (1) 7:25 town (1) 40:22 tracking (1) 39:13 **Tracy (12)** 1:9 2:4 3:10 11:24 12:3 13:24 14:2 15:3,9 53:16 58:14 84:7 training (1) 20:14 trains (1) 75:17 transcript (1) 86:15 translate (1) 28:11 transparency (2) 29:25 36:10 transparent (3) 26:5 27:10 28:15 traumatized (1) 45:1 treated (2) 28:20 32:3 tremendous (1) 21:3 **trial (8)** 19:6 30:6,14 31:10 34:2 36:5 64:16 83:15 trials (5) 19:8,9,10,11 25:11 trouble (1) 59:10 troubling (1) 85:3 trucks (1) 57:19 true (4) 79:6 80:13 81:24 86:15 truncated (6) 82:6,13,17,18,21,24 truncation (4) 16:21,25 17:2,4 trust (2) 45:25 70:25 truthless (1) 46:1 try (8) 11:5 12:25 13:2 27:21 30:3 40:18 64:12 72:5 trying (12) 4:6 12:1 23:14 27:4,9 29:11 36:11 38:18 39:23 45:13 74:9 82:22 turn (4) 10:22 65:12 73:8,9 turns (2) 12:17 74:14 Twitter (1) 59:20 two (16) 9:18 14:24 16:19,23 25:10 41:4 50:21 69:5,7,21 75:15,18 77:23 81:10,16 82:11 type (6) 36:2 42:24 44:6,11,20 46:19 types (1) 8:4 typically (1) 30:4

U.S (3) 38:11 75:13 77:3 ultimate (1) 40:7 ultimately (6) 13:8 27:22 31:21 37:21,25 49:17 umbrella (1) 75:13 unanimous (1) 24:10 uncomfortable (1) 44:4 undercover (3) 67:23 69:14 70:2

terrible (1) 40:22

71:13,14 75:2

thanks (2) 5:18,23

theory (2) 34:21 77:2

terrific (2) 57:6 61:8

testament (2) 38:5,12

thank (20) 5:19 10:21,25 15:12

51:8 64:20 65:4 70:6,7,18,20

21:2 23:16,17 37:12 41:18 47:2

underlying (1) 40:15 undermine (1) 35:12 undermined (1) 30:22 undermines (1) 78:11 undermining (1) 33:2 understand (12) 21:18 48:4,9 58:7 60:16 65:3 67:22 80:2 81:23 82:25 83:17 85:2 understanding (2) 36:6 41:11 understands (1) 76:24 understood (3) 25:1 27:6 34:6 undertake (1) 31:5 undertaken (1) 14:23 underway (1) 27:14 unequaled (1) 29:13 unfair (1) 28:22 Unfortunately (1) 52:23 unit (12) 17:19 18:25 21:24 22:18 29:5 30:5,11 34:1 38:6 42:4 50:3 68:24 unlawful (1) 19:22 unnerves (1) 53:12 unpredictable (1) 26:22 unsettled (1) 76:12 unsubstantiated (4) 72:16,21 73:12 74:16 up-the-chain (1) 35:4 up-to-date (2) 66:9 68:17 update (1) 20:17 upfront (1) 14:22 upper-level (1) 26:16 urgency (1) 78:2 use (2) 26:19 32:10 usual (2) 6:15 53:14 usually (2) 39:3 50:18 utter (1) 26:10

٧

vacating (1) 31:23 vacation (6) 18:15 19:19,23 20:6 30:16 71:9 vaque (1) 48:1 van (1) 52:21 vans (3) 51:24 52:6 57:6 varies (1) 39:2 various (1) 13:16 vehicle (1) 57:21 vehicles (1) 52:14 vein (3) 6:24 23:18 28:25 vendor (1) 84:18 venues (1) 51:20 verdict (1) 19:6 verdicts (1) 19:8 version (2) 41:8 56:12

viable (1) 28:3 victim (1) 72:23 Victims (1) 73:7 video (12) 15:6,7,7 21:1 46:11 48:16,19 54:16 58:19 74:13,13 74:16 videos (8) 43:1,2,2 46:7,8,12 70:24 71:4 videotaping (1) 58:16 Vietnam (1) 40:21 view (6) 8:23 14:14 25:4 27:18 33:3 64:1 viewed (1) 30:13 views (1) 28:3 violence (1) 76:2 virtually (1) 20:21 virtue (1) 30:22 vision (1) 62:21 volunteered (1) 6:12 volunteerism (1) 6:17 vote (4) 3:13 23:24 24:6 32:4 voted (2) 30:5,10

W

wait (1) 70:11

waiting (1) 59:5 wake (1) 22:8 walk (1) 42:13 walking (1) 57:3 walks (1) 61:15 want (49) 3:20 5:1 7:17,22,23 8:14 10:13,17 12:2,6 13:25 15:9 23:6 24:8,20,24,24 25:7,9,19 26:11 34:14 41:13,24 43:23 45:8 47:5 48:5,19,20 49:14 54:19 55:17,17 56:1,3 60:1 62:7,8 65:18 66:14 66:19 67:20,22 71:5,17 72:7 74:4 74:23 wanted (10) 22:20,21 29:20 33:19 42:1 49:23 73:16,17 75:15 81:5 wants (5) 5:6 12:25 28:16,20 37:22 warrant (1) 14:12 wasn't (5) 6:10 22:1,4 49:8 73:11 watched (2) 71:3 76:16 wave (1) 37:4 way (34) 4:15 6:25 7:15 12:8 23:14 25:7 26:6 32:6 34:22,24 41:6 47:20 48:20 49:16 51:19 57:17 59:14 60:5,6 61:11,11,11 62:9,24 69:15 70:1,2 72:20 77:24 78:20 80:21 81:15,25 86:18 ways (7) 14:8 25:15 26:7,22 27:9 37:14 82:2

26:13 41:25 70:16 we're (40) 3:15 4:6 8:21 11:1,3,5,8 12:4,20 13:12 14:19 19:3,8 20:23 21:17 22:8 25:23 26:5 27:1 34:24 35:9 38:18 40:18 41:12 43:3 51:2 51:5,21 55:7,13 59:1 62:24 63:12 64:1 65:25 69:1 76:1 77:13 81:17 82:22 we've (17) 8:3 11:13 16:6,19 19:10 27:14 29:25 41:21 42:4 47:7 49:19 50:5,6,16 58:12,14 66:10 website (1) 46:11 **Wednesday (1)** 1:3 week (8) 15:5,8 20:25,25 25:13 55:18 61:18 77:9 week's (1) 3:22 weeks (1) 14:24 well-known (1) 49:7 went (7) 49:25 56:8 66:12 75:10 77:1 84:12.12 **WHEREOF (1)** 86:20 window (4) 68:2,3,11 74:25 windows (1) 77:2 wish (1) 24:16 withdrawn (2) 16:24 17:3 within-entitled (1) 86:14 witness (2) 48:6 86:20 word (3) 26:19,21 56:18 words (7) 6:4 9:4 31:25 32:2 34:14 34:19 76:10 work (24) 4:16 5:14 9:15 13:19 20:20 21:3 25:16 32:21 40:2,3,8 41:12 44:22 45:3 49:15,16 55:6 61:1,9 62:12 63:21 77:15 78:3,11 worked (3) 5:9 34:12 36:7 workers (3) 65:17 67:11,24 working (4) 4:22 58:4 59:1 60:17 workings (1) 76:24 works (1) 51:14 world (1) 59:18 worried (1) 46:9 worry (1) 54:23 worthy (2) 27:24 83:11 writing (3) 9:25 70:14,16 wrong (5) 6:6 44:15 46:3 69:16 82:3 X

y'all (16) 43:6,18 44:19 45:3,19,20 45:25 46:1,5,11,15,17,20,24 47:1 68:18

yeah (3) 18:21 47:11 74:24

we'll (8) 3:17 4:10 8:25 15:1 26:6

	l	I
year (8) 15:21 16:3,8 17:14 42:24	1PP (1) 25:17	53:17
50:3 54:21 57:13		5-day (1) 54:6
year-to-date (4) 15:20,23 16:1	2	50 (1) 39:3
18:20	2 (5) 1:15 18:4,18 19:16 20:11	50s (1) 74:3
years (5) 42:5 58:12 69:5,21 73:23	2-fare (1) 75:17	510 (1) 15:17
yesterday (1) 26:14	2-hour (1) 26:14	517 (1) 16:7
Yoon (2) 2:7 9:12	2-percent (1) 17:10	52 (1) 75:9
York (9) 1:6,6,23 8:17,19 38:25	2,605 (5) 17:10,16 81:17,18,20	548 (1) 17:16
49:9 86:6,11	2,662 (1) 17:11	57 (1) 17:5
Yorker (1) 77:11	2,703 (1) 16:10	58.5 (1) 18:20
Yorkers (1) 56:9	2,739 (1) 16:11	
young (3) 58:5,7 72:18	2,907 (1) 15:20	6
Youngik (2) 2:7 9:12	20 (1) 75:9	6 (3) 1:19 18:8 42:23
YouTube (1) 46:12	2011 (3) 65:23,23 68:14	6:30 (1) 51:16
1001000 (1) 10112	2013 (4) 15:16 17:4,7,24	60s (1) 73:24
Z	2014 (15) 1:3 15:14,18 16:5 17:6	653 (4) 80:18,19,20,24
zero (2) 62:21,22	17:10,11,23,25 18:13,22 19:17	66 (1) 17:14
zone (1) 75:17	20:2,7 86:21	68 (1) 15:15
0	21 (1) 17:17	7
————	212.95.DEPOS (1) 1:23	
1	215 (1) 19:1	7 (3) 1:20 18:7,9
<u> </u>	21st (1) 59:21	70 (2) 17:18 26:2
1 (15) 1:14 17:22 18:3,4,10,14,16	223 (1) 17:19	753 (7) 80:22,22,25 81:3,6,8,14
18:17 19:2 20:1,8 75:10,10 78:18	23 (1) 19:15	75th (1) 57:10
79:12	23rd (1) 66:8	776 (1) 84:10
1-800-CCRB (1) 57:23	25 (3) 18:20 19:4,7	
1,078 (1) 15:21	29 (2) 19:11 73:11	8
1,200 (1) 80:11		8 (5) 1:21 16:20 20:5 82:25 83:3
1,218 (10) 15:19 79:5,13,21,22,25	3	8:00 (2) 50:19 57:15
81:11,14,18 84:10	3 (8) 1:16 18:6,9,9,13,15 19:5	80s (1) 39:3
1,834 (1) 17:17	42:23	
10 (3) 20:5 45:6 59:7	3:00 (1) 50:18	9
10.2 (1) 78:25	30-something (1) 42:22	9 (6) 16:21 17:20 19:9 78:18,24
10:21 (1) 1:4	30s (1) 73:23	79:7
100 (2) 1:5 56:11	30th (1) 68:14	9/11 (1) 74:21
10007 (1) 1:6	311 (1) 57:23	90 (3) 61:21,21 62:5
101 (1) 16:4	31st (1) 17:9	90s (2) 39:4 75:10
10543 (1) 1:23	33 (1) 17:8	914.381.2061 (1) 1:23
10th (1) 1:5		914.722.0816 (1) 1:24
12 (2) 17:21 18:22	4	94 (1) 17:13
12-year (1) 60:1	4 (4) 1:17 18:14,14 42:23	95 (1) 16:2
12:06 (1) 85:9	4:00 (1) 50:18	953.3767 (1) 1:23
120th (1) 42:7	40s (1) 74:2	99 (1) 56:10
13 (2) 1:3 19:13	43 (1) 19:10	99 (1) 30.10
139 (1) 1:22	` '	
14 (2) 16:1 72:15	44 (2) 17:6 19:12 442 (2) 15:14 84:13	
14.4 (1) 15:24	46 (1) 75:9	
14th (1) 86:21	465 (9) 15:19 78:19 79:15,20,24	
15 (1) 19:19	80:12 81:12,21 83:1	
155 (1) 15:22	47 (1) 17:3	
16-year-old (1) 59:25	488 (1) 16:7	
177 (1) 78:24		
18 (5) 16:2 62:9 72:15 78:25 79:9	5	
18-months (1) 17:21	5 (6) 1:18 17:22 18:1 19:23 42:23	
	I	I