CALL TO ORDER
Alderman Bernstein called the meeting order at 7:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE January 30, 2006, MEETING
The minutes of the January 30, 2007 meeting were called and unanimously accepted (3-0). (Alderman Jean-Baptiste was not present at this time.)

CONSIDERATION OF JANUARY 2006 TOWNSHIP MONTHLY BILLS
Alderman Holmes had a question regarding the Accounts Payable Aging Report, items 22 23, Postmaster rolls of stamps $80.00, and U.S. Postmaster postage $200.00. Her question pertained to these items both being on the bills list at the same time. Mr. Terry noted there was no one from the Township present as today was a holiday for them and he would inquire regarding these items.

Alderman Bernstein called for a motion to accept the January 2006 Township bills noting they are subject to an analysis of that issue. Alderman Moran moved for approval, seconded by Alderman Holmes, approval unanimous (3-0). (Alderman Jean-Baptiste was not present at this time and arrived shortly thereafter.)

CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO ANIMAL CONTROL ORDINANCE
Alderman Bernstein said at his request this was put on the agenda for consideration of modification. This Dog Ordinance was addressed several years ago after an incident involving a couple of Rottweilers when it occurred to him that there were enough teeth in our Dog Ordinance. He does not want to particularize any dog as a dog is as good as their master/mistress and the ability to control and the rearing they’re given. He does not necessarily want to give a dog “one bite”, because that bite could prove to be very serious. We now have a situation with a pair of Rottweilers that had been running free and were cited a couple of times but the case was dismissed because people didn’t come to court. Subsequently two of them very seriously attacked a smaller dog causing a $1,000 worth of veterinary bills. After some negotiations we eventually voluntarily got the owner to get rid of the dog that was thought to be the aggressor. The other dog now is now characterized as a dangerous dog and this man now has to either get rid of the dog or build a compound to house the dog and take ameliorating methods. Alderman Bernstein said he has driven by the house and does not see any new facility going up. There has not been any kind of building permit in the nature and type of structure we mandate for dangerous dogs which requires a building permit. When this was put into effect it was made to be more painful than getting rid of the dog.

Alderman Bernstein noted Linda Teckler, the City’s Animal Control Warden, is present tonight and has some very salient points about modifications she thinks the ordinance requires. He does not know how restrictive we can be and the due process of requirement whether we can give only one bite before we can get the dog out of town which he would like to see happen. Evanston has a lot of dogs, he loves them and wants them to run free at the dog parks and dog beach but they have to be controlled at all times. If people can’t control their dogs it’s not the dogs’ fault its peoples’ fault.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said all of the communication in the committee packet is about the impact of chaining dogs and how their disposition becomes meaner where they’ve attacked or killed children and questioned if we’re talking about what to do about dogs that attack us. Alderman Bernstein said that’s part of it. He received a copy of a letter and a newspaper article from a young woman, in attendance tonight, that was included in the packet about how many people raise their dogs, putting them on a three foot chain, keeping them from food and water, and are then very surprised when the dog...
gets off the chain and attacks somebody. Alderman Bernstein said he wants to analyze the entire ordinance as it is not sufficient for the number of dogs in this community. At the same time we will have to get more serious about licensing dogs as there are more unlicensed than licensed dogs in Evanston. Ms. Teckler noted licensing dogs was different years ago when there were part timers and more people working in this area, but at the present time it’s not an option because of staffing. Alderman Bernstein said licensing every dog in town would mean needing to create another position, maybe a part or a half time position. The Dog Ordinance is not an effective ordinance; it has too many loop holes, one of which is not knowing how long people have to appeal the fine on dangerous dogs. The Chief of Police has to act within 10 days. Alderman Moran said what he understood from the material is there was a suggestion that we at least amend the Dangerous Dog Ordinance to eliminate making the chaining illegal, which makes a lot of sense to him.

**Alderman Moran moved that staff prepare an amendment to the Dogs, Cats, Animals and Fowl Ordinance, Chapter 4, to prohibit chaining of dogs in the fashion that has been exemplified in the material received by the committee and bring that back to the committee for action.** If we’re going to do wholesale revision of the ordinance there should be some kind of analysis from staff. Alderman Bernstein remarked there will be a lot of people coming to talk about their dogs but his concern is once we’ve declared a dog dangerous under our ordinance it may be much too late and asked if there are questions or problems with the consensus to the amendment proposed by Alderman Moran.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said other than having read the articles saying the kids that were killed or injured were all killed or injured by dogs that were chained . He does not know whether dogs become dangerous because they’re chained and more information or specifics would help him understand this. Alderman Bernstein said reading the article he got the sense chaining is an inhumane treatment of dogs and does not care whether or not they become vicious as a result of this, as initially they should not have to go through that. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said never having had a dog his perception of sense chaining is an inhumane treatment of dogs and does not care whether or not they become vicious as a result of this.

Mistie Lucht, sent the letter and article to Alderman Bernstein, said she’s working toward not chaining your dog 24 hours a day in your back yard. Dogs typically chained like that are probably not licensed or vaccinated and sometimes not fully cared for. Generally they are left outside 24 hours a day, do not have adequate shelter and are subject to all kinds of weather elements. They’re most likely neglected as well and can become victims because if they’re chained they can’t get away from other dogs or people that abuse the dog which is not safe for the community or for the dogs that are chained.

Alderman Moran agreed with Alderman Bernstein about making the transition from being chained to becoming more aggressive and more dangerous. To him that is not a civilized way to treat a dog.

Alderman Holmes asked how this will be enforced, how do you identify these dogs, do people call in when they see them, who is going to do the follow-up. Those are the questions she would ask especially when she sees you only pay $10 for a license which to her seems ridiculously low. Maybe we could have more staff if the process helped pay for it, to do the monitoring and enforcement of whatever kind of ordinances we have. Alderman Bernstein said people will call in and either Ms. Teckler or someone that the Police Department designates will go out and take a look to the extent there is some ordinance being violated and it will be addressed. He does not anticipate police will be going around and looking in people’s back yards but it has come up in his ward many times that people were brutalizing dogs. Alderman Jean-Baptiste noted the objective is to modify the ordinance so dogs are treated more humanly to which Alderman Bernstein added the other part is his primary concern is to get Ms. Teckler and the Legal Department thinking about what we can do. We have a lot of dogs running free often with the consent and knowledge of the owners who are walking behind them a half block or so away not knowing what their dogs are into, especially if the dog is not a socialized dog. Ms. Teckler said in regards to the Dangerous Dog Ordinance 9-4-17, under (B) paragraph it says a pen or dog run area six foot high (6’) or a secure top. Dogs can climb very easily so she thinks it needs to be six foot high with a secure top. She also feels that dangerous dogs should be micro chipped so the dog that is scanned will always go back to the owner. As far as insurance of $100,000, she does not know any insurance company that will insure that other than Lloyds of London or some other comparable company, which is something that should be checked into. She also thinks they need to change the time limit for an appeal of 10 days. Ms. Teckler did not think the construction is necessary if they’re going to walk the dog. When they walk the dog they have to have the dog muzzled on a three foot leash.

Alderman Bernstein did not know what ability we have to find out whether or not one bite is going to be sufficient or if we can do that, will there be any support at all, even from him. He does not want anybody seriously injured either a human being or another animal before some dog gets declared a dangerous dog. To the extent that we can stop that perhaps it’s the function of raising the penalties, these are not very steep penalties for that kind of conduct. He asked if Ms. Purze could research information regarding concerns prohibiting chaining to see what others have done with regard to ordinances. We’re not looking to preclude a specific breed; we’re modifying the behavior of the owners not the dogs.

**V. CONSIDERATION OF A REFERENCE TO ENDORSE STATE SMOKE FREE LEGISLATION**
Alderman Tisdahl, who is not here tonight, originally wanted this item on the agenda to revisit the Clean Air Ordinance in Evanston to determine whether or not we wanted to modify what we did a couple years ago when we were asked to go smoke free. Several Aldermen said we would encourage the state to go smoke free and we now are aware that Chicago has a modified smoke free program which will become a smoke free program.

**Don Ziegler, Evanston Health Advisory Board**, said House Bill 4338 was introduced by Representative Collins and co-sponsored by our own Julie Hamos. It is to seek a 100% comprehensive smoke free Illinois in all work places including bars and restaurants to be consistent with New York and many other states including Great Britain. That bill is pending and has gotten out of committee and is in the House. When he heard from Alderman Tisdahl that there was some interest in bringing this up she asked him to draft a letter and contacted different advocates from the Illinois Coalition Against Tobacco saying Evanston would support this legislation, what’s the best timing and to whom should we send this. Their recommendation to have the greatest impact was to send a letter to the Governor and to the head of the Senate Emil Jones and Representative Maddigan, President of the House. Since Julie Hamos is a sponsor we did not need to send a letter to her. Alderman Bernstein asked if staff could create a resolution to present to the Council wherein the City of Evanston expresses support for House Bill 4338.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said the first issue is to try to get a resolution in support of the state’s initiative, which he supports with the modification suggested by Alderman Bernstein. **Alderman Jean-Baptiste moved to support the resolution with the modifications as suggested. Alderman Holmes seconded the motion.**

**Betty Ester, from the audience**, questioned the type of device Alderman Moran mentioned. Alderman Moran responded that is a filtration system equipped with devices to render the exposure to second hand smoke someplace else. Maybe we should also think about dropping the smoke trapping equipment. Alderman Bernstein said maybe the resolution could speak to this if it’s the will of the Council is to go smoke free. The reason he couldn’t support a smokeless restaurant was because that is the nature and basis of our revenue production and he does not want to do anything to hurt them. He hoped it wouldn’t be a question of life and death versus money. The state of California says it’s business and they can monitor it because you have to go to Nevada if you want to smoke, and New York is similar. In Evanston people, if they want to, may go to other communities to smoke. The nature of the resolution he would like to put forward is if the entire state would go smoke free.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said the first issue is to try to get a resolution in support of the state’s initiative, which he supports with the modification suggested by Alderman Bernstein. **Alderman Jean-Baptiste moved to support the resolution with the modifications as suggested. Alderman Holmes seconded the motion.**

Alderman Moran did not think we should go for the proviso if they can come up with equipment that renders the air the equivalence of second hand smoke someplace else. Maybe we should also think about dropping the smoke trapping equipment. Alderman Bernstein said maybe the resolution could speak to this if it’s the will of the Council is to go smoke free. The reason he couldn’t support a smokeless restaurant was because that is the nature and basis of our revenue production and he does not want to do anything to hurt them. He hoped it wouldn’t be a question of life and death versus money. The state of California says it’s business and they can monitor it because you have to go to Nevada if you want to smoke, and New York is similar. In Evanston people, if they want to, may go to other communities to smoke. The nature of the resolution he would like to put forward is if the entire state would go smoke free.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said the first issue is to try to get a resolution in support of the state’s initiative, which he supports with the modification suggested by Alderman Bernstein. **Alderman Jean-Baptiste moved to support the resolution with the modifications as suggested. Alderman Holmes seconded the motion.**
Chief Kaminski said this is an Annual Report of the Office of Professional Standards which is actually two components of the Police Department. It has the Internal Affairs component and the inspectional process component. The inspectional component is quality control for the organization, we monitor polices, procedures, and office behavior. We do an early warning system where we track all our officers on an all performance indicator to see if any problems are beginning to show. We do all types of reviews of our procedures and programs to make sure we’re doing the right things and if we find problems we try to correct them. The Internal Affairs component deals with staff inspections done throughout the organization where various components are routinely checked to make sure we’re doing the right things. Internal investigations are a result of activities brought to our attention by somebody else or activities we find ourselves. There a number of types of investigations we conduct internally about our employees whether they’re sworn or civilians. When a citizen comes in and files a formal complaint under the statutes regarding a police officer’s conduct in the community it is investigated thoroughly. Various administrative reviews are done where we look at officers’ behavior, for example if they came late, they had an accident, or they did something that we noticed was inappropriate, we conduct a thorough investigation on that. Anytime anybody contacts the Chief to look into something because they do not want to file a formal complaint we take that very seriously and investigate it under the category of Department Inquiry. If we find somebody did something wrong, we take it to the next level and conduct a disciplinary action. We have a Use of Force model which Mr. Brown’s report indicates is one of the more thorough and complete Use of Force policies around. Mr. Brown’s report mentions that our policies surpass none others in the country. All activities are monitored very closely on a regular basis throughout the Police Department. As a result we’ll take disciplinary or corrective action regarding our officers for any of those activities. In last year’s complaint register we had 10 complaints, in the area of administrative reviews 112 actions were taken for officers. The top 3 categories are tardiness, preventable accidents, and court miss. We did 75 departmental inquiries, 42 incidents of abusive force. In miscellaneous investigations we look at pursuits, specifically profiling, we track all the data on our traffic stops for the last 2 years and from that data we track every year. Each officer is called in to personally review their data. Background investigations are done on all the people coming into the department as well as for other positions. The Office of Professional Standards does a lot of work; we internally do a lot of checks and balances that any business would do to make sure we’re providing a quality service to the community. We take this very seriously and take all of our complaints seriously. What you do not see in this report is the flip side to this. The Chief said he often comes to this committee and we talk about some of the things officers have done, maybe inappropriately but nobody’s perfect. Each time he comes he brings a packet and in today’s packet there are 53 complimentary letters sent by citizens, which far exceeds the negative letters received, that don’t get as much publicity as somebody doing something wrong. At least 53 citizens took time to compliment the officers and write a letter or send an email about what they did positively in the community and we should be especially proud of those activities. When we get a complaint it’s investigated thoroughly and the officers report directly to the Chief. They’ve been trained in criminal investigation and investigative procedures, they’re very good investigators. As you all know when you have a complaint you need those investigative skills to do a thorough and complete investigation as well as understanding the police officer Bill of Rights which was passed by Illinois legislators and we are obligated to follow all the guidelines set forth in this bill.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste remarked Chief Kaminski talked about how an evaluation is conducted and asked what are some of the shortcomings seen with the department especially since you have a number of very young officers on the force. You do not have the officers you had in the past, that live in and know the neighborhood and he wanted to know how the Chief sees those aspects and what is being done to try to rectify those. Chief Kaminski said he would not call that a shortcoming, any organization is going to go through a transition. Currently we are going through a transition; a lot of the people are retiring after 20 or more years. We’ve got very good young people, however in an organization you like to balance some senior people with young people. Right now we’re hovering at 55% under 5 years. The challenge for us is to make sure we have the ability to train people and get them on line with all our policies, procedures and especially the mission and values of what the department is all about. The organization is changing fast; people are leaving faster than we can get people on board to train which is currently our biggest challenge. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked the Chief to what extent does he feel his officers know the community, to which the Chief responded, when they’re out in the field training program we try to do a number of things to build continual community engagement into all of their activities. Can you do it on a regular basis, so we’ve been short staffed for the past few years and are just catching up to our staffing level now. Starting off the year we’re finally at enough people hired, for the past 2 or 3 years we were hovering at between 15 to 20% non usable bodies because of the retirements and trying to get everybody on board. It takes at least 9 months to a full year to replace an officer. We have never lowered our standards of the hiring process, in fact we have increased standards and in today’s market we do not see the volume of people wanting to be police officers as in the past. We’re doing 3 to 4 tests each year getting over 100 people applying, out of the group that starts the process by the time we’re done we may be lucky to 5 or maybe 7 people, which is how stringent the process has been as we try to get the best people for the jobs.

Alderman Holmes thought there would be a lot of preparation time in terms of people retiring as you would know when they’re going to retire. What is the process for doing that? Chief Kaminski said not necessarily, some people walk in and say its time to go and they’re gone, some people say they’re going to leave and then don’t leave. It’s hard to pin people down to this because you can’t ask them when they’re going to leave.
VI. CONSIDERATION OF AN APPEAL OF THE DISPOSITION OF A CITIZEN COMPLAINT
Alderman Jean-Baptiste noted the first incident was initiated August 3, 2005 by some interaction between officers and some youths who were in downtown Evanston and between the parent of one of the youths who complained to the Police Department as well. Alderman Bernstein indicated to the committee that we have the ability to go into Executive Session as some statements from the last open meeting gave officers names and badge numbers all which are relevant in terms of an investigation but just as people are presumed innocent officers are presumed innocent until the process determines that they are not innocent and liable for their actions. Some of these complaints can result in personnel actions and we have the right as a committee to go into Executive Session to discuss matters with respect to personnel. We don’t want to call names at open meetings, as in the reports we have initials identifying people. Often people feel they can’t speak openly in a large group and we have the prerogative of going into Executive Session if we think we’re going to get better answers or a better discussion. People not involved in that particular case are excluded from Executive Session. Alderman Bernstein asked if the committee or complainant wish us to go into Executive Session to discuss this particular case. Alderman Moran explained work rules in relation to the Police Department and according to our collective bargaining agreements with them they have certain rights of confidentiality when there are potential disciplinary ramifications. If people want to mention names we need to go into Executive Session, if they don’t want to mention names we don’t have to. Alderman Holmes said for purpose of staying in an open meeting we ask people to refrain from using badge numbers or names of the officers until we can get through the complaint. If we then need to go into Executive Session then we can do so. Alderman Bernstein noted the internal investigation has been completed and we have an analysis of what they determined. If we don’t accept the analysis the Police Department has given us or do not like the sanction or fact that it was founded or unfounded, that is something else we have to address and names are needed to do that. Alderman Jean-Baptiste wanted to clarify if the resolution binds the officials of the City not to be discussing the sanction or fact that it was founded or unfounded, that is something else we have to address and names are needed to do that. Alderman Jean-Baptiste wanted to clarify if the resolution binds the officials of the City not to be discussing the sanction or fact that it was founded or unfounded, that is something else we have to address and names are needed to do that. Alderman Jean-Baptiste suggested following the process of having the option of going into Executive Session if we need to suggest somebody’s name. He also did not want to take that off the table for our next meeting when we may not have specific complaints on the table in terms discussing process. While it’s binding to us as officials not to call out an officer’s name because we have some authority over their employment status, etc., etc., he’s not sure whether he agrees it aught to be binding on the citizenry who may have a particular complaint. For the purpose of this session only he is suggesting we go forward and try to hammer out the process that will follow because we have some differences in that. Alderman Bernstein was not sure he understood exactly what Alderman Jean-Baptiste was saying to the extent we can go forward with the process that’s going to be open session and transparent, but to the extent people want to call names, and that’s their right, we can’t do it in open session.

Bennett Johnson, NAACP, referred to the logic when you talked about the exemption of innocence of the defendant in the court. The basic premise is persons should be tried in open process and the same thing should be applied to the police officers who also should have benefit of an open trial. His experience has been that with officers who have multiple complaints, where there’s smoke there’s fire and he’s been involved in this police arrest process for a decade. He would strongly urge that be an open process. Alderman Bernstein said that’s a valid point but it’s a question of degrees. We have contractual obligations. If we’re talking about a policeman whose physically abusive he wants him gone. If somebody wants to charge him with a battery then it becomes an open process seeing his name is in the newspaper along with any other defendant and he comes to trial in an open court. Here we’re talking about possible suspension or expulsion from a job depending on the nature and severity of the charge. That’s an employment issue, no freedom is involved. Mr. Johnson said a policeman is the law, he is the primary contact that a citizen has with the government so therefore it’s more than just job. He represents the City, he represents all of us and therefore that should be the primary consideration.

Alderman Bernstein called upon the first complaint which is one that was heard before and asked if the complainant wished to go into Executive Session to name names, if not it should be kept generic. We’re talking about officers yet to be named, but that does not prevent you from asking the policeman’s name. It’s not a closed process if the complainant wants to open it up. He, nor this committee, knows the policeman’s name. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked if the complainant knows the result of the Chief’s investigation, to which the Chief responded, yes, he did talk with the
complainant. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked the Chief if he could give an overview of the nature of the allegation and what the process was.

Chief Kaminski said he is the one responsible for all this data and has probably talked to most people in the room tonight. We’ve added an additional review process to the complaint process. Prior to coming to this panel we’ve run the synopsis of these complaints by another group of people to get their input trying to make sure we’re doing the right thing or at least viewing the facts. The group is comprised of volunteers who have been part of his Advisory Board for the last 6 years, volunteers who want to remain anonymous who actually serve as extra eyes and ears reviewing and giving input in these cases. We’re trying to make sure we’re not missing things along the way. He encourages anybody who wants to be part of the Advisory Board to come on board, give him your names after the meeting tonight. This particular complaint took place downtown where as you know we have a special beat, Beat 87 that was put into effect several years ago. We have a special car that patrols the downtown area from 7:00 p.m. until 3:00 a.m., on Friday and Saturday nights which was in direct response when the theater and development began because of a lot of calls and complaints from every facet of the community about problems with young people, with robberies, etc., at the theater where Puck’s restaurant is. During the summertime when people eat outside kids would ride by there and throw stuff at the people, take stuff off the tables, stand around and use very disparaging language to the people. To curb that kind of activity we put a police officer there from 7:00 p.m. until 3:00 a.m., Friday and Saturday nights to patrol that area to make sure everybody is safe and we don’t have those problems. We had a couple of incidents we told the officers to pay special attention to, groups of young people going through the downtown area doing a thing called “wilding”, which is groups of young people walking up to a person, adults and young people, for no reason at all and punching them. The officer in this case was doing his job walking the area and saw groups of young people in the street and several times asked them to please get off the street and please get onto the curb. The response by the young people, according to the officer, was there were derogatory comments and remarks made to the officer about his appearance and his name. The officer let it go by and several citizens walked up to the officer afterwards and told him he was very composed. The officer left the area after giving that directive, he came back a short while later as they usually do to check to see if there was compliance by the young people and there was not. The officer approached again and again asking to do that, the young person did not abide to that and the officer said he’d have to arrest him. The officer then took the individual into custody and brought him in to the station and called the parents and let the parents know about the activity that was going on. That was the extent of it; there was nothing further about the arrest. That’s a summary of the case.

Pat Gregory, parent complainant, said that’s a real brief synopsis of what happened, but that’s not what happened. Her son was there and was standing on the curb, the police officer did come over and ask him to move and he moved and he turned around and asked the officer would it be okay if he stood in front of the theater and the officer told him no. When her son put his hand on the door to walk inside the theater the officer arrested him and he and all of his friends asked what had he done, the officer said it was something he said. The kids and her son said he didn’t say that but the officer said yes he did he said it in a different kind of way. Ms. Gregory’s nephew knowing her son had never been in trouble before and was scared was not going to let him go the police station by himself and was going to go with him so the police officer arrested him too. When she got to the station she asked to see her son and the Sergeant in Charge refused to let her see him, then took her in a room explaining to her what happened. The Sergeant said her son was standing in the middle of the street to which Ms. Gregory said she couldn’t believe her son would be standing in the middle of a busy street for as long as the officer said he was standing there. The Sergeant said her son then turned around and asked the officer a question and maybe the officer looked at her son as being smart and said he/she would have not arrested him and just told him to go into the theater, but the officer looked at it as being disrespectful. Her son was then taken to the station where a Juvenile officer was standing over him and cursing at him telling him he was going to take him to Maywood Juvenile Detention Center and his mother would never see him and kept cursing him. They would not let her see her son as she asked several times to see him. She told the other officer that her nephew didn’t do anything and asked to let him go. The officer told her police officers don’t give rides, if he came to the station he’d be arrested. The officer then gave her a piece of paper to sign that was supposed to be a release form and he would not give her a copy of the paper she signed because he said it was for confidentiality or whatever reasons. Her son was not allowed to go to downtown Evanston for 7 days. She hears what you’re saying about not letting police officers names and badge numbers be mentioned, but her son didn’t even have the opportunity of due process, he was already convicted and punished. She has dealt with some very nice and very helpful officers in the community, but how can that police officer be unfounded and you’re telling her son he can’t go downtown Evanston after dark or when the street lights come on. The officer who had her sign the paper said they could not find him in the system but now he’s in there like he did something. She is very angry about this and in the report it says the only officer that was found guilty was the officer that was cursing. All of them should have been found guilty. She was not afforded the right to see her son at all which is not right, her son was not afforded due process but he was punished. You talk about not punishing these police officers but these juveniles they take in and do the paperwork on and take whatever action they want, sometimes they’ll go to court and sometimes they don’t, but that paperwork is there. She’s not happy with this and will not stop until something is done. She understands what Chief Kaminski is saying but its not working for her, if it’s a class action suit we need we will get that. They don’t understand the psychological damage they’re doing to these young black males by always throwing them around and up
against cars. People drive by and see these black boys on cars and automatically think these boys are bad. Her son is not bad. She spent too much time and money to make her son an upright citizen. Up until this point he respected police officers and so did she, but at this point she does not respect any of them. Anytime you treat teenagers like that because you can, she had an officer tell her, "I did it because I can", she wrote his name down and three years later that's the officer that arrested her younger son and that's a problem. She talks to different African American people in the community and they talk about these officers, these veteran officers, who have been on the force for so long they fondle the teenagers and do other kinds of things that are scary. She does not like what she's seeing, she's not pushing anything undercover, and she's not going behind close doors and talking to anybody, because she can take care of her son. She looks at her students who come to her and say the police did this to me, I'm so scared. Not too long ago a boy called her to ask her if there's anything she can do to help him. He said he hasn't always been a good person but now he got accepted into college and missed two college interviews because there's one police officer that's by his car every time he goes out of his house and always harassing him telling him about Chicago. She does not know what this big thing is about Chicago, we live in Evanston and they work in Evanston and they work for us we don't work for them.

What bothers her is she got this ridiculous letter in the mail talking about unfounded. Police OPS are police officers, the Chief just said he has a group of people he’s been working with, is she supposed to be impressed because he opens this up and shows them this case and they say we're going to agree with you. What makes her think that they won’t? People are afraid of the police, she’s not afraid of the police because she hasn’t done anything wrong. Her children should not be afraid of the police because they haven’t done anything wrong and she told them if you do the right thing, if you mind your business you won’t get in trouble. I told them a lie, because her son just asked a question and was arrested. What happened to those records? To this date nobody has called her or said anything to her about what’s going on, its 6 months later. Just tell her what she needs to do, what she needs to tell her son and her students and every other black person in this community what we are supposed to tell our kids. If you’ll be quiet the police won’t arrest you, well that’s not true because they pull up and say arrest all of them, mob action. How in the world do you call it mob action when you see a six foot 250 pound police officer with a gun and a billy club and you just saw him rip up your friend. Are you going to be tough and walk up on this officer, and then there’s 10 more standing behind him and all of a sudden somebody drives up and says just take them all. So they take them all and call it mob action and then what about their friends who are white. One said he just got stopped downtown by the police and had $20 worth of marijuana in his pocket and the policeman took the marijuana and put it in his pocket and said he didn’t see this, go on home. The kids tell each other these stories. We raise our children to get along with and communicate with each other. Even her white students say the police don’t handle them like they do our black friends. She does not care who believes her or who doesn’t. How in the world can we just arrest somebody just because they’re going into the theater, or just because they asked a question?

Last summer when she start letting her son go out by himself they watched a movie about some police officers that grabbed a boy off the street, the boy got away but he had been molested. Her son said when he sees the police he’s going to run away. She said let’s call the police and see what you’re supposed to do. She called and talked to a juvenile officer that said, no you don’t run but if a police officer approaches you just ask them if you’re in any kind of trouble. If they tell you no then you say okay I have to get home. But, when her son asked a question it was looked at as being disrespectful. She knows four other people that received letters like she received and have stories like hers, so something’s not right but she’s not afraid to take three steps forward, she’s had it.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said when he was reading this he wasn’t sure what the charge was as he didn’t see it. The Chief said there were no formal charges it was just an in station adjustment. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked then why was he arrested. The Chief said he was arrested and brought to the station and then released to the parent, the basis for the arrest was disorderly conduct with no formal charges filed against him. In a situation like this we want the parents to know what happened and then release them to the parents, there are no formal charges in Juvenile Court or anything. It’s just to let them know what the young man was doing because we certainly don’t want there to be a record, we don’t want a negative impact. We want to try to make sure he knew what the officer was doing at the time so that this wouldn’t happen again. In reference to the delays that Ms. Gregory had that was just getting the kids out and trying to get them down from upstairs where the youth officers are. We know Ms. Gregory was upset at the time and they were trying to do as much as they could to let her know what was going on. The Chief said he was sorry that Ms. Gregory got the letter before we had a chance to talk because he did call her and left a message to talk to her about this. Ms. Gregory called him back several days later and they talked. He wanted to call and talk to her about the other incident she called about but she did not call him back so we really did not get a chance to get a little dialogue on what was going on.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said there were a number of youths acting disrespectfully but he did not get a sense that the officer identified this particular individual and his cousin as acting disrespectfully. Was that an arbitrary action like pulling one or two of the youths out? The Chief said the officer asked everybody to please comply. We talk about society and rights we also talk about social contract. The social contract we all have is when the police ask you to do something you comply. The officer asked him and then left the area, when he came back they were doing the same thing, so the message that the officer got is his request to them the first time was totally ignored. The point is when the officer's
message the first time wasn’t taken serious enough to comply. They brought your son to the station; they called you and let you know what happened. That’s the extent of it; he’s not trying to minimize it from Ms. Gregory’s part but is trying to balance things.

Ms. Gregory said the Chief was not there nor was she there, the officer can tell the Chief anything he wants to tell him. She’s telling him her experience at the police station was not a good one. That officer had a negative impact on her son just grabbing him, putting handcuffs on him and throwing him in the car when he didn’t do anything. What happens when an officer asks a teenager to do something and they comply, they get arrested anyway. Her son complied, he asked him to move off the curb, her son turned around and asked him if it’s okay if he could stand in front of the theater and everybody said that’s all he asked the officer. She does not see how you could get anything smart out of that. The officer told him no, he was compliant, he was going in the door and he got arrested. As she understands it if the officer asks you to do something and you do it you’re complying but the officer came back and lied to the Chief and said he walked around several times with everybody out there saying he asked her son to move and her son moved. There were a lot of kids there and he didn’t arrest the white boy that was laughing at his shoes but him pulled him over to the side, talked to him and then he and his group left. He then came over because he thought her son and friends were having a conversation about something else. He just assumed that they were laughing at him, why does anybody have to assume he is that great he has control over everybody. Her son asked him how do you pronounce your name because of what it looks like. Nobody even laughed from his group and that’s what everybody said. You have these officers who review everything that has to do with officers. The only officer that was founded was the one that was cursing, to her every last one of those officers are founded. Why would she have to sign a piece of paper that at first she was lied to and told the paper was a release, and as she later understood it was some kind of agreement that she should have received a copy of. What would have happened if she decided not to sign anything wouldn’t have been able to take her son home, but he wasn’t arrested.

Alderman Bernstein asked Chief Kaminski what the paper Ms. Gregory signed was, to which the Chief responded, it’s a station adjustment sheet to release him to the parent. It just says the young man’s been station adjusted for whatever it was. Ms. Gregory said what you’re saying is my son was guilty, he was station adjusted, he was punished because he could not go downtown for 7 days. Her son was brought down to the station which means he was arrested, he was humiliated, degraded and then let go. He wasn’t there for a few minutes before they let him go, he was there a while. When the officer went upstairs he lied and told her that her son was upstairs talking, talking, talking. The officer was lying because Ms. Gregory knows how her son is with her. It angers her that the Chief would sit here and defend this officer saying he left and came back. He didn’t leave and come back, he’s lying and why isn’t he here, he should be here to tell her that in front of all these people. He is lying and everybody else lied, she should not have had to sign anything if she just came down to pick him up. Her white friend said when she went down they gave her son and she did not have to sign anything and he was really doing something, it was because of curfew. Ms. Gregory said she is not a confrontational person, does anyone think she wants to sit here before all these people and discuss this. She’s upset because she’s pushed into a position she does not want to be in, because her son is going through a thing with the whole police department and now is she supposed to convince him not to run when he sees the police. How can she convince him to stand there and comply?

Her older son is also scared of police officers. They stopped her son’s friend in front of his house; they picked up her son and came down the block, while she was standing at a house. The officer that stopped him ended up being the backup for officer that was the backup the first time, if that makes sense. Ms. Gregory pulled down the street and looked in the car and saw that was her son so she got out of her and asked the same officer what’s going on, is everything alright. The officer asked her who she said as and she that was her son in the car and she wanted to make sure everything was alright. The officer told her to get in her car and move it before he gives her a ticket for double parking, she got in her car and went to the end of the block parked and came back and again asked if everything was alright, the officer told her to just stand right there, and she asked the other officer if the kids are alright, they said, stay back. She then called the police station and asked the person at the desk what the procedure is because she just wanted to know if everything was okay and was told the backup officer should be able to give her that information. Then the same officer made all the boys get out of the car, search them, they had book bags that were dumped out on the ground to which Ms. Gregory asked why they were doing that and the answer was because they can. That is why these officers have that mentality because they have a leader that will back them up.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said at this point in time your differences have clearly been delineated. Let’s have some discussion in terms of process. Unfortunately we have a process, we’d like to see a different process but that’s what we have right now. Alderman Holmes wanted to clarify that in terms of this incident there are no records whatsoever on this young man. Chief Kaminski responded, right, but there’s always a general field report that’s under our records and none of those records are ever releasable to anybody by Juvenile Court law. Alderman Bernstein said if somebody is referred to Juvenile Court the record of a station adjustment will be on the record. There’s a note of the HASJ adjustment station and it’s less than a referral to the court but it is of record on the kid’s record.
**Brad Barett, Ms. Gregory’s son**, said when he was at the police station and while sitting down and they were taking his information an officer came into the room and asked what did he do steal a bike or sell drugs and he was wondering what was he talking about. The officer said no he was just standing outside downtown Evanston. Brad asked what did I do and he said don’t worry about what you did we’ll tell you what you did when you get done with this. They just assumed that he stole something or was selling drugs.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked Brad if he was able to make that complaint to the Chief or to anybody in the police department. Brad said he told his mom and she did. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said that’s an important piece of information to always put out so the Chief can at least know all that goes on because in his opinion there’s no place for that kind of insinuation. Alderman Holmes thought that should have come out in the investigation by the OPS, didn’t they question the young people involved in the incident. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked Brad if he mentioned that when they interviewed him to which Brad responded, he did not say that exactly but told them the officer was assuming things about him.

**Ms. Sherry Gregory, Ms. Pat Gregory’s sister, her son was with Brad when the incident took place** and the same things happened. He was at his dad’s that weekend and she got a phone call from his dad saying he was at the police station and she asked what happened, and if she needed to come. Brad’s dad said he would take care of it and call her back. He called back and said It was really nothing he got arrested but he didn’t do anything and they had him sign the papers saying he couldn’t go downtown for 7 days. Her son is kind of slow and was telling her things they were saying to him at the station and the officer that arrested him still bothers him when he sees him. She’s not going to the police department because she’s been there on numerous occasions trying to get things resolved that had not been resolved. She confronted the officer herself and told him to leave her son alone and if he has a problem with her son to contact her because she’s his mother. She told him you will not disrespect, accuse, of want to know what he’s doing every time you see him, because he does not get in trouble, he does not have that mentality like the other kids have. He’s not out getting into trouble because he’s with his older cousin, Brad who’s 2 years older than him, because our family is close. Are you going to arrest me because I want to know what’s going on with my sister? Ms. Gregory went on to relate another problem she had with her older son in relation to police officers that also involved E.T.H.S. She thought when people come with these types of problems they should be looked at as a community. A lot of these people don’t have kids or don’t know about these kids, but these kids get along and they talk to one another. He also thought this committee should be more public and something has to be done about the way the police are handling these kids threatening them by always watching them. She told her son let them watch him and every time they say something to him don’t even respond to them just let her know and as the mother she’ll deal with it and if they have any respect they will contact her if you were that disrespectful because she is responsible for you.

Alderman Holmes was trying to understand if these were just station adjustments why the kids weren’t allowed to go downtown for 7 days. Chief Kaminski responded when the youth officers are part of their counseling they set parameters for the kids and suggest there’s a consequence for actions and what’s to be done. It’s a very informal thing; it’s a learning experience and what is gone over with the parents. Alderman Holmes wanted to clarify if this is an informal way that the juvenile officers interact with the young people. Chief Kaminski said the philosophy is to try to change behavior, to deal with the experience, and make sure there’s no criminal record. When there’s inappropriate behavior there’s consequences which are what the parents agreed to. Alderman Holmes asked if it’s informal what would happen if the kid went downtown within the 7 days. Chief Kaminski said it’s not really a legal document it’s more of an agreement the parents have with the police. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked if Ms. Gregory agreed with the youth officer about the 7 day downtown condition, to which the Chief responded, that is correct. Ms. Sherry Gregory said that was not her understanding, the police talked with her son’s dad. Ms. Pat Gregory said that was not negotiated with either her or her sister they just told us they had to sign the paper it was a release form. The officer said her son is not allowed to go downtown for 7 days and she was not able to get a copy of that form because of the courts, Brad was a juvenile and would be released to her, but she never agreed to anything.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said we have to try to move beyond this point to see what we extract from all of this to move the process forward. Chief Kaminski said he did not know Ms. Gregory was coming to the previous meeting and hoped to be able to talk to her to suggest having little round table with her and her son. We were exchanging telephone calls and Ms. Gregory never got a chance to call him back. He would suggest having a round table at least with the kids because what bothers him the most is the hope that was going to be a learning experience for the young people and if it’s not turning into that from their perspective it’s his responsibility to show where the officers’ are and their perspective and then try to mediate it which he hoped to do before it got to this point. Alderman Bernstein thought it had been a learning experience, but it’s been a negative experience.

Alderman Bernstein remarked not having been on this committee very long, what is our authority is to deal with these complaints. Alderman Moran said under the City Code it’s the Chief’s call when a complaint of misconduct is registered. They do the investigation and ultimately the Chief has to make a determination which he has and recorded to us.
essence we can’t overrule the Chief what we have done in the past is if we review all of this and listen to whomever is here talking, and if we feel that the disposition reported to us is the correct one we move to accept the disposition as its been presented to us and the committee votes to or not to agree. If people are not happy with that then that’s expressed. There used to be a Police Services Committee which got rolled into the Human Services Committee to have these discussions where there would be an allegation of misconduct against a policeman or several policemen and that process would run its course. The Chief would make his decision and then we would have this discussion amongst the committee and people who would come to these meetings. He has always viewed our committee’s roll in this is we are here to listen; we aren’t here to overrule the Chief. The law is clear that the Chief is the one who makes this call. As policy makers we have the authority and ability to advise and consult or whatever, or wherever we feel somehow something’s gone wrong within the activity of the police department. That is our role as he understood it.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said as officials of the City our duty is to make sure we have the best police force and best service we can possibly have. We have youth who can also comport themselves in a way that is in their collective best interest. A discussion he has had with the Chief before is there is a real gap between the officers’ understanding of the reality and the reality idea. There are not a number of officers who do not know the youth they serve nor do they know the population in general. Officers may come with their own prejudices that could be good, bad or indifferent, but they impose that on their reality. In terms of the orientation there should be an additional phase where there is some interaction for the new officers, perhaps going to the churches, to the schools, maybe call for some police community discussions where these new officers are introduced to the community to have a chance to interact and learn more about the community, which he does not how it can be implemented. Others may be involved with the youth at other levels. From time to time some of them could go by the barber shops and talk to the youth who may frequent some of those, but the gap has to be closed. There’s no one size fits all approach to all of the youth. It’s unclear to him what the motivation of the arrest was, the second arrest is even more confusing to him and why we think that aught to be justified. The issue of respect is something all of our youth have to understand, you have to be able to handle the relationship with authority in a way that maximizes your chance of getting away from that kind of confrontation so you don’t get a police record. We can talk policy all we want but there’s a certain amount of defensiveness that needs to go on so people can avoid some of these pitfalls, because some officers are disrespectful and do curse and do presume that every black young man is a thief. That’s a constant fight and he would suggest that there be additional steps undertaken and is not just taken from this interaction. The fact that you include in your advisory an additional review is going in the right direction but opposed to waiting for people to volunteer try to see if you could reach out to recruit some of the longstanding individuals in the community who have some critical interaction with you and with the City so that we can bring some more credibility to the process of review. To review yourself is ultimately to serve yourself. He would suggest we do not close the book in this particular complaint and ask the Chief, since the Chief had intended to have further discussions, to go back and look at the facts and whether or not the outcome is not one that these youths believe that they’ve been punished for something when they don’t feel they did anything wrong. There was some criticism with the officers, some smart talk, for which there may have been alternative ways of dealing with, but the second arrest is totally unclear to him. The first one is cloudy because he does not see where the identification of the individual was severed and apart from the rest of the group. He would suggest that be reopened for further discussion to try to probe the rationale of the officer that decided to sweep their cousin in. His family is raised like that too, no one is going to let one person go without going with them because that person is in trouble and that does not mean that all of them should be swept into the arrest. He does not know what the alternative is but certainly the second individual should not have been arrested for that rationale.

**Alderman Jean-Baptiste moved to reopen the matter and allow the Chief to further investigate and further talk to the youth involved, the parents involved, and the officers and if there could be some discussions between the officers to bring closure to that.** We need a police department that we can respect, that we can count on and the police department also needs to have some predictable interaction with our youth so they understand they’re human beings too, and also need respect so if somebody is disrespecting them they may move them to a point where they may respond to them. He does not think they should go to any extreme and we do not want that authority abused, but it is important that there be some further discussion on this particular issue.

Alderman Holmes agreed with Alderman Jean-Baptiste’s suggestions because if you look at the first encounter with the officer he talks about one youth having a direct confrontation with the officer and several disrespectful comments were made so he gave them a warning and left. Then 45 minutes later when the officer returned he again says one youth and does not identify that youth as being the same youth, therefore she is not sure it is the same person that made him do this. He arrests the cousin for disobeying an officer as well when the cousin simply asked if he could go with his cousin which doesn’t make a lot of sense as far as disobeying the officer is concerned.

Alderman Bernstein said this is just the tip of the iceberg. There is a perception and a perception becomes a reality that we have to address. Years ago we had conversations about the gang problem and met at Evanston High School and started a dialogue, we need to continue the dialogue. Alderman Jean-Baptiste had a good suggestion in terms of getting the police officers here. Historically he has seen the distinction among the people and the same distinctions are with
policemen, they’re people, some have a lower fuse others a higher boiling point but there is definitely concern and its not just expressed tonight we talked when we talked about an advisory committee to hear these complaints. There has to be a method in which we can reach out to this community because he does not want kids walking the streets afraid of policemen, that was the whole idea behind the walking patrolman is to interact with the people. We have a lot of work to do, it’s an ongoing battle, but this is just a symptom of a greater problem we have to adjust which he’s been trying to do for many, many years but does not know how. This is Evanston, we pride ourselves on our “diversity”, but that’s a loaded word. We talk in terms of a youth initiative; this is the serious part of the youth initiative. This committee, in conjunction with the Human Relations Commission, in conjunction with the Police Department has to find a method by which we can start the dialogue and try to interact and impact this kind of thing. At this time Alderman Bernstein introduced the newest member of the Human Relations Commission in the audience

Alderman Holmes asked if we know what officers and how many officers get these kinds of complaints against them, they may need some additional training. Chief Kaminski said he mentioned earlier that we go through a whole series of things to track all of our officers; it’s called an early intervention system. All the data is put into a computer and we look at all types of data, the number of complaints they get, we look at sick call in, lateness, and if we see a threshold being met we deal with the officer on a positive effect. We’ve been tracking and monitoring our officers consistently for years and if there’s a red flag that can be corrected, we watch because we don’t want that liability either.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste noted in terms of the station adjustment if he didn’t think his son did anything wrong and if nobody thought he did anything wrong and if he wasn’t charged with anything then he would not want this station adjustment paperwork on him. It’s important for the Chief to take a look at that, particularly in this case, as to its implication of what people think and perceive. If it says nothing then why have it. The Chief said it’s meant to be a positive interaction between parents, young people and the police. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said if it is intended to be that, that’s fine, if his son did something or you thought he did something and we sat down and talked about it and came to an agreement as to how to correct it that’s another thing. As you say it’s meant to be the coming together of the station, the police officers, and the parents then let’s make it that. In this case these parents are saying they didn’t have a part in that agreement; there was no meeting of the minds in this particular issue. That agreement also says you agree they shouldn’t be downtown for 7 days; please try to take a look at that. Alderman Holmes remarked everything is taped so if that conversation happened its on tape, to which the Chief said we do not tape those cases it’s very informal.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste addressed both Ms. Gregorys and said the Chief is saying it was to have been a collective statement as to how to address that. Ms. Pat Gregory said it was presented to her being paperwork to be signed for the release of her son or she never would have consented to the condition that her son was not allowed downtown for 7 days. If the officer, in trying to make it easy, says this is a release as opposed to going through the hard process of some discussion, some negotiation, some agreement, then we have to find a way to make that happen. Where that did not happen and where people were misled, or the officer made a mistake, has to be revisited.

**Ms. Gordon, also a victim of that process** because it happened to her and she would not sign. Her son was released to her immediately as she told them she refused to sign anything stating the fact that her son was in a gang. She also had an attorney standing next to her. This also involved District 202 when one of the Deans there indicated her son was involved in a fight. The teacher, the person that told her as well as the Dean that her son never started it. By the time she got to the high school, from Evanston Hospital where she works, the Dean called the police and told them her son was in a gang fight and she was not allowed to see him. She told them they had no right to do that. Once she saw her son he told her was innocent and his English teacher told her what happened. The bad thing about this was 2 of the officers tried to gang fight and she was not allowed to see him. She told them they had no right to do that. Once she saw her son he told her immediately as she told them she refused to sign anything stating the fact that her son was in a gang. She also had an attorney standing next to her. This also involved District 202 when one of the Deans there indicated her son was involved in a fight. The teacher, the person that told her as well as the Dean that her son never started it. By the time she got to the high school, from Evanston Hospital where she works, the Dean called the police and told them her son was in a gang fight and she was not allowed to see him. She told them they had no right to do that. Once she saw her son he told her was innocent and his English teacher told her what happened. The bad thing about this was 2 of the officers tried to grab her son but he would not allow them to grab him and he told them he could walk down to the office, they then put him in handcuffs in front of the whole school and walked him to the Dean’s office. By the time she got to the school from work her son was passing her in the hallway in handcuffs and driven to the police station. Not one time did the Evanston Police Department give her a call. When she got there they told her she could not see him and she told them her son is 16 years old how can they tell her she can’t see her child. They wanted her to sign that paper and she refused.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked what is the policy, to which the Chief responded they notify the parents as soon as they reasonably can, conduct an investigation, call the parents down to the station and deal with the parents. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked if parents are allowed to come in and see their kids, to which the Chief responded, yes, if they’re processing them or they’re downstairs it just takes time to go through the process. There is a process that goes on and everyone has to wait until we get it all together.

**Darcelle Giles**, said her son and a friend were at a party with some Northwestern students. Her son is 17 years old, his friend is 19. At the party they asked them how old they were and because they were underage asked them to leave. As they were leaving the police stopped them outside the house, they arrested them and said they did a residential burglary. They said they had a laptop computer and some other things, a detective told her they caught them red handed coming out with some things. They were in the police station for 3 days and her 17 year old son was charged as an adult.
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**Alderman Jean-Baptiste had a motion on the floor that we reopen the process for the Chief to consider some of the issues brought up.** The Chief said he likes to talk to complainants and was going to provide that opportunity to Ms. Gregory because whenever he hears those stories he tries to at least intervene in some way to figure out what was going on and explain that there is always two sides to every story and when we sit down and talk about it beyond being adversarial, you can usually get a better understanding of it. **Alderman Holmes seconded Alderman Jean-Baptiste’s motion.** Alderman Moran suggested we discontinue the committee’s consideration until the next meeting and let the Chief do what he does. Alderman Holmes noted Ms. Gregory’s letter from the Chief stated if she was not satisfied she could come before this committee, which is what she did. Alderman Bernstein assured the community that there is nobody on this committee, including the Chief of Police, who sanctions the kinds of activities that are alleged. Nobody is accepting it, nobody is condoning it and to the extent that we can find out what’s happening we’re going to do something about it. This is not what Evanston should be about and he knows Chief Kaminski doesn’t want that to be what his Police Department is about. Our Legal Counsel, Elke Purze, indicated to him that as a mediator with the Neighborhood Justice System she has been involved in mediations and perhaps that’s part of the approach that we can take, but we have to start a dialogue and get to the bottom of this. Kids are kids no matter what color they are. Policemen have the most difficult job in the world but there are times when their judgment sometimes is right, and sometimes is wrong. To the extent that there’s profiling going on, that’s absolutely wrong and should not be and will not be tolerated.

**Judith Treadway, the Branch Secretary of the Evanston North Shore Branch NAACP as well as Executive Committee member.** Thank you for agreeing to review this decision. She came to ask for an appeal process regarding the decision of the Evanston Police Department’s complaint of Ms. Gregory. Also, she feels as far as the community is concerned, the earlier part of the discussion was the articulation of the contract between the City of Evanston and the Police Department and asked if that supersedes the contract between the citizen and the City of Evanston that we should be protected and our rights should be upheld. As a matter of record, she has received numerous phone calls regarding police behavior and has three formal complaints, one of which if related to the incident just reviewed. She has worked with another member of their committee, Bennett Johnson, who has a long history of working around these issues related to police and citizen concerns. She wants to acknowledge she has received these phone calls and complaints based on several issues, one is police harassment of our youth in particular black males, one is language that is inappropriate in terms of a probable cause stop or an engagement of our youth in the public, another is police stops that were based on “probable cause”, another is related to the treatment of African American women when they’re approached or dealt with by the Police Department on these “probable cause stops”, another is about loitering what is it and if kids are going to the movies is that loitering or are they standing in line like all the other 75 or 100 people waiting to get in because there’s no room on the sidewalk. Also, there is a perception that is a reality for many of our black youth that they are being intimidated by the police who are supposed to be protecting them. She has worked with the police since she came here in 1990 and she knows there are good policemen, bad policemen, good kids, and bad kids. One of the requests she wants to make is we need to have more sensitivity training and reaction training for our law officers in particular, especially because there is a changing of the guard. We have a lot of new officers who are coming from what she calls very sensitive communities that are homogenous and not as diverse as Evanston. Because these young officers are coming to our community they’re bringing their frame of reference and how they dealt with their community which is creating some conflict because they’re coming in with the authority and the gun which is automatically intimidating to our youth. Many of our youth are not engaged in any kind of criminal or breaking the law acts, but because they all dress the same they seem to be representative. They’re not representing anything but the fashion so she always tells the kids to put the pants up on their hips so no one will presume that you are of a certain persuasion in the community. We are greatly concerned about not having our parents contacted when an incident occurs, not only regarding the police officers in the street but at the high school where we have a police officer stationed. There is an assumption that our children are guilty when they are not. When she came here in 1990 and participated in the Task Force at the high school she was told that a station adjustment was supposed to be a talking to and that’s all, there’s not supposed to be any paperwork done, not any
consequences, just a talking to and that was all that was supposed to happen. She received a request from a citizen asking her if she has demographics on the station adjustments to which she said how would you assume there’s demographics if the black kids are the only ones getting the papers and the white kids are being sent home, you are going have a skew of data that’s only going to be representative of one group.

Her last complaint is from a Hispanic parent in Evanston whose son was standing on the corner opposite of the campus of ETHS and was picked up by the police because there were issues about the young student. She can grant that police could talk to him but to arrest him because he’s staying on the other side of the street waiting for his girlfriend is what she considers precipitous of having some engagement unnecessarily with the youth just because he might have been picked up by the police previously. As far as posture she just wants the committee to be aware of the fact that the NAACP is looking at all these things. She has talked with the parents and can vouch for the fact she has heard the same thing over and over, and heard the officers’ response to the situation. She heard it again tonight and does not think our language has changed and out of sincerity and willingness to protect her child she feels this definitely needs to be reviewed and appealed by our Police Department with your assistance. In terms of law enforcement we wish to cooperate but we don’t need to continue to have this adversarial perception in our community but we do have one and it’s very difficult for those of us who wish to work with the Police Department when we hear stories from some our parents about what’s happening to their black boys. We’re not working to get cooperation for safety and security in community we’re working to have people have animosity towards our Police Department and she does not think our police officers want that.

Her last complaint is regarding the hiring policies of this Police Department. She was approached by an unnamed person from Chicago showing her all of his credentials, all of the good work he had had done in the community, all the awards he received from the Chicago Police Department for his problem solving and policing, and building consistence of the community to make it safe from gangs, etc., etc., etc., telling her he applied for a position here. He was terrified that I would even come and ask to support him to be hired by the Police Department because of the politics of these people selecting whose going to be on our police force. She does not know what happened to this officer; she has not seen him nor does know whether he’s here or not. As far as she’s concerned she met him and was so pleased how pleasant he was to everybody he came in contact with and is very concerned that she does not see his face on our Police Department. Thank you very much and we will be back.

Al Gibbs, said his concern is not about him having children in trouble but when this was brought to him about the concern of so many young black men in our community having problems with the police. There’s been a time he sat down with you about 12 or 15 years when he wanted your assistance for something he disagreed with from a detective investigating a case he was assaulted and from what the detective said to him he thought he should have brought it to your attention. You did give me the time to speak to him and hear what he had to say he still felt put out he did the wrong thing he went to someone that was supposed making feel that the door was open and he did get in but whether you heard him and addressed what he really was concerned about he thinks fell on deaf ears. Everything he hears tonight seems to these people has fallen on deaf ears for many years. He may have spoken earlier out because he felt a little angry earlier about this going into Executive Session but to him it has always been something with trust with police in our community. What he sees in the 5th ward every day is them giving our young black men a serious problem. Once he did see community police and thought that was very nice because the young kids were interested in meeting the police officers and felt when they grew up they wanted to be a police officer, a fireman or so forth. Those same impressionable youngsters see what’s happening to the kids of their ages and they get horrified. All they have to do is see the police car stop and talk to their mommy or daddy and they start crying. That is sad because the child does not have a vision of kindness towards the police. He thinks more needs to be done and he’s not saying you’re not trying nor would he say the committee here isn’t trying. The OPS decisions are backdoor decisions which he knows because it’s been tried on him a few times. There is this perception that if a black man speaks to a white man, a policeman, that becomes another issue that isn’t about law but how dare you look at me like you’re an equal of mine. If you’re for right and I’m for right we don’t have to come up with a decision about the right. That’s all we have to be bothered with not your practice for racial superiority, he’s not taking it today at 54 and knows not to give it them. A concerned citizen in the community that the problem resides steps up to continue to be a help for the problem be it a black child or white child or any child and be threatened with they’re interfering with police work. Mr. Gibbs proceeded to talk about his personal experiences. He’d like to say if there is a way we all are going to be able to be to do God’s will in this town not the rhetoric of we’re a diverse place we’re not more diverse than what they are in Iran because its too one sides on complaints you generally hear. All officers are not bad, all white people are not bad, black people aren’t either.

Shirley Gordon, said she lives in what is considered a high profile area, and proceeded to go into a problem she has been enduring with the police that they are constantly following her from her home to her work and even when she goes out shopping. The incident began with officers coming to her home and making unfounded accusations to which Ms. Gordon took it upon herself to take the necessary actions to have the incident looked into and is there here tonight make the committee aware of some of the actions taken by the police against citizens for no reason.
Ms. Ducre, has lived in Evanston for quite some time and proceeded to speak about the problems she’s been having regarding parking in her area and about the rudeness of the new officers coming on the force that do not know the community. There are some very helpful officers new and old but her suggestion was also to have new officers know the area so they can better serve the community and residents.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste suggested there should be a community forum for these issues to hear citizens as well as officers views and recommends some initiative should be taken to try to get that accomplished.

Alderman Moran moved to accept the Annual Review, seconded by Alderman Holmes. Motion unanimously accepted (4-0).

Alderman Bernstein recalled Alderman Jean-Baptiste’s motion to reopen the matter and allow the Chief to further investigate and further talk to the youth involved, the parents involved, and the officers and if there could be some discussions between the officers to bring closure to that. Motion unanimously accepted (4-0).

Alderman Moran moved to accept the Chief’s Complaint Register (C.R) as recorded with the exception of C.R. 05-02 to be reopened and investigated. Motion unanimously accepted (4-0).

VII. ADJOURNEMENT
The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Audrey Trotsky, Department of Health & Human Services