IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION - ST. LOUIS BEFORE THE HONORABLE CATHERINE D. PERRY DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Plaintiff,)			
VS.)	4:16-CV-00180-CDP		
CITY OF FERGUSON, MISSOURI,	Defendant.)			
=======================================	:========			
- STATUS HEARING -				
JULY 22ND, 2025				
	:=========			

APPEARANCES

For the Plaintiff:
Nicholas Sheehan, AUSA
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE - CIVIL RIGHTS
150 M Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Independent Deputy Monitor:
Natashia Tidwell, Esq.
SAUL EWING, LLP - Boston
131 Dartmouth, Suite 501
Boston, MA 02116

For the Defendant: Aarnarian D. Carey, Esq. Daniel Carter, Esq. LEWIS RICE, LLC 600 Washington Ave, #2500 St. Louis, MO 63101

<u>Consent Decree Coordinator</u>: Ms. Patricia A. Washington

Stenographically Reported & Produced by:
Linda Nichols, RDR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
111 South 10th Street, 3rd Floor
St. Louis, MO 63102

- INDEX -

OF STATUS HEARING

JULY 22ND, 2025

PROCEEDINGS IN OPEN COURT	р.	2
COMMENTS BY THE COURT	p.	4
STATUS REPORT OF APOLLO CAREY, ESQ.	p.	7
STATUS REPORT OF PATRICIA WASHINGTON	p.	12
STATUS REPORT OF NICHOLAS SHEEHAN, ESQ.	p.	25
STATUS REPORT OF MONITOR NATASHIA TIDWELL	p.	29
COMMENTS BY THE COURT	p.	42
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	n	46

- STATUS HEARING -

2 JULY 22ND, 2025

PROCEEDINGS IN OPEN COURT

AT 10:04 A.M.:

THE COURT: Good morning. We're here in the case of United States of America vs. The City of Ferguson, Case Number 4:16-CV-180. We are here for a Status Conference. A quarterly Status Conference. I'm pleased to see so many people here in attendance.

Let me start by reminding you that we are having -this is being broadcast on the Court's web page or YouTube page.

I'm not sure exactly how we do it. I guess it's on the web
page. And any recording or transmitting of this is prohibited.

That's the national rule by the Judicial Conference of the
United States and violations could result in some kind of
sanctions.

I'm going to ask the Clerk to read the standard warning.

DEPUTY CLERK: All participants are reminded of the prohibitions regarding photographing, recording and broadcasting of court proceedings. Participants who violate Local Rule 13.02 may face sanctions, including restricted entry to future hearings, denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the judicial officer.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. I'm going to ask the lawyers first to just 1 2 stand and state your appearance for the record. 3 Mr. Sheehan? 4 MR. SHEEHAN: Nick Sheehan for the United States, 5 Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. 6 Thank you. 7 And for the City of Ferguson? MR. CAREY: Apollo Carey for the City of Ferguson. 8 9 MR. CARTER: And Daniel Carter for the City. THE COURT: All right. And would the Monitor please 10 11 state her appearance, as well. 12 DEPUTY MONITOR TIDWELL: Good morning, Judge. I don't 13 have a microphone so ... 14 THE COURT: That's okay. We can hear you. DEPUTY MONITOR TIDWELL: Natashia Tidwell for the 15 16 Monitoring team. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 As I said, I am pleased to see the turnout here today. 19 I know that people are concerned about what's going on but 20 I think it's really important that we have such a large group of 21 interested and engaged citizens in this. 22 Mr. Carey, why don't you take the time right now to 23 introduce the City officials who are here with you. 24 MR. CAREY: Sure. I'm happy to do that, Your Honor. 25 I see -- I'll start with our Mayor, Ella Jones.

Councilman Kasoff. I see Councilwoman Covington. From the Council I think that is all I see.

But obviously we have our City Manager and Fire Chief, Chief Hampton. We have Captain Dilworth with us. We have Lisa Stephens and Michelle Richmond, who you interact with on a monthly basis. And obviously we have our Consent Decree Coordinator, Ms. Pat Washington, with us today.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CAREY: Oh, and just coming into the courtroom is Councilwoman Noah.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you. And like I say, I appreciate having you there.

- COMMENTS BY THE COURT -

THE COURT: I do want to mention a couple of things.

I did receive quite a few letters that were sent to the Monitor and provided to me and, as always, we will keep those letters.

They won't actually be docketed in the court file, for everyone's privacy interest, but there are things that I know I appreciate hearing and I've considered that and I thank everyone for their input.

Most of the comments, not surprisingly, express concerns about the recent City Council budget decision that has been reported in the press, as well as sort of the comments about the progress of compliance with the Consent Decree.

I just wanted to make a couple of statements before we

start and hear from everyone what's going on. As I've said before in these hearings, the Consent Decree is not just an agreement between the parties. It's obviously an order of the Court. And just like any other order, if either side violates it, there could be penalties, including contempt of court.

In this case, however, what's happened is that because this was a settlement and because of the good faith shown by everyone, instead of making accusations or wasting time arguing about the past, up to this point the City and the Department of Justice have worked together cooperatively to make the reforms that are contemplated by the Decree. Both sides have acted at all times in good faith. Neither side has filed motions asking for contempt of court. Neither side has filed any motions asking that any part of the Decree be terminated. And as I've said before, nothing in the Decree can be changed without Court approval.

In 2016, when the parties agreed to this Consent

Decree, everyone involved recognized that reform was necessary.

The Department of Justice at that time, based on everything

I saw at the time and that I think everyone knew about, was

prepared to present substantial evidence that Ferguson's

practices violated many people's constitutional rights. I think

everyone knew that things needed to change and things have been

changed. Real progress has been made and real progress is being

made now.

and this is a result of the hard work of the current team who is here, and the support of the City and the people who are doing all the work to implement this. You have an excellent group of professionals who are working very hard to meet the requirements of the Decree and to bring Ferguson's practices into compliance with the constitution.

What's going on right now is really very good progress,

Obviously, real reform takes time and money. But fighting this in court, you know, which was an option for Ferguson when the case was originally filed, would have cost more money and the results could have been anything. But as I tell parties in all cases when they're talking about whether they should settle or litigate, litigation costs a lot of money and if you lose -- and in this case, you know, the City would still have to pay the money for the reforms if they lost because that would be the remedy. So it's not like this is ...

Well, I mean it was a very reasoned decision made at the time by the City to not fight this, and I'm very pleased that they did because I can see and we've all seen -- even though it's taken a lot longer than we all wanted for a lot of good reasons that nobody could prevent -- we all could see that reform was needed and it has really been very substantial, what has been going on.

And I think that the parties who have been working on this every day, the employees of the City and the employees of

the Police Department, really deserve a lot of respect from the community because they have been doing exactly what the law requires and exactly what the Consent Decree requires.

So I'm urging everyone not to stop the momentum that we have going now. It's good momentum, and the team that's in place is moving along more quickly and more efficiently than at any time before now. So that's my comment.

And I'd like to hear the reports from the parties. And obviously everybody is entitled to take the positions they take, but I want to tell from you that from my point of view, things have been going well.

Go ahead, Mr. Carey.

Oh, and Mr. Sheehan, I meant to say we welcome you to the case. Your colleagues who were here and handling the case before were excellent lawyers and I expect exactly the same of you and have no reason to doubt that that's what we're going to have.

So Mr. Carey, go ahead.

- STATUS REPORT -

OF APOLLO CAREY, ESQ.

MR. CAREY: Thank you, Judge.

I appreciate your opening comments there. You sort of maybe even short-circuited a little bit of mine so mine will be a little more brief before I turn it over to the Consent Decree Coordinator to give the Court, as well as the public, a bit more

of a detailed update.

But what I will say is that we appreciate the Court's recognition of the progress that's being made right now as it relates to the Consent Decree, and the hard work that the people who have been working on the Consent Decree have been putting in.

You know, you kind of spoke about, I don't want to necessarily call it the elephant in the room, but the issue of the budget and the Council and the recent budgeting decisions that have been made. And I want to kind of address that at a 30,000 foot level.

What I'll say, Your Honor, about that is, you know, the Consent Decree obviously requires the City -- the Consent Decree, as currently written, requires the City to, you know, obviously fund the reforms, the efforts that are taking place underneath the current document. I think I've said this to the Court before. You know, within certain factions of the City there is Consent Decree fatigue, right? You know, we've been under the Consent Decree for ten years.

You mentioned how it was when we first set it up.

I think I remember standing in this courtroom and maybe hearing a comment that, I don't know how you guys are going to, you know, do everything that you have agreed to do in this document because the document is expansive. Our resources and our structure are less expansive.

And so compliance at certain times throughout the process has really, you know, put the City in a hard position. However, we've worked through that. Some of the reason why it's taken so long to do what it is -- you know, to get to the point where we have the progress that we have now is because we did agree to a document that was super-expansive and our resources just were limited.

And so, transparently, you know, Consent Decree compliance costs a lot of money and I think there is sort of a balance in our community of, you know, folks who are concerned with the amount of money that it costs to comply with the Consent Decree but at the same time, there's another balance, another sort of balancing factor, which is people are supportive of the reforms that we've made. They want to make sure those reforms continue and they want to make sure that constitutional policing, you know, is a thing that's here to stay in the City of Ferguson.

So I think a lot of the reports that you've gotten, a lot of reports that you might have saw in the media, maybe captured that. You know, obviously the Consent Decree does not tell the City Council how to budget, right, and so the City Council is free to budget in the way that they see fit. And at this point in time, you know, we're still moving along. There's money to do what it is we have to do and I don't want the Court to think that we don't have that money.

I think at some point, you know, obviously with the budget cuts, we'll have to address those issues as they come up. To the extent that the City needs to comply with something or pay for something and the money's not there, we'll have to address those, you know, as they come up. But as we stand right now, the City, as you know, the folks who you talk to on a monthly basis are absolutely dedicated to continuing the reform, the reform efforts under the Consent Decree.

You may know that we have recently reached out to the Department of Justice to talk to them a little bit about, you know, making sure that we, you know, can be more efficient moving forward. To sort of chart a path forward as it relates to our efficiencies under the Consent Decree, potentially looking at, you know, portions of the Consent Decree that we could maybe amend and some parts of the Consent Decree that may or may not be even best practice any more just because it's been ten years since it's been put in place.

You know, so we're going to work with the Department of Justice here very shortly to sort of come up with ways to increase those efficiencies. The efficiencies of compliance. Quite frankly, some of the requirements in the Consent Decree may just not really be necessary any more because of what we've done already. But because of the way the document is written, in order to achieve compliance, we kind of sort of gotta cross the t's and dot the i's, which we may have already done, you

know, with our previous work. So the Department of Justice has agreed to sort of work with us in that regard.

We also have recently talked with the Monitor and, you know, I don't want to steal her thunder but she'll talk a little bit about some compliance findings that the City has requested because we want to show the public and show everybody that we are actually making progress under the Consent Decree.

And I know it's been slow and it's not been as fast as, you know, some folks would like, so the parties are all sort of working together to sort of move that needle, so to give the public a little bit more of a transparent look at what's going on and also to give the Court, you know, some comfort that these efforts are still going on despite what you might read in the newspaper.

So with that, that's pretty much -- I just kind of wanted to address that at a 30,000 foot view. I'll leave that alone unless the Court has any questions for me.

THE COURT: No. I just --

MR. CAREY: Okay.

THE COURT: -- I will comment, though, and I hope everybody understands I realize this is a lot for the City to be doing. You know, I realize it's a big Consent Decree and there are limited resources. And that's why I think that everyone involved in this, including the Department of Justice and the Court, have realized that it couldn't go as fast as we wanted

because there were issues with resources, there were issues with personnel, and I know it's not easy.

I do understand that. I know that people can get frustrated when things take a long time but thank you for that.

MR. CAREY: Absolutely.

I'll go ahead and turn it over, Your Honor, to Ms. Pat Washington, who is our Consent Decree Coordinator.

THE COURT: Yes. Ms. Washington, come on up to the lectern and I'll hear your report. Thank you very much for being here.

- STATUS REPORT -

OF PATRICIA WASHINGTON

MS. WASHINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Carey. Good morning, Your Honor. Good morning to court staff and to everyone here. It's good to be here before you today.

I've got a lot to report, and then at the end of that report I'd like to share just some of my thoughts, just as Consent Decree Coordinator, about how we move forward.

So I'll get started. We have been very busy and I want to thank the Monitor and her team, and the Department of Justice, and our attorneys for their efficiency and their diligence in moving us forward, and I'd like to highlight some of the more significant progress that we've made since we were last before the Court.

And I'll start with staffing. Chief Doyle's reputation

and our focus on community policing continues to attract talented applicants to the Ferguson Police Department. We're up to 37 officers and we are nearly fully staffed all around with all personnel at 92 percent.

FPD welcomes six new officers since our last hearing. Three of them graduated from Lincoln University's Law Enforcement Academy on the campus of Harris Stowe State University and there is one graduate from the St. Louis County Municipal Police Academy. All are going through our PTO and on-boarding process now and they are already contributing greatly to the team.

We also have two new officers who joined the team, and they have significant law enforcement experience and they came to us from other jurisdictions.

Chief Doyle elevated two veteran officers to the rank of sergeant, with one spot left to fill. He's currently initiating the corporal's promotion process and that will greatly enhance our police officer training program, the PTO program, because these corporals will become PTO's as part of their responsibilities. So that's excellent for us.

And it should also be noted that while our hiring and staffing rates are increasing, so is our retention rate. Our officers are choosing to stay with the Ferguson Police Department. So that's very good.

As it relates to training, the City continues to engage

highly-qualified subject matter experts to deliver critical

Consent Decree training. Most recently our Training

Coordinator, Lisa Stephens, secured Attorney Matthew T. Brown of

Missouri Prosecution Services to deliver our annual and ongoing

Stop, Search and Arrest training, as required under section 17.

Attorney Brown came very highly recommended. His curriculum has been approved by the Training committee and it is pending reviews now by the DOJ and the Monitor. We anticipate delivering that critical training by the end of September, 2025.

As you know, community policing is a big part of our Consent Decree, and at the heart of community policing efforts is the problem-solving. The Ferguson Police Department has adopted the nationally-recognized SARA model for problem-solving. The four stages, Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment, that's what SARA is, and it provides a framework for analyzing and addressing community problems and crime issues. So FPD has engaged the National Center for Policing Innovation to deliver our SARA-model training for all of our officers.

I want to thank Ms. Stephens, our legal team, and City Manager John Hampton for getting this agreement executed. This is a big win for the City. It's excellent training and it will be provided at no cost to the City.

We've made great progress as it relates to our Crisis
Intervention Team. Lieutenant Todd Mink has been selected as

the CIT Coordinator, as required in paragraph 197. We have four officers selected to serve on our Crisis Intervention Team and all four have attended the 40-hour initial CIT training, and three of them have completed advanced training. And this is critical for us as we begin to specialize in how we respond to calls in Ferguson.

The curriculum for supervisory training, as mandated under section 17, has been completed thanks to Captain Harry Dilworth, and that is now being reviewed by our Training Committee and those responses are due by close of business today.

Our Police Officer Training Program is one giant step closer to being revised and fully implemented. That is the heart of our training at the Police Department. So after some significant challenges getting all 14 modules completed and approved, we revised our strategy and I'm happy to say that Ms. Stephens and I, along with assistance from the Training Committee and the current PTO team, completed the revision of all 14 modules. The last of the modules, modules 11 through 14, have been approved by the DOJ and they are pending approval with the Monitor. So kudos to everyone for working together to get those training modules across the finish line.

As it relates to our First Amendment training, our subject matter expert has completed those training modules. The DOJ reviewed and completed its modifications to that training

and the curriculum is now with the Monitor for approval. So we'll be moving forward with additional First Amendment training.

Under our Use of Force, the supplemental training, our officers have all gone through supplemented training for use of firearms and use of their tasers, and we are now working on Use of Force scenario-based training. That will be done here pretty soon. And that's a good one because it will give us the opportunity to have community involved in some of those scenarios and they'll get a chance do see, in real-time, how officers respond under certain situations.

Then I wanted to say that not mandated by the Consent Decree but still critical to our work, our officers just completed a basic Report Writing refresher course. I was happy to see that because the Municipal Court staff and the judges came to that training and provided their perspective for what they see when our officers are submitting these reports and how it impacts these court cases moving forward. So that was excellent training and I'm appreciative to the court team and to Ms. Stephens and Training for providing that.

THE COURT: As I think I mentioned to you before, although that's not part, specifically, of the Consent Decree, it's something all police departments need all the time.

MS. WASHINGTON: Absolutely.

THE COURT: But we see that in court, judges do,

2/

because when things are not written correctly or are leaving something out, it causes problems later on in court. So the training is really good.

MS. WASHINGTON: It absolutely is. And it was an excellent training. I sat through part of it and I was very pleased with the outcome.

We also have completed some Virtual Academy training on ethics, on implicit bias and on de-escalation techniques. So those are -- portions of the Consent Decree do speak to that but any additional training that we can have in that is going to be helpful to our officers.

And I wanted to turn my attention to the courts, if I might. Perhaps one of the most rewarding reports today is the progress of our Municipal Courts. I have such great admiration and respect for our Court Administrator, Michelle Richmond, and her team. They have done a phenomenal job in completing nearly every mandated aspect of the Consent Decree.

And we hope to begin our Compliance Review with the Monitor very soon. The final initiative to be addressed was paragraph 360 and that dealt with ongoing assessment and improvement. And so we are working with the DOJ, and our legal counsel, and the rest of the team to really kind of sort through what that looks like, how we can get it done, how we do that ongoing, and are things that the court is already mandated to do from the state level, will that suffice in terms of how we do

the ongoing assessment. So I expect them to have completed that review.

And once that agreement is reached regarding the process for collecting, analyzing and reporting that data, then we certainly expect to ask for a Compliance Review on our courts. But our community should be very pleased and very grateful with the work that has taken place with our courts. The judges, Ms. Richmond and her court staff, they've been tremendous to work with and we looking forward to gaining 100 percent compliance and starting that monitoring period.

As it relates to community policing, we continue to make strides there. The residents are reporting that they are seeing an increased presence in the visibility of our officers at neighborhood meetings and events. Our officers are sharing meaningful information during these meetings. They're not just attending and showing up. They're talking about crime stats. They're talking about prevention efforts and initiatives in the neighborhoods. And the residents are reporting that they are feeling more comfortable sharing information with our police officers to improve crime prevention and intervention efforts.

This past weekend, Chief Doyle and Captain Scott Amos participated in a neighborhood walk with the Walk Ferguson group. During their three-mile trek -- and they did it all and I documented it, it's on video -- the residents had the opportunity to engage with the Chief on a variety of issues.

Later in the day the Chief and several of our patrol officers attended two Neighborhood Association block parties. Along with Mayor Ella Jones, I saw Council member Jamil Franklin there, and I saw Council member Naquittia Noah also in attendance. The residents were delighted to have that kind of personal interaction with the Chief and patrol staff, and that's what we need to do to keep building those relationships and gaining, earning that trust.

I also want to share that the Chief's Community
Engagement Council has been very active. They hosted an
end-of-school event for teens that included employers. So those
students who were looking for summer employment got a chance to
talk with employers. They included family resources and
entertainment and a lot more. We had nearly 75 teens who
participated in this event.

The Council is now exploring ways to bring activities and resources into the neighborhood communities and into the apartment complexes because during discussion at one of the Council meetings, one of the things that was brought out is the transportation challenges of families in our communities, that they can't get to where certain activities are held, so we want to try to bring them into the neighborhood. So I'm very pleased with that.

We've also had several policies that have gone out for public comment. That public comment period has expired for many

of these policies and we will now move forward with getting them codified into general orders.

We have had our Crisis Intervention policy, our GPS Tracker policy, the PTO selection policy, our limited English proficiency policy, because we do have a number -- we have a growing population in Ferguson where English is not their first language. We have people come to the Police Department and they want to file reports and we have to get, you know, a translation app out to help us with that. So having this policy in place and having that codified in a general order for how we work with that population is extremely important.

And then I also want to take just a moment, before I get into my thoughts and observations, to thank the Monitor and her team for very efficient Semi-Annual Report prep sessions. The sessions were recently completed. We've reviewed the Preliminary Report and we've provided our feedback, and we anxiously look forward to reviewing the Final Report. But it was a very -- it was a wonderful collaborative process. Even in those areas where we didn't agree on certain things, we were able to provide feedback and some clarity. So I'm looking forward to seeing that Final Report.

So I would now like to just share some of my thoughts about the current state of affairs as it relates to our Consent Decree and what's been happening in our community. There's been quite a bit of community conversation and media attention around

the future of our Consent Decree and our work, in light of the recent budget decisions by the Council.

From my perspective, sadly, a lot of old wounds have been reopened and lines have been drawn in the sand again, and the level of vitriol is upsetting, to say the least. And I trust the Court will continue to weigh in on the future of the Consent Decree but I do want to take a look back at history for a moment and officially just weigh in.

So I'm old enough to remember but in response to racial uprisings across America in the summer of 1967, including Detroit, Newark and dozens of other cities, President Lyndon Johnson established a National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, known informally as the Kerner Commission, named after Illinois Governor Otto Kerner. The Commission was tasked with answering three questions: What happened? Why did it happen? And what can be done to prevent it from happening again?

The Kerner Commission's Final Report was released in February, 1968, and it made headlines for being very blunt in its ground-breaking conclusions. The most famous line from that report was, "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white, separate and unequal."

The report identified major causes for the riots, including systemic racism, police brutality, inadequate housing, poor schools and high unemployment. It also pointed out that

there were many white institutions singled out as primarily responsible for those conditions. The Kerner Commission called for massive investment in housing, education and job programs, but those recommendations were largely ignored.

Instead, President Nixon launched the New Federalism approach, emphasizing law and order and shifting funding toward urban infrastructure and away from equity and social welfare. The result was persistent poverty, divestment in black communities, increased tension between communities and the police, and the beginning of the mass-incarceration decade of black and brown folks and long-term mistrust of government.

The lesson for me, from Kerner, is that neglecting systemic solutions in favor of physical infrastructure failed to address the root causes of civil unrest and social division, and it fostered a new wave of mistrust of police and government systems.

So if 1968 is too far back to go, then let's move forward to the George Floyd era of 2020. I don't think anyone in this courtroom needs to be reminded of the incident that etched, "I can't breathe," into the social justice lexicon. In 2020, in the wake of George Floyd's death, cities across the country made pledges to fund racial equity programs, reimagine policing and support community alternatives to incarceration, but by 2023 many of those efforts were quietly de-funded and de-prioritized. Citing economic pressure and political

backlash, funding shifted back to traditional public works and police budgets.

The result? Community trust eroded again. Problems that were just beginning to show promise were cut midstream. Calls for reform were once again dismissed as impractical and too costly. The lesson? De-funding equity efforts undercuts public confidence and reinforces the belief that social justice is disposable when it's inconvenient.

In Ferguson, the argument to divert Consent Decree funding towards roads or city infrastructure may sound reasonable on paper but it ignores the unique moral and legal obligation to complete once-in-a-generation reform efforts.

Systems reform, as you noted, Judge, takes time. It's expensive in more ways than one, and those who wish to disrupt Ferguson's work on reform, they maintain that the people who were part of the problem are no longer here.

The people weren't the only problem. It's the broken system that allowed those people to pervert justice that was the problem. It's the system that still needs to be addressed, not just the individuals.

Diverting Consent Decree funding in my opinion erodes the foundational justice that we are constructing. And just as we wouldn't abandon a bridge halfway through construction, we cannot abandon court-ordered reform midstream, especially when the infrastructure we are rebuilding is trust, justice and human

rights. The sacrifice and financial hardship the City has endured in its march towards this reform is very real, but I also know that there are some very real soldiers in this fight, including: our City Manager, who has continued to find ways to make limited funding work; our Police Chief, who is committed to continuing the reforms and building a model Police Department with or without a Consent Decree; our Mayor, who continues to work toward the beloved community Dr. King dreamed of; and all the folks on our citizen committees and panels and in the Ferguson Police Departments and our courts. They strive every day to be the face of reform and their work matters.

James Baldwin once said, "The abuse of power that knows no limits is a tyranny that knows no shame." At this moment we must ask us ourselves whether we are witnessing such an abuse, one that places politics over principle and jeopardizes the credibility of Ferguson's hard-fought transformation. The Court will have the final say and history will be the final judge.

So I thank you for allowing me to share my comments today and I look forward to continuing the work that we have started. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. And I appreciate your comments.

(Applause.)

THE COURT: I take it from the applause that many of you do understand that Ms. Washington's work has been huge in getting things moving the way they have the last few months or

1 less. 2 (Applause.) 3 THE COURT: I'll hear from the Department of Justice. 4 If you can step up to the lectern? 5 Now, I don't know if we told you. This is how it 6 always works. They go first, then you, then the Monitor. In 7 the traditional way we call the plaintiff first, but this case is a little different. 8 9 - STATUS REPORT -OF NICHOLAS SHEEHAN, ESQ. 10 11 MR. SHEEHAN: I did have the opportunity to review a 12 few --13 THE COURT: Transcripts? 14 MR. SHEEHAN: -- of the transcripts and some recordings 15 on YouTube, though I will say that's a very difficult act to 16 follow. Thank you, Ms. Washington, for your comments. And 17 thank you, Your Honor, for the opportunity to update --18 THE COURT: Pull that mic a little closer to you so 19 that we -- yeah, there you go. And make it so it points --20 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm soft-spoken, too, so I'll --21 THE COURT: There you go. That's it. 22 MR. SHEEHAN: I was just beginning to thank you for the 23 opportunity to update the Court and the public on the progress 24 we've made in implementing the Consent Decree. 25 I think Mr. Carey and Ms. Washington's comments have

covered most of that ground, so my comments will be relatively brief. Also, thank you, Your Honor, for the warm welcome to the case.

THE COURT: And it's especially warm today in St. Louis. I arranged the weather so you'd really understand.

MR. SHEEHAN: You stole my joke and I don't thank you for that. I'm coming from the Bay area where heat and humidity don't exist, so it was quite a shock when I got off the plane.

You know, Ms. Washington and Mr. Carey referred to the progress that has been made under the Consent Decree and at times thanked the DOJ for their work on that, and I do want to note that I am new to the case, so I thank the Court for its patience, the City and the Monitor, as well, for their patience with me as I get up to speed on the status of the City's compliance with the Consent Decree and this case, in general.

But the progress, any attribution for progress towards the DOJ should really go to the predecessors on this case:

Nancy Glass, Amy Senier, Jorge Castillo, Charles Hart, Cynthia

Coe and many others who were on the case over the years.

To the point of getting up to speed, I will say, as Ms. Washington mentioned, we've received a Preliminary Report from the Monitor. That's been very helpful for me and for the DOJ in understanding where things stand now.

Overall, I'd say in our review, which is still ongoing, we found the report very encouraging. It's, you know, still in

draft but it shows the City has made very solid progress and is in substantial compliance with many Consent Decree provisions. For many other provisions, though it's not yet in substantial compliance, it's made significant progress towards that goal.

I do want to highlight something from the report that

I think is notable to point out related to the Use of Force

audit. I think it's important to highlight just because that's

such a big part of the Consent Decree, which is in and of itself

quite large, but Use of Force is sort of central to it.

The Preliminary Report finds that the Police

Department's use of force is improving, that their practices are generally reasonable and consistent with applicable legal and constitutional standards, which is not to say that things are perfect on that front. Some improvements still need to be made, particularly in the accuracy of force reporting and the thoroughness and follow-through of supervisory reviews.

But again, given the importance of the use of force issue to this Consent Decree, I think it's a notable and encouraging sign that by and large, use of force is generally reasonable and consistent.

You know, going forward on the Consent Decree, we really want to ramp up our efforts to help the City reach compliance. To that end, I think one of the things that's notable about the Preliminary Report and the Use of Force audit, in particular, is that it covers a fairly manageable number of

incidents. Sort of a small sample size. So going forward, our hope is that we'll see speedier assessments of that issue and other issues. We think getting those audits done a bit quicker, a bit more efficiently, will provide both the City, the Court and the community a closer to real-time assessment of how the Department is doing, which will be important both to allow the Department to assess and adjust its practices and to move all of us along towards a successful resolution of this case.

Which is to say, you know, we're very confident that with some effort, some intention, we can expeditiously reach a successful end to this case. It will take an all-hands-on-deck approach. As I said, we're hoping the Monitor can complete compliance assessments a bit more quickly. More frequently. FPD will need to continue filing Biannual Status Reports. The City's team will need to remain stable, as it has been for the first time in quite some time, and to continue their diligent efforts.

And here I do want to echo the Court's praise for the City's team, especially Chief Doyle, Chief Hampton, Captain Dilworth, Pat Washington, especially, Lisa Stephens, Michelle Richmond, and many others who I'm sure I haven't yet had the opportunity to work with, but who I look forward to working with. It's been really crucial that the team has been as stable as it has been for, you know, the past 18 months to two years. I think that we've seen a lot of progress in that time span and

that's attributable largely to the City's efforts and the stability of their leadership team.

And, you know, the DOJ, too, will need to be responsive to both the City and the Monitor's requests and to work with the City to remove any unnecessary obstacles to remedying the issues that underlie our findings of legal violations.

So in sum, we stand ready to support the City in our shared goals and we look forward -- I, personally, look forward to working with everyone here.

And if there's no questions from the Court?

THE COURT: It do not have any. Thank you very much.

MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Tidwell, I'll hear what you wish to say.

- STATUS REPORT -

OF DEPUTY MONITOR NATASHIA TIDWELL

DEPUTY MONITOR TIDWELL: Thank you, Judge. And thank you to the parties and Ms. Washington for their presentations.

As is usually the case, by going last, everyone has said many of the things that I had intended to touch upon but as is usually the case, I have many other things to say, Your Honor, so no worries. I can fill the time.

Beginning at the beginning, once again, I want to begin by thanking the members of the community who continue to engage

meaningfully in this process, especially those who took the time

to submit written comments to the Court in advance of today's hearing. Their remarks speak better than I ever could about the significant impact the Consent Decree and the implementation efforts to-date have had on the Ferguson community, as well as the devastating effect an abrupt cancellation of those efforts would have.

As one community member noted in their remarks, the broader political conversation in Ferguson is largely beyond the scope of my role as Monitor, or even the Court's jurisdiction. However, where those political decisions intersect with or obstruct the path to substantial compliance, the Consent Decree is implicated and the question of what comes next will land before this Court. On behalf of the Monitoring team, I want to express my sincere hope that we don't get to that point.

As I said, the parties have covered already most of the impending and completed projects since our last hearing. At the last hearing I noted our anticipated filing of a Semi-Annual Report that would reflect progress on each Consent Decree provision. Previous Status Reports have included an at-a-glance high-level summary of progress in each section but the parties agreed that it was appropriate for the Monitor to provide a more granular illustration of the current state of compliance.

Since that time, the Monitoring team has prepared a series of crosswalks for each Consent Decree section which detail the Monitoring team's assessment of where each provision

stands on the path to substantial compliance.

As you know, Your Honor, compliance, according to Consent Decree paragraph 427, requires three things: one, incorporation of a requirement into policy; two, training of all relevant personnel as necessary to fulfill the responsibilities pursuant to the Consent Decree; and lastly, carrying out the requirement in actual practice.

Members of the Monitoring team then met with the parties to preview those initial assessments for each provision and to offer the parties the opportunity to provide any additional information. The meetings were extremely collaborative and the Monitoring team thanks the parties for setting aside the many hours of time those meetings encompassed.

To-date we have completed roughly half of the compliance assessment meetings and the parties are currently reviewing part one of the Semi-Annual Report. That includes a compliance chart for the first nine substantive Consent Decree provisions, up through and including section 12, body-worn cameras, a report detailing the results of the Monitoring team's audit of FPD's use of force reporting and investigation, a report detailing the initial findings of the Monitoring team's audit of FPD's use of body-worn and in-car cameras, and lastly, a summary of the Monitoring team's cost from year one through June, 2025, reflecting a billed cost of approximately \$1.6 million dollars over nine years and nearly \$800,000 in

pro bono work by mine and the Deputy Monitor's current and former law firms, Mintz Levin, Hogan Lovells and Saul Ewing.

I will file the report when the parties complete the review. As is customary, the Monitoring team will then schedule a Virtual Town Hall to go over the report with the community and answer any questions. We'll give folks time to digest the report and coordinate with Ms. Washington as to the schedule of other community events so as not to create any conflicts.

We will continue the cadence of crosswalk meetings for the remaining substantive sections, which include Accountability, an area currently undergoing a compliance audit, and we'll file the Supplemental Status Report with a Compliance Assessment for those provisions I anticipate later this summer, depending on the scheduling of the individual meetings.

The Semi-Annual Report and the graph that the parties have reviewed is quite lengthy, so I'll not go provision-by-provision here. Rather, I'll summarize our approach and offer some initial conclusions.

For those provisions that lend themselves to assessment according to paragraph 427's three-step compliance-finding process, the Monitoring team assigned a separate compliance grade to each component: Policy Development, Roll Call Training and Implementation - carrying out the requirement in actual practice.

Some Consent Decree provisions don't fit that

three-part framework. For those, the Monitoring team provided a single implementation finding, without assessing policy or training where it wasn't appropriate to do so. The report also identifies whether a provision or its subparts have yet to be implemented by the City or are in development.

Lastly, where FPD has developed policies and delivered Roll Call training for a particular provision, the Monitoring team issued substantial compliance findings for those subparts, while issuing a "not yet assessed" finding for implementation to reflect the need for a compliance audit in that area.

As Mr. Sheehan noted, there is a need for the Monitoring team to conduct, in a quicker cadence and more efficiently, compliance audits in a number of sections.

Throughout the years we've staffed this Monitoring team leanly, both to reflect the preservation of resources, the City's and mine and my team's, but also to reflect the cadence of work that was being produced.

And as the City has expanded, through the team that's in place, the amount of work that's being produced, we're adding to the Monitoring team, including Abby Iafolla from my firm.

We're expecting the return of our Deputy Monitor, Courtney Caruso.

We've expanded the responsibilities of several of our subject matter experts to other areas so that they can keep the Compliance audits going. And so those areas that are in need,

where we issued a finding of "not yet assessed," we anticipate notifying the parties and developing methodologies for audits in those areas as soon as this fall.

The Monitoring team used the three-part assessment, assessing each subpart, because we felt it was appropriate to give the City credit for the work it has done in policy and training development rather than issuing a single "incomplete" finding. As you and the report readers will see, most of the areas covered in part one of the Semi-Annual Report have achieved substantial compliance in Policy Development and Roll Call Training and are ripe for Compliance auditing.

The report does include compliance findings for those provisions where audits have been conducted and completed.

First, body-worn and in-car cameras. The Monitoring team recently completed its first audit in that area. For that audit, the Monitoring team selected June 1st through the 30th, 2024, as the target period and identified more than 2,000 incidents for which body-worn or in-car camera activation was required by FPD policy or the Consent Decree.

From there, the Monitoring team randomly selected 100 incidents for substantive review of the camera footage and any associated reports. To guide its review and to ensure consistency, the Monitoring team assessed compliance, including the thoroughness and completeness of each of the selected incidents requiring activation, by rating an each-event report

as satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on a number of factors.

The 100 incidents tagged for review included multiple calls for service in which more than one officer was dispatched, 152 total officers. In those instances, the Monitoring team evaluated each officer's compliance separately.

Similarly, the targeted sample included events for which neither applicable FPD policy nor the Consent Decree require camera activation. Those 13 events were removed from the audited sample. The Findings report reflects the results of the review of the remaining 87 total incidents reviewed and 139 officers evaluated.

The City has achieved substantial compliance in Policy Development and Roll Call training for 18 of the 19 body-worn camera provisions that fit within the three-part framework. Of those, ten were assessed during this recent audit. The review revealed that FPD had reached full and substantial compliance in four of those areas and partial compliance in three.

The Monitoring team found that FPD was not in compliance in three areas: paragraphs 232 and 234, which require officers to activate cameras and to document those instances in which they use their discretion not to record, and paragraph 235, which requires officers to promptly notify individuals that they are being recorded. The audit revealed that only 38 of the 139 officers evaluated issued the required notification.

The Monitoring team previewed its findings for the parties and both FPD and DOJ shared/echoed concerns about the identified performance deficiencies. Based on its post-audit conference with the parties, the Monitoring team is confident that FPD is working diligently to improve, and applauds Chief Doyle and FPD for incorporating the audit results into its forthcoming In-Service training. I should thank Ms. Stephens, as well, for that.

As Mr. Sheehan mentioned, another area of the Compliance chart that incorporates the results of the Monitoring team's audits is Use of Force. As Mr. Sheehan alluded, the Use of Force is the Consent Decree's largest section, by far. And in recognition of its outsized importance, the parties and the Monitoring team have dedicated significant time and resources to policy development, training delivery and compliance auditing in this area.

The Monitoring team just completed its second audit of compliance with the Consent Decree provisions related to Use of Force Reporting and Investigation. The Findings report is included in the draft Semi-Annual Report.

As the audit findings and similar assessments by DOJ reveal, FPD still has significant work to do to achieve substantial compliance in some areas. However, Chief Doyle and his staff have been consistently open and receptive to feedback and Ms. Stephens has readily identified areas where FPD's

performance could be enhanced in in-service training.

The Monitoring team previously reported and detailed the results of phase one of the second audit, so I will just summarize the results of phase two. In phase two of the Use of Force Reporting and Investigation audit, the Monitoring team assessed compliance with paragraph 173, which requires all officers using force above un-resisted handcuffing to document the use of force in writing.

To identify and evaluate whether the absence of use of force reporting from a particular incident evidenced that force was not employed or that force was employed but not reported, the Monitor team requested that the City provide a list of all 2022 and 2023 FPD arrests for a select group of offenses, like assault on a law officer and resisting arrest. The Monitoring team selected these offenses based on its judgment that due to the nature of each offense, force may have been employed in effecting the arrest, even if unreported.

In response to that request, FPD reported that there were 89 incidents in which an individual was charged with one or more of the identified offenses, comprising 59 individual arrests or Incident Reports. The Monitoring team compared that list with FPD's Use of Force reporting data and excluded from review in phase two those incidents for which FPD reported and investigated the use of force.

The remaining arrest incident reports, based on the

Monitoring team's review of the narrative summaries of each incident, revealed 21 cases, 11 from 2023 and 10 from 2022, for which additional analysis of body camera footage and other materials was needed to determine whether force was employed but not reported.

Darrel Owens, our subject matter consultant in use of force, began by reviewing the body-worn camera footage for these selected incidents. The results were mixed. In slightly more than half of the cases, 12 of 21, the Monitoring team observed that FPD officers did not use force, and as such, a report was not needed.

Further, the Monitoring team's review revealed that in many instances FPD officers exercised restraint and deescalated arrestees to avoid using force. For example, in one 2023 incident an FPD officer was met with low-level resistance while attempting to make an arrest. Instead of escalating and resorting to what would have been a reasonable force response, the officer disengaged and waited for backup officers to arrive. Once additional officers were on scene, the subject complied and was taken into custody without further incident. The Monitoring team commends FPD for those efforts.

Conversely, the Monitoring team has observed that in 43 percent of the incidents under review, 9 of 21, the arresting officer used force in effecting the arrest and failed to submit a Use of Force report, as the Consent Decree and FPD policy

require. In a number of these cases the arresting officer's report included a narrative description of the force employed. However, neither the officer themselves nor the reviewing supervisors took the additional steps necessary to ensure accurate reporting and investigation of the force used.

While the majority of the unreported cases involved type three force, which does not require supervisory investigation, tasers or OC spray were deployed in nearly half of the incidents, type two force, meaning that a supervisory response and investigation was warranted.

When compared to the results of the first audit, there has been improvement but there is still work to do. As the Compliance Chart reflects, the City has achieved substantial compliance in Policy Development and Roll Call training for most of the use of force provisions that fit the three-part framework. Of those that were assessed as part of this most recent audit, only three were not in compliance. All related to Use of Force Reporting and Investigation. 13 were found to be in partial compliance and seven were found to be in substantial compliance.

Like other areas, the remaining provisions in this section are ripe for additional compliance auditing, and just a few of the provisions in that section have yet to be implemented by FPD.

Lastly, Your Honor, in preparation for today's hearing

I revisited some of the Monitoring team's previous Status

Reports to take stock of all that has been achieved in these
nine years. I was reminded that while you have presided over
this matter since its inception, many of the parties now tasked
with implementation joined the effort after March, 2016, when
the Consent Decree was executed and filed in this court.

I'd be remiss if I didn't recognize recently-departed DOJ attorneys Amy Senier and Charles Hart, who were also here from the beginning. I believe that then Counselor Ella Jones and then Lieutenant Harry Dilworth might be the only City officials who were there at the beginning who still remain today.

Mr. Carey assumed the role of City attorney in October, 2016, and while I was part of the original Monitoring team selected to oversee implementation in the summer of 2016, I did not take over as lead Monitor until December, 2017. By my count -- and I am sure someone will correct me if I'm wrong -- there have been four City Managers, five Police Chiefs, four Consent Decree Coordinators and two Training Coordinators. Those numbers do not reflect the City's early attempts to staff the Consent Decree and Training Coordinator positions with sworn officers who were also still required to perform their other duties.

Beginning in the spring of 2018, each Monitor report includes a recommendation from the Monitoring team that the City

buttress its implementation team by filling these key roles based on the very real concern that implementation would be stalled without dedicated personnel in those positions. The City made one recommended hire in the fall of 2018, the first full-time Consent Decree Coordinator.

By the spring of 2019, there were vacancies in the roles of Police Chief, City Manager, Municipal Court Clerk, Municipal Court Judge and Consent Decree Coordinator. The City had yet to hire from outside someone to fill the Training Coordinator role.

Then came the pandemic. Through true grit and perseverance, the City was still able to make modest gains in implementation despite staffing numbers that reached all-time lows in the winter of 2021.

By 2023, thought prior to Chief Doyle's appointment, implementation had all but stalled following, in rapid succession, turnover in the Chief, City Manager, Consent Decree Coordinator and Court Administrator roles.

The City began to turn the corner in the fall of 2023. Since that time, and despite some external challenges, the Ferguson Police Department and its Municipal Court continued to experience and benefit from a period of sustained consistency and progress.

With the addition of Ms. Stephens and Ms. Washington in 2024, and under the steady leadership of City Manager John

Hampton and Police Chief Troy Doyle, there was a noticeable cultural shift towards transparency and accountability. This tone from the top has permeated both agencies, empowering key personnel to maximize and consolidate their individual talents towards the shared goal of Consent Decree implementation.

FPD has created and maintained internal systems for managing and tracking its compliance efforts, all with an eye towards sustainability, so that any future turnover doesn't result in regression like we've seen in the past.

As the forthcoming Status Report details, the advances made during this reporting period evidence the City's ability to achieve the Consent Decree's goals when the individuals tasked with leading implementation are supported in that effort.

The Monitoring team looks forward to continuing to engage meaningfully with the parties in the next reporting period and beyond.

That's it for me, Judge, unless you have questions.

THE COURT: I do not. Thank you very much.

- COMMENTS BY THE COURT -

THE COURT: And I think that your last comments about the review of the history is much more thorough than I had tried to do, but I did the same effort of going back and trying to see what we had been doing for the last nine years to make sure we were actually doing things and I think we did for a long time.

But things have been moving quickly and that's what

I was trying to express before. I appreciate what the City has done. I know it's been hard, but as I said before, we've got momentum and it does seem to work.

Also, one thing I forgot to mention earlier, one of the advantages of the way this has developed is that the Department of Justice, which technically is an adversary with the City in a lawsuit, Plaintiffs and Defendants, they've provided really substantial resources that the City wouldn't have had, but they have had because of the Consent Decree.

Also, the Monitor resources. Everyone has worked together to maximize the knowledge that is had, both in the City and understanding the history and the culture of the City, but from outside, as well, with the Monitor and the Department of Justice. And the number of subject matter experts and people they've been able to recommend, et cetera, has really been terrific. So these are all things that have worked well.

I do understand that there's disagreement about how things work in the City, and my experience is that cities always have disagreement about how things work in the City. That's sort of the nature of the beast. But most people are able to work through it and walk through it and I would encourage everyone to maintain the courtesy and professionalism that I know you're all capable of, and not have ... You know, disagreements over things like this, when everybody has the best interests of the City at heart, shouldn't be personal and you

should recognize that you may just have different ideas about how to get there.

And so I would urge everyone to please, you know, try to make your points and do what you think needs to happen.

Obviously, you're the decision-makers in the City here. But do it as much as you can, and in the community, without resort to personalization or insults, which there's just no place for here, and it will slow down our progress. We need to keep moving forward in the professional and collaborative way everyone has done and I commend everyone here for doing that. I think it's like we really do have a chance to get this done, and so keep up the good work.

We will have another conference in three months and at that one, the members of the public will be able to speak, as opposed to the written comments. And I hope, I think in three months there will be more progress. And I expect to see more. And I think we all look forward to the report that will be coming out to us all soon. And I think people will appreciate the detailed way it's laid out in going through, you know, provision-by-provision of the Consent Decree. I think that is helpful. And I think it wasn't until now that we really could do that because we had enough progress to be able to show that this is done, although these two things aren't, maybe, but to break it down in the way they have I think is very good, so I appreciate that, what everyone has done.

Thank you all for all your work, and I will talk to you soon and see the public back in about three months. We'll pick a date next time I talk to the lawyers on the phone. All right. Thank you very much. Court's in recess. - RECESS AT 11:10 A.M. -

- REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE -1 2 3 I, Linda C. Nichols, Registered Diplomate Reporter and 4 Certified Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that I am 5 a duly appointed Official Court Reporter for the United States 6 District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, and that 7 the foregoing is a true and accurate reproduction of the 8 Status Hearing held on July 22nd, 2025, in the matter of: 9 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 12 VS. 13 CITY OF FERGUSON, MISSOURI 14 4:16-CV-00180-CDP 15 16 17 I further certify that this transcript consists of pp. 1-46 inclusive. 18 19 20 Dated: August 15th, 2025. 21 22 Linda Nichols Linda Nichols, RDR, CRR 23 Official Court Reporter United States District Court 24 Eastern District of Missouri 25