



---

**Report on the City of Chicago's Response to  
the Execution of the Search Warrant at  
Anjanette Young's Home:  
Executive Summary**

Prepared for

**The City of Chicago**

Submitted by Hon. Ann Claire Williams (Ret.)

December 16, 2021

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### I. OVERVIEW

On the evening of February 21, 2019, Chicago Police Department officers descended upon social worker Anjanette Young's home to execute a search warrant. Only five seconds after officers knocked on her door, one officer began repeatedly striking Ms. Young's front door with a battering ram, terrifying Ms. Young. The door soon gave way, and male officers stormed inside, many shouting and with their guns drawn. Ms. Young stood with her hands up in her living room. She was shocked and in fear. She was alone. And, because she had been getting ready for bed after a shift at a hospital, she was completely naked.

As many in Chicago, across the nation, and around the world now know, Ms. Young had nothing to do with any criminal activity.

Ms. Young's innocence did not help her as she stood naked before the numerous male officers in her living room. After the officers rushed into her home, an officer took Ms. Young's hands behind her back and handcuffed her. One officer placed a short coat around Ms. Young's shoulders, but it left her front completely exposed. Another officer found a blanket and placed it around Ms. Young. But with her hands still handcuffed behind her back, the blanket slid open, exposing her front, until a male officer held the blanket closed.

Ms. Young told the officers over and over throughout this ordeal that they had the wrong home. She repeatedly asked what was happening. She asked who they were looking for. She asked to get dressed. She asked to see the warrant. She asked to call someone. She said she lived alone. She said she was a social worker. She said she followed the law. All of it true, but to no avail.

Eventually, more than 10 minutes after Ms. Young was handcuffed naked, a female officer who had come into Ms. Young's home—Officer Ella French, who would later be tragically killed in the line of duty—took Ms. Young to a bedroom to get dressed. Then Ms. Young was handcuffed again. Ms. Young's handcuffs were finally removed about 20 minutes after the officers entered her home. When the officers left, Ms. Young's front door was broken, with her protection consisting of an ironing board and small side table that officers placed behind the door as they left.

The loss of dignity and the trauma that Ms. Young suffered is plain to all who have read about or watched what she endured. Ms. Young's ordeal shook the City of Chicago and, unfortunately, reinforced the lack of trust that many of Chicago's Black residents have in the police.

The lack of trust was compounded for many by events that took place after the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. These events led to many questions, including:

- Why did it take so long for the City to provide Ms. Young and CBS2 with the body-worn camera footage from the search of Ms. Young's home?
- Why did the City only produce 14 body-worn camera videos from the search in February 2020 when there were 22 videos?
- Why did the City's lawyers try to stop CBS2 from airing the body-worn camera footage?
- Why did the City seek sanctions against Ms. Young in her federal civil rights lawsuit, and why did the City's lawyers drop the sanctions request?
- Why did the Mayor say she only learned of the search of Ms. Young's home in December 2020, when she had been advised of the search in November 2019?
- Why did the COPA investigation into the search of Ms. Young's home take so long?

On December 22, 2020, Mayor Lori E. Lightfoot asked a Jones Day team led by Judge Ann Claire Williams (Ret.) to conduct an independent review of the City's response to the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. Jones Day proceeded to conduct an exhaustive, independent review focusing on the four City departments that were principally involved in this response: (1) the Mayor's Office, (2) the Department of Law, (3) the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA), and (4) the Chicago Police Department (CPD).

Our review did not reveal any evidence suggesting that the Mayor or any current or former City employee took action with malicious intent to add to Ms. Young's mistreatment or to otherwise harm her in connection with the City's response to the search of her home. Nor did our review reveal any purposeful concealment of any information by the Mayor or by any City department relating to this search.

On the other hand, our review did establish that, at times, City personnel failed to recognize the seriousness of what occurred at Ms. Young's home on February 21, 2019. For Ms. Young, the events that evening were undeniably dehumanizing and deeply traumatizing, and for a community whose confidence in local law enforcement and government as a whole has been repeatedly shaken by incidents involving the police (here and elsewhere), the events of that night raised significant questions.

The City failed Ms. Young on February 21, 2019, and then compounded this failure with additional failures in how its departments handled matters in the aftermath of the botched search. While not malicious, these deficiencies generally resulted from City employees failing to recognize and effectuate the values of public service, failing to take ownership and to assume personal responsibility for particular aspects of the City's response to the search, and also from structural obstacles outside of those employees' control, including lack of clear processes and procedures.

Our review led us to make the recommendations found at the end of this Executive Summary and in the accompanying slides.

## II. JONES DAY'S REVIEW

### A. Scope of Review

There were three separate and simultaneous inquiries that arose out of the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. Our review examined only the response to the search by the Mayor's Office, the Department of Law, COPA, and CPD.

Our review did not examine the conduct of any police officer or other City official in the search of Ms. Young's home or in the acquisition of the search warrant. We focused instead on how the departments handled various matters arising out of the search; the relevant City and departmental policies, processes, and practices in place at the time; and whether they should be changed in light of the City's response to the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home.<sup>1</sup>

The Chicago Municipal Code vests COPA with authority to conduct disciplinary investigations into certain conduct by CPD members before and during allegedly improper searches.<sup>2</sup> Consistent with that authority, on November 12, 2019, COPA commenced an investigation of CPD members' actions in the acquisition and execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. CPD members must cooperate with COPA investigations or face discipline including discharge.<sup>3</sup> COPA concluded its investigation on April 29, 2021, and forwarded its findings and recommendations to the CPD Superintendent for review. Officers with sustained allegations were served with administrative charges. COPA's Summary Report of Investigation can be found on its website.<sup>4</sup>

The City of Chicago Office of Inspector General also has the power to investigate certain misconduct. The Chicago Municipal Code grants the Office of the Inspector General the power to investigate the performance of City governmental officers and employees "in order to detect and prevent misconduct, inefficiency and waste,"<sup>5</sup> and the Office of the Inspector General conducted an "investigative inquiry into possible misconduct by City actors related to the search warrant executed at the home of Ms. Anjanette Young and its aftermath."<sup>6</sup> The Office of the

---

<sup>1</sup> In connection with this engagement, Jones Day also provided legal guidance concerning other related issues, including: (1) the existing law governing CPD's release of body-worn camera videos; (2) CPD's policy and related procedures applicable to the release of body-worn camera videos; and (3) CPD's use of force review unit.

<sup>2</sup> Chicago Municipal Code 2-78-120(f),(v).

<sup>3</sup> Chicago Municipal Code 2-78-140.

<sup>4</sup> Summary Report of Investigation, Log #2019-0004600, *available at* <https://www.chicagocopa.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2019-4600-redacted.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Chicago Municipal Code 2-56-030(b).

<sup>6</sup> <https://igchicago.org/2021/01/22/oig-public-safety-section-issues-urgent-recommendations-on-the-chicago-police-departments-search-warrant-policies/>.

Inspector General submitted its report to the Mayor's Office, CPD, Department of Law, and COPA on October 15, 2021.<sup>7</sup>

In recognition of the COPA and Office of Inspector General investigations, our review examined neither the application for nor the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home, nor any of the officers' conduct at Ms. Young's home. Nor was our review a disciplinary review or a review focused on whether misconduct occurred.

## **B. Review Team**

Jones Day's review was led by Judge Ann Claire Williams (Ret.) with assistance from more than 40 other attorneys in various offices of the Firm. The Jones Day team dedicated more than 9,000 hours of *pro bono* legal services to the review. Other members of the Jones Day team included senior attorneys Ted Chung, Jamila Hall, Nicole Henning, and Shireen Matthews.

- Judge Williams, of counsel at Jones Day, is a highly regarded former judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Prior to her elevation to the Seventh Circuit, Judge Williams served as a federal district court judge on the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Before her appointment to the bench, Judge Williams served as an Assistant United States Attorney with the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Illinois for nine years and was Chief of a division.
- Ted Chung chairs Jones Day's global Investigations & White Collar Defense Practice and has led numerous internal investigations. His experience also includes service as an Assistant United States Attorney with the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Illinois, and positions with both the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois.
- Jamila Hall is a partner in Jones Day's Atlanta office, a member of the Investigations & White Collar Defense Practice, and a former Assistant U.S. Attorney with the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Georgia. She serves as investigative counsel to Fortune 500 companies and regularly conducts internal investigations throughout the United States, Latin America, Europe, and Asia.
- Nicole Henning is a partner in Jones Day's Issues & Appeals and State Attorney General Enforcement, Investigations & Litigation practices where she has played key roles in investigations of Fortune 500 companies, and is often called upon by clients to analyze complex legal issues raised by those investigations.
- Shireen Matthews is a partner in Jones Day's San Diego office, a member of the Investigations & White Collar Defense Practice, and a former Assistant United States Attorney for the United States Attorney's Office in the Southern District of California. She has conducted numerous internal investigations and now helps clients build, enhance, and maintain effective compliance programs.

---

<sup>7</sup> OIG Statement on the Issuance of the Anjanette Young Report, October 15, 2021, <https://igchicago.org/2021/10/15/oig-statement-on-anjanette-young-investigation/>.

### **C. Methodology**

Our review included interviews of over 40 individuals, some of whom we interviewed on multiple occasions. Fewer than 10 individuals, citing collective bargaining reasons, declined to be interviewed.

In addition to interviews, Jones Day attorneys reviewed over 250,000 emails from more than 40 current or former City employees. Our attorneys also reviewed relevant text messages on City-issued devices from certain current and former employees. Jones Day also obtained and reviewed other documents, including departmental policies and procedures, court documents, and documents provided by interviewees.

Jones Day also held supplemental interviews and four cross-departmental stakeholder meetings with City employees to discuss the feasibility and practicality of our recommendations for changes to certain policies, processes, and procedures.

### **D. Independence**

Jones Day conducted an independent review. The City cooperated with our review and did not restrict Jones Day's access to relevant information or employees. We were able to conduct the review as we deemed appropriate.

## **III. SUMMARY OF EVENTS**

### **A. Ms. Young's Federal Lawsuit and Airing of Body-Worn Camera Footage**

#### **1. Filing of Federal Lawsuit and Initial Assignment Within the Department of Law**

On August 16, 2019, Ms. Young filed a lawsuit in federal court against the City of Chicago, two named Chicago police officers, and other unnamed police officers. Because Ms. Young's suit included civil rights claims, the Department of Law assigned the defense of the case to its Federal Civil Rights Litigation Division (FCRL). Within FCRL, Assistant Corporation Counsel (ACC) in the City Defense Section (CDS) defend the City as an entity when the City is named as a defendant in litigation, and Assistant Corporation Counsel in the Individual Defense Section (IDS) defend individual Chicago police officers when individual officers are sued.

On August 27, 2019, four CDS attorneys and one CDS paralegal, and four IDS attorneys and one IDS paralegal, were assigned to Ms. Young's case. The ACC who assumed the major responsibilities on the CDS side had been a member of the bar for less than four years and had just started in FCRL the previous month.

#### **2. Initial Requests for Body-Worn Camera Footage from Department of Law to Chicago Police Department**

FCRL paralegals submit requests for relevant documents and information to other City departments after a suit is filed against the City or its police officers. Among other things, body-worn camera footage is always to be requested when relevant. On August 29, 2019, the IDS

paralegal assigned to Ms. Young's case prepared and sent an "information request" (as opposed to a "discovery request," since formal discovery in the case had not begun) for body-worn camera footage to the CPD Office of Legal Affairs. Although the paralegal also attached a document that listed all the officers involved in the search at Ms. Young's home, the face of the form only requested footage from the two officers who had been named in Ms. Young's complaint at that time.

### **3. Amended Complaint in October 2019 Names 14 Officers as Defendants**

Ms. Young amended her complaint on October 12, 2019 to name 12 additional officers as defendants in her lawsuit. The amended complaint named a total of 14 officers as defendants in Ms. Young's suit, in addition to the City.

### **4. First CBS2 Chicago Story Runs on November 12, 2019, and Body-Worn Camera Footage Pulled**

On November 12, 2019, CBS2 Chicago first broke the news regarding the officers' conduct during the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home when it published an article on its website entitled "Innocent Woman: Chicago Police Handcuffed Me While I Was Naked During Wrong Raid."<sup>8</sup> No officer body-worn camera footage accompanied this story.

After the CBS2 story, the primary Assistant Corporation Counsel on the case in the City Defense Section was told that the Mayor's Office had called. After checking, the ACC realized that the Department of Law had not received a response from CPD's Office of Legal Affairs to the August request for the video from the two officers named in Ms. Young's initial complaint. The ACC then emailed an IDS paralegal and asked the paralegal to follow up on the August request. The ACC also asked the paralegal to add to the request the body-worn camera footage from additional officer defendants named in the amended complaint. Although the paralegal responded that she would make the request by no later than the next day, it does not appear that the paralegal followed up as requested. The paralegal worked in FCRL's Individual Defense Section, and the requesting ACC worked in the City Defense Section. FCRL attorneys were only to make requests to paralegals on their same case team (IDS or CDS), and the paralegal may not have followed up as requested because the paralegal worked in FCRL's Individual Defense Section.

With no response from CPD's Office of Legal Affairs, and in a rush in light of the November 12, 2019 CBS2 story, the Assistant Corporation Counsel also turned to a CPD investigator detailed to FCRL. On November 18, 2019 the ACC asked the investigator to pull the body-worn camera footage related to the search of Ms. Young's home. The investigator pulled 14 body-worn camera videos. Ms. Young's amended complaint named 14 officers as defendants. Had the search been more inclusive, however, 22 body-worn camera videos would have been found in the possession of CPD. There were eight additional videos because some officers had turned their cameras off and on while on the scene on February 21, 2019, with the result that

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://chicago.cbslocal.com/2019/11/12/innocent-woman-chicago-police-handcuffed-me-while-i-was-naked-during-wrong-raid/>.

more than one video from that evening existed for some of the officers. In light of these events, ACCs must now obtain supervisor permission to obtain body-worn camera footage from a CPD investigator instead of through CPD's Office of Legal Affairs.

## **5. Motion to Dismiss and Initial Production of Body-Worn Camera Video**

The City and individual officers moved to dismiss Ms. Young's lawsuit on January 24, 2020. A court hearing was held on February 7, 2020. At the hearing, the court directed the City to produce body-worn camera footage from the officers who were inside Ms. Young's home pursuant to a protective order that the parties were to draft and submit. On February 21, 2020, the City produced to Ms. Young's counsel the 14 body-worn camera videos from the search of Ms. Young's home that the CPD investigator had pulled in November. The videos were produced pursuant to a protective order, which meant that by order of the court, Ms. Young's attorney could only use the videos for purposes of her pending federal lawsuit and could not use or disclose them for any other purpose.<sup>9</sup>

Ms. Young filed a request to voluntarily dismiss her federal lawsuit on March 9, 2020, and the court granted it the next day.<sup>10</sup> The Department of Law did not conduct any further searches for body-worn camera footage after Ms. Young dismissed her case.

Six days after the dismissal, Ms. Young's counsel made a settlement demand to the City.

## **6. CBS2 Airs Body-Worn Camera Footage**

On December 12, 2020, nearly 10 months after producing 14 videos to Ms. Young under a protective order, Department of Law attorneys learned that CBS2 had obtained body-worn camera footage from inside Ms. Young's home on February 21, 2019. After determining that no City department had produced this footage in response to a request under the Illinois Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), FCRL attorneys believed that the only way CBS2 could have obtained the footage was if Ms. Young's attorney had given it to the network in violation of the February 2020 protective order. FCRL attorneys filed an emergency motion with the court on Monday, December 14 to stop CBS2 from airing the footage. The motion also requested sanctions against "Plaintiff"; Ms. Young was the plaintiff in the case.<sup>11</sup> The primary CDS attorney on the case drafted the motion, with approval from FCRL supervisors, the then-Department of Law Managing Deputy, and the then-Corporation Counsel. At this point, only one of the FCRL supervising deputies had watched any footage of the search; neither the then-Corporation

---

<sup>9</sup> Agreed Confidentiality Protective Order, *Young v. City of Chicago*, No. 1:19-cv-05312 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 20, 2020), ECF No. 34; Minute Entry Before the Honorable John J. Tharp, Jr., *Young* (N.D. Ill. Feb. 20, 2020), ECF No. 33.

<sup>10</sup> Minute Entry Before the Honorable John J. Tharp, Jr., *Young* (N.D. Ill. Mar. 10, 2020), ECF No. 37.

<sup>11</sup> Joint Emergency Motion to Enjoin CBS from Violating the Court's Confidentiality Order, and Motion for Sanctions Against Plaintiff, *Young* (N.D. Ill. Dec. 14, 2020), ECF No. 38.



Counsel nor the then-Managing Deputy had seen the video. CBS2 opposed the motion, and the court denied the motion the same day it was filed.<sup>12</sup>

Neither the Mayor nor Mayor's Office staff knew about the motion before it was filed. The Mayor and her staff were shocked, and some were angry, that the Department of Law filed the motion without first consulting the Mayor or her staff. On December 16, 2020, at the direction of the Mayor, the Department of Law filed a supplement to its December 14 motion. The new filing stated that the City was seeking sanctions against Ms. Young's attorney and not against Ms. Young. The filing further requested permission, to the extent needed, to release the remaining videos in their entirety, with redactions to protect Ms. Young's privacy.<sup>13</sup>

#### **7. CPD Publishes 20 Body-Worn Camera Videos to its Website**

After the Mayor directed that all body-worn camera footage connected to the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home be released to Ms. Young, CBS2, and the public, CPD published 20 body-worn camera videos on its website on December 17, 2020.

That number of videos was more than the 14 videos the City had produced to Ms. Young's attorney in March during litigation. CBS2 alerted the Mayor's Press Office that it intended to publish a story regarding the City's failure to produce all the relevant body-worn camera videos during Ms. Young's litigation. CPD's General Counsel then identified two additional videos connected to the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home that CPD had not posted on its website, for a total of 22 body-worn camera videos connected to the search at Ms. Young's home. It appears that a CPD sergeant in CPD's FOIA unit decided not to post these two videos on the CPD website because they contained footage only outside Ms. Young's home and therefore did not show the conduct of the search inside the house.<sup>14</sup> It also appears that the CPD sergeant did not consult with supervisory personnel or the CPD General Counsel before making that decision. CPD published the two additional videos on its website on December 30, 2020.

#### **8. City's Withdrawal of Motion for Sanctions in Federal Court, and Ms. Young Files Suit in State Court**

On December 18, 2020, the Department of Law withdrew its motion for sanctions against Ms. Young's attorney.<sup>15</sup> The Mayor provided the language for the motion to withdraw with instructions that it be filed without edits. The court granted the City's motion the same day it was

---

<sup>12</sup> Minute Entry Before the Honorable John J. Tharp, Jr., *Young* (N.D. Ill. Dec. 14, 2020), ECF No. 41.

<sup>13</sup> Defendants' Supplement in Support of its Motion for Sanctions, *Young* (N.D. Ill. Dec. 14, 2020), ECF No. 42.

<sup>14</sup> This CPD sergeant is one of the City employees who declined to be interviewed, citing collective bargaining reasons.

<sup>15</sup> Defendants' Motion to Withdraw the Motion for Sanctions Against Attorney Sauter, *Young* (N.D. Ill. Dec. 18, 2020), ECF No. 49.

filed but stated it had its own concerns with ensuring compliance with, and enforcement of, its orders. Therefore, the court kept a December 22 status hearing as scheduled.<sup>16</sup>

On December 20, 2020, the then-Corporation Counsel and the Department of Law Managing Deputy resigned at the Mayor's request. The Department of Law Director of Public Affairs also left the City that same day.

On January 15, 2021, the City filed a letter from the Mayor with the court that asked the court not to sanction Ms. Young's attorney.<sup>17</sup> Two weeks later, the court issued an order stating that, although Ms. Young's counsel had violated the Agreed Confidentiality Protective Order in the case, it would not impose sanctions.<sup>18</sup>

Ms. Young refiled her case in Illinois state court on February 19, 2021.

## **B. FOIA Requests from CBS2 and Ms. Young**

Shortly after Ms. Young filed her federal lawsuit, CBS2 submitted its first FOIA request for information related to the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. From August 2019 to November 2020, CBS2 submitted three FOIA requests to CPD and one FOIA request to COPA. Ms. Young also personally submitted a FOIA request to CPD in November 2019.

### **1. CBS2 FOIA Request to CPD: August 21, 2019 (Denied)**

CBS2's first FOIA request, sent on August 21, 2019 to CPD, requested all video recorded from officers' body-worn cameras during the search executed at Ms. Young's home, as well as the complaint for the search warrant. A CPD FOIA officer requested an extension of time to respond six days later. On October 31, 2019, CBS2 emailed CPD's FOIA unit to request a status update on this FOIA request. As to body-worn camera footage, CPD denied this FOIA request on November 11, 2019, because it was not submitted with Ms. Young's written consent as required under Illinois law.<sup>19</sup> CPD's response to this FOIA request did not address CBS2's request for the complaint for the search warrant.

### **2. Ms. Young FOIA Request to CPD: November 1, 2019 (Denied)**

Ms. Young submitted a FOIA request to CPD on November 1, 2019. This request sought all video recorded from officers' body-worn cameras during the execution of the search warrant at her home.

---

<sup>16</sup> Minute Entry Before the Honorable John J. Tharp, Jr., *Young* (N.D. Ill. Dec. 18, 2020), ECF No. 50.

<sup>17</sup> Defendant City Filing for the Court's Consideration of Sanctions Against Attorney Sauter, *Young* (N.D. Ill. Jan. 15, 2021), ECF No. 55.

<sup>18</sup> Order Signed by the Honorable John J. Tharp, Jr., *Young* (N.D. Ill. Jan. 29, 2021), ECF No. 57.

<sup>19</sup> See 50 ILCS 706/10-20(b)(1).

The Illinois FOIA statute makes documents exempt from inspection and copying where disclosure would:

- (i) interfere with pending or actually and reasonably contemplated law enforcement proceedings conducted by any law enforcement or correctional agency that is the recipient of the request; [or]
- (ii) interfere with active administrative enforcement proceedings conducted by the public body that is the recipient of the request.

5 ILCS 140/7(d).

A CPD Office of Legal Affairs staff attorney who, per CPD practice, was responsible for reaching out to COPA to determine whether a COPA ongoing investigation may impede CPD's response to a FOIA request, emailed a COPA paralegal to ask whether COPA had an open investigation into the search warrant execution at Ms. Young's home. If so, the CPD staff attorney asked whether releasing body-worn camera footage in response to Ms. Young's FOIA request would interfere with COPA's investigation. After determining that COPA had an ongoing investigation into the matter, the COPA paralegal told the CPD staff attorney that COPA would deny the request under the ongoing investigation FOIA exemption. There is no evidence that the paralegal consulted with an attorney before sending a response. CPD denied Ms. Young's FOIA request on the basis of the pending COPA investigation on November 19, 2019.<sup>20</sup>

The COPA paralegal's response reflected COPA's then-standard practice. At the time, if COPA had a pending investigation, it invoked the FOIA ongoing investigation exemption without further analysis, and records relating to that investigation were not produced. COPA changed its practice regarding the ongoing investigation exemption in 2021. It will now invoke the exemption only in exceptional circumstances.

### **3. CBS2 FOIA Request to CPD: November 12, 2019 (Granted)**

CBS2 sent a second FOIA request to CPD on November 12, 2019. This request asked for the complaint for the search warrant executed at Ms. Young's home. One week later, CPD provided CBS2 with a copy of the complaint for the search warrant, with private information redacted pursuant to 5 ILCS 140/7(1)(b).

### **4. CBS2 FOIA Request to CPD: January 6, 2020 (Pending Until CPD Posted Videos on December 17, 2020)**

On January 6, 2020, CBS2 sent a third FOIA request to CPD. This request sought all video recorded from officers' body-worn cameras during the search warrant executed at Ms. Young's home. The request included Ms. Young's signed consent for release of the footage to

---

<sup>20</sup> On December 16, 2020, Ms. Young filed suit in Illinois state court against CPD. Her suit requested that CPD release all her records under the Illinois FOIA statute and sought a ruling that CPD's refusal to release the records was a willful and sanctionable violation of the statute.

CBS2. The same CPD Office of Legal Affairs staff attorney who reached out to COPA regarding Ms. Young's November 1, 2019 FOIA request reached out to COPA again regarding CBS2's January 6, 2020 request. As with Ms. Young's request, the CPD staff attorney emailed a COPA paralegal and asked whether the COPA investigation was still pending. This time, the CPD staff attorney requested that, if the COPA investigation was still pending: (1) the COPA paralegal confer with the COPA General Counsel regarding the request, and (2) that COPA provide CPD with the basis for why disclosure of those videos to a requester with permission from the video's subject would interfere with COPA's ongoing investigation.<sup>21</sup> COPA's General Counsel was copied on this email.

On January 15, 2020, the COPA paralegal confirmed to the CPD attorney that the COPA investigation was still pending. The COPA paralegal also stated that it was COPA's understanding that body-worn camera video was not released when an investigation is pending. (As noted above, COPA's practice with respect to invoking FOIA's ongoing investigation exemption has since changed.) While COPA's General Counsel received the CPD attorney's email and was blind carbon copied on the COPA paralegal's response to CPD, he does not recall discussing with the COPA paralegal whether or why releasing the video would actually interfere with COPA's ongoing investigation.

On January 22, 2020, a then-Department of Law Deputy Corporation Counsel confirmed to CPD legal and FOIA personnel that when a FOIA request is for a specific video or a specific report within an investigatory file, the analysis is whether the release of that particular video or report would impede the investigation.

CPD did not send a response to CBS2 with respect to CBS2's January 6, 2020 FOIA request until after CBS2 aired body-worn camera footage from Ms. Young's home on December 14, 2020. The next day, a then-Department of Law Deputy Corporation Counsel asked the CPD FOIA Unit Commanding Officer to close out the January 6, 2020 FOIA request, noting "What are we waiting for?" The email also asked CPD to check whether COPA's investigation was still ongoing. A CPD staff attorney then asked COPA whether, in light of the public release of some of the footage, releasing the remainder of the video would interfere with COPA's investigation. COPA's General Counsel confirmed to the CPD staff attorney that further release would not interfere with the investigation. On December 17, 2020, CPD sent CBS2 a FOIA response letter that included a link to the CPD website with 20 body-worn camera videos from the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home.

---

<sup>21</sup> On January 10, 2020, after CBS2 requested review of the denial of its August 21, 2019 FOIA request, the Illinois Office of the Attorney General Public Access Bureau issued its determination that CPD had not violated the Illinois FOIA statute when it denied that request. The determination cautioned, however, that the question in similar future requests submitted with the subject's consent would be whether CPD had proven by clear and convincing evidence that disclosure of the recordings would interfere with pending or actually contemplated law enforcement or administrative proceedings. *See* <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/mayor/statementsanddocuments/PAC-OPINION-2019-Determination-Letter.pdf>.

## **5. CBS2 FOIA Request to COPA: November 19, 2020 (Denied)**

CBS2's fourth FOIA request was sent to COPA on November 19, 2020, before CPD's public release of the videos. This request, CBS2's only FOIA request to COPA, sought the body-worn camera video from the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. The request noted that it contained written permission from Ms. Young to release the video to CBS2. By that time, COPA's practice when invoking the ongoing investigation FOIA exemption was to identify in the denial letter the reason that fulfilling the request would interfere with an ongoing investigation. On November 25, 2020, COPA denied the FOIA request on the basis that its investigation was pending. The denial letter stated that COPA was still in the process of serving allegations and conducting all necessary officer interviews and that release of the footage would interfere with the integrity of COPA's investigation.

### **C. The Mayor's Office's Awareness of the Search of Ms. Young's Home**

#### **1. November 2019**

The current Mayor took office on May 20, 2019, three months after the search of Ms. Young's home. Employees in the current Mayor's Office were first alerted to the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home when CBS2 followed up on its first FOIA request to CPD. After first reaching out on November 1, CBS2 spoke with the Mayor's then-Deputy Press Secretary on November 4 in the hope that the Deputy Press Secretary could assist with following up on CBS2's August 21, 2019 FOIA request to CPD. One of the reporters emailed the Deputy Press Secretary again on Friday, November 8, 2019. The reporter wrote that CBS2 planned to run a story about officers' conduct during the execution of a search warrant at Ms. Young's home and noted that CBS2 and Ms. Young had submitted FOIA requests for the body-worn camera footage. The Deputy Press Secretary responded that he would be back in touch Monday.

Also on November 8, the Deputy Press Secretary emailed, among others, the individuals then holding the roles of Deputy Mayor of Public Safety, Mayor's Office Communications Director, CPD Communications Director, and Department of Law Spokesperson and included a description of the event provided by CBS2. The description included that officers had "handcuffed Young, who was naked, and allegedly left her standing for 40 minutes handcuffed and naked while all-male police officers searched her apartment."

Monday, November 11, 2019 was the Veterans' Day holiday. That morning, a then-Department of Law Deputy Corporation Counsel detailed in an email sent to a number of Mayor's Office personnel, among others, the next steps regarding CBS2's and Ms. Young's FOIA requests, including that CBS2 would receive a denial that day and that Ms. Young would receive the videos the next day. The Deputy Corporation Counsel also included in the email a description of the video's contents, stating, "So far, it appears 13 minutes into body worn, a female officer comes in and takes her into a room. Prior to that, she is given a sheet to cover up." The then-Communications Director sent a follow up email to a small group including the then-Deputy Mayor of Public Safety and asked the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety whether the Mayor was aware of the situation. The Deputy Mayor of Public Safety responded that she told the Mayor there was a bad incident but did not go into details.

A few minutes later, the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety forwarded to the Mayor the Deputy Press Secretary's November 8 email with CBS2's description of the search and copied the then-Chief of Staff and then-Communications Director. The email stated: "Mayor, please see below for a pretty bad wrongful raid coming out tomorrow. Media FOIA was denied and victim FOIA request is in the works and to be released to her tomorrow within the deadline period." The Mayor was out of the office most of the day attending Veterans' Day events. About 30 minutes after the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety sent her email, the Mayor responded by email and requested a call in 10 minutes, stating, "I have a lot of questions about this one." About 10-15 minutes later, the Mayor, Chief of Staff, Deputy Mayor of Public Safety, Director of Communications, and Deputy Press Secretary convened on a call. The call focused on the work of the search warrant execution working group and did not substantively discuss Ms. Young or the execution of the search warrant at her home. The Mayor had convened a search warrant working group in the Fall of 2019 to propose revisions to the search warrant process as a result of a number of problematic search warrant executions. A search warrant working group made a series of revisions in January 2020 and further revisions in May 2021.

That same morning, the then-Deputy Press Secretary informed CBS2 that Ms. Young would receive the body-worn camera footage the next day and that CBS2 would receive a response to its own request later in the day. The Deputy Press Secretary also wrote that, "off-the-record," although he had not watched the video himself, he had been told that it appeared that 13 minutes into the footage, a female officer took the individual into a room to change. This description came from the former Department of Law Deputy Corporation Counsel's summary provided earlier that day.

On November 18, 2019, a Department of Law Deputy Corporation Counsel informed the Mayor's Office Communications Director and several other Mayor's Office personnel that body-worn camera footage would not be released to Ms. Young in response to Ms. Young's FOIA request because COPA had an ongoing investigation. There is no evidence that anyone alerted the Mayor that Ms. Young would no longer receive the body-worn camera footage.

## **2. December 2020**

Over a year later, on December 9, 2020, a CPD public relations employee forwarded the Mayor's then-Deputy Press Secretary an email from a CBS2 reporter indicating that the station was working on a news story about a wrong raid at Anjanette Young's home. Late in the evening of December 14, 2020, CBS2 aired the body-worn camera footage from the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home.

The Mayor learned about the news story the next morning. The CBS2 report was discussed during a standing 8:00 a.m. COVID-19 call the Mayor had with her team. After the call, the Mayor watched body-worn camera video from the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home for the first time. She thought it was horrifying. The Mayor called her then-Chief of Staff and asked if he had watched the video. Her Chief of Staff then watched the video for the first time.

The Mayor released a statement later that day saying that she had become aware of the incident involving Ms. Young that day. She did not recall that she had been notified of the search

on November 11, 2019 by email. Her staff did not fact-check whether December 15 marked the first time the Mayor was notified about the search at Ms. Young's home or conduct a search of the Mayor's email or staff members' email before the statement was issued.

On December 17, the Mayor acknowledged at a press conference that she had been notified in November 2019 of the search of Ms. Young's home. She also clarified that Ms. Young had made a FOIA request for the body-worn camera footage from the search and that the request had been denied.

## **D. Investigation by COPA**

### **1. COPA Opens Investigation in November 2019**

As noted above, COPA is authorized to conduct investigations of police officer misconduct in areas including allegations of improper search and seizure.<sup>22</sup>

Although Ms. Young filed a lawsuit against the City and individual officers on August 16, 2019 alleging many improprieties in the execution of the search warrant of her home, no procedure at the time required that the Department of Law notify COPA of suits that contained allegations falling within its purview. COPA was not notified that Ms. Young had filed a lawsuit. A few weeks later, on September 4, 2019, an Assistant Corporation Counsel in the City's Department of Law contacted a COPA paralegal. The ACC asked, for purposes of gathering relevant documents for the litigation, whether COPA had opened a file in Ms. Young's matter. That inquiry also did not prompt COPA to open a file, as no procedure at the time required COPA to open a file or to refer a matter to the COPA intake department upon receipt of a discovery request.

Instead, a media inquiry prompted COPA to open an investigation. On November 11, 2019, the COPA Public Information Officer learned about the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home after media inquiries about the search. The COPA Public Information Officer informed the then-COPA Chief Administrator and then-Deputy Chief of Intake about the inquiries that day. The Deputy Chief of Intake checked the COPA database and found no pending COPA investigation into the events at Ms. Young's home. He then located and reviewed Ms. Young's complaint in her federal lawsuit and concluded that the matter fell within COPA's jurisdiction. He directed COPA to initiate an investigation, and a log number was opened the following day.

### **2. COPA Preliminary Investigation**

On November 13, 2019, COPA received, uploaded, reviewed, and logged the body-worn camera footage from the search of Ms. Young's home. COPA also reached out to Ms. Young's attorney and requested his cooperation with its investigation. That evening, COPA's Deputy Chief of Intake informed the Chief of Investigative Operations and Deputy Chief Administrator that the case was ready to be assigned to an investigator, and that the investigation regarding the events at Ms. Young's home should be prioritized in light of the attention the case had received.

---

<sup>22</sup> Chicago Municipal Code 2-78-120(f),(v).

On November 19, 2019, after an unsuccessful attempt to obtain Ms. Young's cooperation, COPA assigned the investigation to a unit with experience handling complex Fourth Amendment cases (e.g., cases involving issues relating to searches by law enforcement).

About six weeks later, on December 30, 2019, a COPA supervisor assigned the case to an investigator. Over the next few days, the investigator obtained a copy of the search warrant, issued a subpoena to the Department of Law for records related to Ms. Young's suit, and requested and reviewed documents including the rap sheet for the search warrant subject, the case report, arrest report, and state court records.

### 3. COPA Did Not Seek Affidavit Override in 2019

COPA is not permitted to interview officers as part of its investigation until it obtains either (1) a sworn statement from a complainant, or (2) an affidavit override from the Bureau of Internal Affairs based on objective, verifiable evidence.<sup>23</sup> COPA's own policies require it to make a good-faith effort to obtain a sworn statement from a civilian complainant.<sup>24</sup>

Sometimes, as in this case, the subject of a police encounter declines to provide a sworn statement. In that instance, section 2.4.1 of COPA's Rules and Regulations provides:

If, after 30 days from the date the complaint is made, COPA has been unable to obtain a sworn affidavit in support of a complaint, the COPA Chief Administrator will determine whether the complaint will be declined for lack of an affidavit or whether COPA will pursue an affidavit override from the Chief of the Bureau of Internal Affairs, or his or her designee, pursuant to the relevant department rules and collective bargaining agreement provisions.

Although COPA had not obtained a sworn statement from Ms. Young by December 12, 2019—and indeed never received one—COPA did not seek an affidavit override that day, which marked 30 days from the date COPA opened its investigation.

In 2019 and early 2020, if the subject of the police encounter did not voluntarily give a sworn statement to COPA, COPA would generally either close the case or, if the subject had filed litigation with the City, wait for him or her to make a sworn statement in the course of the litigation (e.g., a deposition). This was done for a variety of reasons, including concern that COPA might not be aware of the full extent of any misconduct until hearing from the subject of the encounter.

---

<sup>23</sup> See COPA Rules and Regulations § 2.4.1.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.* § 2.4.



In December 2020, the Office of Inspector General released a report concerning COPA's use of affidavit overrides.<sup>25</sup> The report concluded, among other things, that "COPA did not pursue affidavit overrides when supporting evidence was available."<sup>26</sup> In late 2020, COPA's investigators underwent consent-decree compliant training regarding affidavit overrides. Now, COPA employees intend to seek affidavit overrides earlier in investigations if the evidence warrants.

#### **4. February to Mid-March 2020: COPA Monitors Litigation Status; No Action on Investigation**

From February to mid-March 2020, the COPA investigator assigned to Ms. Young's matter monitored her federal lawsuit to see whether she would make a sworn statement in litigation. On March 10, 2020, Ms. Young dismissed her suit without making such a statement.

#### **5. Mid-March to November 2020: No Action on Investigation**

For much of 2020, COPA took little action on the investigation of the execution of the search warrant at Ms. Young's home. COPA prioritized other cases, including officer-involved shootings; complaints related to protests after George Floyd's murder; cases nearing the statute of limitations; and cases COPA inherited from the Independent Police Review Authority, the body that preceded COPA before COPA was established in 2016. The investigator on Ms. Young's matter primarily devoted his efforts to investigations involving team members of former Chicago Police Sergeant Ronald Watts, a case involving a juvenile that was on the COPA "Top 15" priority list, and cases that could be finalized during the pandemic without additional interviews. Ms. Young's case was not on COPA's "Top 15" list. The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020 meant that for months, COPA investigators had either no ability or limited ability to conduct in-person interviews of officers, and the police union usually did not agree to remote officer interviews.

Between May and November, COPA's only activity on the matter consisted of intermittent checks of the state court docket to see whether Ms. Young had refiled her lawsuit in state court.

#### **6. May 10, 2020: 180 Days After Start of COPA Investigation**

If COPA does not conclude an investigation into alleged officer misconduct within six months, the Chicago Municipal Code requires COPA to send notice to the Mayor or her designee, the CPD Superintendent, the Chairman of the City Council Committee on Public Safety, and, if relevant, the complainant or employee named in the complaint.<sup>27</sup> The spreadsheets COPA sent to the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety did not identify any case by the complainant or subject's name. Instead, the lists were in the form of a spreadsheet that contains the log number,

---

<sup>25</sup> <https://igchicago.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/OIG-Evaluation-of-the-Use-of-the-Affidavit-Override-in-Disciplinary-Investigations-of-CPD-Members.pdf>.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>27</sup> Chicago Municipal Code 2-78-135.

date of complaint/notification, category code, category code description, and current status. The lists were also not cumulative and only listed cases that had newly crossed the six-month threshold. In this case, Ms. Young's case crossed the six-month threshold on May 10, 2020, but the report sent to the Mayor's Office for the month of May did not include Ms. Young's case number.

#### **7. December 2020: Renewed Media Interest Prompts COPA Action**

CBS2 aired the body-worn camera footage from Ms. Young's home on December 14, 2020. The Mayor called the COPA Chief Administrator. On December 15, the COPA Chief of Investigative Operations called the lead investigator at home and stated another investigator who could devote full-time attention to the case was being added to the team.

On December 17, COPA's Chief Administrator stated at a Police Board meeting that the investigation would be complete by "early 2021."<sup>28</sup> She made a similar comment at a December 22, 2020 City Council Special Joint Committee Meeting on Anjanette Young.<sup>29</sup>

On December 18, COPA assembled a team of approximately 10 persons to aid in the investigation of the search at Ms. Young's home. Later that day, COPA requested an affidavit override from the Chief of the Bureau of Internal Affairs. The request was granted the same day.

COPA conducted its first officer interview in the matter on January 6, 2021. COPA conducted further interviews of officers, the confidential informant who provided information that led to the search warrant, and other witnesses in February and March. COPA completed its final witness interview on April 14, 2021 and delivered its report to the CPD Superintendent on April 29, 2021.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

Our review found no evidence that the Mayor or any current or former City employee took action with malicious intent to add to Ms. Young's mistreatment or otherwise harm her in connection with the City's response to the botched search of her home. We found no purposeful concealment of any information by the Mayor or by any City department. We did, however, find failures in oversight and accountability by each of the four City departments who were responsible for responding to the aftermath of the search of Ms. Young's home, including that, at times, certain City officials or employees:

- Did not adequately consider Ms. Young's dignity and did prioritize certain cases involving egregious misconduct (e.g., psychological/mental trauma);
- Did not follow procedures, maintained flawed procedures, and/or lacked procedures altogether;

---

<sup>28</sup> 12/17/20 Police Board City of Chicago Public Meeting, Tr. at 13:5.

<sup>29</sup> 12/22/20 City Council Special Joint Committee Meeting on Anjanette Young, available at <https://vimeo.com/showcase/8928590/video/491741216> at 7:24:03.

- Did not adequately communicate within and across departments;
- Did not live up to the City’s public service mission; and
- Lacked ownership, including a sentiment of that’s “not my job” or siloed behavior resulting in a scattered response.

Our review led us to make the recommendations that follow.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Department of Law

1. Highlight Responsibility to Residents of Chicago
  - (a) Draft Department of Law values statement and promote its importance
  - (b) Implement additional substantive training on process, procedures, and values
  - (c) Implement internal efforts to boost morale and reinforce public service mission
    - (i) E.g., formal swearing in for new ACCs
  - (d) Institute periodic meetings with Department heads
2. Better Identify and Understand Risk
  - (a) Hire Risk Manager with full access to functioning tracking system to review cases and implement broad-based change (*in progress*)
  - (b) Encourage Department of Law attorneys to take a holistic approach to cases, considering both duty to client and protection of public trust
3. Emphasize Role and Accountability
  - (a) Create comprehensive policy manual to clearly delineate employee roles and responsibilities
  - (b) Devise escalation criteria to ensure appropriate review and consideration of risk
4. Support High-Quality Litigation
  - (a) Formalize intake within FCRL to ensure that recently hired attorneys shadow more senior attorneys

- (b) Offer mandatory, live interactive training for attorneys and paralegals (*in progress*)
- (c) Develop specific, periodic trainings on obtaining documents / information from CPD for all FCRL case teams
- (d) Implement formalized, indexed repository of sample pleadings and forms on the FCRL shared drive

5. Standardize Processes

- (a) Develop standard formalized processes for all pre-trial, trial, and appellate stages
- (b) Document chain of command or reporting structure for sensitive issues (to include reporting to Mayor's Office and other departments)
- (c) Revise existing written materials to include processes and specific responsibilities for attorneys and paralegals (*in progress*)
- (d) Consider creating a separate and independent "discovery response team" to handle all aspects of discovery for FRCL

6. Increase Salaries and Expand Resources

- (a) Increase budget and salaries to attract more senior-level, experienced staff and litigators in Department of Law
- (b) Allocate funds to implement new case management program (*in progress*)

**B. Mayor's Office**

1. Policy

- (a) Differentiate roles within public safety between those individuals tasked with high-level strategic vision from those individuals tasked with operational implementation (*in progress*)
- (b) Job responsibilities of Chief Risk Officer / Deputy Mayor of Public Safety should be viewed through lens of their duty to the City's residents
- (c) Deputy Mayor of Public Safety should review sensitive body-worn camera footage before public release (*in progress*)

- (d) Provide Chief Risk Officer / Deputy Mayor of Public Safety with access to the necessary data and materials to track and follow-up on policy initiatives
- (e) Implement a process to streamline retrieval of key CPD information and share key data when appropriate (*complete*)
- (f) Implement consistent process to evaluate and triage lawsuits alleging police misconduct, and to assess risk and provide feedback to CPD
- (g) Track metrics of newly-implemented policies, such as search warrant data

## 2. Communications

- (a) Clearly define roles and areas of authority to address supervision and division of responsibility with respect to: (1) “owning” the entirety of a high-risk situation; and (2) escalation to senior leadership, particularly Mayor, Chief of Staff, and Deputy Mayors (*in progress*)
- (b) Formally adopt strategy and process to fact-check key public statements by the Mayor prior to release
- (c) Consider training or onboarding manual to reinforce core values, and how to implement values in carrying out job duties in the Communications Department
- (d) Trainings/onboarding should emphasize that the communications perspective cannot override the human element; facts, not media deadline, should drive Communications Department’s approach (*in progress*)
- (e) Formally adopt process around viewing and escalating high-risk and urgent videos
- (f) Engagement in FOIA weekly meetings to flag risk relating to media-based FOIA requests (*in progress*)

## 3. FOIA

- (a) Identify at least one key stakeholder to consistently attend, participate, and flag issues in cross-Department FOIA meetings, and include training for appropriate escalation of issues (*in progress*)

- (b) FOIA weekly meetings should include senior-level engagement to appropriately flag risks and should include a process to escalate the issues to Chief of Staff and Mayor
- (c) FOIA roles, responsibilities, and supervision should be formally identified and memorialized
- (d) When Mayor issues policies that intersect/overlap with FOIA, provide training for FOIA officers so that Mayor's priorities about transparency and accountability are well known and understood
- (e) Provide access to redaction software to improve responsiveness
- (f) Provide recurring training on GovQA, a software implemented in the Mayor's Office in November 2020, which helps governments manage their FOIA process (*in progress*)
- (g) Utilize GovQA software to publicly archive responses to FOIA requests

4. Senior Leadership

- (a) Formally adopt key values and best practices in writing (mission statements, policies, guidelines)
- (b) Conduct trainings and/or onboarding to reinforce core values and priorities (*in progress*)
- (c) Adjust "Tone at the Top" to encourage staff to discuss tough issues that arise on a regular basis and to approach job duties with lens towards City residents (*in progress*)
- (d) Establish more regular check-ins between Mayor and Senior Staff (and between junior staff and their managers) (*in progress*)
- (e) Train personnel within Mayor's Office to take a longer-lens view toward issues before they become "fires"
- (f) Recruit higher-level personnel to implement strategic vision (*in progress*)
- (g) Hire junior-level support for Chief of Staff, particularly relating to project management

**C. Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA)**

**1. Case Initiation**

- (a) Formalize communication between Department of Law, CPD, Mayor's Office, and COPA when civil lawsuits are filed (*in progress*)
- (b) Develop and implement procedure for notifying COPA of litigation activity relevant to its investigations (e.g., depositions, interrogatory responses, etc.)
- (c) Develop SOP for COPA paralegals handling discovery requests from Department of Law

**2. Timing and Efficiency**

- (a) To promote transparency and accountability in cases alleging police misconduct, encourage federal civil rights complainants to agree to cooperation provisions in settlement agreements (*in progress*)
- (b) Implement affidavit override early in investigative process when there is no complainant statement but substantial objective evidence (e.g., body worn camera footage) (*in progress*)
- (c) Follow provision in COPA Rules and Regulations requiring affidavit override decision within 30 days after intake
- (d) CPD should standardize data entry of BWC footage among police districts and provide training on new procedures
- (e) Add staff specializing in FOIA and transparency issues to more efficiently and accurately ensure appropriate public release of information (*in progress*)
- (f) Timely request budget for additional investigators, if necessary
- (g) Discuss strategies for identifying any cases that could be efficiently and fully resolved without formal COPA investigation (*in progress*)
- (h) Either create remote access to OEMC materials or identify full-time COPA employee to be assigned to OEMC facility

3. Public Trust

- (a) Continue efforts to publicize COPA's work and raise awareness of COPA's process (*in progress*)

4. FOIA

- (a) Provide consistent and thorough training for FOIA officers that emphasizes core value of transparency
- (b) Ensure adequate attorney oversight of FOIA responses (*in progress*)
- (c) Improve coordination among City agencies for FOIA responses
- (d) Create a citywide FOIA database of requests and responses to track FOIA requests to various departments (*complete*)

5. Case Prioritization

- (a) Identify and memorialize factors COPA investigators should use to prioritize cases; review periodically
  - (i) Ensure that individuals subject to gross/egregious mistreatment are prioritized
  - (ii) Ensure that psychological harm is considered along with physical harm
  - (iii) Be aware of community significance of cases
- (b) Build in flexibility to kick start high-priority cases with additional investigators, and communicate urgency to other City agencies
- (c) COPA should send report to designated individual within Mayor's Office, CPD Superintendent, and Chairman of City Council Committee on Public Safety of all cases pending more than 180 days with sufficient information to identify the cases and their import



- (i) At minimum, report should include case name, nature of case, and time case has been pending
- (ii) Report should be cumulative

**D. Chicago Police Department**

**1. FOIA**

- (a) Complete CPD General Counsel's draft SOP relating to FOIA requests, and provide associated training to FOIA personnel (*in progress*)
- (b) Consistent timing in responding to FOIAs is imperative
- (c) Implement policies and practices for triaging and handling of specific FOIAs that seek to ensure statutory compliance
- (d) Ensure compliance with January 2020 guidance from then-Deputy Corporation Counsel: When a FOIA request is for a specific video or a specific report within an investigatory file, the analysis is whether the release of that specific video or report would impede the investigation.
  - (i) Consider SOP (and/or other memorialization of the guidance on this topic) and related training
- (e) Identify and implement means to increase efficiency and capacity in review/redaction of body-worn camera video footage in light of the time-consuming nature of redactions and resource limitations

**2. Body-Worn Camera Footage**

- (a) Implement SOP covering whether / when / how to publicly release body-worn camera footage; SOP should— (1) further transparency as a guiding principle; and (2) establish review and supervisory approval process, and provide training on same, as means of ensuring accountability for persons/functions with review and approval responsibility
- (b) Make sure appropriate City personnel have access to body-worn camera footage, and can easily access particular body-worn camera footage for official City use (e.g., FOIA responses, litigation)
- (c) Develop and implement training for OLA paralegals to ensure they understand the process to search for, obtain, and send body-worn camera footage to Department of Law

3. Risk Management

- (a) More active engagement from CPD's Office of Risk Management with respect to significant incidents and issues
  - (i) In particular, consider ways to improve Office of Risk Management's integration into CPD department operations