

ADP CONSULTING LLC
MAJOR (RET.) ALFRED D. PETERS

PROPOSAL TO ASSESS AND REPORT

RESPONSE TO THE UNITED STATES, THE
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF
BALTIMORE, AND THE POLICE
DEPARTMENT TO ASSESS AND REPORT ON
IMPLEMENTATION OF A CONSENT DECREE

1273 PRECIOUS COURT
TOMS RIVER, NJ, 08755
PHONE (732) 773-0169
WWW.ADPCONSULTINGLLC.COM

PROPOSAL TO ASSESS AND REPORT

ADP CONSULTING LLC'S RESPONSE TO RFA B50004996 FOR AN INDEPENDENT
MONITOR FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF A CONSENT DECREE REGARDING THE
POLICE DEPARTMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY-RFA ¶32	2
SCOPE OF WORK-RFA ¶33.....	5
PERSONNEL AND CURRENT TIME COMMITMENTS SUMMARY OVERVIEW BY MEMBER-RFA ¶34	36
QUALIFICATIONS-RFA ¶35	47
PRIOR EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES-RFA ¶36.....	49
BUDGET-RFA ¶37	56
COLLABORATION AND COST EFFECTIVENESS-RFA ¶38.....	59
POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST-RFA ¶39.....	68

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY-RFA ¶32

ADP Consulting LLC (ADP), led by Major (Retired) Alfred D. Peters is proud to introduce and propose its team to serve as Independent Court Monitor of the Baltimore Police Department in the Consent Decree with the United States, the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, and the Police Department of the City of Baltimore (collectively, “the Parties”).

Our team is well equipped to meet the core responsibilities of assessing compliance, providing Technical Assistance, working collaboratively with the Parties and stakeholders, engaging in community outreach, and issuing public reports that are both comprehensive and comprehensible.¹

A. SUMMARY OF TEAM MEMBERS: QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

As is further detailed in Section III below, the ADP team members bring broad expertise from federal, state and city government, civil rights, and community engagements, including experience with assessment in each of the 17 core elements identified in the decree.² The Monitor and several other members of the team have previous experience participating on Monitoring Teams for seven different consent decrees or court orders.³

Team members include:

- Major Alfred Peters, Monitor, has extensive experience overseeing law enforcement and police practice issues, including experience with three Consent Decrees and Monitoring Teams. His law enforcement experience spans 40 years and includes experience implementing community oriented policing grants, and extensive experience conducting internal affairs investigations, background investigations, criminal investigations and training development and evaluations.
- Dr. John Klofas, Deputy Monitor, has extensive experience, covering five Consent Decrees, in which he has focused on development and implementation of early

¹ RFA ¶4, 8-14

² Consent Decree 2-2, 01/12/17

³ Manuel de Jesus Ortega Melendres Court Order, No. CV 07-2513-PHX-GMS

United States of America v. the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rico Police Department, Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-1566 (FAB); United States of America v. the State of New Jersey, Division of State Police, Civil No. 99-5970 (MLC); United States v. Prince George’s County, MD, 8:04-cv-00185-RWT (D.Md.); United States of America v. City of Detroit, Michigan and the Detroit Police Department, No. 03-72258; Delphine Allen, et al., vs. City of Oakland, et al., in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, No. C00-4599 THE People of the State of New York v. the City of Niagara Falls and the Niagara Falls Police Department, in New York State Supreme Court, 8th Judicial District

intervention systems and on wide range of assessment and evaluation issues. He has worked extensively on crime and violence reduction efforts in communities around the country, and as Director of the Center for Public Safety Initiatives at the Rochester Institute of Technology, is particularly well equipped to oversee the data-driven assessment and analysis of compliance with the requirement of the decree.

- Dr. John Carnevale has experience with three Consent Decrees and served for over 11 years at the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), where he was responsible for the development of the Performance Measurement Effectiveness System that ONDCP uses to assess the progress of the Strategy in achieving its goals and objectives. He is currently involved with the Monitoring Team overseeing compliance on matters related to analysis of traffic stop data to look for the presence of racial profiling by Maricopa County Sheriffs' Office deputies making traffic stops.
- Major Robert Cicchino currently oversees all investigations and audits relating to school districts, including the two state operated school districts of Newark and Paterson. He also oversees security operations for school districts throughout the state of New Jersey. Major Cicchino served in the New Jersey State Police (NJSP) for 29 years, and his past responsibilities included being assigned as the Commanding Officer of the Office of Professional Standards (OPS) where he oversaw all internal investigations and incidents involving use of force by members of the NJSP.
- Major Sabrina Tapp-Harper is a native and resident of Baltimore who currently commands the Domestic Violence Unit of the Baltimore City Sheriff's Office. She also supervises in-service training, and provides training on use of force and ethics for the Sheriff's Office. Her familiarity with local issues and conditions also reflects a long career with the Baltimore Police Department where she served for 26 years before retiring as Major. During this period she worked with the BPD Internal Affairs Division, Education and Training Division; commanded the Special Investigations Section, and served as commander of Northern Police District; and worked in 5 out of 9 of the City police districts. During 2005-2008 Major Tapp-Harper was assigned by the BPD commissioner to serve as a liaison and provide needed leadership to the Baltimore School Police Force.
- Mayor William A. Johnson, Jr. Mayor William A. Johnson, Jr. brings extensive local government and community experience to the team. Before choosing not to pursue reelection, he served for twelve years as the elected Mayor and chief administrative officer of Rochester NY. He then spent 13 years as a tenured professor working in the area of urban policy. Before election as Mayor, Bill Johnson served for 21 years as the President and CEO of the Urban League of Rochester, and for nearly two years preceding that, he was the Deputy Executive Director of the Urban League of Flint, Michigan. While with the Urban League, he played a leading role in advocating police reforms after a string of deadly force incidents involving African Americans. Improving police-community relations became a major goal of his time in office as Mayor, reflected in his extensive oversight of and engagement with the Rochester

Police Department (RPD). Working with a series of chiefs of police, including Robert S. Warshaw, Mayor Johnson oversaw the implementation of new community policing programs and planned collaboratively with the police department and Rochester.

- Erika Ostlie, M.A., a native and resident of Baltimore, has almost 20 years of experience in criminal justice and legal research, including expertise in survey research, performance measurement, policy and program evaluation and data analysis. She provides training and Technical Assistance to clients at the federal, state, and local levels, and facilitates interagency processes to develop performance measurement systems.
- Director Melvin Tony Perez brings 30 years of law enforcement experience to the team including experience in the management, development and delivery of advanced police training and law enforcement Technical Assistance, especially in the areas of data-driven policing, criminal investigation, field intelligence, crime analysis, officer safety, and highway safety. He was also responsible for overseeing New York State law enforcement accreditation and standards while with the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Service. He is also fluent in Spanish.
- Dr. Michael Polakowski has experience monitoring three Consent Decrees. He is currently involved with the Monitoring Team overseeing compliance on matters related to analysis of traffic stop data to look for the presence of racial profiling by Maricopa County Sheriffs' Office deputies making traffic stops. In this capacity, Michael Polakowski has assisted in the development of the Early Intervention System (EIS). In addition, Dr. Polakowski has assisted in oversight of statistical analyses of traffic and patrol activity and evaluated the sufficiency of policies regarding biased-based policing, command responsibilities, and traffic enforcement. Furthermore, Dr. Polakowski has evaluated training protocols pertaining to the EIS and TraCS systems and authored several quarterly reports for the Monitor Team as a whole. He also has experience conducting internal investigations, staffing issues, training, statistical analysis, and staffing issues.
- Sarah Read, J.D. has over 30 years experience in conflict resolution, both as a mediator and facilitator, has worked with community engagement and dialogue, managed large complex projects involving difficult legal issues and produced many complex reports. She is also an experienced trainer.
- Commander Jeffrey Romeo retired from the Detroit Police Department after serving as liaison to the United States Department of Justice and the court appointed Monitor in relation to two consent decrees during the period December 2007- June 2013 while assigned to the Detroit Police Department's Office of Civil Rights. Commander Romeo assisted with comprehensive reform in the areas of supervisor accountability issues; arrests; witness detention, interview and interrogation; use of force/detainee injury reporting and investigation; investigatory stops and frisks; internal affairs investigations; citizen complaint investigations (these investigations were conducted

by the Office of the Chief Investigator, the investigative arm of the civilian oversight Board of Police Commissioners) and discipline; seeking community reviews and comments on any new and revised policies; development and implementation of EIS; custodial detention practices and safety and sanitary practices in holding cells.

As the above illustrates, the ADP Monitoring Team brings together a unique group of diverse individuals that together blend and meet the criteria set forth in the Request for Applications, RFA ¶26, and are committed to maintaining the highest ethical standards as they have done so throughout their careers as set forth in RFA, ¶24.

B. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BUDGET

As is further detailed in Budget below, our proposed budget does not exceed the \$1.475 million limit referenced in RFA ¶29. Our estimated budget for the first year of work, which includes the preparation of the Monitoring Plan and commencement of monitoring, is \$1.453 million. The projected budget for future years is an average of \$1.354 million. We are well aware of the provisions of the Consent Decree, including that the Monitor “to the extent practicable, use any relevant data collected and maintained by BPD prior to conducting separate data collections,⁴ and the direction that the City and/or BPD will provide office space and reasonable office support.⁵ We understand that no provision is made in the budget for non-working travel time.⁶ We are mindful of the obligation to be good stewards of public funds and the importance of ensuring that the fees and costs of monitoring are reasonable throughout the monitoring term.⁷

SCOPE OF WORK-RFA ¶33

This section of the proposal addresses ¶s 8-24, 33 of the RFA. We first provide an overview of the ADP Team’s approach to monitoring, and then address the process of monitoring, providing detail on each of the 17 areas addressed in the Consent Decree.⁸ The Section ends with a note on the completion of monitoring. We recognize that, unless otherwise indicated by the Court, the final Consent Decree fully defines the parameters of the Monitoring Team’s work by specifying the changes that will be required of the Baltimore Police Department to achieve full and effective and sustainable compliance. We further recognize that the Decree charts a very detailed course for reform and our goal will be to document progress and ensure that the BPD and City stay on the clear course that is mapped out in the Decree. Finally we recognize and appreciate the

⁴ Consent Decree ¶460

⁵ Consent Decree ¶448

⁶ Consent Decree ¶448

⁷ Consent Decree ¶48

⁸ RFA ¶ 11, 47

Parties' commitment to collaboration and transparency as shown in the Decree, and we are ourselves committed to those ends.

A. CORE CONCEPTS OF THE ADP MONITORING PLAN

We will use three core concepts, which we see as embedded in the Consent Decree to organize and direct the monitoring process. These core concepts are relevant across all the individual areas to be monitored. They are, therefore, relevant to our selection of personnel, our work processes, and our reporting practices. These core concepts are:

1. *Constitutional Police Practices.* This refers to the critical police processes outlined in the Decree and involves technical areas of police practice, particularly as they pertain to constitutional policing.
2. *Ongoing Assessment and Analysis.* This addresses the many data and analysis issues that are noted in the decree not only as they relate to compliance but also as they relate to ongoing management practices. Thus, this refers to the integration of analyses related to achieving compliance with the requirements of the consent decree and the tracking of processes, outcomes, and effects of implementation using valid and reliable measures.
3. *Community and Civic Engagement.* This refers to a broad category of expectations regarding the relationship of the community with the BPD and the reform process including community oversight and engagement throughout the monitoring process and beyond.

As the diagram illustrates, these core concepts are best understood not as individual or separate concerns but as inter-related and overlapping elements in our plan. Stated another way, monitoring in each of the substantive areas of the Decree will focus on police practices but also simultaneously on their impact on the community as well as the relationship between the community and BPD. Moreover, we will track progress, measure effects, and report findings throughout the monitoring process.

Core Elements of the Monitoring Plan



B. COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT

The ADP team shall utilize a clear and concise three level assessment process delineated below. As required, the development of annual monitoring plans will occur within 90 days of assuming

duties as the Monitor.⁹ The discussion here provides detail as to how we will approach development of that plan. In the process we pledge that the receipt of all information shall be maintained in a confidential manner and we will work closely with the Parties and other stakeholders as is further described in Scope of Work below.

The ADP team will assess and report compliance in three levels, which will need to be met sequentially as follows:

Compliance Level 1 (Policy Compliance)

The ADP team will determine progress toward Level 1 Compliance through an evaluation of policies and procedures required under the Consent Decree. We recognize that, based on the RFA, some policies are already seen as compliant, although those are not specifically identified in the documents. The team will retain responsibility for reviewing all relevant policies to consider their consistency with Decree requirements. We appreciate that this task will be aided by the Department's commitment to transparency and the posting of policies on its web page.

Compliance Level 2 (Training Compliance)

When it is determined that appropriate policy is in place, Level 1 compliance is, therefore, achieved, the quality, and completeness of training under the particular policy will be assessed. When the curriculum and training delivery are assessed as sound and appropriate, and when it is completed for all relevant personnel in the department, Level 2 Compliance will be recognized.

Compliance Level 3 (Full Operational Compliance)

When Level 2 (Training) compliance is achieved, the Monitoring Team will assess relevant operations and performance for achievement of Level 3 (Full Operational Compliance). This will involve the collection and analysis of relevant data on the implementation of practices that support each requirement in the Decree. For each requirement, we will first define compliance and outline the measures that will be utilized to determine compliance. We will discuss specific methodologies with the Parties to ensure their full understanding and Consent Decree with all aspects of the process.

In collaboration with BPD's Special Operations and Development Division, Training Academy, we will assess the impact of training using Kirkpatrick's Level 4 evaluations (measures the degree targeted outcomes occur, as a result of the training event(s) and subsequent reinforcement). This will involve observing and documenting field activities of officers and compare their activities to the training delivered.¹⁰

Reporting Compliance Conclusions

For our reports each identified requirement within the Consent Decree the Full Operational Compliance level will be scored using the following compliance categories.

⁹ Consent Decree ¶ 461

¹⁰ See <https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/kirkpatrick.htm>

In Compliance –where the requirements of the decree, as assessed under the methodology noted above, have been achieved.

In Partial Compliance – where, while it cannot be said that compliance has been achieved, substantial progress toward compliance has nonetheless been made.

Not in Compliance – reserved for circumstances where Compliance has not been achieved and substantial progress has not been made.

Deferred Compliance – only for those circumstances in which we are unable to fully determine the compliance status of a requirement due to a lack of data, incomplete data, or other reasons. A finding of Deferred Compliance will be used in no more than two consecutive quarters. Beyond that, a finding of Compliance, Partial Compliance or Not in Compliance will be used.

The Use of Data in Assessing Full Compliance

To assess full compliance we will analyze relevant and agreed upon data covering the full period of review, or when appropriate we will analyze data from scientifically valid representative samples of cases. We will work with the Parties to achieve an agreed upon percentage requirement for achieving full compliance. That requirement will be set at a level to allow for routine measurement error in the data. At the present time annual totals of key elements such as complaints or uses of force are not fully known to the team. Therefore, exact sample size cannot be determined. However, this example will illustrate how an agreed upon percentage requirement would work: In many cases we would expect, based on experience, that annual sample sizes will range between 300 and 400 cases where the total number of elements such as citizen complaints or arrests is between approximately 1,000 to 12,000. With this we would establish a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of plus or minus 5%. This means, for example, that we will be able to say that we are 95% sure that the true level of arrests processed in a timely fashion according to the Decree is within plus or minus 5% of the level shown in the sample. We would then compare that with an agreed upon level for achieving full and effective compliance.

Although we anticipate that the Monitor and the Parties will collaboratively establish an expected percentage level for recognizing full compliance, we also note that we would use that level as an advisory level and would expect to use our best judgment on recognizing compliance. That is to say, we acknowledge that precise statistical criteria may not always be the most appropriate way of determining compliance and that qualitative judgment should also be made.

We further recognize that when small numbers of cases are considered in particular analyses, such percentages may reflect an inappropriate and often unattainable compliance standard. In such circumstances one or two cases can prevent attainment of compliance. Our analysis will accommodate the problem of small sample size so as not to artificially prevent achievement of compliance. Our plan includes discussion with the Parties of our specific methodologies relevant to audits and outcome assessments to ensure mutual understanding of best practices in data collection protocols and compliance monitoring.

Illustrating the Details of the Compliance Assessment Process

Below is an illustration of how the compliance levels would be applied in practice:

Each task of the decree would be measured against our three phase criteria and compliance assessments on a semi-annual basis. The results will also provide further direction to our Annual Monitoring Plans.

1. Phase 1 – Policy/Procedure/Protocol

- a) For any place where the Decree provides for BPD to submit policies, procedures, protocols, or other materials to the Monitor, BPD will submit such materials to the Monitor and to the Plaintiffs' representatives within the specified timeframe.¹¹ While we acknowledge the previous meaningful changes to numerous policies, we also recognize the interrelatedness of these policies to the implementation of new procedures and the potential effects of that interrelatedness. Therefore we recommend an ongoing assessment of policies to commence upon appointment and continued annual review by BPD and the Parties. We acknowledge that where the Parties agree, and subject to Court approval, our team will refrain from conducting a Compliance Review or Outcome Assessment of a requirement of the Consent Decree previously found to be in full compliance by the Monitor for at least four quarters.¹² However, the Monitor can choose to periodically review compliance with any requirement to ensure full and effective compliance after full compliance has been recognized.
- b) Parties will have an opportunity to provide first draft comments or recommendations within 14 calendar days of receipt of draft policy reviews from the Monitor. The Monitor will incorporate industry best practices within their review process, communicate the results of their review, and provide any concerns or recommendations to BPD within five calendar days. BPD will have an opportunity for amendment and resubmission within the subsequent 14 calendar day period. In the event that the BPD prepares revisions in response to comments or recommendations, the Plaintiffs will have seven days to return comments or recommendations upon the submitted revisions. If necessary, due to the complexity of issues, either Party may request an extension of the deadlines from the Monitor. We note that a failure to meet required deadlines could result in consequences such as notice to the Court and the public of missed deadlines and or publication on the Monitor's website.¹³
- c) If the Monitor approves the documents, the approval would then be documented and communicated to the Parties. Where neither party objects to the Monitor's decision, this decision would then be final. When the Monitor has approved the matter, no further actions will be required of BPD prior to the prompt implementation of the relevant, policies, procedures, protocols, or materials.¹⁴
- d) If the Parties do not agree with the Monitor's determinations, they reserve the right to seek enforcement of the provisions of the Consent Decree. Plaintiffs would then consult with officials from the City and BPD before instituting enforcement proceedings and will make a good faith attempt to resolve any disputes before seeking intervention from the Court.¹⁵ Any

¹¹ Consent Decree ¶ 3

¹² Consent Decree ¶ 466

¹³ Consent Decree ¶ 461(b)

¹⁴ Consent Decree ¶ 461(b)

¹⁵ Consent Decree ¶ 493

disputed policies, procedures, protocols, or other materials shall not require BPD implementation until after the Court's determination. If the Parties are prepared to dispute the document via Court intervention, we request a notification of the intent and the opportunity for resolution, or at a minimum the ability to confirm our position.

2. Phase 2 Training Compliance Review: Development/Delivery/Documentation

- a) The ADP Team in collaboration with the Parties will ensure that training programs are proper, effective and comprehensive, and when necessary subject to approval by the Maryland Police Training and Standards Commission (the MPTSC).¹⁶
- b) The process we recommend ensures there are an adequate number and qualified instructors.¹⁷
- c) The Parties and we would collaborate on the development of a Training Plan to include in-service, supplemental training, and a revised Field Training Officer (FTO) Program.¹⁸
- d) Consistent with our monitoring process we would review documentation of training for required personnel.¹⁹

3. Phase 3 Full Compliance Outcome Assessments (In-Field Implementation)

- a) As described above, the ADP Team will assess full and effective compliance using the agreed upon criteria and required percentages.
- b) The ADP Monitoring Team will examine all information needed to complete the assessment. The Monitor will have unfettered access to all information the Monitor deems necessary.²⁰
- c) We intend on the incorporation of both qualitative and quantitative reviews of available data that will provide an overview of officer behavior and activity while performing law enforcement activities.

The ADP team represents this as an illustration of processes that will require the collaboration of the Parties to ensure a timely and cost-effective monitoring process.

C. PROVISION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Monitor expects to address Technical Assistance issues in two ways.²¹ The Monitor may periodically identify provisions of the Consent Decree, which suggest the need for additional training and may recommend that BPD seek Technical Assistance to meet those needs. In other circumstances, the Monitoring Team will provide Technical Assistance when, based on Monitoring reports, DOJ or BPD request such assistance in areas consistent with the Monitor's responsibilities under this Consent Decree. The Monitor will also be prepared to make other recommendations as deemed necessary.

¹⁶ Consent Decree ¶ 291, 295

¹⁷ Consent Decree ¶ 293, 296, 297

¹⁸ Consent Decree ¶ 294, 298

¹⁹ Consent Decree ¶ 299, 300

²⁰ Consent Decree ¶ 483

²¹ Consent Decree ¶ 468

The ADP team brings a proven history of providing Technical Assistance to vary and diverse agencies nationwide. We have provided specific assistance for policy development, training development, and delivery, and the development of Early Intervention Systems. We are prepared to respond to any request from the Parties, or as a result of our reviews, to provide Technical Assistance not only in a timely manner, but also in a cost effective manner leveraging various technological and human advantages. The Monitor's and other team members provision of Technical Assistance in past monitoring engagements has been recognized²² as beneficial to the organization, the individual, and the community by providing timely and cost effective assistance.

D. REPORTING

As described in the Consent Decree,²³ the Monitor will prepare semiannual reports, and more frequent special topic reports as needed, delineating the progress of the BPD in achieving full and effective compliance. As required, drafts and other communications shall be sent to the Parties for comment prior to finalization for the purpose of resolving any factual errors or ambiguities. The Monitor will file the required reports with the Court. In consultation with the Parties, we will also disseminate public reports and data through multiple channels including the Monitor's web page. As required, reports, budget material, work plans and accomplishments, and other documents will be available through the web page. The Monitor will also host meetings in various locations throughout the city, involving both community members and members of the BPD in order to promote discussion, interaction, and understanding. Information shared at these meetings should also be available online, with opportunities for further comments and links to things like policies and processes for reporting. This is discussed further in the section on Collaboration and Cost-Effectiveness below.

E. A NOTE ON COMPLETION OF MONITORING

The Monitor is committed to establishing an orderly process for terminating monitoring when full and effective compliance with the requirements of the Consent Decree is achieved and recognized by the Court. The Monitor will work with the Court and the Parties to develop a plan for the phased completion of monitoring. This will include but not be limited to (1) a planned removal of some requirements from active monitoring. Note, however, that the Monitor will periodically review requirements that have achieved full compliance to assure that they remain in compliance over time. The Completion of Monitoring Plan will also include (2) development of organizational systems to accommodate the gradual transfer of responsibilities for review of compliance to BPD as described in the Decree,²⁴ which contemplates BPD doing assessments under supervision by the Monitor during the last two years of the Monitorship. This transfer of responsibilities will include (3) a gradual transfer to BPD of the requirements to prepare written compliance reports. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, will also (4) develop a plan for the sustainability of compliance after the work of the Monitor is completed.

²² Melendres Order, Puerto Rico PD

²³ Consent Decree ¶ 471

²⁴ Consent Decree ¶457

F. COMMUNICATIONS AND COLLABORATION

As is further explained in the section on Collaboration and Cost-Effectiveness below, below, we will regularly communicate with the Court and the Parties, the officers and organizations representing officers of the BPD, and community stakeholders throughout the monitoring process. This includes meeting the timelines and other requirements for comment and coordination laid out in the Consent Decree.

G. MONITORING FOR THE 17 AREAS IN THE CONSENT DECREE

As was requested by paragraph 33 of the RFA, the following provides descriptions of how we will monitor each of the 17 areas for compliance identified in the Consent Decree. These comments on the 17 sections summarize and provide examples of how ADP will go about monitoring compliance with the Consent Decree. These are not intended as a detailed plan. Construction of a detailed plan will be the first step taken, should our application to serve as Independent Monitor be accepted. The ADP team also understands that the role of the Monitor is defined in and circumscribed by the terms of the Consent Decree itself, and that those terms will be closely observed in the monitoring plan.²⁵

Community Oversight Task Force (CD II)

The ADP team is knowledgeable regarding the concept and practice of community oversight of the police. Members of the team have experience with oversight models in Detroit, Maricopa County, New York City, and Oakland California. We have a team member with unique insights into the history of civilian review in Baltimore based on a career with the police department. In addition two members of our team will be dedicated entirely on issues related to community relations and the police, including oversight. Mayor Johnson has emphasized community oversight throughout his career and Sarah Read has a long history of community engagement. Both are trained, experienced in conflict resolution, and able to evaluate procedures used for investigation and resolution of citizen complaints and to provide Technical Assistance in this area if requested. We further have the experience to evaluate and support the COTF's review and recommendations of reforms of the current civilian review process. Accordingly, the team is able to understand and analyze the laws that govern this function and evaluate the consistency of recommendations made by the COTF with those laws.

We recognize that the COTF is expected to review and, as deemed appropriate recommend reform regarding the long existing Civilian Review Board. In our process we will delineate the requirements identified in the specific relevant paragraphs of the Decree. We will monitor deadline requirements, membership representativeness and staffing, adequacy of budget and resources, and alignment of goals and processes between the COTF and the Consent Decree. We will also monitor the timeliness of the review of the civilian oversight process, the nature of recommendations for reform and the timelines for COTF completion and publication of a final report. Our monitoring process will also include examination of the process for public

²⁵ Consent Decree ¶445

engagement in the production and presentation of the COTF's report and their responsiveness to public comments.²⁶

The team would also expect to include discussion relating to the citizen oversight function in interviews with members of the COTF, key stakeholders, past, current civilian review board members, and other interested Parties. We would do this to gain insights on the existing review process, COTF's access and use of data from the user evaluation process for citizen complaints; and the interface between the citizen oversight process and the accountability policies and procedures of the BPD as well as the impact of State law. We will conduct interviews with member of COTF and BPD to ascertain levels of support and cooperation or of conflict and resistance.²⁷

The monitoring regarding the COTF will be the primary responsibility of Major Sabrina Tapp-Harper, Mayor William Johnson, Sarah Read, and Erika Ostlie, who will work with other ADP team members on this area of the Consent Decree.

Community Policing and Engagement (CD III)

This section of the Decree contains 14 detailed paragraphs dealing with community policing strategies, engagement and outreach to the community and an annual assessment of the community's experience with BPD, its perceptions of the Department and perceptions of public safety. ADP recognizes that community engagement and outreach is a critical component of the Consent Decree's goal of creating "positive, constructive, and long-lasting change" for both BPD and the community at large,²⁸ and that that change is to be responsive to and shaped by community priorities.²⁹ ADP team members bring considerable experience for monitoring in this area. Mayor Johnson has a strong record of citizen empowerment. He is joined Sarah Read who brings a history of experience with communication strategies to tap community attitudes and views. Baltimore native Major Tapp-Harper has in-depth knowledge of the history of police-community relations in Baltimore.

As with all Decree requirements monitoring in this area will focus on policy, training, and full operational compliance. Team members will focus on how input received from the community is reflected in the BPD's definition of community policing. We believe this will demonstrate how BPD integrates that commitment to community policing across all major departmental areas including, as examples, recruitment, training operations, personnel evaluations, accountability systems, and the collection of relevant data and recognition for outreach efforts that reflect best practices or otherwise deserving of note.

²⁶ Consent Decree ¶14

²⁷ Consent Decree ¶13

²⁸ RFA ¶10

²⁹ Consent Decree ¶1

Monitoring in this area will necessarily involve review of the development and implementation of BPD's outreach and community engagement plans.³⁰ We would consider the extent and efficacy of outreach to various stakeholders and neighborhoods. This would include review of the number and types of activities used for engagement, the geographic dispersion of outreach efforts, attendance and participation, and other data relevant to the sustainability of community policing and engagement including that gathered through the community survey discussed below. The exact data to be gathered and utilized in monitoring would be discussed with parties and stakeholders, and detailed in the monitoring plan.

In our monitoring of training, we will expect to see community-policing philosophies widely represented across all training areas, and that trainings meet the timing and content requirements of the Consent Decree.³¹ We will evaluate training development and scheduling to assure that at least eight hours of quality in-service training on community policing and problem oriented policing, as directed by the Consent Decree³², is delivered across the Department. In addition, we will assess management practices designed to assure officer familiarity with their assigned neighborhood areas and local leaders and quality of life concerns, including those related to police tactics such as pedestrian stops.³³

We will also Monitor the Decree requirements regarding the Department's outreach programs. This will involve assessments of policy and implementation of outreach plans, which support regular routine interactions with community members as well as structured activities such as outreach meetings and community programs. We will also review the Department's development and implementation of a community outreach and public information program which will be required holding at least two meetings per year in each police district to update progress and address community concerns regarding the Consent Decree.

BPD is also expected to produce a publicly available annual report on its outreach activities. The Monitoring Team will be available to provide Technical Assistance in this area and will review the document and plan for public release as part of its compliance review process.

As Monitor, the ADP team would design and conduct, in cooperation with BPD and the City, an annual survey of the Baltimore community's experience with and perceptions of the BPD and public safety, consistent with the requirements of the Consent Decree.³⁴ The Monitoring Team has considerable expertise in survey development and analysis. The survey design and implementation will meet requirements for reliability, comprehensiveness, and representativeness of respondents. As required, we will retain an individual, to be approved by the Parties, to assist

³⁰ Consent Decree ¶19

³¹ Consent Decree ¶16 a-h

³² Consent Decree ¶16

³³ Consent Decree ¶17

³⁴ Consent Decree ¶¶23, 26, 459

in the effort.³⁵ We would expect to use a survey method that is both easily understood by the public and that affords an opportunity to track changes in the public's perceptions of the BPD as the Consent Decree is implemented. We would also monitor how BPD analyzes and uses the results of this survey in policy development and training.³⁶

The monitoring of community policing and engagement will be the primary responsibility of Mayor Johnson and Sarah Read, who will work with other ADP team members on this area of the Consent Decree. Dr. Michael Polakowski and Dr. John Carnevale will address issues related to data collection and analysis.

Stops, Searches, Arrests, and Interactions (CD IV)

The ADP team is experienced in conducting evaluations of documentation of stops, searches, and arrests by police officers to assess whether the activities were made in accordance with the Fourth Amendment and the police agency's policy. ADP's law enforcement professionals possess first-hand experience with the implementation of these types of policies. Additionally, Team members have extensive experience addressing issues relating to collection of Stop Data, its analysis, and the presentation of Stop Data for the purposes of review of the practice and analysis of risk related behavior by police.

Our assessment process will ensure that the BPD's policies, training, and practices are consistent with current law and professional model police practices. The Consent Decree between the USDOJ and the BPD states that a policy related to this topic has been developed and implemented which meets the requirements of the Consent Decree. The requirements of the Consent Decree are comprehensive, including effective documentation and supervisory reviews of stops, searches, and arrests. The training on these policies is to be completed within one year of the entering of the Consent Decree. The BPD is required to digitally collect and analyze data specific to stops, searches, and arrests. The BPD is also required to record interactions with citizens. Audits are required to be conducted by the BPD to evaluate the quality and completeness of supervisory reviews of investigatory stops or detentions, searches, and arrests. The Monitoring Team will review these polices, but we expect that they will continue to meet standards for policy compliance in our review.

To ensure and monitor effective implementation of the policy, we will assess training on the relevant policies and, if needed, we will assist the Parties in the development of training specific to the Fourth Amendment, Search & Seizure, and Investigatory Stop reporting.

With regard to implementation we will identify processes to help assess the extent to which Stop Data reports are properly used when they are required. This will involve periodic review of incidents and arrest reports to assure that stop data reports had been prepared when appropriate based on the requirements noted in ¶41. We will also examine samples of stop data reports to

³⁵ Id.

³⁶ Consent Decree ¶25

assure that that they are thorough and properly completed and that prohibited conduct as described in ¶43, such as pretext stops, are not used. Special emphasis will be put on the articulation of reasonable suspicion and the accuracy and thoroughness of required supervisory reviews. Additionally, we will review for appropriateness any action resulting from the stop including searches, confiscations of contraband and arrests. This will include review of information on required supervisory permission to make arrests in the offense categories named in ¶61. We will utilize similar criterion and process to evaluate vehicle stops.

We recognize that the key to effective evaluation of stop data lies in the robustness of the data captured and utilized for analysis. Often, independent data systems must be coordinated and bridged to facilitate the use of Stop Data in a comprehensive review for compliance or a risk management review by the BPD. To address this issue ADP team members will review electronic data storage processes and provide Technical Assistance if needed. We will also review the strategy and products for comprehensiveness of the analysis and we will regularly observe for the purpose of compliance review the BPD's assessment of their Stop, Search, and Arrest Practices.

The monitoring of stops, searches, and arrests will be the primary responsibility of Director Melvin Tony Perez and Commander Jeff Romeo, who will work with other ADP team members on this area of the Consent Decree. Dr. Michael Polakowski and Dr. John Carnevale will address issues related to data collection and analysis.

Impartial Policing (CD V)

Police legitimacy is crucial in fostering a relationship of trust between the police and community they serve. The Consent Decree indicates that BPD has taken steps to ensure that its officers provide impartial policing services and that a new training curriculum was put in place April 2015. The ADP team will review existing BPD policies and ensure that they are in compliance with requirements of Consent Decree. If deficiencies are found, ADP will work with BPD to ensure that policies are put in place to enhance community trust and ensure that such policies provide equal protection of law to all individuals.

Policing Issues surrounding stopping individuals in violation of the Fourth Amendment are a major theme that permeates the Consent Decree. Regardless of the many reasons that the Baltimore police may stop an individual, the Consent Decree is clear about the impact of the stops—a disproportionate number of African American residents of Baltimore bear the brunt of unconstitutional policing by the police department. The monitoring process must provide ongoing assessments of the progress of reforms in assessing police practices in achieving the objective of eliminating biased policing from the ranks of the BPD.

The Consent Decree requires that BPD ensure that its officers document the demographic category of all persons who are the subject of investigatory stops and detentions, vehicle stops,

frisks, searches, seizures, arrests, and civilian complaints.³⁷ The ADP team will ensure that BPD captures this information regarding investigatory stops and detentions, vehicle stops, frisks, search, seizures, arrests, and civilian complaints, and other determinants leading to biased policing in the treatment of all citizens of or persons in Baltimore. We will provide quality assurance checks on the data to ensure its veracity in determining impartial policing by the BPD.

The proposed Monitoring Team has extensive experience with helping law enforcement develop data collection system that are efficacious in addressing the presence of biased-free policing. Team members Dr. Carnevale and Dr. Polakowski, have extensive knowledge and understanding of the research methods to use to look for biased policing. That experience has shown that the determination of biased policing requires deliberate assessments of police practice based in science and not innuendo. Drawing on the extensive research literature on biased-free policing, the ADP team will conduct evaluations of these data using descriptive statistics and inferential statistical methods to test for the presence of biased-based policing within districts and organization wide. The monitoring process will provide at least annual assessments of the progress of reforms in assessing police practices in achieving the objective of eliminating biased policing from the ranks of the BPD and report findings on the Monitor's website.

The most difficult question when analyzing police stops has proven to be the establishment of the denominator, or population base, when calculating rates of stops by race. For example, studies of highway stops have the advantage of being able to establish approximate population base estimates by studying the demographics of drivers on the roadway.³⁸ In cities, this problem is complicated by racially concentrated housing and neighborhoods, and by concentrations of crime. Police can be expected to be concentrated in high crime neighborhoods where concentrated minority populations may reside. Comparisons of rates of stops by race are, therefore, extremely problematic. Continuing with the example of traffic stops, the accepted solution from the field is to look for patterns of behavior that differ across, say, race/ethnicity after the traffic stop has occurred. Similarly, this approach is used in looking for disparities in police behavior for other areas such as investigatory stops and detentions, searches, and so forth. Our analyses will recognize these problems. It will track overall numbers of stops and will calculate rates based on crime data and personnel. We will also make calculations by arrests and stops, but with the understanding that the number of stops and arrests are not independent of one another.

To understand and address the potential problems of bias in police stops, it is best to consider comparisons across elements of the process. That process involves multiple steps. The focus, therefore, can be on differences in officer's justifications for stops, their rates of searches following stops, and outcomes of stops such as detecting contraband and arrest. Our analysis will focus on this approach to understanding the problems of police stop, question, and frisk activity. The Monitor will work closely with the Parties to identify data and methodologies that shed light

³⁷ Consent Decree ¶ 200, 459g, i

³⁸ Consent Decree ¶ 21

on efforts to achieve biased-free policing. Better data will enable the effective application of research methodologies to assess changes in policing as it affects biased-free policing.

The ADP team will review training curricula and records to ensure that training is provided according to the Consent Decree regarding police Stops, Frisks, Searches, Arrest, and Use of Force in a bias free manner and that community members knowledgeable on policing protected classes are to lead or assist in such training when appropriate. The team members with primary responsibility are Director Melvin Tony Perez and Commander Jeffrey Romeo, and other ADP team members. These very qualified experts can provide such training, policy, or supervisory guidance.

Responding To And Interacting With People With Behavioral Health Disabilities or In Crisis (CD VI)

The core outcomes sought in this segment of the Consent Decree are to decrease inappropriate criminal justice involvement for individuals with behavioral disabilities, prevent unreasonable use of force, and contribute to the overall health and welfare of individuals³⁹. The ADP team will compare baseline and annual data on the use of force. We will review the number of people subject to emergency petitions who were eligible for community based services, as well as the number of referrals by BPD to community mental health services or to hospital emergency rooms. We will review individual involvement (diversion and dispatch).⁴⁰ We will also incorporate data from surveys, and complaint resolutions.⁴¹ We will work with BPD and the Parties to ensure the adequacy of the data to be collected and monitor that collection.⁴² We will evaluate the City's coordination with the Collaborative Planning and Implementation Committee (CPIC). We will review the expansion of representation on that committee, the adequacy of the gap assessment that is conducted, and the revision of the BPD's policies and procedures to reflect both the information obtained from that assessment as well as the other requirements of the decree. The ADP team will ensure that they reflect a preference for the least police-involved response possible consistent with public safety.⁴³

Finally, the ADP team will evaluate the training provided to Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) officers and Coordinator, as well as the required training to all BPD officers, supervisors and dispatchers.⁴⁴ This review will encompass recruitment, operations of the CIT team, and related dispatch and management.⁴⁵

³⁹ Consent Decree ¶ 96

⁴⁰ Consent Decree ¶¶ 98, 113

⁴¹ Consent Decree ¶459(h)

⁴² Consent Decree ¶42

⁴³ Consent Decree ¶¶ 97, 98, 101-103, 104

⁴⁴ Consent Decree ¶106-118

⁴⁵ Consent Decree ¶109-110, 113

Use of Force (CD VII)

This subject area characterizes the largest portion of the Consent Decree by covering a total of 93 paragraphs, which range widely from policy requirements to important definitions and practices such as de-escalation. Included are reporting and supervisory review requirements and internal investigations. The Consent Decree reflects the critical importance of this area and presents a comprehensive agenda for change at BPD regarding use of force.

The ADP team possesses critical resources for monitoring the force related requirements of the Consent Decree in an equally comprehensive manner. These resources include career law enforcement officers, who have risen through the ranks of their departments to leadership positions nationally, and policy analysts and researchers who have contributed to knowledge in this area. In conjunction with Consent Decrees, team members have monitored the use of force in seven police departments across the country.

We believe the ADP team's approach for assessing compliance will serve the people of Baltimore well in this complex area in which many details have been agreed upon as reflected in the Consent Decree. Our initial focus will be on policy compliance. The Consent Decree indicates that the BPD has recently improved and implemented comprehensive policies regarding use of force, force reporting, investigations, and reviews.⁴⁶ The Consent Decree acknowledges that the policies meet its requirements. We will, however, review these policies from the role of Monitor although we do not anticipate significant problems. We do, however, recognize that the policies cover a large and important area of concern.

Once policy compliance is confirmed for the relevant paragraphs of the Consent Decree, training on those policies will be carefully analyzed and reviewed, and if necessary, updated. This will involve reviews of curricula, selection and evaluation of instructors, observations of training classes, and documentation of trainees to assure successful completion.

To illustrate the detail of our training evaluation, we will track data in all areas described in this section of the Decree including:

- Whether each Performance Review Board member attended the required annual training on legal updates regarding use of force and the Training Academy's current use of force curriculum:⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Consent Decree ¶123

⁴⁷ Consent Decree ¶209

- Whether officers attended proficiency training on the use of OC Spray before they are certified to carry and/or use OC Spray. Such training will include protocols regarding officers’ responsibilities following OC Spray use, including minimizing exposure of non-targeted individuals and decontamination of exposed subjects.⁴⁸
- Whether the BPD developed and implemented a plan to ensure that it can track the date of officers’ qualifications and require that officers successfully qualify in accordance with the Maryland Police Training and Standards Commission (“MPTSC”) regulations and standards with each firearm they are authorized to use or carry while on duty. Ensure that officers who fail to qualify immediately relinquish their corresponding BPD-issued firearms.⁴⁹
- Whether all current officers, and all new officers as part of its Professional Development and Training Academy (“Academy”) training curriculum, attended and completed use of force training as determined by the Monitoring Plan and in conformance with the terms of the Consent Decree.⁵⁰
- Ensure all officers attend the annual use of force in-service training.⁵¹
- Conduct a review of the training curriculum for SIRT, which conducts both the criminal and administrative investigations of Level 3 Reportable Force incidents.⁵² Determine who attended and successfully completed training:
- Determine whether the Training and Policy representatives to SIRT, who respond to a scene of a use of Reportable Force, identify any policy or training issues.
- On-site observation, reviews of Body-Worn Camera recordings, as well as reviews of documents provided to the ADP team by way of document requests, will be performed to evaluate levels of operational compliance.

Reviews of use of force reports and the supervisory investigations of those incidents will be conducted to assess whether the incidents were documented, investigated, and maintained in accordance with the Consent Decree. Generally, an assessment would entail determining whether

⁴⁸ Consent Decree ¶158

⁴⁹ Consent Decree ¶161

⁵⁰ Consent Decree ¶¶166, 167

⁵¹ Consent Decree ¶168

⁵² Consent Decree ¶201

an uninvolved supervisor was notified of the use of force event; whether the supervisor responded to the scene, when required; whether third party witnesses were adequately interviewed and their statements documented; whether all involved and witnessing officers accurately documented their own accounts of the incident; and whether the supervisor appropriately reviewed the use of force event and made an appropriate assessment based on the evidence available.

Many critical areas of the Consent Decree specific to the law enforcement practices of the BPD appropriately overlap. For instance, the ADP team will seek to identify unreported use of force events by reviewing Incident Reports and Office of Professional Responsibility investigative reports to identify whether any officers failed to properly report a use of force event.

The ADP team will assess whether officers utilized Body-Worn Cameras to record contact with citizens by reviewing a sampling of audio and video recordings and make determinations on whether the audio and video recordings are being initiated appropriately and retained in accordance with policy.

The most serious use of force reviews is those that involve the use of deadly force. These incidents demand the highest level of review and departmental integrity. Failure to do so results in the greatest loss of confidence by the community being served. Thorough, accurate, and efficient administrative reviews are critical to the improvement of policy, officer safety tactics, training, and other management concerns. The ADP team will review reports and recommendations made by the Special Investigation Response Team (SIRT) as a result of Level 3 Reportable Force incidents. A review will be conducted of the training and curriculum for the members of SIRT to ensure that it comports with the terms of the Consent Decree.⁵³

The ADP team will also review the policies and procedures for the BPD's Use of Force Assessment Unit (UOFAU), which conducts reviews of all administrative use of force investigations designated as Level 1 and Level 2. Reviews of the assessments and recommendations made by the UOFAU will be conducted to evaluate whether it is meeting its mandate to conduct meaningful reviews of chain of command reviews of Level 1 and Level 2 use of force investigations.

The BPD's Performance Review Board,⁵⁴ authorized to review all Level 3 Reportable Force incidents and fatal vehicular crashes, will also be included in the monitoring process by the ADP team. It is important that the Board bases their findings and recommendations related to the application of the use of force consistent with BPD policy as delineated in the Agreement by the

⁵³ Consent Decree ¶201

⁵⁴ Consent Decree ¶207

parties. Furthermore, a review will consider whether the Board identifies issues related to deficiencies in policies, training, equipment, and tactics. The Consent Decree requires the BPD to collect, analyze and prepare publicly available reports related to use of force investigations and reviews.⁵⁵ The ADP team members will assess the methods utilized to collect and analyze the data as well as the content of any prepared reports to determine whether the BPD meets the terms of the Consent Decree.

For the purposes of accountability and transparency, the annual analysis of data related to uses of force events to identify trends and correct any issues that may exist is an important tool for the effective management of the BPD. In determining whether the terms of the Consent Decree are being fulfilled in this area, the ADP team shall review the methods utilized by the BPD to collect and analyze the data and any resultant recommendations made related to the subsequent identification of any issues that may exist.

Interactions with Youth (CD VIII)

Members of the ADP team have worked extensively with youth and have the capability to monitor and evaluate BPD's efforts to improve the ways it interacts with youth, taking into account maturity and other general and individualized factors.⁵⁶ Reflecting the detail of our plan, monitoring will begin with a review of policy and training in this area.

The ADP team training evaluation will review the instructor selection, content, and timing of that training, but also the collaboration of community-based youth advocates and community organizations to participate in development and implementation of these youth-focused trainings.⁵⁷

We are aware that there are a number of programs in place such as the a partnership currently underway between the IACP and Howard University entitled "Policing Inside Out" that brings together students, community members, and police officers to discuss issues that we face daily and to ultimately bridge the gap between the police and the community. We will assess how the BPD is interacting with these programs and the potential for building upon them.

With regard to assessing operational compliance, data to be reviewed will include the rate of police interactions with youth, including stops, searches, and arrests that result in officer using force.⁵⁸ We will also review reports of arrests of youth to examine whether alternatives to arrest

⁵⁵ Consent Decree ¶¶215-217

⁵⁶ Consent Decree ¶ 218-220

⁵⁷ Consent Decree ¶¶218-220

⁵⁸ Consent Decree ¶459

were considered. We will conduct a similar analysis to assess the appropriateness of officer behavior in stops, searches, uses of force and detentions.

In reviewing the City's obligations under this section of the Consent Decree, we will look at the timeliness and depth of stakeholder engagement in the City's completion of a comprehensive assessment of its efforts to decrease youth involvement with juvenile and criminal justice systems, and its efforts to inform the public of recommendations made.⁵⁹

Overall we will seek and review specific indicators of BPD's efforts to ensure adequate guidance on developmentally appropriate responses to and interactions with youth. We will also assess how youth are engaged as stakeholders in assessing and recommending changes in the policies, training, and practices that affect them. Among other things we will evaluate the number, efficacy and types of activities used for engagement, and the geographic dispersion of outreach efforts.

Transportation of Persons In Custody (CD IX)

We recognize the significance of this issue in the context of the Consent Decree and understand that the Parties were unable to produce reliable records of detainees injured during transport. The review by DOJ did show that persons being transported by the BPD received injuries, some of which were severe and in certain instances, fatal.

The ADP team has extensive experience in the development and implementation of policies on Use of Force and Detainee Injury reporting and investigations as well as the transportation of detainees. Our team has conducted audits and reviews of reports and investigations of use of force incidents and detainee injury incidents to ensure that required reports and investigations were completed in accordance with policy requirements that contained specific Consent Decree mandates. The ADP team has participated in the reviews of in-custody deaths, and serious incidents of uses of force, e.g., firearm discharges and incidents resulting in serious injury or death. The ADP team will work in collaboration with the Parties to create accountability practices within the BPD.

Our Monitoring Team reviews always begin with thorough examinations of relevant policy. The Consent Decree between the Parties states that the BPD recently implemented new and/or amended policies regarding transportation of passengers and persons in custody that meet the requirements of the Consent Decree. The policies specify the type of equipment to be installed and maintained in transport vehicles, e.g., cameras, seat belts and straps; maintenance of video

⁵⁹ Consent Decree ¶219

recordings; comprehensive protocols for transferring detainees; internal auditing of the transportation practices; and training requirements.⁶⁰

These comprehensive requirements provide officers, supervisory personnel and command staff with clear guidelines and a procedure to identify members who may not comply with the requirements. These policies will be reviewed as part of the monitoring process in order to verify their completeness.

The policies will form the basis for our development and assessment of training. For that, training course content, qualification of instructors, and user evaluations will be developed and reviewed. A review of existing training records and databases will be conducted. The assessment will review whether drivers of transport wagons attend and successfully complete a minimum course of eight hours. The course content is designed to cover a wide range of issues related to the safe transportation of detainees, including safe driving techniques, identification of medical distress and injuries, and proper restraint techniques.⁶¹

The ADP team members will examine operational compliance with each requirement of the paragraphs in this section. This will involve reviews of equipment and records of maintenance, reviews of BPD inspections of transportation vehicles and our own inspection of equipment and restraints in transportation vehicles to assess their condition and use. We will also inspect dispatch logs and other records where BPD is required to report and preserve for review information on all transport of persons in custody. ADP team members will review reports of injury and corresponding required use of force reports.

The ADP team will assess whether the video recording equipment and seat belts and straps were operational; whether officers are appropriately recording the transportation of detainees; and whether officers are using separate vehicles to transport males and females. The ADP team will review dispatch recordings and/or field based officer reporting of the seven specific details required for every instance of transport of persons in custody.⁶²

An evaluation of the quarterly audits⁶³ and inspections⁶⁴ performed by the BPD will be conducted to determine if they meet the terms of the Agreement.

⁶⁰ Consent Decree ¶ 76-81

⁶¹ Consent Decree ¶ 238

⁶² Consent Decree ¶ 232

⁶³ Consent Decree ¶ 236

⁶⁴ Consent Decree ¶ 225

First Amendment Protected Activities (CD X)

The ADP team notes that BPD has recently implemented new or revised policies designed to safeguard the First Amendment rights of all individuals. Our methodology requires that we review all policies relevant to Consent Decree requirements. We will begin with that review in this case to assure ourselves that the policies meet constitutional and best practice requirements. The policy review will be followed by a review and assessment of existing training for those policies. Training will be required to cover the wide range of conduct addressed in the Consent Decree. Topics will include issues such as “legally protected speech,” rights to observe and record, “lawful public protest,” behavior that constitutes “interference” and other concepts such as procedural issues regarding declarations of unlawful assemblies and warrantless searches of recording devices. The accuracy and thoroughness of training will be assessed.

The Consent Decree highlights that infringement upon first amendment rights of individuals are identified as typically appearing in three ways⁶⁵: Stops and arrests predicated on an officer’s perception of disrespect or insolence; excessive use of force in response to perceived disrespect and insolence; improper interference with individuals recording police activity both proper and improper.

To assess compliance we will examine samples of arrest reports, complaints, and use of force reports to assess whether activity inconsistent with the Consent Decree has occurred. We will review BPD required plans for addressing any known significant pre-planned protest or assemblies and review official and unofficial reports on how such plans were implemented at the events. When appropriate we will interview members of the public regarding these events. Through the incorporation of other assessments, including body-worn camera recording reviews, supervisory interventions and discipline, we, along with Party consensus, will establish compliance ratings with regard to First Amendment protected activities.

Handling of Reports of Sexual Assault (CDXI)

The USDOJ’s Investigation raised considerable concerns of gender bias regarding BPD’s treatment of sexual assault victims. The findings highlighted that victims were often met with skepticism and their behavior questioned, reports from victims in sexual trade were often ignored, and that transgender individuals were often mistreated or searched by inappropriate gender officers. Issues were also raised regarding misclassification of rape cases, backlog of rape kits, and improper or threatening interview techniques. This report also outlined shortcomings in the

⁶⁵ Findings Report, Page 116

investigative process, collection of evidence, testing of rape kits, case closure classification, or collection of DNA.

The ADP law enforcement professionals have lengthy career experience in handling reports of sexual assault from taking initial reports to conducting and overseeing investigations and prosecutions to training officers and investigators. We also have experience monitoring court order reforms regarding procedures related to sexual assault cases as presented in the detailed expectations in the Consent Decree.

Policy analysis forms our first stage of compliance review. Although policy revisions have been noted for other areas of the Consent Decree there is no such notation here. Therefore we recognize that the task may involve reviewing and, perhaps, recommending revisions to policies, general orders, rules and regulations regarding the development of training and the implementation practice guidelines and ensure that they fulfill requirements outlined in consent decree.

The ADP team will evaluate BPD's sexual assault policy and protocols to ensure that any procedure or practices implemented include a trauma-informed, victim centered, multi-disciplinary response to investigating, and reporting sexual assault crimes. The ADP team will ensure BPD policies and training articulate the significant role and responsibility of all officers, throughout the sexual assault response and investigation. We will ensure they articulate the opportunity for forensic examination and comprehensive medical care to the sexual assault victim; and ensure all victims are offered access to free and confidential support, social service referrals, and information from a trained sexual assault victim advocate⁶⁶.

ADP's law enforcement team will review BPD's initial and ongoing training to detectives in its Sex Offense, Family Crimes, and Child Abuse Units as it relates to BPD's policies and practices applicable to law enforcement response to sexual assault. We will assess if BPD's initial and annual in-service training comports with the requirements set forth in ¶ 259. In addressing concerns highlighted in the DOJ findings and listed in ¶ 259, the ADP team will ensure that training provides guidance on working with vulnerable populations, to include the homeless, sex workers, individuals with Behavioral Health Disabilities, and the LGBT community.

Supervisors play a crucial role in the investigation and oversight of criminal sexual assault cases. The ADP team will ensure that any new policy or training implemented by BPD thoroughly outlines supervisory responsibilities to include supervisory review of response, investigation, and case status. In addition, ADP will ensure that reporting, tracking, supervisory

⁶⁶ Consent Decree ¶258

oversight, detectives follow up and a final determination on the status of open cases is made in accordance with the requirements established in the Consent Decree.⁶⁷

Our compliance review will also closely examine implementation. Each requirement in this section will be assessed for operational compliance. That will require extensive document review of reports and investigations of sexual assault including reports in which initial indicators of sexual assault, such as 911 calls did not result in reports. We will also interview investigators to assure that Consent Decree requirements for investigations are met. The ADP team will also review Consent Decree requirements regarding BPD's method for collecting, sharing, tracking, and coordinating with other agencies as it pertains to identifying serial rapists. The ADP team will review other required improvements in the areas of data collection, analysis, and reporting of sexual assaults including sharing that data in community collaboration and external oversight efforts.

Technology (CD XIII)

The Monitoring role for the Consent Decree requirements addressing technology is significantly different than it is in other areas. In this area the Consent Decree anticipates extensive development work to identify needs through a Resource Study⁶⁸, establish a Resource Plan⁶⁹, and procure and implement contemporary law enforcement technologies. These stages are also linked to a significant number of other Decree requirements, which require collection and analysis of data.

The Monitor's first task in this area will be the design and development of a comprehensive study of technology needs which is referred to in the Decree as the "Resource Study." The Monitoring Team has strong resources in the area of applied Technology with Dr. Michael Polakowski, Dr. John Carnevale, and Dr. John Klofas. They will work with BPD to include the design, objectives, and deadlines for this review in the Monitoring Plan, which will be produced by the team.

Based on the Resource Study a Resource Plan will be generated by BPD. The Monitor will assure that the plan reflects the needs, resources of the Department as well as the state of technology development in the field. As specific in the Consent Decree, ¶270, those resources will include but not be limited to computers, databases, software including a records management system and the infrastructure for an Early Identification System (EIS). The Monitor, working

⁶⁷ Consent Decree ¶262

⁶⁸ Consent Decree ¶268

⁶⁹ Consent Decree ¶269

with DOJ and BPD will also assist and review policy and practice as it relates to Body-Worn Cameras.

BPD is required in the Consent Decree to make its best effort to implement the Resources Plan in a timely fashion and to update the plan annually. They are also required to disclose deployment of new technologies to the public or in some cases to advise DOJ as to any choice not to disclose the technology. The Monitor will assess compliance on each of the issues noted above.

Supervision (CDXIII)

Woven throughout the USDOJ Findings Report are references to deficient supervision and oversight of officer activities that ultimately lead to officers engaging in a broad spectrum of constitutional and statutory violations. This section of the Consent Decree provides a comprehensive blueprint for elements critical to supervision. The ADP team recognizes that appropriate supervision is the single most important key to effective and full compliance. We further recognize however, effective supervision only begins with the first line supervisor. Integral is the implementation of accountability systems where each level of additional supervision is also held to consistent accountability standards. In this section the basic structure of a policy development and implementation process is made clear, as are the core elements of training expectations for BPD. The foundation issues for improvement and implementation of an early identification system (EIS) are also included.

Members of the ADP team have extensive experience in these critical areas based on their own law enforcement careers as well as overseeing the policy development and training processes required under Consent Decrees that they have monitored. The ADP team recognizes the fundamental importance of the issues to be monitored in this area.

For this section, the policy issues and processes relate to the development of all policy in BPD and are not generally focused on any particular area. Our Monitoring activity, therefore, will focus on the required process for developing and implementing policy in general. Beyond process, we will also review the soundness, clarity, and fairness of policies as well as the dissemination of policy across the department including its availability in electronic form.

Beyond such outcomes, however, the Consent Decree makes clear that the Monitor, DOJ and BPD are expected to work together collaboratively and even describes a “Collaboration Period.” It is evident that BPD and DOJ have already completed some work in this manner and have agreed that many recently revised policies meet Consent Decree requirements. The ADP team fully expects to continue work in this manner in its analysis of policy, review of revisions and review of implementation.

Along with policy issues, this section deals with fundamental issues in training. Here too a collaborative role for the Monitor is expected. That approach will be incorporated in a comprehensive plan for the renovation and updating of training facilities and in creating a Training Plan for comprehensive in-service and supplemental training of officers. The Monitor will contribute to that plan and assure that the decree's requirements for it are met to support compliance findings. The ADP team is uniquely poised to provide Technical Assistance in the training arena.

The policy and training requirements in this section of the Decree form the foundation for improving supervision including specific expectations regarding its character, supervisory duties, and supervisor training. Requirements regarding development and use of an Early Identification System are also included. The ADP team will work collaboratively with the Parties across these areas but will also have responsibility for assessing and documenting levels of compliance with the specific requirements of the Consent Decree under these topics.

Our system for compliance monitoring and assessment allows for each critical phase of policy, training and in-field implementation to receive thorough and transparent review, but most importantly provides a foundation for BPD to carry forward based on full and effective compliance assessments.

Misconduct Investigations and Discipline (CD XIV)

This is the second largest section of the Consent Decree, after the section on Use of Force. It covers 86 paragraphs and includes detailed sub-paragraphs. That length is testament not only to the importance of the area overall but also to the significance of developing and implementing a well-functioning accountability system, one that will be seen as fair by members of the community and its officers. This is an area for which the clarity and comprehensiveness of policy are paramount, the quality of training is critical, and implementation must be exacting. It is, we believe, an area for which the ADP monitoring method, with attention to all three of these steps, will clearly demonstrate its value.

An effective system for investigating complaints of officer misconduct is a basic component of any department's accountability and credibility. Such a system requires an open process for filing complaints; the prompt and thorough investigation of civilian complaints; the sustaining of those complaints when they are supported by a preponderance of the evidence; and the imposition of fair and consistent discipline when appropriate. By contrast, a police department that fails to adequately investigate civilians' allegations of misconduct through its internal affairs system may be seen as tacitly permitting officers to engage in such conduct.

The ADP team will evaluate the existence or development and implementation of internal affairs policy and procedures, the purpose of which shall be to protect the professional integrity of the BPD and to fully, fairly and expeditiously investigate and resolve complaints and other misconduct investigations. Required are findings based on a preponderance of the evidence with no automatic preference for an officer's statement over a civilian complainant. Without the introduction and institutionalization of these core concepts the internal affairs component of the department serves nothing more than title. The ADP team will review and/or develop formal eligibility criteria for command and staff personnel of internal affairs who supervise or conduct internal investigations. Establishment of these criteria will provide other management personnel a tool for the review of the performance of persons serving in these capacities. Criteria may include an assessment of prior investigative experience and training, analytic, and writing skills, interpersonal and communication skills, cultural and community sensitivity, commitment to police integrity and their previous performance as a police officer.

The ADP team will assist the parties to develop transparent, objective criteria to guide and document disciplinary decisions reached as a result of a thorough and comprehensive investigation, and develop comprehensive training in these criteria. Consistent application of disciplinary decisions will overcome the current widespread belief both within and outside the BPD that discipline is sometimes meted out inconsistently or unfairly.

The ADP team monitoring process will include a review of the complete disciplinary process, from design in policy through its multiple stages and ending in findings and sanctions, as well as review processes. We will also consider the adequacy of staffing and resources to assure proper case processing and the avoidance of case backlogs and we will consider the rights and protections required by law and policy.

We will first focus on the adequacy of policy and will assist in policy development, as needed. That policy will specify the categories and levels of offenses and the processes for adjudicating disciplinary cases, including a matrix of expected sanctions based on charges. We will also evaluate the BPD's policies to assess, among other things, whether clear standards of proof are established for advocates and finders of fact in disciplinary hearings. Our review will consider penalty ranges for policy violations, including provisions that allow for the consideration of mitigating and aggravating factors in determining appropriate discipline.

The ADP team will also review training across a wide range of areas relevant to misconduct investigation and discipline. Those will include the training of all officers on the process and on the need for transparency in facilitating the filing and investigation of complaints.

The Monitoring team will review disciplinary cases to examine the extent to which the processes and outcomes are consistent with policy. We will review selection and training of OPR investigators and we will review investigative practice and the roles of OPR supervisors in the review investigations. We will also review the processes for those cases when criminal conduct by an officer may be involved.

This is an extensive and detailed area as it is laid out in the Consent Decree. The Monitor must be concerned with proper and open processes and consistent and defensible outcomes. To support those outcomes the Monitor will also be concerned with the quality of public quarterly reporting by OPR and the Community Review Board (CRB), and in the formation and quality of an integrity-testing program to assess civilian complaint intake procedures.

Coordination with Baltimore City School Police Force (CD XV)

This section of the Consent Decree requires review of the collaboration between BPD and the Baltimore City School Police Force (BSP) as it relates to BPD's core mission. An MOU between BPD and BSP authorizing BSP to exercise law enforcement powers throughout the city was executed February 2, 2016. The Consent Decree⁷⁰ requires BPD to evaluate how BSP has used its delegated powers under the MOU, identify deficiencies, identify opportunities for improvement, implement appropriate corrective actions and measures, and document what it does. Following the initial assessment, BPD is to conduct biennial evaluations of its efforts at improving its coordination with BSP. The Consent Decree further requires BPD to advocate for change in the MOU to address administrative investigations when both agencies' officers are involved and to propose policies and protocols governing the proper investigation of civilian complaints under those circumstances.

Several members of the ADP team have experience with these types of partnerships and MOUs. Major Sabrina Tapp-Harper has specific experience with the BSD. During 2005-2008 Major Tapp-Harper was assigned by the BPD commissioner to serve as a liaison and provide needed leadership to the Baltimore School Police Force.

In its monitoring function, the ADP team will review the schedule for completing the required assessment of the delegation of power to BSD. Specifically ADP will look for alignment between the standards used to assess BSD's actions and the policies and procedures governing the BPD. This includes BPD's efforts to improve the ways in which it interacts with youth, the City's efforts to minimize the interaction of youth with the criminal justice system, and the COPTS recommendations for civilian complaints. The ADP team will conduct reviews of the

⁷⁰ Consent Decree ¶¶416 - 418

data provided by the BSP and the analysis conducted by the BPD to determine whether the assessments were adequate to identify deficiencies and/or opportunities for improvement. We will specifically look at the procedures for reporting, collecting and analyzing data relating to calls, incidents, stops, arrests, and use of force by BSP officers exercising law enforcement powers per MOU.

The ADP team will further review the clarity of the recommendations made and the sufficiency of the means suggested for monitoring implementation. ADP will ensure that BPD conducts biennial evaluations of BSP's use of its delegated authority, consistent with the original assessment, the recommendations it makes with respect to the MOU, and its proposed policies and procedures for the handling of civilian complaints.

We will also review the adequacy of the trainings provided by BPD to BSP, or BSP participation in trainings provided by BPD to its own officers, with regard to the policies and procedures mentioned above and the achievement of the outcomes mentioned below.

In evaluating the effectiveness of the coordination between BPD and BSD, we will examine data relating to the frequency of calls, incidents, stops, arrests, and use of force by BSP officers. In addition, we will assess BPD's efforts to modify and adapt the MOU to changes in how the BPD and BSP cooperate with each other's respective administrative investigations, when appropriate. We will also assess progress on correcting the areas of deficiency and implementation of the improvements identified in the assessment, and on the handling of civilian complaints.

Recruitment, Hiring and Retention (CD XVI)

The Consent Decree prescribes a major role for the Monitor in this area. The Monitor will specify a timeline for development and approval of a Recruitment Plan and a Retention Plan. Working with BPD, the Monitor will conduct an in-depth review of current hiring practices. For this area, the Consent Decree provides clear specifications and details to strengthen the Department through its hiring and retention efforts. Across this effort, it is clear that the goals of community representation and diversity must be of paramount importance.

The maintenance of any police workforce level has become one of the chief challenges facing law enforcement today. Perplexing to all of law enforcement, both the supply of and demand for qualified officers are changing in a time of increasing attrition, expanding law-enforcement responsibilities, and decreasing resources. These internal and external conditions contribute to the difficulties that many agencies identify with while recruiting a workforce that represents the demographics of their communities, nurturing an organization that is committed to providing its

employees the opportunity for long-term police careers, and delivery of police services that effectively implements community policing theory and practice.⁷¹

The ADP team provides exceptional focus in the development of policies that provide clear goals and objectives, and specific steps to achieve full and effective compliance for the BPD. These steps provide the very foundation for a clear perception and attraction by potential candidates that will enhance the workforce and appropriately reflect the diversity of the Baltimore community.⁷² Our methodology will provide a solid foundation for the development of practices that will clearly establish minimum standards, define an outreach methodology specifically designed to inform city youth and provide clear direction to build a foundation to attain membership in the ranks of BPD. These programs will be established and memorialized within the BPD and provide clear direction for distribution of recruiting information, career opportunities of the BPD, compensation, and a specified process from recruitment through the evaluative process to hiring.⁷³

We recognize that for success to be obtained there exists a requirement of support and collaboration from the City of Baltimore with BPD and a joint recognition of fiscal responsibility and cost effectiveness. Our team is experienced in assisting and providing recommendations for the design and completion of comprehensive recruitment plans and retention plans that serve goals regarding community representativeness and diversity.

Major Peters has provided previous direct assistance, guidance, and counsel to the New Jersey Office of the Attorney General on these issues while assigned as the Unit Head for the Office of State Police Affairs. John Carnevale has extensive experience in staffing and recruitment planning, and John Klofas has completed reviews of police hiring processes that have considered the impact of each step on final hiring decisions and diversity.

Staffing, Performance Evaluations and Promotions (CD XVII)

The ADP team will provide subject matter expertise in a collaborative effort with BPD to conduct a comprehensive staffing study and develop a Staffing Plan. The core requirements of that Plan are described in the Consent Decree. These requirements address important organizational needs and note that the plan should anticipate a phased in approach that reflects the City and BPD's fiscal resources. Members of our team have performed these studies and constructed staffing

⁷¹ Wilson, J. M., Dalton, E., Scheer, C., & Grammich, C. A. (2010). Police recruitment and retention for the new millennium. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

⁷² Consent Decree ¶420

⁷³ Consent Decree ¶¶421-427

plans for their own or other organizations, as well as through the process of monitoring other departments.

The anticipated plan will also include provisions for performance evaluations of all officers by their supervisors. The factors to consider in those evaluations are included in the Consent Decree and provide clear statement regarding expected human skills, attitudes, and commitments to a changed organizational culture. Discussion of the promotion process also includes similar goals.

The ADP team has direct experience in the development of policies and procedures to enhance a crucial mechanism for employee growth and organizational control, the performance evaluation. We return to our basic premise that thorough and complete policies provide the basis for comprehensive training. Our training methodology for completing thorough performance evaluations includes significant scenarios driving an understanding of supervisors how to properly prepare for and conduct face-to-face meetings with subordinates to discuss and document successes and areas in need of improvement.⁷⁴

The Team will assist the BPD in reviewing and revising its staffing, personnel, and promotions processes. That will include evaluations of policy and training and monitoring implementation in this area. Although this section of the Consent Decree is presented in a small number of paragraphs, the ADP team recognizes the importance of the issues presented in them and the importance of providing assistance and monitoring regarding them.

Officer Assistance and Support (CD XVIII)

The ADP team is committed to the health and well-being of law enforcement officers and will work tirelessly to ensure their needs are appropriately met. This will include assisting BPD to implement an effective Employee Assistance Program (EAP) for all of its sworn officers. As required in the Consent Decree, that will include a program capable of providing, among other things, confidential counseling services; crisis counseling; stress management counseling; and mental health evaluations. Additionally the program will support peer intervention and well-being protocols for officers in stressful situations such as during public demonstrations or civil unrest.

We are aware of the existing Baltimore City Employee Assistance Program (EAP), made available by the City's Department of Human Resources. We note the clear experience of its staff to address some of the needs of its members. Our team can assist BPD and the City to collaborate to address officer needs. We are also aware of the Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice

⁷⁴ Consent Decree ¶433

Assistance, and Public Safety Officers Benefits Program, which could also provide further guidance with ensuring that important needs are addressed appropriately.

As the collaborative processes move forward and officer assistance and support initiatives are refined and implemented, the ADP team will also follow through with its monitoring responsibilities. This will involve assessment of relevant policies and of training that addresses those policies and the related assistance issues. We will also review the Department's maintenance and the availability of a list of local mental health and physical health providers. The ADP team will also assess the level of compliance with the specific assistance plans and requirements noted in the Decree.

PERSONNEL AND CURRENT TIME COMMITMENTS SUMMARY OVERVIEW BY MEMBER-RFA ¶34

A. TEAM MEMBERS

The ADP team members are experts in law enforcement, police monitoring, auditing civil rights compliance and constitutional policing, community engagement, and best practices in the field. The team also includes two members with deep ties to the Baltimore community, one of who had a successful career with BPD. We add to those credentials areas of expertise in topics that are identified in the USDOJ Investigation and the Consent Decree as particularly important in Baltimore. Those include the history of engagement in civil rights and our extraordinary credentials in local government and community affairs, including one team member who had a lengthy tenure as mayor of a medium-sized city. Additionally, we bring strong expertise in data management and assessment by team members who also have substantial experience in monitoring police departments. The ADP team is also diverse by race, ethnicity, and gender and is also well versed in collective bargaining issues from the perspective of management and employee. The construction of this team reflects our commitment to racial, ethnic and gender diversity and includes a bilingual member with fluency in Spanish. The broad expertise and diversity of this team will make a strong contribution to the field of monitoring and will provide a foundation for the provision of Technical Assistance, as needed. We believe the composition of this team is unique for a Monitoring Team.

Team members have participated in monitoring of seven Consent Decrees, including:

- Manuel de Jesus Ortega Melendres Court Order, No. CV 07-2513-PHX-GMS
- United States of America v. the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rico Police Department, Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-1566 (FAB)
- United States of America v. the State of New Jersey, Division of State Police, Civil No. 99-5970 (MLC)
- United States v. Prince George's County, MD, 8:04-cv-00185-RWT (D.Md.)

- United States of America v. City of Detroit, Michigan and the Detroit Police Department, No. 03-72258
- Delphine Allen, et al., vs. City of Oakland, et al., in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, No. C00-4599 THE
- People of the State of New York v. the City of Niagara Falls and the Niagara Falls Police Department, in New York State Supreme Court, 8th Judicial District

Biographies of Team Members, setting forth their names, background and other current employment as requested in ¶ 35 of the RFA are set forth in this section. Team organization and assignment of roles and responsibilities is addressed in Section B.

Major Alfred Peters – Monitor

Major Alfred Peters will serve as Monitor, overseeing law enforcement and police practice issues. His experience covers three consent decrees. Major Peters currently assumes a similar role on the Monitoring Team for the Manuel de Jesus Ortega Melendres Court Order for oversight of the Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office, and previously for the Warshaw and Associates consultant group to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the case of United States of America v. the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rico Police Department, in the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of duties as Monitor in this case. Major Peters previously assumed a command position in the Office of State Police Affairs for oversight and implementation of the United States of America v. the State of New Jersey, Division of State Police, Civil No. 99-5970 (MLC) for Racial Profiling. Major Peters was Director of Public Safety for the Lakewood Police Department (2005-2007), after retiring as Troop Commander of the New Jersey State Police with over 27 years of service. Major Peters responsibilities with the NJSP include serving as Unit Head of the Office of State Police Affairs in Office of the Attorney General, Commandant of the Training Academy, Executive Officer of the Human Resources Section, and Troop “A” Troop Commander. Major Peters has extensive experience conducting internal affairs investigations; background investigations, criminal investigations, and training evaluations, as well as implementing community oriented policing grants. Major Peters earned a B.S.H.S. in Human Services and an M.S.M in Management from Thomas Edison State College.

Dr. John Klofas – Deputy Monitor

Dr. John Klofas will serve as Deputy Monitor, overseeing assessment and analysis. He has extensive experience, covering five Consent Decrees, in which he has focused on development and implementation of early intervention systems and on wide range of assessment and evaluation issues. He will also address Risk Management related issues under the Consent Decree. Dr. Klofas has worked as a member of the Independent Monitoring Team with Eduardo Gonzales on the Memorandum of Consent Decree (MOA) between the Prince George's County Police Department (PGPD) and the USDOJ; and with Monitor Robert Warshaw on the following cases: United States of America v. City of Detroit, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division; Delphine Allen, et al., vs. City of Oakland, et al., in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California; and People of the State of New York v. the City of Niagara Falls and the Niagara Falls Police Department, in New York

State Supreme Court, 8th Judicial District. Additionally, he has served on the Warshaw and Associates consultant group to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the case of United States of America v. the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rico Police Department, in the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico. Dr. Klofas is Professor and former Chairperson of the Department of Criminal Justice and is Director of the Center for Public Safety Initiatives (CPSI) at Rochester Institute of Technology. He also serves as a member of the New York State Metropolitan Police Training Council, the State's POST equivalent. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of duties as Deputy Monitor in this case. Klofas has worked extensively on crime and violence reduction efforts in communities nationwide and extensively with the Rochester Police Department. He oversees State and National evaluations of violence reductions and policing programs. He has written extensively on community violence and on management in criminal justice. He holds a Doctorate in Criminal Justice from the State University of New York at Albany.

Team Members

Dr. John Carnevale

Dr. Carnevale has experience serving on the Monitoring Team for three consent decrees, and over 30 years of experience in drug policy, criminal justice, and health care policy and program evaluation work with the U.S. Government and in the private sector. He served for over 11 years at the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), where he directed the formulation of the National Drug Control Strategy and the federal drug control budget to implement it. He was responsible for the development of the Performance Measurement Effectiveness System that ONDCP uses to assess the progress of the Strategy in achieving its goals and objectives. Dr. Carnevale also conducted research at the Office of Management and Budget and together with his work in the White House, has served three Administrations and four drug czars. Since forming his firm in 2000, Dr. Carnevale has developed and managed an extensive portfolio of projects involving policy research and evaluation, public budgeting, strategic planning, performance measurement, economic impact evaluations, and local law enforcement agency reform. He is currently involved with the Monitoring Team overseeing compliance on matters related to analysis of traffic stop data to look for the presence of racial profiling by Maricopa County Sheriffs' Office deputies making traffic stops. He also worked with a law enforcement team tasked with helping the Puerto Rico Police Department implement reforms prescribed by a Consent Decree with the Police Department and the U.S. Department of Justice. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case. Dr. Carnevale is also serving a four-year term on the National Institute on Drug Abuse National Drug Advisory Council. Dr. Carnevale has also worked as a Public Finance Economist in the U.S. Department of the Treasury in the Office of State and Local Affairs. He has provided expert testimony, briefings, and policy analyses for Members of Congress; state and local government leaders; International Organizations; and Public Interest Groups. Dr. Carnevale holds a Bachelor's degree in Economics from the University of Maine and a Doctorate in Public Finance Economics from the Maxwell School at Syracuse University.

Major Robert Cicchino

Major Robert Cicchino is currently the Director of the Office of Fiscal Accountability and Compliance and the Office of School Preparedness and Emergency Planning for the New Jersey Department of Education. He oversees all investigations and audits relating school districts, including the two state operated school districts of Newark and Paterson. He also oversees security operations for school districts throughout the state. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case. Major Cicchino served in the New Jersey State Police (NJSP) for 29 years, and his past responsibilities included being assigned as the Commanding Officer of the Office of Professional Standards (OPS). As Commanding Officer of OPS, he oversaw all internal investigations and incidents involving use of force by members of the NJSP. Major Cicchino also worked in conjunction with the Office of State Police Affairs for oversight and implementation of the United States of America v. The State of New Jersey, Division of State Police, Civil No. 99-5970(MLC) for Racial Profiling. During his career, he was assigned as the Executive Officer of the Investigations Section of the NJSP, as well as being assigned to the Management Review Unit, which was responsible for conducting audits, program reviews and staffing analysis of units, bureaus and sections within the NJSP. Major Cicchino earned a Masters Degree in General Education from Seton Hall University, a BS in Criminal Justice from Rowan University and attended the School of Police Staff and Command conducted by Northwestern University.

Major Sabrina Tapp-Harper

Sabrina V. Tapp-Harper is a native Baltimorean and graduate of Paul Laurence Dunbar Community Senior High School. Major Tapp-Harper holds a Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice from Coppin State University and a Master of Science Degree in Applied Behavioral Science from Johns Hopkins University. Major Tapp-Harper has been a guest at the White House, during President Obama's Administration, concerning the Violence Against Women Act, and was part of the panel with Attorney General Loretta Lynch during the rollout of the guidance on Identifying and Preventing Gender Bias in Law Enforcement Response to Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence. She was a Research Fellow at the International Association of Chiefs of Police in 2008 and worked on publications related to Returning Combat Veterans, In-Custody Deaths related to Electro-muscular interruption Devices (NIJ), Restoring Trust-Internal Affairs, and she published an article in Police Chief Magazine entitled *Lojacks for Laptops*. From 2005-2008 Major Tapp-Harper was assigned by the BPD Police Commissioner to serve as a liaison and provide needed leadership to the Baltimore School Police Force. Major Tapp-Harper retired from the Baltimore Police Department, at the rank of Major, after serving in that agency for 26 years. While with the Baltimore Police Department Major Tapp-Harper served in the Internal Affairs Division, Education and Training Division, and Public Affairs Division. She also commanded the Special Investigations Section, and served as Commanding Officer of Northern Police District; Major Tapp-Harper worked in 5 of the 9 Police Districts in Baltimore.

Major Tapp-Harper now Commands the Domestic Violence Unit of the Baltimore City Sheriff's Office, where she oversees the service of protective orders. In 2015, this unit that assumed service that had been very low, received the Governor's Award for increasing the service rate dramatically. Major Tapp-Harper also oversees in-service training, and provides training on Use

of Force and Ethics for the Sheriff's Office. Major Tapp-Harper was an adjunct professor for the Community College of Baltimore for 16 years where she taught several Criminal Justice Courses, such as Introduction to Criminal Justice, Juvenile Delinquency, and Criminal Investigations. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case.

Major Tapp-Harper has been an active leader of two youth dance ministry groups at the New Metropolitan Baptist Church for the past 16 years, where she is a lifelong member. Major Tapp-Harper is a board member, participates in activities, and gives feedback to the non-profit GEMS girls group for high-risk, high school girls started by a School Police Officer.

Recent Projects with relevancy would include Youth and Police: Finding Common Ground, which took place at Howard University under a cooperative Consent Decree with the U.S. Department of Justice, COPS Office-Panel Discussion-Major Tapp-Harper was an invited speaker about her insight, especially policing minority communities.

Mayor William A. Johnson, Jr.

William A. Johnson, Jr. has had a multi-faceted career. He served as President and CEO of the Urban League of Rochester (1972-1993), as Mayor of Rochester (1994-2005), and as Distinguished Professor of Public Policy and Urban Studies at the Rochester Institute of Technology (2006-13). Since retiring from RIT, he founded and is the CEO of Strategic Community Intervention LLC (SCI), a consulting firm that practices in the areas of community engagement, governmental reform, and strategic planning/design.

Throughout his career Mr. Johnson has searched for innovative and collaborative ways to resolve longstanding problems. This approach is exemplified by his extensive oversight of and engagement with the Rochester Police Department (RPD) over the course of his career. While with the Urban League, he played a leading role in advocating police reforms after a string of deadly force incidents involving African Americans between 1975 and 1993. He had been a member of a police reform commission (1976-77) appointed by his predecessor, Mayor Thomas P. Ryan, Jr.; and a 10-year member of the Rochester Civil Service Commission (1983-93).

The Mayor has worked with a series of chiefs of police, including Robert S. Warshaw, Mr. Johnson oversaw the implementation of several new programs and planned collaboratively with the department and citizens. These programs included: establishing formal Neighborhood Empowerment Teams (NETs); establishing Sector Planning Committees; the creation of youth empowerment programs that constructively engaged youth across the community in solutions and more positive interactions with the criminal justice infrastructure; a civilian complaint review process utilizing the Center for Dispute Services and its civilian personnel to review complaints against the RPD; the widespread use of Citizen-Police Academies, which greatly improved citizen rapport; and creating an Emotionally Disturbed Persons Response Team, which dispatched specially trained policemen to the scenes where intervention with persons who were a threat to themselves and others was successfully utilized.

With SCI, Mr. Johnson has advised several public sector and not-for-profit clients on how to implement public engagement strategies in all phases of community development initiatives,

believing that problems are most effectively resolved with the concurrence and involvement of all stakeholders, especially those who are traditionally excluded from discussions and deliberations. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case.

He holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees in political science from Howard University in Washington, D.C. He was also trained as a mediator and fact finder by the New York Public Employment Relations Board (PERB).

Erika Ostlie, M.A.

Erika Ostlie, Carnevale Associates, LLC, Research Director, a native of Baltimore, is a senior-level criminal justice and substance use researcher with expertise in survey research, strategic planning, performance measurement, logic model development, policy and program evaluation and data analysis. With almost 20 years of experience in criminal justice and legal research, she provides training and Technical Assistance to clients at the federal, state, and local levels, and facilitates interagency processes to develop performance measurement systems. She has worked with clients such as the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Charlottesville, VA Adult Drug Court, the District of Columbia's Department of Behavioral Health, and Baltimore Substance Abuse Systems. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case. Ms. Ostlie holds a Master's Degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice from the University of Maryland, College Park.

Director Tony Perez

Director Perez' law enforcement career spans over thirty years. He has been employed by the New York City Police Department, Rochester Police Department, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, and the New York State Police. Mr. Perez currently is Director of Intelligence for the New York State Police, and oversees the New York State Intelligence Center. In such capacity he is responsible for the Criminal Intelligence Unit and the Counter Terrorism Center. While with the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Service, he served as Deputy Commissioner for the Office of Public Safety and was responsible for the management, development and delivery of advanced police training and law enforcement Technical Assistance, especially in the areas of data-driven policing, criminal investigation, field intelligence, crime analysis, officer safety, and highway safety. He was also responsible for overseeing New York State law enforcement accreditation and standards. He retired as Deputy Chief of Operations from the Rochester Police Department in New York in 2008. Mr. Perez is fluent in Spanish. He holds a B.S. in criminal justice from State University of New York College at Brockport and an MBA from Medaille College.

Professor Michael Polakowski

Associate Professor Michael Polakowski's experience includes work with three Consent Decrees. He has been with the University of Arizona since 1990 and has assisted local offices of Police, Prosecutor, Pretrial Service Bureaus, Drug Courts, and the Arizona Department of Corrections with the creation, implementation and evaluation of innovative programs. Professor Polakowski

holds a Doctorate in Sociology with an emphasis in criminology, statistics and organizational theory from the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Professor Polakowski served six years on the Governor's Commission for Arizona Police Officer Standards and Training, which oversees certification, and educational issues for both law enforcement and correctional officers in Arizona. Prior to his academic career Professor Polakowski worked for eight years in law enforcement ranging from patrol duties to detective sergeant. During this period, Professor Polakowski created and participated in a liaison program with the local High School, instituted cross-collaborative SWAT training with adjoining communities and conducted Internal Affairs investigations.

Michael Polakowski, Ph.D., has also designed and created risk assessment instruments for Pima County, Arizona Pre-trial Services, and Pre-Trial Service organizations in Newark, New Jersey. Each of these efforts led to the adoption of new processes aimed at reducing the population of pre-trial detainees as well as the ability of Pre-Trial Service staff to conduct their own ongoing evaluation of bail and pre-trial release without any increase in crime or failures to appear for released detainees.

Professor Polakowski has also assisted local Police Departments in the selection and hiring of Chiefs of Police and the development of response and patrol strategies. These efforts used statistical analyses of past practices as well as surveys of community residents' preferences. Most recently, Professor Polakowski has begun working with the City of Tucson, Arizona Police Department to develop responses to crime and disorder occurring in and around convenience stores.

Professor Polakowski currently works with Warshaw and Associates, Incorporated as the Monitoring Group that oversees the implementation of a Federal Court's order pertaining to racially biased policing in Maricopa County, Arizona. In this capacity, Michael Polakowski has assisted in the development of the Early Intervention System. In addition, Professor Polakowski has assisted in oversight of statistical analyses of traffic and patrol activity and evaluated the sufficiency of policies regarding biased-based policing, command responsibilities, and traffic enforcement. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case.

Sarah Read, Esq.⁷⁵

Sarah Read has over 30 years of experience in conflict resolution and works as an attorney, mediator, facilitator, trainer, and consultant on conflict resolution processes. She has mediated a wide range of disputes, including commercial, employment, and community disputes. She has also helped to design, and facilitated, multi-stakeholder dialogues on community and regulatory issues. As a Partner and Senior Counsel at Sidley Austin, LLP in Chicago she handled complex regulatory disputes, which included the design and facilitation of several different collaborative

⁷⁵ [Sarah J. Read](#)

processes. Now retired from Sidley, she has, through her legal practice in Columbia, MO⁷⁶ and consulting firm,⁷⁷ worked to resolve various community disputes and has facilitated a range of community engagement processes, including listening circles, study circles, and world cafes. Sarah is a neutral with the American Arbitration Association's commercial panel, and a mediator with the USPS REDRESS program. She served on the Missouri Supreme Court Commission on Alternative Dispute Resolution, is a mediator with The Missouri Bar's Lawyer-to-Lawyer Dispute Resolution Panel, and is a past chair of The Missouri Bar's Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee. In October 2010, she received the President's Award from the Association of Missouri Mediators in recognition of her efforts in education and promotion of mediation throughout Missouri. She runs an active blog facilitating dialogue,⁷⁸ has published several e-books,⁷⁹ and has presented to many professional groups on mediation and facilitation skills. As a community volunteer, she has worked extensively with youth. She is also certified in the HBDI/Whole Brain Thinking framework for individuals and teams.

Ms. Read received her B.A. Degree, cum laude, in 1978 from Yale University and her Juris Doctorate degree with the Order of the Coif from the University of Wisconsin in 1981. She practiced for many years in Chicago with Sidley Austin LLP, and has been AV Pre-eminent™ rated by Martindale-Hubbell for more than 15 years. She is a member of the Missouri, Illinois, and Wisconsin Bars and the American and Chicago Bar Associations. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case.

Commander Jeffrey Romeo

Commander Romeo served 27 years in the Detroit Police Department, retiring at the rank of commander in 2013. From December 2007 through June of 2013, his assignment was the Office of Civil Rights, where he served as the liaison to the United States Department of Justice and the court appointed Monitor in relation to two consent decrees. His work led to reforms in the areas of supervisory accountability; span of control; arrests; witness detention; interviews and interrogations; uses of force/detainee injury reporting and investigations; investigatory stops and frisks; internal affairs investigations; citizen complaint investigations (which were conducted by the Office of the Chief Investigator, which is the investigative arm of the civilian oversight Board of Police Commissioners); discipline; seeking community reviews and comments on any new and revised policies; development and implementation of an early intervention system; custodial detention practices and safety and sanitary practices in holding cells.

As part of his responsibilities, Commander Romeo participated in consent decree mandated activities which included:

Command Level Force Review Team, which reviewed all incidents where officer discharged a firearm and any in-custody deaths.

⁷⁶ (www.readadr.com)

⁷⁷ (www.buildingdialogue.com)

⁷⁸ <https://buildingdialogue.wordpress.com/>

⁷⁹ <https://buildingdialogue.wordpress.com/products/>

Quarterly meetings between the Detroit Police Department and the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office. His position required him to coordinate efforts with the Wayne County Prosecutor's Office by meeting quarterly to identify and attempt to resolve any potential issues that may exist between the two agencies.

Quarterly meetings between the Detroit Police Department and the City's Law Department. These meetings were held to discuss any lawsuits that were concluded to identify any issues that may relate to training, officer tactics or conduct.

Holding Cell Compliance Committee. This committee was responsible for meeting and working to facilitate compliance with the requirements specific to the department's detention facilities including detainee and employee safety procedures, food service and cleanliness.

His other responsibilities included updating the policy manual and participating in the development, testing and implementation of the department's early intervention system, which was developed to detect and resolve potentially problematic officer behavior. An internal audit team was under his direction. The audit team conducted audits on nearly all of aspects of the consent decree requirements. Command officers were responsible for implementing corrective actions in relation to issues identified in the audits. He participated as a department advocate in discipline cases where he presented evidence and witnesses in disciplinary trial board hearing in relation to officers being charged with serious misconduct. He also participated in disciplinary trial boards as a panel member. He has been an instructor at the Detroit Police Academy where he provided instruction to supervisors in the Leadership and Accountability course.

Commander Romeo is currently a managing partner with Strategic Research Services, LLC, a law enforcement consulting, and private investigative services firm in the Metro Detroit, Michigan area. Commitments for these positions allow sufficient time for the performance of monitoring duties in this case.

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE MONITORING TEAM

Major (Ret.) Alfred D. Peters will serve as the Monitor with overall responsibility for the project and a special focus on law enforcement and police practice issues. Given his extensive police executive experience, he will focus on the critical police practices covered by the Consent Decree. Major Peters retired from the position of Troop Commander with New Jersey State Police in 2005 after 27 years of service with the Department during which he also served in the key positions of Training Academy Commandant and Unit Head for the Office of State Police Affairs within the New Jersey Office of Attorney General. In his next position, Major Peters served as Director of Public Safety with the Lakewood, New Jersey Police Department. He worked with Chief Robert Warshaw assisting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in response to their federal Consent Decree and on monitoring the compliance with the court order involving the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office in Arizona. He was previously instrumental in helping the New Jersey State Police gain compliance with the NJ Consent Decree on Racial Profiling.

Dr. John Klofas will serve as Deputy Monitor with broad responsibilities for the program and a specific focus on assessment and analysis under the Decree. The Deputy Monitor will be responsible for areas of the decree involving data collection and usage as well process and outcome analyses, including tracking and analyzing performance metrics associated with specific decree requirements including such as assessments of the efficacy of community engagement and trust of the police. He is Professor of Criminal Justice and Director of the Center for Public Safety Initiatives (CPSI) at Rochester Institute of Technology in Rochester, New York. Dr. Klofas has worked in institutional and community corrections and has over 20 years of experience working with local police departments and criminal justice systems across the country on management and violence reduction strategies. He has an extensive record of research and scholarship in the area and has been a team member on consent decrees in Prince George's County, Detroit, Oakland, and Niagara Falls, New York. He has also worked with the Puerto Rico Police Department in responding to its Consent Decree.

As shown below, the ADP team is organized around key concepts that reflect the specific and unique concerns identified in the USDOJ investigation and outlined in the Consent Decree with the City and City of Baltimore Police Department. The Monitor and Deputy Monitor have deep and rich experience in the identified core areas and are joined by the members of the ADP team who have the experience, expertise and the diversity to address the issues in the Decree. These estimates are based on current knowledge and will be adjusted as the monitoring plan takes shape. The Monitor and Deputy Monitor reserve the ability to assign and reassign staff as need to promote collaboration and cost-effectiveness of the services rendered.

STAFF AREAS BY HOURS

	Major Alfred D. Peters 600 Hours / 28% FTE	Dr. John M. Klofas 480 Hours / 23% FTE	Dr. John T. Carnevale 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Major Robert Cicchino 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Major Sabrina V. Harper 480 Hours / 23% FTE	Mayor William Johnson 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Ms. Erika Ostlie 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Director Melvin Tony Perez 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Dr. Michael Polakowski 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Sarah Read, Esq. 400 Hours / 19% FTE	Commander Jeffrey Romeo 400 Hours / 19% FTE
Community Oversight Task Force	X	X			X	X		X		X	X
Community Policing and Engagement	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	
Stops, Searches, Arrests and interactions	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		
Impartial Policing	X	X		X	X			X			X
Responding To And Interacting With People With Behavioral Health Disabilities or In Crisis	X	X	X				X		X	X	
Use of Force	X	X	X	X			X		X		
Interactions with Youth	X	X			X	X				X	
Transportation of Persons In Custody	X	X	X				X	X	X		X

First Amendment Protected Activities	X	X		X	X					X	X
Handling of Reports of Sexual Assault	X	X	X	X			X		X		
Technology	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Supervision	X	X		X	X			X			X
Misconduct Investigations and Discipline	X	X		X				X			X
Coordination with Baltimore City School Police Force	X	X			X		X				
Recruitment, Hiring and Retention	X	X			X	X		X		X	
Staffing, Performance Evaluations and Promotions	X	X	X	X			X		X		X
Officer Assistance and Support	X	X	X					X		X	X

QUALIFICATIONS-RFA ¶35

BY COMPLIANCE AREA

	Major Alfred D. Peters	Dr. John M. Klofas	Dr. John T. Carnevale	Major Robert Cicchino	Major Sabrina V. Harper	Mayor William Johnson	Ms. Erika Ostlie	Director Melvin Tony Perez	Dr. Michael Polakowski	Sarah Read, Esq.	Commander Jeffrey Romeo
Community Oversight Task Force	X	X			X	X	X			X	
Community Policing and Engagement	X	X			X	X	X			X	
Stops, Searches, Arrests and interactions	X	X	X	X				X	X		X
Impartial Policing	X	X		X				X			X
Responding To And Interacting With People With Behavioral Health Disabilities or In Crisis	X	X			X					X	
Use of Force	X	X	X	X				X	X		X
Interactions with Youth	X	X			X	X				X	
Transportation of Persons In Custody	X	X			X			X			X
First Amendment Protected Activities	X	X				X		X		X	X
Handling of Reports of Sexual Assault	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	
Technology	X	X	X				X		X	X	
Supervision	X	X		X	X			X			X
Misconduct Investigations and Discipline	X	X		X	X			X			
Coordination with Baltimore City School Police Force	X	X			X						X
Recruitment, Hiring and Retention	X	X				X	X				X
Staffing, Performance Evaluations and Promotions	X	X	X	X					X	X	
Officer Assistance and Support	X	X				X				X	

BY RFA ¶26 CRITERIA,

	Major Alfred D. Peters	Dr. John M. Klofas	Dr. John T. Carnevale	Major Robert Cicchino	Major Sabrina V. Harper	Mayor William Johnson	Ms. Erika Ostlie	Director Melvin Tony Perez	Dr. Michael Polakowski	Sarah Read, Esq.	Commander Jeffrey Romeo
a. Monitoring, auditing, evaluating, or otherwise reviewing performance of organizations such as law enforcement agencies, including experience monitoring settlements, consent decrees, or court orders;	X	X	X	X					X		X
b. Law enforcement practices, including community policing and engagement; use of force and force investigations; practices for conducting and reviewing pedestrian and vehicle stops, frisks, searches, and seizures; practices for conducting and reviewing arrests; crisis intervention and de-escalation techniques; bias-free policing, First Amendment protected speech and public assembly and related rights; intake, investigation, and adjudication of complaints of officer misconduct; civilian oversight; police-youth interactions; and policy development and officer and staff training;	X	X		X	X	X	X				X
c. Assessing legal sufficiency and compliance with constitutional and other legal requirements;	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
d. Familiarity and understanding of local issues and conditions, including local experience and expertise with Baltimore’s diverse communities, and issues and challenges facing those communities;	X				X		X				
e. Criminology and statistical analysis, including internal and external benchmarking techniques, regression analysis, and other relevant statistical methods;	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
f. Familiarity with federal, state, and local laws;	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
g. Evaluating organizational change and institutional reform, including by applying qualitative and quantitative analyses to assess progress, performance, and outcomes;	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
h. Working with government agencies, including municipalities, elected officials, civilian oversight bodies, collective	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

bargaining units, and other stakeholders interested in policing issues;											
i. Engaging effectively with diverse community stakeholders to promote civic participation, strategic partnerships, and community policing;	X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X
j. Mediation and dispute resolution, especially mediation of police complaints and neighborhood mediation;	X	X			X	X				X	
k. Use of technology and information systems, including data collection and management, and analytical tools, to support and enhance law enforcement practices;	X	X	X				X		X	X	
l. Appearing in court as a judge, monitor, counsel, or expert witness, or providing other types of testimony;	X	X	X	X					X	X	X
m. Writing complex reports for dissemination to diverse audiences;	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
n. Providing formal and informal feedback, technical assistance, training, and guidance to law enforcement agencies;	X	X		X	X	X		X			X
o. Reviewing policies, procedures, manuals, and other administrative orders or directives, and training programs related to law enforcement practices;	X	X		X	X	X					X
p. Municipal budgets and budgeting processes;	X	X				X				X	
q. Completing projects within anticipated deadlines and budgets; and	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
r. Any other qualifications the Monitor candidates believe are pertinent to fulfilling the duties of Monitor under the Consent Decree.: SB/WBOE/MBOE, RFA, ¶34(e)	SB		SB			SB/MBE				SB/WBE	

PRIOR EXPERIENCE AND REFERENCES-RFA ¶36

As requested in paragraph 36 of the Request For Applications, the following table lists current or recent experience (within the last 10 years) for each team member that is relevant to the monitoring duties specified in the RFA. The numbered paragraph that corresponds to the relevant current or recent experience is shown in bold following the project name (RFA #35). Non-confidential work product that is similar to the materials required for this project is hyper-linked.

Team Member	Experience	Reference
Alfred D. Peters RFA ¶26, a-r	New Jersey Consent Decree	Colonel Joseph R. Fuentes PO Box 7068 West Trenton, NJ 08628 609-882-2000 Thomas J. O'Reilly Executive Director

<p>The following is a reference to one of many reports Major Peters has prepared for his work on the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office Consent Decree: 07cv2513-795 Order Redacted Report 9-28-14.</p>	<p>City of Baltimore, MD. Wayne Brown Exercise & Training Manager, Mayor's Office of Emergency Management Incident Command System Training</p> <p>Melendres Court Order, Maricopa County, AZ</p> <p>Member of Warshaw and Associates Consultant to Commonwealth of Puerto Rico regarding Consent Decree</p>	<p>The Police Institute Office of the Chancellor Rutgers University 123 Washington St., Suite 110B Newark, NJ 07102-3094 973-353-2503 (O) 973-803-1473 (C) 973-353-2555 (F) thomas.oreilly@rutgers.edu</p> <p>Peter C. Harvey (AG) Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP New York, New York 10036 212-336-2810 pcharvey@pbwt.com</p> <p>Dr. Gerard LaSalle 9 Phyllis Lane Fairfield, NJ 07004 jlalalle24@comcast</p> <p>Robert Warshaw – Monitor 348 Wabash Drive Sylva, NC 28779-8798 828-507-7546 Rohtopcop@aol.com</p>
<p>John Klofas</p>	<p>Memorandum of Consent Decree, Prince Georges County. Served as Monitoring Team Member addressing risk management</p> <p>Detroit MI Consent Judgment Served as Monitoring Team Member addressing risk management</p> <p>Oakland CA Consent Judgment Served as Monitoring Team Member addressing</p>	<p>Robert Warshaw 348 Wabash Dr. Sylva, NC 28779 Tel (828) 586-1843 rohtopcop@aol.com</p> <p>John Girvin J.Martin Solutions Hibbard Road Holly, NY 14470 Tel. (585) 770-3523</p>

	<p>risk management</p> <p>Niagara Falls NY Consent Judgment Served as Monitoring Team Member addressing risk management</p> <p>Member of Warshaw and Associates consult to Com. of Puerto Rico regarding Consent Judgment.</p> <p>Note: see report links below.⁸⁰</p>	
<p>William A. Johnson RFA 26a-b,f-j, n, p</p>	<p>Consultation with city of Sanford Florida (Mayor and City Manager's offices) in the aftermath of the Trayvon Martin Shooting</p>	<p>Andrew Thomas Sr. Project Manager Office of City Manager City of Sanford 300 N. Park Ave Sanford FL 32771 407.688.5132 (0) Andrew.Thomas@Sanfordfl.gov</p>
<p>Sabrina Tapp-Harper RFA 26b-d, f-i, o-r</p>		<p>Judge Halee Weinstein District Court Of Maryland 1400 E. North Ave. Baltimore, MD 21202 410-878-8737 halee.weinstein@courts.state.md.us</p> <p>Sheriff Kathy H.Witt Office of The Fayette County Sheriff</p>

⁸⁰ The following are links to reports that Dr. Klofas has worked on in Detroit and Oakland as well as a program evaluation in Rochester (<http://policeperformancesolutions.com/pdflib/detroit-report-ind-mon-18-2014-04-16.pdf>; <http://policeperformancesolutions.com/pdflib/oakland-report-ind-mon-19-2014-10-30.pdf>;<https://www.rit.edu/cla/criminaljustice/sites/rit.edu.cla.criminaljustice/files/docs/WorkingPapers/2013/2013-10.pdf>).

		<p>150 N. Limestone, Suite 265, Lexington, Kentucky 40507 859-559-9898 sheriffkathywitt@fayettesheriff.com</p> <p>Neil Schachter President-Northwest Citizens on Patrol 410-365-9169 2700 Taney Road Baltimore, MD 21209 neil@nwcp.info</p> <p>Grayling Williams Assistant Chief Portsmouth Police Department 801 Water Street, Suite 300, Portsmouth, VA 23704 757-393-8257 x5602 williamsg@portsmouthva.gov</p> <p>Professor Edward Jackson Program Coordinator-Professor, Baltimore City Community College 6101 Fairdel Ave. Baltimore, MD 21206 410-419-0142 edjack717@aol.com</p>
<p>Sarah J. Read RFA 26i, j, m,q</p>	<p>Columbia, MO community visioning process and visioning implementation plan.</p> <p>Community Dialogue Guide/Kettering Foundation Local Based Issues Learning Exchange</p>	<p>Paula Hertwig Hopkins Former Assistant City Manager, Columbia, Missouri phertwighopkins@gmail.com</p> <p>Jim Robertson, Managing Editor, Columbia Daily Tribune (retired) Jimrobertson203@gmail.com</p>

	<p>Reach Out Metro, Group Youth Mentoring Platform</p>	<p>Matt Leuchtman Gifted Education Specialist Cross Categorical Disabilities Specialist Maker Mentors Future Problem Solving Youth Advisory Council Liaison Battle Volunteer Corps Wake Up! Campaign Sponsor Battle High School Columbia Public Schools mleuchtman@cpsk12.org (573) 214-3300</p> <p>Tom Rose, President, Cradle to Career Network, Columbia, MO tomrose@centurytel.net</p>
<p>Tony Perez RFA ¶26, a-r</p>	<p>Superintendent New York State Police (FMR)</p> <p>New York Attorney General's Office Chief Investigator (FMR)</p> <p>New York State Deputy Secretary for Public Safety (FMR)</p> <p>New York City Police Department Deputy Chief of</p>	<p>Joseph D'Amico Senior Vice President MSA Security 9 Murray Street, New York, NY 10007 (212) 509-1336 Email MSDBM@aol.com</p> <p>Mary Kavaney, Esq. Chief Administrative Officer Global Alliance 731 Lexington Ave. New York, NY 10022 (518) 596-4183 Email mkavaney@globalcyberalliance.org</p> <p>John Bilich A/Chief Security Officer The Port Authority Police Department</p>

	<p>Operations (FMR)</p> <p>New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services Executive Deputy Commissioner (FMR)</p>	<p>The Port Authority of NY & NJ 4 World Trade Center 150 Greenwich Street New York, NY 10007 (212) 435-6645 Email jbilich@panynj.gov</p>
<p>Michael Polakowski RFA ¶26, a-r</p>	<p>Melendres Court Order, Maricopa County, AZ</p> <p>Delphine Allen, et al., vs. City of Oakland, et al,</p> <p>United States of America v. City of Detroit</p> <p>Created Ethics Program in School of Government and Public Policy.</p> <p>Worked as a consultant with the National Institute of Corrections</p> <p>2014 IACP's J. Stannard Baker Award Recipient, Member: Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), FBI Law Enforcement Executive Development Association (LEEDA), Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police (ACOP) and International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)</p>	<p>Chief (Ret.) Robert Warshaw – Monitor 348 Wabash Drive Sylva, NC 28779-8798 Phone:(828) 507-7546 Rochtopcop@aol.com</p> <p>Professor Neil Vance Kanbay Chair in Ethical Governance University of Arizona School of Government & Public Policy PO Box 210027 Building: Social Sciences neilv@email.arizona.edu Phone:(520) 621-5024</p> <p>Daniel G. Sharp Chief of Police/Interim City Manager Oro Valley Police Department 11000 N La Canada Drive Oro Valley, AZ 85737 dsharp@orovalleyaz.gov Phone:(520) 229-4900 Fax: (520) 229-4979</p>
<p>Jeffrey Romeo RFA ¶26, a-r</p>	<p>Detroit Police Department's Two Consent Decrees</p>	<p>James E. White Assistant Chief of Police Detroit Police Department</p>

		<p>Detroit Public Safety Headquarters 1301 Third Street Detroit, Michigan 48226 313-596-2750 whitej932@detroitmi.gov</p> <p>DeShaune Sims Commander Professional Standards Detroit Public Safety Headquarters 1301 Third Street Detroit, Michigan 48226 313-400-7530 SIMSD424@detroitmi.gov</p> <p>Allan Charlton, Esq. 6926 Pebblecreek Woods Dr West Bloomfield, MI 48322 313-530-4650 allanmchar@yahoo.com</p>
Robert Cicchino RFA ¶26, a-r	New Jersey Consent Decree	<p>Colonel Joseph R. Fuentes Superintendent, Division of State Police PO Box 7068 West Trenton, NJ 08628 609-882-2000</p> <p>Chief Paul Morris Chief of Detectives Division of Criminal Justice NJ Office of the Attorney General Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex 25 Market St. Trenton, NJ 08611 609-674-1008 (O) 609-984-0028 (C) morrisp@njdcj.org</p> <p>David Corso Business Administrator Mt. Olive School District 227 US 206 #10 Flanders, NJ 07836 973-691-4008 ex. 8201 (O) 609-203-7058 (C) dcorso@mtoliveboe.org</p>
John Carnevale	Member of Warshaw and	Robert Warshaw

RFA ¶26, a, e, g, k, l, m, n, o, q, r	Associates consult to Com. of Puerto Rico regarding Consent Judgment. Melendres Court Order, Maricopa County, AZ	348 Wabash Dr. Sylva, NC 28779 Tel (828) 586-1843 rochtopcop@aol.com
Erika Ostlie RFA ¶26, a, e, g, k, l, m, n, o, q, r	Member of Carnevale Associates conducts data analysis and research on criminal justice matters	John Carnevale Carnevale Associates, LLC 4 Belinder Road Gaithersburg, MD 20878 301-977-3600

BUDGET-RFA ¶37

Budget Narrative

ADP Consulting LLC (ADP), led by Major (Ret.) Alfred D. Peters is proud to introduce and propose its team to serve as Independent Court Monitor of the Baltimore Police Department in the Agreement with the United States, the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, and the Police Department of the City of Baltimore. Our team is well equipped to meet the core responsibilities of assessing compliance, providing technical assistance, working collaboratively with the parties and stakeholders, engaging in community outreach, and issuing public reports that are both comprehensive and comprehensible.

It is estimated that the budget for ADP to complete the required Court Monitoring activities will take no more than 7,920 hours per year to complete and cost \$1,453,521.59 per year during years one to three, \$1,438,755.59 during year four, and \$971,515.59 during year five. These estimates are based on the requirements shown in the Request for Applications.

KEY PERSONNEL

Major (Ret.) Alfred D. Peters will serve as the Monitor with overall responsibility for the project and a special focus on Law Enforcement and Police Practice issues. Given his extensive police executive experience, he will focus on the critical police practices covered by the Decree. In addition to quarterly site visits, he will make at least three additional trips to Baltimore per quarter. He will commit to 600 hours per year during years one through four and 400 hours during year five at a rate of \$250 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$150,000.00: Year five: \$100,000.00.

Dr. John Klofas will serve as Deputy Monitor with broad responsibilities for the program and a specific focus on Assessment and Analysis under the Decree. He will be responsible for areas of the Decree involving data collection and usage as well process and outcome analyses, including tracking and analyzing performance metrics associated with specific Decree requirements

including such as assessments of the efficacy of community engagement and trust of the police. In addition to quarterly site visits, Dr. Klofas will make at least three additional trips to Baltimore per quarter. He will commit to 480 hours per year during years one through four and 300 hours during year five at a rate of \$225 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$108,000.00: Year five: \$67,500.00.

Mr. William A. Johnson Jr. will co-lead activities regarding Community Engagement and Civilian oversight. He will also support team activities related to interactions with youth, First Amendment protected activities, recruitment, hiring, and retention, and officer assistance and support. In addition to quarterly site visits, Mr. Johnson will make at least three additional trips to Baltimore per quarter. He will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 260 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00: Year five: \$53,820.00.

Major Sabrina Tapp-Harper will serve as one, of the two, ADP team's local representatives and support Community Engagement and Civilian Oversight activities. She will also support team activities related to interacting with people with behavioral health disabilities or in crisis, interactions with youth, handing reports of sexual assault, transportation of persons in custody, supervision, misconduct investigations and discipline, and coordination with Baltimore City School Police Force. Major Tapp- Harper is local to Baltimore and will not incur any travel expenses related to site visits. She will commit to 480 hours per year during years one through four and 240 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$99,360.00: Year five: \$49,680.00.

Sarah J. Read, Esq. will serve as co-lead for activities regarding Community Engagement and Civilian Oversight. She will also support team activities related to stops, searches, arrests and interactions, interacting with people with behavioral health disabilities or in crisis, use of force, handing reports of sexual assault, technology, staffing, performance evaluations and promotions, and officer assistance and support. In addition to quarterly site visits, Ms. Read will make at least three additional trips to Baltimore per quarter. She will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 260 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00: Year five: \$53,820.00.

Director Melvin Tony Perez will support team activities related to Stops, Searches, Arrests, and Interactions, impartial policing, use of force, transportation of persons in custody, First Amendment protected activities, supervision, and misconduct investigations and discipline. He will participate in quarterly site visits and will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 200 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00: Year five: \$41,400.00.

Dr. Michael Polakowski will provide oversight on Data Analyses and support team activities related to stops, searches, arrests, and interactions, use of force, handling reports of sexual assault, technology, and staffing, performance evaluations, and promotions. He will participate in quarterly site visits and will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 200

hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00: Year five: \$41,400.00.

Commander Jeffery Romeo will support all team activities related to identified Law Enforcement issues, such as stops, searches, arrests, and interactions, impartial policing, use of force, transportation of persons in custody, First Amendment protected activities, supervision, coordination with Baltimore City School Police Force, and recruitment, hiring, and retention. He will participate in quarterly site visits and will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 200 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00: Year five: \$41,400.00.

Major Robert Cicchino will support all team activities related to identified Law Enforcement issues, such as stops, searches, arrests, and interactions, impartial policing, use of force, handling of reports of sexual assault, supervision, misconduct investigations and discipline, and staffing, performance evaluations and promotions. He will participate in quarterly site visits and will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 200 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00; Year five: \$41,400.00.

Dr. John Carnevale will provide oversight on Data Analyses and support team activities related to stops, searches, arrests, and interactions, use of force, handling report of sexual assault, technology, and staffing, performance evaluations, and promotions. He will participate in quarterly site visits and will commit to 400 hours per year during years one through four and 200 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$82,800.00: Year five: \$41,400.00.

Erika Ostlie, MA will support Community Engagement and Civilian Oversight activities and lead the analyses of the Community Survey data. She will also support team activities related to technology and staffing, performance evaluations, and promotions. Ms. Ostlie is our second ADP representative local to Baltimore and will not incur any travel expenses related to site visits. She will commit to 600 hours per year during years one through four and 300 hours during year five at a rate of \$207 per hour. Total cost per year for years one to four: \$124,200.00: Year five: \$62,100.00.

TRAVEL:

The ADP team assumes members will travel to Baltimore at least once per quarter, for five-day site visits during years one through three and three-day visits for years four and five. Some team members, such as the Monitor and the Deputy Monitor, and those working on community engagement will visit the BPD more frequently, but these interim trips will only be two days each. Two team members, Major Sabrina Tapp-Harper and Erika Ostlie, live local to Baltimore and will not incur any travel expenses over the life of the project. Travel calculations for all other key personnel are listed below. Prices listed for airfare and Amtrak calculations were obtained on May 15, 2017, assuming that travel arrangements can be made 30 days prior to departure. Prices are round trip from each team member's home base. Hotel calculations are based on the FY 2017 Federal Per Diem rates for Baltimore in September. If awarded the contract, the ADP team will

negotiate a group rate with a local hotel so these costs may be flexible. Travel calculations also include the federal FY 2017 daily Per Diem rate for Baltimore (\$69 per day). The total travel budget for the ADP team is \$76,892.00 per year for years one through three and \$67,772.00 for years four and five.

Travel by individual personnel:

Alfred D. Peters: Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$2520; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ two nights each @ \$159 hotel = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104. Total per year: \$10,728.00.

John Klofas: Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$3600; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 nights each @ \$159 per night = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104. Total per year: \$11,808.00.

William A. Johnson: Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$3600; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ two nights each @ \$159 hotel = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104. Total per year: \$11,808.00.

Sarah J. Read: Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$475 each airfare from Columbia, MO = \$5700; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ two nights each @ \$159 hotel = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104. Total per year: \$13,908.00

Tony Perez: Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$1200; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$1200; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$828. Total per year for years one to three: \$5,760.00; Total years four and five: \$3,936.00.

Mike Polakowski: Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$400 each airfare from Tucson, AZ = \$1600; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$400 each airfare from Tucson, AZ = \$1600; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$828. Total per year for years one to three: \$6,160.00; Total years four and five: \$4,336.00.

Jeffery Romeo: Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Detroit, MI = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each

airfare from Detroit, MI = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$828. Total per year for years one to three: \$5,660.00; Total years four and five: \$3,836.00.

Robert Cicchino: Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$828. Total per year for years one to three: \$5,400.00; Total years four and five: \$3,576.00.

John Carnevale: Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Chicago, IL = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Chicago, IL = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$828. Total per year for years one to three: \$5,660.00; Total years four and five: \$3,836.00.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT

ADP Consulting, LLC Staff

Staff of ADP Consulting, LLC will provide administrative support, attend site visits, and assist with quarterly report and other report writing, and coordinate travel activities for the team. The total budget for ADP Consulting support totals \$203,448.59 per year for years one to three of the project and \$197,802.59 per year for years four and five.

A full-time Administrative Assistant may participate in quarterly site visits, and will commit to 2080 hours per year for all five years of the project at a rate of \$24.04 per hour totaling \$50,003.20 per year in direct labor costs. An Office Manager may also participate in quarterly site visits and will commit to 480 hours per year for all five years of the project, totaling \$24,691.20 per year in direct labor costs. Two additional support staff will commit to 200 hours each per year for all five years of the project at rates of \$35.08 and \$43.87, totaling \$7,016.00 and \$8,774.00 per year in direct labor costs. In sum, direct labor costs for ADP Consulting, LLC total \$ \$90,484.40 per year for all five years of the project.

ADP Consulting's budget also includes a 14% fringe benefit rate. Total costs for direct labor fringe benefits are \$12,667.82 per year for all five years of the project.

Other direct costs include \$7,500 per year for office supplies and travel for the Administrative Assistant and the Office Manager. Travel for each position was calculated as follows: Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$828. Travel totals \$5,400.00 per year for each employee for

years one to three and \$3,576.00 per year for each employee for years four to five. Travel is also budgeted for any subject matter experts or technical experts the team may require at \$10,000 per year over all five years of the project.

Direct costs including all labor, fringe, and other direct costs total \$ \$131,452.22 per year for years one through three and \$127,804.22 per year for years four and five.

ADP Consulting charges a General and Administrative rate of 54.77% as indirect costs. Costs associated with the G&A rate total \$71,996.38 per year for years one to three and \$69,998.37 per year for years four and five.

Legal Services

The ADP team will require legal services to ensure legal sufficiency and compliance with constitutional and other legal requirements. Legal services total \$12,000 per year for all five years of the project.

Company Seven Training and Technical Assistance

The ADP Team will use Company Seven of Allentown, NJ to oversee the community survey website design and development and custom software for this project. In addition, Company Seven will provide monthly maintenance, hosting, technical assistance, and training on how to use the online tool. Company Seven's training and technical assistance totals \$91,821.00 per year for all five years of the project.

Prager Metis CPAs

The ADP team will require Prager Metis CPAs to provide accounting services: preparation, review, and auditing of financial statements, and the preparation of tax documents. Prager Metis CPAs' services total \$8,200 per year for all five years of the project.

City of Baltimore Monitor Budget

I. Personnel	Name	Position	Rate	Option Years										Total			
				Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five					
				HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT		HOURS	AMOUNT	
	Alfred D. Peters	Monitor	\$250.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	600	\$ 150,000.00	400	\$ 100,000.00	2800	\$ 700,000.00
	John Kifias	Deputy Monitor	\$225.00	480	\$ 108,000.00	480	\$ 108,000.00	480	\$ 108,000.00	480	\$ 108,000.00	480	\$ 108,000.00	300	\$ 67,500.00	2220	\$ 499,500.00
	William A. Johnson		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	260	\$ 53,820.00	1860	\$ 385,020.00
	Sabrina Tapp-Harper		\$207.00	480	\$ 99,360.00	480	\$ 99,360.00	480	\$ 99,360.00	480	\$ 99,360.00	480	\$ 99,360.00	240	\$ 49,680.00	2160	\$ 447,120.00
	Sarah J. Read		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	260	\$ 53,820.00	1860	\$ 385,020.00
	Tony Perez		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	200	\$ 41,400.00	1800	\$ 372,600.00
	Michael Polakowski		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	200	\$ 41,400.00	1800	\$ 372,600.00
	Jeffrey Romeo		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	200	\$ 41,400.00	1800	\$ 372,600.00
	Robert Cicchino		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	200	\$ 41,400.00	1800	\$ 372,600.00
	John Carnevale		\$207.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	400	\$ 82,800.00	200	\$ 41,400.00	1800	\$ 372,600.00
	Erika Ostle		\$207.00	600	\$ 124,200.00	600	\$ 124,200.00	600	\$ 124,200.00	600	\$ 124,200.00	600	\$ 124,200.00	300	\$ 62,100.00	2700	\$ 558,900.00
	Subtotal			4,960	\$1,061,160.00	4,960	\$1,061,160.00	4,960	\$1,061,160.00	4,960	\$1,061,160.00	4,960	\$1,061,160.00	2,760	\$599,920.00	22600	\$4,838,560.00
	II. Travel																
	Alfred D. Peters	Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$2520; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 nights each @ \$159 hotel = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104															\$ 53,640.00
	John Kifias	Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$3600; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 nights each @ \$159 per night = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104															\$ 59,040.00
	William A. Johnson	Years 1-5 Travel: 3 trips per quarter @ \$475 each airfare from Columbia, MO = \$5700; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 nights each @ \$159 hotel = \$2544; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380; 2 trips per quarter @ 2 days each @ \$69 per diem = \$1104															\$ 69,540.00
	Sarah J. Read	Resides local to Baltimore City; no travel expenses needed															\$ -
	Subtotal																\$ 13,908.00

Tony Perez	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$1200; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$345. Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$300 each airfare from Rochester, NY = \$1200; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$828	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 5,760.00	\$ 3,936.00	\$ 3,936.00	\$ 25,152.00
Michael Polakowski	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$400 each airfare from Tucson, AZ = \$1600; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$345. Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$400 each airfare from Tucson, AZ = \$1600; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$828	\$ 6,160.00	\$ 6,160.00	\$ 6,160.00	\$ 6,160.00	\$ 6,160.00	\$ 4,336.00	\$ 4,336.00	\$ 27,152.00	
Jeffrey Romeo	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Detroit, MI = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$345. Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Detroit, MI = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$828	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 3,836.00	\$ 3,836.00	\$ 24,652.00	
Robert Cicchino	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$345. Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$828	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 3,576.00	\$ 3,576.00	\$ 23,352.00	
John Carnovale	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Chicago, IL = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$345. Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$275 each airfare from Chicago, IL = \$1100; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$828	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 5,660.00	\$ 3,836.00	\$ 3,836.00	\$ 24,652.00	
Erika Ostlie	Resides local to Baltimore City; no travel expenses needed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Subtotal		\$ 76,892.00	\$ 76,892.00	\$ 76,892.00	\$ 76,892.00	\$ 76,892.00	\$ 67,772.00	\$ 67,772.00	\$ 366,220.00	
III. General Support										
ADP Consulting, LLC		\$ 203,448.59	\$ 203,448.59	\$ 203,448.59	\$ 203,448.59	\$ 203,448.59	\$ 197,802.59	\$ 197,802.59	\$ 1,005,950.95	
Legal Services		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 60,000.00	
Company Seven Training & Technical Assistance		\$ 91,821.00	\$ 91,821.00	\$ 91,821.00	\$ 91,821.00	\$ 91,821.00	\$ 91,821.00	\$ 91,821.00	\$ 459,105.00	
Prager Metis CPA's		\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 8,200.00	\$ 41,000.00	
IV. Total Direct Costs		\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,438,755.59	\$ 1,438,755.59	\$ 6,770,835.95	
TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET		\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,453,521.59	\$ 1,438,755.59	\$ 1,438,755.59	\$ 6,770,835.95	

XXXXXX, 2017 to XXXXXXXX ADP Consulting, LLC City of Baltimore Monitor Budget																
I. Personnel	Labor Category	Description	Rate	Year One		Year Two		Year Three		Year Four		Year Five		Total		
				HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	HOURS	AMOUNT	Total Hours	Total Costs	
	I. Staff															
	Office Manager		\$51.44	480	\$ 24,691.20	480	\$ 24,691.20	480	\$ 24,691.20	480	\$ 24,691.20	480	\$ 24,691.20	2400	\$ 123,456.00	
	Administrative Assistant		\$43.87	200	\$ 8,774.00	200	\$ 8,774.00	200	\$ 8,774.00	200	\$ 8,774.00	200	\$ 8,774.00	1000	\$ 43,870.00	
	Administrative Assistant		\$35.08	200	\$ 7,016.00	200	\$ 7,016.00	200	\$ 7,016.00	200	\$ 7,016.00	200	\$ 7,016.00	1000	\$ 35,080.00	
	Administrative Assistant		\$24.04	2080	\$ 50,003.20	2080	\$ 50,003.20	2080	\$ 50,003.20	2080	\$ 50,003.20	2080	\$ 50,003.20	10400	\$ 250,016.00	
	Subtotal			2,960	\$ 90,484.40	2,960	\$ 90,484.40	2,960	\$ 90,484.40	2,960	\$ 90,484.40	2,960	\$ 90,484.40	14,800	\$ 452,422.00	
	II. Benefits (14%)				\$ 12,667.82		\$ 12,667.82		\$ 12,667.82		\$ 12,667.82		\$ 12,667.82		\$ 63,339.08	
	III. Other Direct Costs															
	Travel	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$628			\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 3,576.00	\$ 23,352.00
	Office Manager	Years 1-3 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel = \$3180; 1 trip per quarter @ 5 days each @ \$69 per day per diem = \$1380 Years 4&5 Travel: 1 trip per quarter @ \$210 each Amtrak from Trenton, NJ = \$840; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 nights each @ \$159 per night hotel=\$1908; 1 trip per quarter @ 3 days each at \$69 per day per diem = \$628			\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 3,576.00	\$ 23,352.00
	Administrative Assistant				\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 5,400.00		\$ 3,576.00	\$ 23,352.00
	Other Travel Expenses				\$ 10,000.00		\$ 10,000.00		\$ 10,000.00		\$ 10,000.00		\$ 10,000.00		\$ 10,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
	Office supplies				\$ 7,500.00		\$ 7,500.00		\$ 7,500.00		\$ 7,500.00		\$ 7,500.00		\$ 7,500.00	\$ 37,500.00
	Subtotal				\$ 28,300.00		\$ 28,300.00		\$ 28,300.00		\$ 28,300.00		\$ 28,300.00		\$ 24,652.00	\$ 134,204.00
	V. Total Direct Costs				\$ 131,452.22		\$ 131,452.22		\$ 131,452.22		\$ 131,452.22		\$ 131,452.22		\$ 127,804.22	\$ 649,965.08
	VI. General and Administrative Rate (54.77%)				\$ 71,996.38		\$ 71,996.38		\$ 71,996.38		\$ 71,996.38		\$ 71,996.38		\$ 69,988.37	\$ 355,985.87
	VII. Fee (0%)				\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
	TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET				\$ 203,448.59		\$ 203,448.59		\$ 203,448.59		\$ 203,448.59		\$ 203,448.59		\$ 197,802.59	\$ 1,005,950.95

COLLABORATION AND COST EFFECTIVENESS-RFA ¶38

As an agent of the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, we will work collaboratively with the City, BPD, and DOJ to assess implementation of the Consent Decree, provide Technical Assistance, engage in community outreach, and issue public reports on BPD and the City's compliance with the Consent Decree, and to do so in a cost effective manner.⁸¹ Our team has a proven track record of successful collaboration in the monitoring projects in Arizona, Puerto Rico, California, Detroit, and New York discussed elsewhere in this application, as well as in a variety of community engagement projects. For example, community engagement programs established and overseen by Bill Johnson include: establishing formal Neighborhood Empowerment Teams (NETs), staffed by a Lieutenant, two Patrol Officers, and civilian code enforcement personnel and focused on customer service and "quality of life" issues, as prioritized by neighborhood residents; the establishment of Sector Planning Committees as the governing arm of the NBN process, ushering in an unprecedented level of shared governance and allowing citizens from the city sectors to plan and prioritize service requests from City Hall; the creation of youth empowerment programs that constructively engaged youth across the community in solutions and more positive interactions with the criminal justice infrastructure; a civilian complaint review process utilizing the Center for Dispute Services and its civilian personnel to review complaints against the RPD; the widespread use of Citizen-Police Academies, which greatly improved citizen rapport; and creating an Emotionally Disturbed Persons Response Team, which dispatched specially trained policemen to the scenes where intervention with persons who were a threat to themselves and others was successfully utilized. Sarah Read has worked on a diverse set of engagement projects including community visioning and dialogue. She recently provided dialogue trainings to youth at two different high schools to assist them with their own outreach efforts. John Klofas implemented the Rochester Youth Police Project. Major Tapp-Harper's expertise in working with youth is illustrated by the fact that she has been an invited speaker on working with youth and finding common ground most recently two panels sponsored by the DOJ and COPS at Howard University.

We understand the need and are committed to regularly meeting with both community stakeholders, and with BPD officers⁸² both to inform and to listen to questions, concerns and suggestions. The ADP team has a successful history dealing with various key stakeholders while engaged in similar litigation. We note the need to include in our outreach efforts all of the organizations representing the police officers of various ranks of the BPD such as the Fraternal Order of the Police Lodge No. 3 (FOP) the Vanguard Justice Society, Inc., and the Baltimore School Police in many facets.⁸³ Additionally, we recognize the need to include community groups such as the Campaign for Justice, Safety & Jobs, Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund and the No Boundaries Coalition of Central West Baltimore that submitted detailed comments to the court for consideration, as well as other

⁸¹ RFA, ¶4, Consent Decree ¶ 27; also see 38 – need give specific examples.

⁸² Consent Decree ¶474, 475

⁸³ Findings Report, Page 16

stakeholders named in the Decree. We intend on ensuring a broad and encompassing avenue for essential input as implementation progresses. We intend to meet regularly with the community, either in person, along with BPD, and by leveraging technology to remain cost-effective in our efforts to listen to questions, concerns, and suggestions of the community as implementation progresses and to inform the community of monitoring guidelines established within the Decree.⁸⁴ As required, reports, budget material, work plans and accomplishments, and other documents will be available through the web site referenced above. The Monitor will also host meetings in various locations throughout the city, involving both community members and members of the BPD in order to promote discussion, interaction, and understanding. Information shared at these meetings should also be available online, with opportunities for further comments and links to things like policies and processes for reporting.

We intend to design and upgrade our website to allow our experts the ability to conduct timely, reliable, comprehensive, and representative surveys of the community's experience, and perceptions of BPD and public safety in conformance with all of the criteria established within the Consent Decree.⁸⁵ In addition our website, which also will be used to post reports and to update the public, will also allow for members of the public to submit information and comments. The ADP team also recognizes a need to seek input from those individuals that may not have access to the Internet. We intend on incorporating a handwritten survey to address this need and when necessary personal interviews. All stakeholders will be provided various open channels of communication with the Monitor and designated Monitoring Team members.

The ADP team will have two members who will reside in Baltimore over the course of the project and the team will conduct at least one five-day site visit to Baltimore each quarter. Our Monitoring Plan will include an ability to provide quarterly in-person public meetings to coincide with our compliance site visits at strategic locations to seek this critical transfer of information. The Monitor and/or Deputy Monitor will make monthly visits and will maintain continuous communication with the Parties. ADP team members will also conduct additional site visits, as needed. Scheduling stakeholder meetings in conjunction with these regular site visits will help to manage costs. Additional outreach efforts, including those related to the community survey which is discussed in the subsection on Community Policing and Engagement under "Scope of Work/Monitoring For the 17 Areas" will be discussed with the Parties and detailed in the Monitoring Plan.

We will also work closely with the Parties to ensure the specifics of the Monitoring Plan are clear and control costs. Our Monitoring plan will specify clear timelines and actions after our appointment. Initial immediate discussions with the Parties will clearly identify the type of data we will require monthly, our data evaluation methodology, the transparent inclusion of party review and recommendations, and a merging of this methodology to incorporate community perceptions of progress. The ADP plan incorporates a close relationship with BPD and its staff in a cost-effective and collaborative manner, which will ensure both full and effective compliance

⁸⁴ RFA ¶¶22, 27

⁸⁵ Consent Decree ¶¶23, 24

under the Consent Decree and a positive, constructive, and long lasting change for the BPD and the community at large.⁸⁶ We intend on working side by side with BPD and to provide Technical Assistance as requested to assist them in the development of a department plans to conduct these or similar assessments upon the successful termination of the Consent Decree.⁸⁷

The team will engage in a wide range of information gathering practices including: reviews of policies, reports, and other documents; interviews and observations; and attending relevant meetings with the Parties, the police, the local government, and community members. The Monitor will oversee the review and analysis of information, issuing quarterly reports that address compliance with requirements identified in the forthcoming final Consent Decree.

In preparation for monitoring, each requirement of the final Consent Decree will be identified and analyzed, and specific measures of compliance will be developed. Specific data necessary for measuring compliance and protocols for collecting it will be developed and discussed with the Parties. Prior to each site visit, and in a timely fashion, the ADP Team will request documents and records necessary to maximize on-site time for compliance determination purposes. In months when the team does not conduct site visits, subject to the concurrence of the Parties, the Monitor and/or designated team members will either travel to Baltimore or participate in a telephone conferences with the BPD, community representatives, and the USDOJ to discuss progress under the Consent Decree, and other matters of mutual concern. As noted above, two members of the team are residents in the community and will be available for consultation as needed.

We expect to develop with Parties, a tiered dispute resolution protocol to identify any emerging issues regarding compliance to promote early resolution and thus save costs.⁸⁸

The ADP team is committed to transparency in all of its endeavors. We will file comprehensive semi-annual reports and post these reports on our website, detailing the status of progress made by the City and the BPD in a manner allowing all stakeholders to clearly understand. Each of these semi-annual reports will include a complete description of work conducted by the Monitor, methodology, and findings for compliance reviews (redacted as necessary for privacy concerns and legal compliance), methodology and findings for each Outcome Assessment conducted, projections for work to be completed during the next reporting period to include anticipated challenges or concerns, and the extent to which Decree requirements have been met, incorporated into policy, trained upon, reviewed or audited by the Monitor, all provisions of Technical Assistance and an appendix listing each paragraph requirement that has attained “Full and Effective Compliance,” is “In Progress,” or is “Not Started.”⁸⁹ The Parties will be provided a copy of these semi-annual reports at least 14 days prior to Court filing and public release to allow for comment. Early on we will develop report templates to promote efficient assembly, minimize

⁸⁶ RFA, ¶10

⁸⁷ Consent Decree ¶458

⁸⁸ Consent Decree ¶461(i)

⁸⁹ Consent Decree ¶471

costs, and allow for comparison across reports. The ADP team understands our requirement to post final reports, Party comments, and Monitor’s responses will be included on our website which, as noted above, will be designed to receive public feedback.⁹⁰

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST-RFA ¶39

As noted in Section III above, all team members have indicated that they can arrange current work commitments, and will limit future work commitments as needed to ensure they can fulfill their duties to this Monitoring Team. No conflicts of the types identified in paragraph 39 of the RFA, and no other potential or perceived conflicts, have been identified by any member of the team. All team members have read and understand the restrictions on representation or work on matters adverse to the City, or BPD or the United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, set forth in paragraph 479 of the Consent Decree All team members understand that they will be deemed to have read and understood the RFA and the Consent Decree and are willing to be bound thereby.

All ADP Team members have reviewed their personal situations to identify and disclose any potential or perceived conflicts⁹¹ of interest involving the individual member, associated firms, or organizations, and any employee(s) assigned to any project or proposed subcontractor(s). A description of current employment and time commitments for each member is included in the biographies in the section addressing RFA 34 above. These members acknowledge and disclose the following information:

Major (Ret.) Alfred Peters: Major Peters, representing ADP Consulting LLC, was principal in a former contract, completed in 2009 with the City of Baltimore, Office of Emergency Management, for the delivery of NIMS required Incident Command training for the Baltimore Fire Department and command members of the Baltimore Police Department.

Major Tapp-Harper: Major Tapp-Harper currently commands the Domestic Violence Unit of the Baltimore City Sheriff’s Office, where she oversees the service of protective orders. Major Tapp-Harper has sought a conflict review and has received that review conducted by the Assistant Attorney General. The review has determined no conflict exists, and that this would be considered secondary employment.

The ADP Team represents there are no existing conflicts or potential bias that could bar any individual or our team from selection, including the need for any legal or ethical opinions or waivers upon which our candidacy relies.⁹²

⁹⁰ Consent Decree ¶472

⁹¹ RFA, ¶39

⁹² RFA, ¶40



In summary, our team is well equipped to assume the specific responsibilities assigned to the monitor under paragraphs 442-488 of the Consent Decree. We are strong in law enforcement expertise, in community engagement, and in other areas that reflect advancements in the practice of monitoring. We are confident that, given the opportunity, we will serve the Parties to this Consent Decree, and the residents of Baltimore, the officers of the Baltimore Police Department, and other stakeholder groups, efficiently and effectively.

Respectfully Submitted,

A.D. Peters



Major Alfred D. Peters (Retired)

