

Community Engagement Plan

By: Germain Thompson

Community Liaison

Submitted 3/6/2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
II.	PREFACE	4
III.	HISTORY	4
IV.	INITIAL EFFORTS	6
V.	THE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN	11
	Component I: Community Outreach	11
	Component II: Community Education	12
	Information Sessions	13
	Component III: Community Feedback	14
	Organizing and Reporting the Feedback	15
	Component IV: Closing the Gap/Circling Back	16
	Monitor Involvement	16
VI.	MILESTONES AND TIMELINES	17

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nearly a decade has passed since a federal judge found that the New York City Police Department (“NYPD”) was liable for violating the constitutional rights of individuals with respect to certain policing practices and appointed a federal monitor (the “Monitor”) to oversee the remedial process. With the NYPD still not fully in compliance with the Court’s remedial order, the Monitor last year proposed an independent Community Liaison position to engage communities most affected by NYPD practices and to provide more opportunities for these impacted communities to be heard. “The mission of the Community Liaison will be to seek, receive, and organize concerns from community members and ensure that they are communicated to the Monitor.” *Floyd et al. v. City of New York et al.*, 08 Civ. 1034, ECF No. 888-1, at 2 (Aug. 25, 2022).

Germain Thompson was appointed as the Community Liaison in December 2022 and charged with creating a Community Engagement Plan (“CEP”) to accomplish these core goals. The initial CEP will evolve over time and is based on information gathered and efforts made to date.

This CEP begins with a *Preface* by the Community Liaison that reflects his commitment to build a team that knows and loves the City of New York and believes change is possible.

Following the *Preface* is a more detailed history of the litigation that has led us to the appointment of the Community Liaison. Next is a section on *Initial Efforts*, describing the Community Liaison’s efforts and work to date. This section illuminates the framework for the position, and includes a description of the team that has been assembled to form the Office of the Community Liaison (the “Office”).

These introductory sections lead to the heart of the *Community Engagement Plan*, which includes four components:

- Component I focuses on community **outreach**;
- Component II focuses on community **education** about the issues included in the remedial process;
- Component III describes the planned efforts to **seek, gather, and report** the views and concerns expressed by community members regarding the NYPD practices that are within the purview of the Monitorship; and
- Component IV calls for the Office to “**circle back**” and return to those who offered their views and recommendations to report on whether and how their feedback made a difference.

Finally, appended is a chart setting forth the goals, objectives, and deliverables of the CEP, including a timeline for the activities contemplated to accomplish these goals.

The Office wishes to acknowledge the support we have received from the Court, the Monitor Team, the parties, and community stakeholders as we have worked to design this plan to bring the voices of the community forward.

II. PREFACE

Community! Community! Community! We repeat that word so often so that people understand that we cannot make change without putting community first. Often we see elected officials, police officers, and other authorities coming into communities, directing them to change, telling them what they should be doing and how they should be acting, and saying what they believe communities want to hear. However, communities want those in power to listen, to hear their wants and needs, and to understand that people who live in the community are the experts in their own lives and know what is best for their community.

The Office of the Community Liaison’s plan is to “Bring Community Voices to the Forefront!” This is a slogan that was created with careful thought, intention, and commitment to put community voices first and elevate their lived experiences. Though we may not have answers to all of the challenges that plague Black and Brown communities, this is a start.

III. HISTORY

On August 12, 2013, a federal judge in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York found that the NYPD stop-and-frisk practices violated individuals’ rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. The Court ordered that the City engage in a remedial process to reform the NYPD’s unconstitutional practices (the “Remedial Order”).¹ The Monitor was appointed to oversee the NYPD’s progress implementing these reforms, which cover the constitutional violations in the lead case of *Floyd v. City of New York*, 08 Civ. 1034, as well as the constitutional violations in *Ligon v. City of New York*, 12 Civ. 2274, a class action lawsuit challenging the NYPD’s practice of conducting stops in and around private buildings, and *Davis v. City of New York*, 10 Civ. 699, a class action lawsuit that challenged the race-based enforcement of trespass laws in New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) buildings.

On July 29, 2021, the plaintiffs in the *Floyd* and *Davis* cases requested that the Court modify the Remedial Order to, among other things, appoint a “Community Collaborative Board” that would oversee the remedial process, have the Monitor conduct annual community surveys and semiannual field audits of stop-and-frisk activity, and have the Court hold public status conferences at least twice a year. While that motion was pending, the Monitor submitted a proposal for a community liaison position intended to engage the communities most affected by the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk practices and provide more opportunities for those communities to be heard. Representatives from the parties, the City, and the Monitor Team reviewed applications for the position, interviewed candidates, and recommended candidates to the Monitor and the Court. On December 16, 2022, after interviewing the finalists, the Court appointed Germain Thompson as the independent Community Liaison. On March 28, 2023, the Court denied the plaintiffs’ motion.

¹ For more information about this decision, visit www.nypdmonitor.org/about. The Remedial Order is available at www.nypdmonitor.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/01-Floyd-Remedy-Opinion-8-12-13.pdf.

The Community Liaison's role is limited in scope. The Community Liaison is responsible for gathering information from impacted community members and informing the Monitor and the Court of those perspectives so that they can better assess the City's and the NYPD's compliance with the Court-ordered remedial measures. Notably, the Community Liaison's role does not include investigating allegations of misconduct by the NYPD; such allegations, if brought to the attention of the Community Liaison, will be referred to the agencies responsible for investigating such allegations.

With the appointment of Germain Thompson on December 16, 2022, the Court formally adopted the Community Engagement Liaison Framework, and directed the Community Liaison to undertake the role and carry out the functions set forth in the Framework, that provides as follows:

The mission of the Community Liaison will be to seek, receive, and organize concerns from community members and ensure that they are communicated to the Monitor. A key purpose of community engagement is to make impacted community members' perspectives known to the Monitor and to ensure that the Monitor meaningfully considers and incorporates such perspectives in its assessment of the City's ultimate compliance. For example, when impacted community members believe that the Department's policies and practices have not accomplished the reforms required by the Court's orders or community members have recommendations for how those policies and practices should be revised, the Community Liaison can communicate those perspectives and recommendations to the Monitor. In this way, the Monitor may incorporate the community's ideas and perspectives into recommendations for Department policies and practices and in assessing the City's compliance with the remedial order. To further collaboration and communication, recommendations for Department policies and practices proposed by the Community Liaison will be shared with the Parties, so that the Parties can comment on and discuss them. The Monitor will also weigh the experiences and perspectives of community members in compliance reviews and assessments. The collective voices of community members can provide context to the Monitor's assessments and potentially identify issues or pathways that need further examination.

Floyd et al. v. City of New York et al., 08 Civ. 1034, ECF No. 888-1, at 2 (Aug. 25, 2022).

IV. INITIAL EFFORTS

Since his appointment, the Community Liaison has focused on the essential duties of his role as set forth in the job posting for the position:

- Developing a CEP that will be shared with the Monitor and the parties;
- Conducting outreach and increase community engagement by offering community members greater access to information and more opportunities to be heard regarding the NYPD's Stop, Question, and Frisk ("SQF") policing and trespass enforcement practices and the Monitorship;
- Hearing the concerns of City residents about the NYPD's SQF policing and trespass enforcement practices, including about racial bias in street encounters and trespass enforcement, assessing them, and communicating them to the Monitor;
- Engaging community organizations, community leaders, youth, and other stakeholders in the reform process by developing opportunities for dialogue; and
- Implementing online and offline strategies to collect feedback, recommendations, and input from community members most impacted by NYPD's said policing/practices in street encounters and trespass enforcement and the reforms implemented as part of the Remedial Order.

The first function listed—to develop a CEP—has been progressing over the course of this year as the Community Liaison has taken steps to establish the Office. The CEP has evolved as the Office has grown and has increased outreach efforts and will likely continue to evolve based on input from the Monitor, the parties, stakeholders, and staff, but much has already been accomplished that sets the stage for the Plan. Activities performed to date, as well as projected activities, are included in the appended chart that sets forth the goals, objectives, deliverables and timeline.

As is clear from the Community Engagement Liaison Framework (page 5) and as described further in this CEP, the core mission of the Community Liaison is to “seek, receive, and organize concerns from community members.”

To accomplish this, we have been focused on establishing the Office and developing the CEP based on two key goals that drive the Plan's defined objectives, deliverables and timeline:

- ***Ensure that community members affected by SQF and trespass enforcement are aware of the Monitorship and of their rights and opportunities to have their voices heard and that the Monitor meaningfully considers community concerns, perspectives and recommendations;***
- ***Ensure that the Monitor incorporates the community's ideas and perspectives into recommendations for NYPD policies and practices and in assessing the City's compliance with the Remedial Order.***

The Court-appointed Community Liaison, Germain Thompson, an experienced community organizer, with the support of Liz Gaynes, a longtime leader in the nonprofit criminal

justice field, recognized that soliciting, organizing and reporting feedback from people affected by NYPD's SQF and trespass enforcement practices would require more than one individual. They embarked on an analysis of the likely neighborhoods where community engagement efforts would be most critical, to determine the size and experience of staff needed to accomplish the Community Liaison's goals. Using maps of the City's NYCHA developments, police precincts, City Council districts, and Monitor data on the locations of street-level interactions, they identified key neighborhoods and groups from which they would seek and receive input. They also gathered information from known organizations, including members of Communities United for Police Reform, a coalition of groups that have supported efforts to address excessive and racially discriminatory police practices from the beginning of the litigation as well as parties' attorneys. Germain drew on his experience as an organizer at the Legal Aid Society, which included extensive contact with the City's Crisis Management System as well other grassroots, service and advocacy organizations involved in police reform efforts, and Liz added her knowledge and relationships with nonprofit and government agencies across the City. This led to the development of an internal shared spreadsheet of dozens of organizations, coalitions, and leaders of grassroots, neighborhood and faith-based groups.

By mapping the overlap of neighborhoods where NYPD activity is greatest with precincts, City Council districts, probation/parole offices, school districts, community boards, NYCHA developments, CUNY campuses as well as the groups identified for the spreadsheet, we were able to estimate the extent of outreach and interaction needed to reach those most impacted by SQF and trespass enforcement, and determine the staffing and resources needed to meet the goals of community engagement. A key determinant was the recognition that it was important to target impacted people whose concerns are not always heard by those in positions to change the policies and conditions that affect them, including youth, migrants, residents of homeless encampments and residential programs (shelters, transitional/reentry housing, dormitories), the LGBTQ+ community, and those with prior experience with the criminal legal system, in neighborhoods where significant street-level stops (and certain vehicle stops) have been reported.

In addition to the activities targeted in the *Floyd* litigation, the *Davis* and *Ligon* cases focused on policing within NYC's public housing and private multi-family dwellings. While there are more than 300 NYCHA developments, with the vast majority of residents being Black and Latinx, it would not be possible to reach them all even under the best of circumstances. Therefore, the Office will focus its resources on those communities and housing developments where publicly available data and the team's personal experience suggests the greatest NYPD activity. At the same time, we know that New Yorkers are mobile and often live in one neighborhood and travel to other parts of the City for work or leisure, potentially requiring a broader geographic plan and a large number of meetings in a wide variety of communities and settings.

Based on the information gathered through the mapping exercise, the Community Liaison developed a proposed budget and staffing plan for the Office, ultimately approved by the Court and the City, that included a Senior Community Organizer and three Community Organizers who would be deployed to:

Community Engagement Plan
Last Updated: March 6, 2024

- Attend existing meetings and events in an effort to build toward more targeted meetings;
- Organize and facilitate meetings with groups of people who are most likely to have been affected by, or have knowledge of, policing in their communities;
- Solicit feedback on specific topics that are within the scope of the Monitorship, including recommendations;
- Distribute information on resources that would be appropriate for concerns raised that are not within the scope of the Monitorship;
- Relay to the Community Liaison the results of the engagements for reporting and for informing future planning and actions by the Office;
- Support surveys or other means to reach people who are not attending workshops (information and feedback sessions); and
- Maintain relationships with community groups and provide follow-up information.

The staffing plan also includes an Administrative Assistant to support the team, including setting up the meetings and engagements, receiving the information to be organized for reporting, submitting expense reports and invoices, and managing the business functions of the Office. Additionally, the team includes a part-time Social Media Specialist to ensure that community outreach information is shared on multiple platforms on a regular basis, distributing information on feedback opportunities via social media and email blasts for organizations, public officials, and students to ensure that the affected public is aware of the Monitorship, the settlement, and the opportunities to express their views, concerns, and recommendations about NYPD's compliance.

Utilizing the outreach capacity of the Monitorship website and of relevant organizations, the Community Liaison created job postings for the approved staff positions and began a recruiting effort. Following an extensive interview process led by Germain Thompson with support from Liz Gaynes and Jane Perlov from the Monitor Team, all positions were filled by May 2023. Staff were selected based on their backgrounds, including trusting relationships with the communities most affected by SQF, familiarity with issues related to policing and police reform, cultural competence, experience with public housing and/or the criminal legal system, and demonstrated communication, facilitation, and organizing skills.

The team assembled includes:

- Community Liaison Germain Thompson holds a Certificate as a Paralegal from Pace University, and prior to his appointment as Community Liaison, was a community organizer at the Legal Aid Society for nearly a decade. He is the founder of Take It To the Court Foundation, a nonprofit that organizes basketball tournaments to raise awareness about violence and develop skills and talents of the youth and young adults who participate.
- Senior Community Organizer Tatiana Hill holds a BA in political science from SUNY Purchase, and has a background in labor organizing as well as community grassroots organizing with VOCAL NY and the Women's Criminal Justice Association, and has served as a staffer for State Senator Jabari Brisport.
- Community Organizer Josmar Trujillo has a BA in Sociology from Queens College and has served on campaigns and organized public forums and meetings related to policing

and schools, utilizing his skills as a video producer, columnist, blogger, and has managed press relations, social media and newsletters.

- Administrative Assistant Ruth Etienne holds a BS degree in Psychology from Touro College, has worked in the nonprofit sector as a counselor, manager, and internal auditor/investigator for people with Developmental Disabilities, and was most recently employed in a hospital setting providing operations support to various departments.
- Social Media Specialist Erica Jones has a BS degree in Psychology and three years' experience in social media marketing and management, with the goal of creating impactful social media strategies that not only engage but promote social change.
- Consultant Elizabeth Gaynes is a Senior Fellow at the New York Women's Foundation, and President Emerita of the Osborne Association, a nonprofit criminal justice service and advocacy organization, following her early career as a criminal defense and prisoners' rights attorney. She holds a JD from Syracuse University College of Law.

Throughout the process of establishing the Office, including setting up fiscal and management guidelines, ordering equipment and supplies, and building out the CEP, the Community Liaison and his team have met regularly with the Monitor (bi-weekly), the parties' attorneys, NYPD, and the Law Department, to share updates and gather information from the Monitor Team and the parties about their hopes and expectations for the Office and the CEP. In addition, team members have received supplemental training from the parties, the Monitor Team, and other consultants on the history of the litigation and the Monitorship, previous Joint Remedial Process efforts under the leadership of Judge Ariel Belen, and current issues in policing and NYPD. Office staff also received training on working with the media and understanding applied research.

From the beginning of his tenure, the Community Liaison organized meetings with the groups known to him from Communities United for Police Reform (CPR) and anti-gun violence groups across the City² to gather information regarding their knowledge of the Monitorship and their interest in providing feedback about current experience of SQF among their staff and participants. Despite a lack of knowledge about the current state of SQF and the Monitorship among many groups, all organizations contacted were eager to participate in the Office's efforts.

By June 2023, with the team in place, outreach activities expanded to additional sites and people, including tenant organizations, City Council members/staff, public officials and community organizations. The Organizers are being deployed by borough, based on their specific knowledge and connections (Tatiana in Brooklyn, Ameratu in Manhattan, Wilfredo in the Bronx, Josmar in Queens, and Germain in Staten Island), with flexible approaches for citywide organizations and NYCHA developments. The Administrative Assistant tracks all outreach meetings and continues expanding the list of organizations that have been and will be contacted and hopefully engaged, while the Social Media Specialist prepares to focus on a communications plan to publicize the Office's work, meetings, and events.

² These initial groups included, among others: ManUp!, B.R.A.G, Red Hook Initiative, Community Capacity Development, Life Camp, BIVO, KAVI, SOS, and the Tayshana Chicken Murphy Foundation.

V. THE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

An important function of the Community Liaison was to develop the CEP. This plan has already gone through several iterations to reflect feedback from the Monitor and the parties and will continue to evolve as the work progresses. However, it will remain true to the established Framework, while incorporating new information.

The CEP consists of four distinct but interacting components. Each component functions both independently and contemporaneously with the other components. Each will serve to inform the other, ensuring real-time feedback and adjustments where necessary to fulfill the Community Liaison's goals and objectives as previously described in the Community Liaison job description (see page 7).

- Component I is Community Outreach, aimed at organizations, groups, and individuals/influencers.
- Component II includes Community Education, primarily through workshops titled information sessions.
- Component III focuses on Community Feedback gathered through feedback sessions, which include workshops, community meetings, or individual conversations designed to gather stories and lived experiences, and may include events, polls, and/or surveys.
- Component IV is Closing the Gap/Circling Back, ensuring that the Office returns to the people, communities, and groups previously visited to provide updates and to promote follow-up and continued engagement.³

Component I: Community Outreach

The primary goals of this component is to identify potential organizations, groups and individuals who may contribute their experiences and perspectives toward SQF, and introduce the Community Liaison and the Office for the purpose of setting up further mee Community outreach is vital to the success of the CEP. Not all members of communities are open to speaking about their experiences (whether negative, positive, or neutral) to those whom they do not know. Thus, building relationships helps to bridge that gap, allowing for genuine conversations with those most directly impacted by SQF and trespass enforcement. To do so, the Office has focused on the analysis of communities directly affected and the organizations working with them, as well as direct outreach to local leaders whom the people trust and respect.

Many of the groups that serve or advocate on behalf of these communities have pre-existing connections to one or more of the Office team members. This allows the team to introduce the community engagement process and the role that community groups will have in it to numerous groups, enabling these partners to encourage participation from their members and general members of the community. Outreach will, over time, expand to new individuals and

³ Components are not linear; for example, community outreach will continue to occur even while the team may be conducting surveys. Or, in conducting information sessions, the team may learn information that may require rethinking survey methodology or additional community outreach. Each component is not meant to function in a silo or proceed in linear fashion.

groups, many of whom will be brought to the table through these existing relationships and community events that will be attended or sponsored by the Office.

The Community Liaison team is discussing strategies to reach new organizations by relevance to each case (*Davis, Floyd, and Ligon.*) The team has begun by attending Tenant Association (TA) meetings, criminal justice and political events, religious events, and neighborhood events to build relationships with community members and organizations. The Liaison team is also working with the NYPD's Community Affairs Bureau, regularly attending their events, Community CompStat meetings, and other NYPD-sponsored meetings to build relationships with attendees and participants, in addition to working with parties' counsel to engage their community stakeholders and attend related events.

We understand multiple attempts at outreach may be required before we get sufficient participation in the activities described in Components Two and Three, but we are hoping that by being a regular presence in the community and having a familiar face, and/or an introduction from a trusted source, community members will talk with us on their own terms. Just showing up in a community or NYCHA development one time, or fielding a survey, or going to one meeting, is not enough, as we know people need to feel us out and decide what and how much they are willing to disclose. Community members may also feel uncomfortable around us because of previous experiences with government or nonprofit service providers, or concerns that we are going to bring (more) police presence to their neighborhood. Therefore, we must go into these situations with an understanding that community members may, understandably, be cautious and suspicious, since—despite the diversity and community roots of the team—we are an outside entity coming into their neighborhood.

This is part of why the community outreach strategy (as well as the Community Education component, below) includes distributing informational pamphlets—both in person and online—about the Federal Monitorship of the NYPD and the role of the Community Liaison. Materials are being designed for use during all phases of the work, with an emphasis on building an online presence through social media. This is important for getting the word out about ways for the community to get involved. These materials are also important to incentivize attendance at workshops, meetings or events. (Drafts of all pamphlets and branded materials will be or have been shared with the Monitor's team and parties for feedback before being provided to the public. Materials will also be translated into Spanish and possibly other languages.)

We want to emphasize that this project must be collaborative and interactive, and in order for it to be successful, this must be a shared effort between community stakeholders and the Office. The community is going to be educating us as much as we are educating them, so we hope to break the ice with these conversations so that community members are open to further involvement in workshops and events that comprise the following components of the work.

Component II: Community Education

Component II builds on the outreach efforts and ensures that the public knows who we are and why we are here. This is consistent with the stated role of the Community Liaison to “conduct outreach and increase community engagement *by offering community members greater*

access to information and more opportunities to be heard regarding the NYPD’s stop, question and frisk policing and trespass enforcement practices and the Monitorship” (emphasis added). This requires everyone (the Community Liaison, the Monitor Team, the parties, and community stakeholders) to be aligned on the purpose and promise of the Office. To that end, community education builds community trust and paves the way to receiving the information and recommendations that will come from the feedback sessions (Component III, below).

As stated above, community education goes both ways: as the team’s approach leads to a greater understanding of SQF, Trespass Enforcement, and the Monitorship by the public, the public can help the team gain knowledge and understanding of the public’s views and ideas, and how best to structure interactions to get the most feedback.

Information Sessions

The need for education about the Monitorship (and the litigation that led to it) was immediately clear as the Community Liaison and consultant began their initial outreach. In order to get the kind of feedback needed by the Monitor, community members need more education about SQF and the Monitorship, so the team has been building out the format for information sessions. These workshops—advertised as “Info Sessions”—include flyers, power points, videos, and other communication methods that provide both background information and resources. The knowledge that can be gained through community education is key to realizing the goal of “more opportunities to be heard.”

By holding workshops and community conversations detailing the “who, what, how, where, when and why” of the Monitorship, as well as information about the history, goals, and activities of Office, we hope to engender willingness for further interaction. In any event, it will be useful for community members to learn about the three cases that resulted in the Monitorship; SQF and trespass enforcement; and the different levels of legally cognizable police encounters.⁴

It is critical that these information sessions are held in places that are accessible and at locations known to the community. We will endeavor to provide accommodations to the best of our ability so that as many people can participate as possible. This may include doing some of these sessions on Zoom for people who cannot, for whatever reason, attend an event in person; or it may include providing food or incentives for those who attend to show appreciation for giving us their time.

There will be some variations based on the audience. For example, information sessions for people in NYCHA developments will depend on both working with tenant associations as well as local grassroots organizations and human services agencies that are within close proximity to the residences, and may focus more on trespass enforcement. Because the *Davis*

⁴ The Office is not hosting “Know Your Rights” workshops, although many groups have offered or sponsored such programs. Such a workshop may be a recommendation by the Community Liaison to the Court after speaking with community members, but the CEP does not purport to provide legal advice or education regarding the legality of and/or structure around SQF. However, information sessions will include some basic information regarding the different levels of police encounters in order to best obtain community stories that will inform other components of the CEP.

parties' attorneys are already conducting meetings or roundtables, the Community Liaison will coordinate activities with them.

For heavily policed neighborhoods that were the focus of the *Floyd* litigation, the outreach will be more focused on working through local groups, organizations and agencies that operate in these communities. Many grassroots groups as well as nonprofit service organizations (including those funded by the NYC Department of Probation, Department of Youth and Community Development, Department of Homeless Services, and Administration for Children's Services) will have both staff and participants who have important perspectives to share.

Component III: Community Feedback

This Component will gather feedback using multiple mechanisms, including individual and group discussions, polling, or surveys, and other potential feedback loops to enable the information, concerns and recommendations received to be organized and reported to the Monitor. The Office consists of experienced organizers and community representatives who are aware that people have a broad range of feelings and experiences, and we want to gather as much information as possible to better inform our work. For example, we expect to hear and document:

- How many encounters community members are experiencing;
- The character of the encounters (context, demographics, etc.);
- Community members' opinions about the number and character of encounters;
- Community members' ideas on the NYPD's SQF policing; and
- Community members' opinions about solutions to any problems that they have surfaced.

The format for the feedback sessions is being designed, understanding that there may be resistance or skepticism about the request for information, and that the format may need to be somewhat different based on the differences among the groups through which we would be working, whether grassroots advocacy groups, youth-serving organizations, high schools and community colleges, or the larger human services sector. We hope to offset reluctance to trust our process by having previously offered information sessions as well as social media publicizing the role of the Community Liaison and the Monitorship. Residents of buildings that are the focus of the *Davis* and *Ligon* cases may be more amenable to surveys and individual opportunities for engagement.

Through both information sessions and feedback sessions (and workshops or meetings that combine giving and receiving information about SQF and trespass enforcement), we expect to learn when encounters are happening, the context of the situation, the frequency and demographics of who is experiencing SQF and/or trespass enforcement, and whether community members believe the encounters are being conducted fairly and/or without racial bias, according to the guidelines we will have shared. While we are not asking people if the stop they experienced was "constitutional," we want to obtain sufficient details to enable the Community Liaison to report to the Monitor and the Court, and enable them to determine whether NYPD has made the required changes and reforms or if other changes or reforms are necessary. We hope to learn whether community members believe that policing practices related to SQF and trespass

enforcement have changed in the ten years of the Monitorship and if their experience of these practices has improved. *See Davis*, 10 Civ. 699, ECF No. 624-1 (Amended Compliance Matrix).

Because not everyone is comfortable or available to share their experiences in an open or group setting, we are also investigating methods for fielding surveys or polls, or other methods of online or direct contact, including door knocking, street canvassing, tabling at events, etc. to engage members of the community who do not participate in other groups or events. Our intention is to reach as many people as possible, and our experience thus far suggests that we will be able to build on the trust that exists between community members and trusted organizations and community groups; tenant association presidents and officers; community organizers; and leaders who already know members of the Office to encourage people to meet with us. The Office will try a variety of efforts to hear as many different experiences and opinions as possible.

Organizing and Reporting the Feedback

Regardless of the willingness of community members to share their concerns, ideas, and recommendations, the value of this feedback depends on our ability to record and organize the information. This requires both a clear set of “questions” and a data collection system capable of recording the answers and sharing them with the Monitor.

The Community Liaison is working with the Office team and advisors to assist in the identification of the most significant questions/topics to be covered (whether in a feedback session, poll or survey). We hope to gather both participants’ demographic information (e.g. age, race, zip code) as well as details of their experiences relevant to the Monitorship. We recognize that the information they share is only useful to the extent it is recorded and reported to the Monitor. The Office organizers are equipped with iPads to record meetings when participants allow, or to take notes during or following meetings. However, to organize the information in a way that is useful to the Monitor requires a data collection system that is aligned with the methods and efforts of the Office team. The Community Liaison, Administrative Assistant, and consultant Gaynes have been reviewing data collection and reporting instruments, and will work with an IT expert to design data collection and reporting instruments that are flexible and enable the team to capture information provided during each meeting, including time and place of the meeting, topics discussed, number of people in attendance and their demographics, and feedback provided, along with information about when to follow up and with whom. In preparing for these meetings, the team will design presentations for varied audiences that may differ based on age, history of justice-involvement, gender, language, etc.

While not all feedback will come from the feedback sessions—the primary method for gathering information—other approaches including surveys have not yet been solidified. While some stakeholders have encouraged us to field a large survey that reflects a multi-year research effort, our primary approach has focused more on direct community engagement. Nonetheless, we have spoken with a variety of experts in applied research, polling, and surveys, at academic and other institutions, to gather information on possible approaches to including a survey (alone or as part of feedback sessions), and are engaging with experts on ways of organizing information received through all sources. This is an evolving process due to the wide variety of possible approaches for gathering feedback, and a dearth of community input at this point.

Specifically, given the CEP's heavy focus on community engagement and input, it is the Community Liaison's recommendation that any surveys issued be informed by initial community meetings and feedback and then developed in a way that community members can understand and relate to, and ensure the most accurate entries available.

The Community Liaison plans to ensure that the questions posed—whether in meetings or surveys, in person or online—reflect and address the issues faced by the community that are specific and timely with respect to the focus of the Monitor, and that delve into the root issues meant to be addressed by the Monitorship. Details regarding the methodologies to be used will be updated as we progress through the CEP, and will be shared with the Monitor and the parties.

Component IV: Closing the Gap/Circling Back

The final component of community engagement includes going back to the people and groups with whom we have met previously to update them on where we are in the process, using multiple strategies to provide information to those who shared their experiences about how their feedback was utilized. (These return visits and events also offer opportunities to engage new people.)

Many times, well-meaning people (including researchers, candidates, elected officials, government agencies—and organizers) go into neighborhoods, get the information they need, and leave, never to return to thank the community members who helped them complete their project or answered their questions, or to offer updates on the recommendations that were developed or rejected based on the initial feedback. We do not want to do that, so this component of work requires the Office to go back to the groups, leaders, individuals, and others who helped us with this project to thank them for their assistance and support and to continue to engage with them in the process. We will use this time to inform them about progress to that point, current activity, goals for the future, and anticipated outcomes as we continue to listen for and collect new information or recommendations based on the experiences of communities that have experienced NYPD SQF and trespass enforcement. We are committed to this part of the engagement process because maintaining relationships and retaining trust will be jeopardized if we seem to have forgotten the community members whose participation makes the work possible. We recognize that without the help of community members, it is not possible to do this job, and so it is imperative that we keep them involved in the process.

Monitor Involvement

An important part of this component is having the members of the Monitor Team attend or participate in some community meetings so the people with whom we have spoken can actually see and meet the people who have received the information and data collected, to hear how it is being utilized, and to learn about any follow up recommendations. At this point, many would know the Office, but it is important for them to see who receives the information we collect from the community. Therefore, this component will be a combined effort between the Community Liaison team and the Monitor Team to acknowledge those who have participated in sharing experiences and making recommendations, to answer any questions they may have, and provide updates as well as they can at that time. We will use multiple strategies, addressing both

people who have already participated in Information Sessions and/or Feedback Sessions, as well as new community members who are just learning about the Monitorship and interested in learning more. These events will include community forums, Zoom updates, podcasts, and other opportunities to sustain community engagement in this effort.

It is important to emphasize that this CEP is a living document, and the timeline that follows offers a framework for measuring the progress of the Office. In addition to the quarterly reports that will provide updates and progress on the deliverables, the Community Liaison and his team will continue to meet regularly with the parties and the Monitor Team to share challenges and solicit ongoing feedback on the plan and its evolution.

VI. MILESTONES AND TIMELINES

To measure progress of the CEP, we have attached a chart dividing each component into objectives and tasks, and setting forth a timeline to complete those tasks. The components, objectives, and tasks were developed to accomplish the core goals set forth in the CEP.

Because it is not known how long the Office—or the Monitorship—will exist, the timeline will be an ongoing process and a useful way to take stock of what work has been done to date and what work will be done in the next six months. The Community Liaison will submit quarterly reports, with updates and on the progress of these goals and objectives, to the Court following the end of the quarter, starting with Q4.