



Unanswered Questions

If the SAO would have lived up to their promises, we would have asked the following questions:

Q1: Why were there so many tables missing between what they turned over to us through Discovery and the FOIA data?

Facts

# of tables in FOIA data but not discovery data:	87
# of tables in discovery data but not FOIA data:	84
The total number of tables missing b/t datasets:	171

Q2: Why are there so many empty tables in the FOIA data?

Facts

# of Tables in FOIA data that are empty:	112
--	------------

Q3: Why are there so many empty fields in the FOIA data?

Facts

# of empty fields in FOIA data:	2,195
---------------------------------	--------------

Q4: The SAO told us their Crimes database contains 7,000 fields but they only turned over 5,220 fields through FOIA. Why are they withholding 1,780 or 34% of the fields?

Facts

The SAO never responded to our efforts to engage the office to find out why so many of the fields they turned over were empty.

Q5: Of the 5,220 fields in the FOIA data 2,195 or 42% are empty, why?

Facts

Hon. Judge Peter Flynn ordered the both parties to work together so that we could determine what fields should be withheld for privacy and what fields could be opened. He stated his desire that this litigation would result in an agreement that would prevent any need for future litigation. In court, both parties signed on to work together to figure out an agreement that would prevent future litigation. One aspect of that was ongoing engagement by the SAO to honor the agreement and answer inquiries about the data they are turning over. This never happened.

Q6: The SAO failed to turn over a data dictionary for the multi-million-dollar CRIMES database stating: "They don't possess one."

Facts

This is the same answer we received for years to our requests seeking copies of training

documents. The SAO responded over and over again that they did not possess a single training document. Then suddenly in 2020 they miraculously located a 90-page training manual. No such miraculous discovery has yet produced the data dictionary.

Q7: Why did the SAO's office turn over data in a proprietary format ultimately violating the Illinois Freedom of Information Act?

Facts

The SAO tells us their multi-million-dollar CRIMES database doesn't export data in any other format despite this being contrary to the very essence of databases.

Q8: Why is the SAO telling us it is too hard to pull data from their database when this completely contradicts what the data technicians and employees - still working at the SAO told us in the final settlement conference as we were ironing out the agreement?

Facts

In the final settlement conference where the agreement was reached, data employees at the SAO's office told us that while the initial pull of data would take some time to create, to code subsequent data pulls would be very easy and would not be burdensome at all.

Q9: Why is the SAO telling us there is no evidence of any such agreement being reached between their Office and CJP yet they admit they have never spoken to the two people from their data office who were in the meeting?

Facts

They have repeatedly told us there is no evidence of any settlement agreement being reached between us and their Office but they also admit to never speaking to the two people from their data office who are still employed by the Office and worked with CJP. For this to be true, the SAO's Director of Policy, Research, and Development, SAO's Freedom of Information Officer, and the lawyer handling the case (all three attended and participated in the final settlement conference) would all have to be negligent in their duties and did not make a single note about why the case was resolved.

Q10: When we requested felony prosecution data from 1990-2010 why did the Office lie to us and state they did not possess the data?

Facts

In pre-litigation discussions, the SAO originally told us they did not possess the data and that it was now in the custody of the Cook County Bureau of Technology. When we told the SAO we would seek it from the Bureau, they came back to us and told us they did in fact possess the data as it was imported into the CRIMES database before the transfer of computer equipment took place.

Chicago Justice Project

105 W. Madison St., Suite 1500 Chicago, IL 60602

Ph. (312) 971-6745

www.chicagojustice.org

www.cpbinfocenter.org

info@chicagojustice.org