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[Handwritten note:]

She had already made arrangements with...
**Archdiocese of Chicago Priest Vitae Card**

William Lewis Lupo  
Born:  
Ordained: 04/29/1965  
Died:  
Ethnicity:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Help of Christians Parish (Leclaire Ave.)</td>
<td>Assistant Pastor</td>
<td>06/30/1965</td>
<td>06/08/1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Mother of the Church Parish (Lawrence Ave.)</td>
<td>Assistant Pastor</td>
<td>06/08/1972</td>
<td>06/11/1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Parish (Des Plaines)</td>
<td>Associate Pastor</td>
<td>06/11/1979</td>
<td>06/10/1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Wayside Parish (Arlington Heights)</td>
<td>Associate Pastor</td>
<td>06/10/1986</td>
<td>07/01/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter Damian Parish (Bartlett)</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>07/01/1990</td>
<td>06/27/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Leave</td>
<td>06/27/2002</td>
<td>07/17/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>07/17/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraordinary Appointments:
William L. Lupo
ordained a priest
April 29, 1965
The one thing I
always thought I
was pretty good
at was loving.

Please pray for me
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2001

TERM ENDS IN 2002

Excerpt: Diocesan Priests’ Placement Board, 00000000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wants an extension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2001

TERM ENDS IN 2002

Excerpt: Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, 00/000000

AOC 017185
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 01</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2002

TERM ENDS IN 2001
TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/ YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2/9/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63 Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/YR 70</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 Wants an extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/ YR 70</td>
<td>AGE IN 02</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 02</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 01</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2001

TERM ENDS IN 2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/I</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 02</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2001

TERM ENDS IN 2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wants an extension
### TERM ENDS IN 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1/8 | 07/01/90 | William L. Lupo '65 | St. Peter Damian | 2
|     |          |                 |          |      |           |            |               |

63 Wants an extension
Accused priest still in rectory

BY SUE TER MAAT

Parishioners at St. Peter Damian church in Bartlett learned recently that the church’s former pastor, who resigned in June amid allegations of sexual misconduct, is still living on church property.

At a special meeting with the Chicago Archdiocese at St. Peter Damian this week, it was revealed Rev. William Lupo has been living in the church rectory, a residential building next to the church on Crest Avenue.

Some parishioners who attended the meeting were under the impression that when Lupo resigned, he had also left Bartlett. Lupo’s departure as pastor was sudden — announced during a June Mass by an auxiliary bishop. Lupo then sent a letter to parishioners, denying the sexual misconduct allegations and explaining his decision to resign for health reasons.

It was unclear if Lupo had contact with any of his former parishioners, something the archdiocese prohibits. But rumors of his presence at the church were brought forward during last week’s meeting.

“When people found out, they were surprised,” said John Kavouris, a St. Peter Damian parishioner and a Bartlett village trustee. “They thought he had left immediately. They did not know about the arrangement. It surprised some people because they assumed he had moved out.”

Lupo is in the process of moving to another home, said Dennis Kowalski, St. Peter Damian’s business manager. Kowalski didn’t know whether Lupo is living in the rectory full time or living somewhere else and slowly bringing over his belongings.

The Chicago Archdiocese has not given Lupo a timetable for his departure, although it has been made clear to Lupo he can’t stay permanently, said Jim Dwyer, a Chicago Archdiocese spokesman.

The archdiocese did not formally inform the congregation because it didn’t see the need to do so, Dwyer said. It was assumed by the archdiocese that Lupo, who spent the last 12 years at St. Peter Damian, would be given some time to find another home, he said.

“We are trying to emphasize the more responsible thing, which is not to just toss someone out on the street unprepared,” Dwyer said.

The information came to light when about 100 St. Peter Damian parishioners attended a meeting, set up by the archdiocese, to ask what qualities church members wanted in Lupo’s replacement. The Priest Placement Board will create a profile based partly on the comments made by the parishioners, according to church officials.

Rev. John Clemens, who was heading the meeting, said Lupo was in the process of moving out. Kavouris said Clemens told them that finding Lupo’s replacement will take about three months. Kavouris said. The Rev. J.C. Murray, a retired priest sent from the Chicago Archdiocese, has taken over services until a permanent replacement is found, Kowalski said.

Lupo was one of eight priests who resigned or were removed in June because of allegations of sexual misconduct.

When the allegations against Lupo surfaced in the early 1990s, he was already serving at St. Peter Damian, having come to the parish in July 1990. More than one teenage girl alleged sexual misconduct by Lupo while he was serving at St. Mary Church in Des Plaines between 1979 and 1986, said Mary McDonough, an archdiocese spokeswoman.

Lupo’s predecessor at St. Peter Damian, the Rev. James Ray, was removed in June from his job as assistant liaison in the Chicago Archdiocese Office of Health and Hospital Affairs after allegations against him. Those allegations surfaced in 1991 when he was ministering at a church in Lake County. A man told the archdiocese that when he was a minor and Ray was a priest at St. Peter Damian, Ray sexually abused him. Ray served at St. Peter Damian from 1984 to 1989, McDonough said.

See PRIEST on PAGE 14
June 14, 1965

My dear Father Lupo:

I hereby appoint you assistant to the pastor of Our Lady Help of Christians Church, Chicago, Illinois.

You will kindly report for duty on Wednesday, June 30, to Monsignor Kelly, the pastor.

Wishing you every blessing in this, your first appointment, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Cletus F. O'Donnell
Administrator

Reverend William L. Lupo
6926 N. Osceola Avenue
Chicago 31 Illinois
Reverend William L. Lupo  
Our Lady Help of Christians parish  
832 N. LeClaire  
Chicago, Illinois 60651

Dear Father Lupo,

It gives me great pleasure to appoint you as Vicarius Cooperator to the Reverend Peter F. Hayes, Pastor of Our Lady Mother of the Church parish, 8747 W. Lawrence Ave., Chicago, Illinois and to grant you the necessary faculties for the faithful discharge of that duty (Canon 476, 3).

This appointment is effective immediately, but I would ask you to make arrangements with the Pastor about the exact date when you will assume your new duties.

Wishing you every blessing and priestly success in this pastoral assignment, I remain, dear Father Lupo,

Very truly yours in Christ,

Archbishop of Chicago

Vice Chancellor

cc: Reverend Peter F. Hayes  
Reverend Patrick J. O'Malley  
Edward F. Kelly
June 8, 1972

Reverend Peter F. Hayes
Pastor, Our Lady Mother of the Church
8747 W. Lawrence Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60656

Dear Father Hayes,

I wish to inform you that, in conformity with Canon 476, § 3, I have assigned the Reverend William L. Lupo as Vicarius Cooperator at Our Lady Mother of the Church parish, Chicago, Illinois.

I commend him to you and your good people.

With every sincere personal good wish, I remain, dear Father Hayes,

Very truly yours in Christ,

Archbishop of Chicago

cc: Reverend William L. Lupo
Reverend William L. Lupo
Our Lady Mother of the Church Rectory
8747 W. Lawrence
Chicago, Illinois 60656

Dear Father Lupo:

In accordance with Canon 476, and following the recommendation of the Diocesan Clergy Personnel Board, His Eminence, John Cardinal Cody, is pleased to appoint you as Associate Pastor to the Reverend Martin W. Farrell, Pastor, St. Mary Parish, Des Plaines, Illinois.

This appointment is effective June 11, 1979, but I would ask you to make arrangements with the Pastor about the exact date when you will assume your new duties.

Wishing you every blessing and priestly success in your new pastoral assignment, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Rev. Msgr. Richard A. Rosemeyer
Vicar General and Chancellor

Rev. Peter F. Hayes, Our Lady Mother of the Church Parish, Chgo.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
POST OFFICE BOX 1979
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60690

May 20, 1986

Dear Father Lupo:

In light of the recommendation of the Clergy Personnel Board, I am pleased to appoint you as Associate Pastor to the Reverend Richard J. Ehrens, Pastor of Our Lady of the Wayside Parish, Arlington Heights, Illinois.

The effective date for this appointment is June 10, 1986. However, I ask you to speak with your new pastor regarding necessary arrangements.

Bill, thank you for your work at Saint Mary Parish. May you draw satisfaction from your efforts and have a sense of peace as you complete this assignment. The experiences that you have had in the past will assist you in your new work.

My prayers are with you at this time, and I ask for a remembrance in yours as well.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Fraternally yours in Christ,

Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend William L. Lupo
Saint Mary Church
794 Pearson Street
Des Plaines, Illinois 60016

cc: Reverend Richard J. Ehrens
Reverend Paul F. Rosemeyer
Clergy Personnel Board
Dear Dick:

Enclosed you will find a copy of the letter appointing Father William L. Lupo as Associate Pastor of your parish. This appointment is made following the recommendation of the Clergy Personnel Board.

I commend him to you and the people of Our Lady of the Wayside Parish with the hope that your faith community will be enriched and nourished by your combined efforts in proclaiming the Gospel message.

I ask you to extend my best wishes to the other members of your staff as you welcome your new associate.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Fraternally yours in Christ,

[Signature]

Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend Richard J. Ehrens
Our Lady of the Wayside Church
432 West Park Street
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

cc: Reverend William L. Lupo
April 30, 1990

Dear Father Lupo:

It is my pleasure to appoint you to be Pastor of Saint Peter Damian Parish, Bartlett. This appointment is made in consultation with the Priests' Personnel Board and is effective July 1, 1990. Your term of office will be for six years.

Most Reverend John Gorman, Episcopal Vicar, will act as my delegate in receiving your Profession of Faith. I ask that you contact him as soon as possible concerning your formal installation as Pastor. Once this takes place, he will forward the official documents for your installation to the Chancery.

It is understood that you will be mentored by Bishop Gorman and Father Peter Bowman for a period of one year, at which time there will be an assessment which I have asked them to work on with you.

Bill, I would like to take this occasion to thank you for the service you rendered at Our Lady of the Wayside Parish. I know that your ministry there has touched the lives of the people of God as you have given of yourself in word and example.

I am confident that the Parish community at Saint Peter Damian will receive you and respond wholeheartedly to your pastoral leadership. Know that as you begin this pastoral charge you have my support and prayers. Should you ever need me for anything, please do not hesitate to call me.

With gratitude for your cooperation and with cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Ecclesiastical Notary

Reverend William L. Lupo
Our Lady of the Wayside Parish
432 W. Park Street
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005

cc: Most Reverend John R. Gorman, Episcopal Vicar
Reverend R. Peter Bowman, Dean
Reverend Jerome G. Klug
Reverend Martin J. Barnum
Diocesan Priests' Personnel Board
Office of Appraisal and Evaluation
Office of Research and Planning
Center for Development in Ministry
Certificate of Installation of the Pastor
Archdiocese of Chicago

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, presented the Reverend

William L. Lupo

to the members of the parish community of
Saint Peter Damian, Bartlett

assembled in church.

In their presence, I have installed him as their pastor with the prescribed ceremonies, in accord with canon 527, §2, and have entrusted him with the leadership and pastoral care of this parish community with all the rights and responsibilities described in the general law of the Church, especially canon 519, as well as the particular statutes of the Archdiocese of Chicago, and his letter of appointment.

Given at Bartlett, Illinois, on the 30th day of the month of July, 1990, in the Year of Our Lord

It is He who gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers in roles of service for the faithful to build up the body of Christ, till we become one in faith and in the knowledge of God's Son, and form that perfect man who is Christ come to full stature.

Ephesians 4:13

NAME

EPISCOPAL VICAR

TITLE
Profession of Faith
Archdiocese of Chicago

I, Reverend William L. Lupo, with firm faith, believe and profess all and everything that is contained in the Symbol of Faith, that is:

“We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father. Through him all things were made. For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven: by the power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary, and became man. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered, died, and was buried. On the third day he rose again in fulfillment of the Scriptures; he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end. We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son. With the Father and the Son, he is worshiped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets. We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.”

I firmly embrace and accept all and everything which has been either defined by the Church’s solemn deliberations or affirmed and declared by its ordinary magisterium concerning the doctrine of faith and morals, according as they are proposed by it, especially those things dealing with the mystery of the Holy Church of Christ, its Sacraments and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Witnessed by:

Name
EPISCOPAL VICAR
Title

Dated at Bartlett, Illinois

On the Day of the Month of
In the Year of Our Lord 1990

William L. Lupo
Signature
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a phone call from Victim JN to the Archdiocese’s 800# on April 1, 1993 in which Victim JN alleges that Fr. William Lupo engaged in inappropriate sexual conduct with her and her sister, Victim JP, approximately nine years ago at St. Mary in Des Plaines. The conduct consisted of Fr. Lupo exposing himself to Victim JN and Victim JP and occurred more than once.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a meeting between Steve Sidskowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, and Victims JN and JP and their mother on April 1, 1993, in which Victims JN and JP detail their allegations of inappropriate sexual behavior by Fr. William Lupo when they were minors and Fr. Lupo was assigned to St. Mary in Des Plaines. According to Victims JN and JP, the abuse consisted of hugging and kissing, which occurred hundreds of times, as well as Fr. Lupo being partially or completely nude when they would come up to his room on several occasions. Victim JN alleged that these incidents began when she was in 7th or 8th grade and continued until she was a sophomore in high school in the mid-1980s. Victim JP alleged that these incidents began when she was around 12 years old and lasted until she was around 17 years old in the mid-1980s.
4/2/93  Fr. Bill Lugo, St. Peter Damian, Bartlett

allegations: excessive hugging, profane kissing, naked in shower + bathroom in presence of girls.

To: File

From: Steve Sidiowski

Re: Phone call to Bill Lupo

Date: 4-3-93

- I informed Bill Lupo we need to meet. He’ll call back with definite time on Sunday; either 10:30 a.m./11:00 a.m. or 3:00 p.m. on Monday, April 5th.

- Jed Stone - his attorney.

- Phone call from Bill Lupo - April 3, 1993 - Meeting 7:30 p.m.

- Monday, April 5, 1993, 3:00 p.m., meeting - my office - with Bill Lupo and Jed Stone.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a meeting between Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, and Rev. Bill Lupo on April 5, 1993, in which Fr. Lupo responds to the allegations of inappropriate sexual behavior by Victims JN and JP. Also present were Pat Tuite and Bob Martwick (Fr. Lupo’s attorneys), a friend of Fr. Lupo’s and Pat O’Malley, Vicar for Priests. During the meeting, Fr. Lupo details his recollection of the 1984 events surrounding his alleged accidental exposure to the victims, as well as the actions taken in response. According to Fr. Lupo, he met with the victims and their family after the events and “had the impression it was resolved.” Fr. Lupo also denies inappropriate sexualized hugging and kissing.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a phone call from Victim JO to Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, on April 6, 1993 during which Victim JO details her allegation of sexual abuse against Fr. William Lupo. According to Victim JO, the abuse consisted of one instance in 1985 of Fr. Lupo kissing Victim JO for an extended period. This occurred while Fr. Lupo was assigned to St. Mary in Des Plaines and just after Victim JO had turned 18 years old. Victim JO also notes that she later heard stories of Fr. Lupo exposing himself to minor females.
TO:  File

FROM:  Steve Sidlowski

RE:  Phone call to [redacted] (Lupo)

DATE:  April 7, 1993

"We need to protect other girls at this time. We need to monitor him."

- "It looks like he is looking for a vulnerable woman to get involved with."

- "It’s a definite incident (the nakedness)." It’s also consistent with what the other two said. You need an evaluation of him. I’m anti "P" test - it’s too expensive.

- Perhaps [redacted]. If you can’t get a monitor, pull him out temporarily. (Lupo)
TO: File
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: April 7, 1993
RE: Phone call to POM re: Lupo

- "There's a good chance there might be denial on his part - it's the minimalization of what they did. It might be something that he's minimizing and they are exaggerating.

- Not something for withdrawal but some action must be taken.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

Date: April 7, 1993

Board Members Present:

[Redacted]

Others Present:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.):

1. The Board completed a First Stage Review in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.9 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

2. Determination: There is reasonable cause to suspect that W.L. engaged in sexual misconduct with a minor. Basis: Consistency of W.L.'s conduct as seen in allegations from three different teenage girls at the time and W.L.'s acknowledgement of naked exposure of body to one of the teenage girls at the time; the Board seeks to ensure minors are not at risk of sexual misconduct in the unmonitored presence of W.L. given the three allegations and confirmation of credibility of accusers by another Archdiocesan priest present in parish at the time.

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should be imposed upon W.L. to ensure that he is not alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult. A live-in priest monitor is suggested; and if refused by W.L., the Board would recommend W.L.'s immediate withdrawal from his ministerial assignment; other parish staff should be notified/requested to serve as monitors of W.L.
Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowksi
Administrator

Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, April 7, 1993.

The Review Board considered the oral report from Steve Sidlowski in the matter of the Rev. William Lupo. The Board conducted a First Stage Review. A couple of members on the Board suggested an immediate withdrawal of Fr. Lupo from his ministerial assignment. However, the Review Board did determine that there was reasonable cause to suspect that Fr. Lupo engaged in sexual misconduct with minors, but the Board recommended that Fr. Lupo should be monitored, and that a twenty-four hour monitor was needed, such as a priest to live in the rectory with him.

Also, the Board recommended that other parish staff should be notified and requested to serve as monitors of Fr. Lupo.

The Board concluded that Rev. Lupo should not be alone in the presence of the minors under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

REVIEW DATE: 4-7-93

REVIEW STATUS:
1st Stage X
Suppl.
2nd Stage

1. Name: Rev. William Lupo D.O.B. 53 yrs. old
   Parents: (liv. or dec.) F Living M Deceased in 1965
   Siblings: B Older brother - ; Younger brother - suburbs
   S Younger sister in suburbs

2. Education: Graduated St. Mary of the Lake/MA in 1965
   Quigley & Mundelein

3. Ordained: 1965

4. Assignments:
   Our Lady Help of Christians: '65-'72
   Our Lady Mother of the Church: '72-'79 Assoc. Pastor
   *St. Mary's-DesPlaines, Ill.: '79-'86
   OUR Lady of Wayside '86-'90
   St. Peter Damian '90-present as Pastor

5. Removed from Ministry: Undetermined Date: 4-7-93

6. Present residence: St. Peter Damian Date: Since 1990

7. 

8. Allegations:
   1st Date Date of Offenses Sex/Age of Child Credibility
   1979 or 1980 F/14 or 15 until college X
   2nd Date 1981-1984 F/12 to 15 departure X
   Additional Summer, 1985 F/16 to 18 yrs. 2 mos. X
9. General Nature of Offense(s) Allegation of exposure of full, naked body in bed to 14 yr. old girl in rectory and of partial nakedness to 2 other teenage girls in/around his bedroom/shower; also passionate kissing and hugging over approximately 6 years with at least 3 teenage girls.


11. Special concerns or problems: Rev. Lupo is only priest in current parish assignment - Pastor Emeritus no longer lives there; no school, though active CCD (700+ kids) Program. Though strong denial, Lupo acknowledges some aspects of incidents.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a phone call from Rev. *** to Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, on April 7, 1993, in which Fr. Henegan details for Mr. Sidlowski his recollection of the 1984 allegations by Victims JN and JP that Fr. William Lupo exposed himself to them, as well as the actions taken in response. According to Fr. ***, when he was informed of the allegations, he called the Archdiocese and told Rev. Tom Ventura; he also spoke with the victims and their family. Fr. Lupo also spoke with the family and Fr. *** felt the matter had been taken care of. Additionally, Fr. *** mentions that “way after” the allegations of Victims JN and JP, another girl told him that Fr. Lupo had hugged and kissed her inappropriately.
PHONE CALL TO REV. BILL LUPO

4-8-93

- Informed him fully of the Review Board’s 1st Stage Review, determinations and recommendations and the Cardinal’s decision. I explained what his monitoring means.

- "There’s no teenage girls or boys who work there either in the rectory or the parish."

- Let me say "I have nothing against it. I can virtually assure you I’ll go along with it."

- Dennis Kowalski: Please also inform him.

- He will tell Dennis and the others on his staff. Then I (S.S.) will call them to confirm they know of the allegations and understand what monitoring means.
PHONE CALLS TO 4-8-93

(not home - left message with)

- I informed them of the Review Board’s 1st Stage Review determinations and recommendations and Cardinal Bernadin’s total agreement with the recommendations.

- and agreed to give their names/#’s to and vice/versa

- specifically stated that now having heard Bill Lupo’s firm denials and so-called explanation, both she and favor his immediate withdrawal from his parish. knows of a couple of friends who might have more information to share about Lupo. She intends to call her one friend in and notify her about the allegations now brought forward against Lupo.
PHONE CALLS TO REV. JEROME RIORDAN 4-9-93

- Not in (afternoon) - I left detailed message on phone recorder and asked he call me back at work #’s. (As of 4-10-93, 11:30 a.m. - no voice mail message). I acknowledged his earlier conversation with P.O.M. and B.L. Thanked him for helping, stated I understand he’s moving into St. Peter Damian’s tonight but noted we should talk further ASAP.

- Phone call around 6:20 p.m. - Phone recorder still on. This time I left no message.

- Phone call to Jerry Riordan, 11:35 a.m., 4-10-93. Left another detailed message similar to above. Left my work and home phone numbers. Stated I realize he very well may already be in St. Peter Damian’s Parish and that I intend to call B.L. there shortly - perhaps if he’s there I’ll speak with him also.

- Phone call to Bill Lupo - 4-10-93- I confirmed his phone conference call with P.O.M. and J. Riordan of 4-9-93. He intends to fully cooperate with the monitoring and blank. J. Riordan did move into St. Peter Damian’s yesterday and is now living there. Jerry is at the bank. B.L. will tell him to please call me and that I’ve been trying for 2 days to contact him and left messages in his last home.

- We discussed blank. I told him I’ll let him know when/where/who next week some time - he’s ready to avail himself any day - Monday thru Friday though he has a pastor’s meeting on Friday (says he could skip it) from the Deanery. His Dean is Pete Bowman. We discussed me (or P.O.M.) perhaps notifying him of this situation and who/how to do it.

- B.L. noted he has a cottage in Wisconsin. Normally, he goes there Wednesday evenings and stays there through Thursday, and returns late Thursday afternoons or in the evening. I asked for 4-14 to 4-15 this time it be put on hold pending arrangements for blank - that’s no problem with B.L.

- He mentioned blank and hoping to respond to her allegation. I told him fullness/substance of her allegation and noted he need say NOTHING to me concerning it without his attorney present. After listening to the " blank incident", B.L. laughed and responded "I can tell you’ve never seen blank, have you (implying reference to her physical appearance)?" I will say "that regarding blank’s allegation...that was just totally fabricated - totally a lie. I just can’t imagine this. There’s obviously a conspiracy here between the two families," he added.

- Before he made the above remarks, I told him he need not state anything to me in response, but he fully acknowledged that he
wanted to and had no problem with me taking notes regarding his above statements.

- I also noted that if I am to receive any further information, i.e. another, different allegation from a different source, I will have to inquire, and that the Review Board would have to consider it, and perhaps his entire situation/status would then be reconsidered. B.L. understands that would be the case.
PHONE CALL TO BOB NEWTON  
Youth Minister at St. Peter Damian Parish  
4-9-93

- Girl answered phone - Bob not home. I left message for him to call me and asked her to tell Bob it is very important.

- Evening (6:30 p.m.) Sounded like young adult male answered. Bob not home - will be back in an hour or so - at store. I left my name and message again and again asked to tell Bob my call is "very, very important and it regards St. Peter Damian's."

PHONE CALL TO BOB NEWTON  
4-10-93

(Note: No voice mail message had been received as of 11:20 a.m.). Not home - he's at work - but at a different full-time job apparently. The boy on phone (sounded like same guy as last night) stated "He's paid (as Youth Minister at St. Peter Damian) but it's part-time." I left my work #'s, name and asked him to please tell Bob on message that it's "very important."
PHONE CALL TO SR. EDNA KAZEK, SSJ 4-9-93

- Pastoral Associate at St. Peter Damian Parish.

- Sister not in (6:30 p.m.) - I left message with my name &# and stated to fellow nun I’d likely call her back later on Good Friday evening.

- Phone call later in evening - I spoke with Sr. Edna. I explained situation - in brief - asked if she’d agree to assist (along with Fr. Gerry Riordan) in the monitoring of Bill Lupo. She fully agreed and is glad to help. She stated she would help out 100%. She said B.L. told her at length about the allegation this last week (before the 1st Stage Review however and imposition of monitoring restrictions) and it’s been a cumbersome past week at St. Peter’s, i.e., tension filled. I explained Gerry Riordan’s larger role with this situation, but that certainly if she became worried or concerned that B.L. was violating his restriction of no unmonitored contact with those under 18 without presence of another responsible adult, she should go to and talk to B.L. about it and contact me as well. She agreed. Sr. Edna did mention that in the last three years B.L.’s been in the parish (she was there for years before him) she has not personally seen any unusual conduct toward those under 18 by B.L.

- However, Sr. Edna noted that with the previous pastor, all parish staff had access to him in his living quarters in the rectory - not so with Bill Lupo. Sister stated no one is allowed into Bill Lupo’s living quarters unless he specifically is present and/or authorizes it. She felt I should know about this and that mainly it is just different than with the previous pastor.
To: Fitness Review Administrator  
From: Vicar for Priests Office  
Re: Suggested rules for role of monitor  
4/9/93

ROLE OF MONITOR

1. The monitor is a guest in the parish house.

2. His presence there is for protection of both potential victims and the priest who is being monitored. The monitor has voluntarily agreed to serve in this capacity for the good of minors, for the good of the priest, for the good of the parish, for the good of the church. The alternative might be removal from parish with all that would mean for the individual priest and for the parish itself.

3. The monitor is not the confidant nor the confessor of the priest. His relationship to the priest is in the external forum. Our recent experience leads us to believe that the monitor needs to remain as objective as possible. The two should not discuss the details of the allegation.

4. Function of the Monitor

   a. The monitor is paid through the FRA office, including the $200 per month for stipends/stole fees. The parish should not pay the monitor any money at all. The parish agrees to furnish room and board for the monitor. If this becomes a hardship for the parish, the FRA office will pay for room and board.

   b. The priest retains his role in the parish. If he is the pastor, all decisions about the parish are his responsibility. The monitor, as resident, is to recognize and follow the authority of the pastor in parish matters.

   c. The monitor may help in the parish if that is acceptable to the pastor. If the pastor does not want him to help, then so be it. It would seem that it might be helpful in easing the situation between the men if the monitor were allowed to do some things around the parish.
d. The monitor specifically supervises the priest's work around the parish with regard to the potential risk to children. The principal and other necessary people should also know of the protocol restrictions.

e. The priest is not to be in the presence of those below 18 without another responsible adult being present. If such a situation occurs, as it might on occasion, then the monitor should point this out to the priest. The priest is to acknowledge it and immediately remove himself from that situation. If the priest does not comply or if he minimizes the situation, then the monitor is required to notify the Fitness Review Administrator immediately. The monitor is not a spy, but is authorized to go where the priest goes around the parish. He does not have to explain his presence there.

f. When the priest absents himself from the parish, he is required to keep a log book of where he goes, for how long, with whom he will be, and when he will return. This logging-in should be done before the priest goes anywhere. The monitor must have access to this log book. The monitor need not accompany the priest away from the parish. Any prolonged absence from the parish (i.e. overnight or longer) must be cleared beforehand with the Fitness Review Administrator. (In order for the monitor to be effective, he must be able to account for the priest's itinerary when he is away from the parish.)

g. On a regular basis, the priest, the monitor and FRA will meet either face to face or by conference call to see how things are going, to iron out problems, etc.

h. The person bringing the allegation forward needs to know what is being done. In as much as he can, within the law and within people's rights to confidentiality, the FRA or the Victim Assistance Minister will keep that person informed.

5. Initially the monitoring takes place during the first stage review. It may also be part of the second and final stage review. The protocol and its observance will be presented to the Fitness Review Board for their consideration and recommendations vis a vis remaining in ministry.
PHONE CALL FROM BOB NEWTON 4-12-93
(Part time Youth Minister St. Peter Damian)

- He understands and agrees to monitoring - i.e. helping out with the monitoring of Bill Lupo.

- With Youth Ministry procedures, there is always 2 adults involved whenever teenage girls or boys are around.

- Youth Group - not really active at moment. There are social events, say 15 to 60 kids could come - e.g. ski trip. 5 to 1 ratio Bob likes to maintain if possible.

- Bob: "All the time he's been here he has always conducted himself in a professional manner" - only within the last 6 months however, he's allowed Bob into his rectory room - did not before.

- He's never noticed situations where there was any type of sexual misconduct - he's not been in such situations to Bob's knowledge.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

Date: April 17, 1993

Board Members Present:

Others Present:

Ralph Bonaccorsi
Thomas Paprocki

Steve Sidlowski
2. The Board closes its file in this matter.

* The Board received updates on other matters from the Administrator, including the matter, the PFR-23 matter and the matter. The Board discussed business matters including the priests' housing situation.

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski

Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
Steven Sidlowski
25 W. Chicago - Ste 440
Chicago, IL 60610

Dear Mr. Sidlowski:

Fr. Bill Lupo has requested I correspond with you with regard to my observations of his character and priestly demeanor while I was serving with him at St. Mary's Parish from 1980 through 1983.

During that time, Fr. Bill worked closely with myself and the other adult and teen leaders of the youth ministry program. I had a close working relationship with each of the ten adults and the twelve teen leaders throughout the three years of youth ministry at the parish. As I recalled to you in our meeting on 4/5/93, there was frequent and frank communication among these twenty-two people, and there were occasions when improprieties were brought to my attention, by both adults as well as teens. These included purported sexual improprieties as well as a number of alcohol-related incidences. I would be extremely surprised if any such improprieties as were alleged in our 4/5/93 meeting would have eluded virtually all of the twenty-two personnel working with youth in the parish, who networked to an enormous number of teens, including all three of the women who alleged offenses against Fr. Bill.

Never in the three years of youth ministry had anyone approached me with concerns about Fr. Bill's priestly demeanor, boundaries, or sensitivity to others' boundaries. He was a very warm, expressive man, who readily embraced others and received embraces. This was no secret, and was a part of the youth ministry culture, as well. It was, I believe, a strength of Fr. Bill's, and a way to affirm others, not to destroy them, as is alleged. In his preaching and in his personal ministry to others, he has been a strong leader and a role model of what it means to be both Christian and human.
Knowing Fr. Bill personally for over ten years, and possessing responsible clinical skills in this area, and after hearing the evidence, such as it is, against him, I am grieved that a man who in no way possesses characteristics of individuals who perpetrate sexual improprieties, according to my clinical sensitivities and my personal knowledge of him, will forever question whether a healing or affirming embrace will be misconstrued, and cause him to again be defending his priesthood.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please feel free to contact me.

Yours truly,

cc: Fr. William Lupo
Please be advised that the Review Board met on April 7, 1993 and conducted a First Stage Review in the matter involving Rev. William L. Lupo.

The Board has recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should be imposed on Fr. Lupo and that he should not be allowed alone in the presence of persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult. The Board also recommended that further action should be taken.

I’ve asked our Assistance Minister, Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, to contact you about any questions you may have about the further review of the matter. You also are free to contact me about any questions as well at (312) 751-5205 (06) or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister
April 19, 1993

Dear [Name],

Please be advised that the Review Board met on April 7, 1993 and conducted a First Stage Review in the matter involving Rev. William L. Lupo.

The Board has recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should be imposed on Fr. Lupo and that he should not be allowed alone in the presence of persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult. The Board also recommended that further action should be taken.

I’ve asked our Assistance Minister, Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, to contact you about any questions you may have about the further review of the matter. You also are free to contact me about any questions as well at (312) 751-5205 (06) or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister
Reverend William L. Lupo  
St. Peter Damian Parish  
109 S. Crest Ave.  
Bartlett, Ill. 60103  

Dear Fr. Lupo:

Please be advised that the Review Board met on April 7, 1993. In the meeting, the Board fully considered my oral report. The Board assumed responsibility for the matter by conducting a First Stage Review pursuant to Article 4.9 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry.

The Board made the following determinations:

(1) Preliminary actions taken by me were appropriate;  
(2) Restrictions should be imposed upon you; and  
(3) Further action is required.

As a result, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that you should not be alone with persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board has instructed me to communicate their determinations and recommendations to you. In addition, I will contact you to discuss the further action to be taken and further review of the matter.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski  
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Rev. Patrick O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
Your Eminence,

Please be advised that the Review Board met on April 7, 1993. The Board fully considered my oral report in the matter of the Rev. William Lupo. The Board assumed responsibility for the matter by conducting a First Stage Review pursuant to Article 4.9 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry.

The Board made the following determinations:

(1) Preliminary actions taken by me were appropriate;
(2) Restrictions should be imposed on Fr. Lupo; and
(3) Further action is required.

As a result, the Board recommends that Fr. Lupo should not be alone with persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board has instructed me to communicate with Fr. Lupo regarding the further action to be taken. I anticipate that a Second Stage Review will be scheduled in due course.

The Board will report to you any further determinations and recommendations following the Second Stage Review.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Archbishop’s Delegate
to the Review Board
April 19, 1993

Dear [Redacted]:

Please be advised that the Review Board met on April 7, 1993 and conducted a First Stage Review in the matter involving Rev. William L. Lupo.

The Board has recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should be imposed on Fr. Lupo and that he should not be allowed alone in the presence of persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult. The Board also recommended that further action should be taken.

I’ve asked our Assistance Minister, Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, to contact you about any questions you may have about the further review of the matter. You also are free to contact me about any questions as well at (312) 751-5205 (06) or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister
PHONE CALL FROM [REDACTED] 4-21-93

- Wondering about status on Lupo - [REDACTED]

PHONE CALL TO [REDACTED] 4-21-93

- I informed her of status: [REDACTED] monitors in place. Second Stage Review next step. Referred her again to VAM. She intends to call Mayra. Also, she will call [REDACTED].
- phoned and left message on Voice Mail.

- She said that some other person would be calling Steve to report problems with the same person has problems with (B. Lupo).

- told this third party that she would let Steve know that she was going to call so that he would be expecting the call.

- said this other person should be calling within the next few days.
I called Fr. Riordan yesterday to update him on Lupo’s current status; i.e. to see how things are going with the monitoring, let him know one of the victims had called to report that another person may be coming forward with another allegation against Lupo, and to see if there have been any problems since the monitoring has begun. Riordan was not in. I left a message for him to call back.

Fr. Riordan called me back earlier this morning. By that point, I had already spoken Fr. [Redacted] as well. Hence, I fully informed Jerry about the possible, new person coming forward, as well as Rubey’s report that Lupo may have been bringing in unaccompanied girls into the rectory to interview or see them for Confirmation recently.

Jerry Riordan was not aware that Lupo may have been seeing teenage girls in the aforementioned-way until we spoke. Jerry stated that he was out of town briefly to celebrate his 50th Anniversary as a priest.

Jerry also noted that Lupo had gone to his Wisconsin cottage and had left on Wednesday and would be back on Thursday evening. I had called Lupo on Wednesday afternoon, May 12, 1993. He was not in. The receptionist at St. Peter Damian’s stated he was gone and would not be back until some time on Friday, May 14, 1993. As such, I then called Fr. Jerry Riordan on Wednesday to see if Lupo had gone to his cottage or just where he was. When Jerry called back on Thursday he also gave his beeper number.

In any event, Jerry Riordan assured me that he would question around the parish "discreetly" about how the parish Confirmation process works, and we agreed to be in touch about what he discovers sometime very soon.

As of Friday, May 14, 1993, I had not heard from Jerry Riordan; however, Bill Lupo did call me earlier in the day and I was unavailable.

I will need to touch base with Jerry Riordan no later than early next week to see what he has discovered. I did call Tom Paprocki on May 14, 1993, to inform him but he was not in. I did mention to [Redacted] and [Redacted] on the phone today that there may be an issue forthcoming with Lupo.
MEMO
TO: File
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: May 13, 1993
RE: Phone call from Rev. Charlie Rubey

Father called on May 12, 1993. Rita took a message and I called him back later; he was not in and I left a voice mail message for him.

called me again this morning. He told me that he had spoken recently with Fr. of St. Juliana Parish, who is a good friend of , said that both he and have a mutual friend, a , who Art recently spoke with. According to , ’s sister-in-law (’s wife’s sister) lives at St. Peter Damian Parish in Bartlett. It seems that told that ’s sister-in-law told that Bill Lupo had recently required all girls who were about to undergo Confirmation to go to his rectory unaccompanied to meet personally with Bill Lupo. ’s niece i.e. his sister-in-law’s daughter, was one of the girls who was required to go to the rectory to meet alone with Lupo, according to .

stated "I’m not trying to bury Bill Lupo - I’m just concerned about the safety of children." .

said he intends to speak with about this situation, and that may then give me a call himself about this situation.

acknowledged that he knows a good deal about situation involving Lupo. As such, he also acknowledged that told him recently that she and her sister expect that another woman may be contacting my Office to discuss another possible allegation of sexual misconduct regarding Lupo.
MEMO
TO: File
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: May 13, 1993
RE: Phone call from

She called today to insure I had received her voice mail message from yesterday. She reiterated that she expects I will be receiving another call regarding Bill Lupo, perhaps in the nature of another allegation of sexual misconduct against him. herself has spoken to this other person and stated that there were definite "similarities" between what happened to her sister and .

I also informed that I had spoken with Rev. this morning. was aware that intended to tell me about information to the effect that Lupo may recently have asked girls preparing for Confirmation to go into his office alone with him. was also aware that information at this point is third-hand, but that Rubey would be asking his friend if he is willing to call me personally to give me further information.

I reminded that the Victim Assistance Ministry is available for herself and her sister . She thanked me for that reminder and said she may be in contact with them soon;
TO: File
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: May 18, 1993
RE: Phone call to Rev. Jerry Riordan

I called him to see if he'd gathered information regarding the report of Bill Lupo seeing girls before Confirmation unattended. Jerry responded: "I haven't covered the Confirmation situation as yet. I'll look into that and get back to you in the next day or two." He noted that Lupo actually returned from his cottage last Thursday at Noon - i.e. he had only been gone one day.

I told Jerry I'd spoken to the Chancellor, as well as Review Board Chairperson and Vice Chairperson about the latest situation.

Jerry said Lupo called me the last couple of times because he wants to discuss what happens next regarding [REDACTED].

PHONE CALL 5-19-93
- Jerry does not have more information as yet. He may call Rita on Friday, or voice mail to leave a message, when he finds out more. I told him I will be gone for two days on retreat with Sexual Misconduct response team personnel - Lake Geneva, Wisc. if he needs me.

- I gave Jerry information to give Bill Lupo on the 5-24-93/5:00 p.m. meeting at my office on [REDACTED]; he'll pass it on to Bill. I told Jerry I already spoke to Pat Tuite's firm about it today.
I called Bill Lupo. He was not in. I left a message for him to call me back. (When I spoke to Jerry Riordan last night, he said apparently Lupo wants to discuss what happens next).
MEETING WITH FR. BILL LUPO 5-24-93 (Contd.)

- It should also be noted that Bill Lupo presented me, at the end of the meeting, with further information regarding this case in the form of a statement. Bill Lupo thought that this was very significant. His attorney Tuite agreed. I told him I would let the Review Board know about it.

- Lupo also asked if I had received two letters in the form of character references on his behalf. Lupo said that one of the persons was someone who was involved with Youth Ministry at St. Mary’s Parish at the time of the allegations. The other woman, I believe it was, either knows Bill Lupo currently at St. Peter Damian Parish or knew him at the time of the allegation at St. Mary’s Parish in DesPlaines. I told Bill Lupo that to date I had not received these letters. He was amazed; he was certain that they would have been sent to me. I told him that Rita Mongan or I would check with the Mail Room of the Pastoral Center to see if we had received any letters to this effect. We agreed that we would be in touch about whether I had received this further evidence through these letters.

- A few days later Lupo called to see if we had received the letters. In the interim since the 5-24-93 meeting, Rita had checked with the Mail Room and discovered that there were no such letters. She informed Lupo of that fact. Lupo again expressed amazement at that and wondered if the letters were lost somehow. He told Rita that he would contact those two persons to ask them to re-submit their letters to me. (He is asking that the [redacted], as well as these two letters, be presented on his behalf as part of his Second Stage Review at some point).

- As of 6-10-93, my Office has still not received any such letters.
PHONE CALL FROM GERRY RIORDAN: 5-28-93

- I've got name of head of Confirmation program at St. Peter's - he'd know if there were personal interviews or how they do Confirmation.

- Bob Newton: H-______________________
- Compensation: Money not worked out.
- He has not talked to Bill Lupo about it.

- Gerry's question: Did he (Lupo) perhaps interview them before the sexual misconduct allegation was brought to the FRA's attention?

- "I didn't know Bob Newton knew about Lupo's situation or else I would have contacted him sooner."

- Please send him copy of monitor rules...he lost the 2nd copy we sent him.

PHONE CALL TO BOB NEWTON - Youth Minister 5-28-93
St. Peter Damian Parish

- Bob does help coordinate the parish's Confirmation.

- The Confirmation process: they DO interview with a priest - this was established a year ago - it's boys as well as girls.

- This year we changed it so that I was present also - I was present in all the meetings with the kids since the allegations have come forward. Last year, Lupo did the interview by himself. There were maybe 10 interviews.

- Before the allegation, there were interviews for Confirmation which Bill Lupo conducted alone with the kids, but that was standard practice prior to the allegations. Some of the interviews occurred in March. The majority - about 2/3rds of the interviews with the teens prior to Confirmation were done BEFORE the sexual misconduct allegations came forward.

- Bill Lupo was insistent that two adults be present in the room during interviews. So far, to Bob's knowledge, Bill Lupo is holding up to the monitoring agreement in general. "I have not seen any situations at all where B.'s been alone with kids since early April," he said.

- Bob said I should feel free to contact him about Bill's situation - he is always available.
June 2, 1993

Dear Mr. Sidlowski,

I am writing on behalf of a very good friend; he seems to need some positive support, not only in his eyes, but in yours as well: Father Bill Lupo. First, let me introduce myself. I have been employed there since 1990; previously, I worked at a [ ] Restaurant while obtaining my degree. My job experience started right after graduating from eighth grade, however—when I started working at St. Mary’s Rectory.

That’s about it for dates—I’m not very good at remembering exact times. I can’t tell you for sure when I first met Loops, but I can tell you the situation. At the rectory, I was sort of an assistant housekeeper/cook/phone girl/receptionist. One afternoon, as I was preparing carrots for the priests’ dinner, a young man walked in the back door and said he had an appointment with Fr. Farrell. Well, I was mortified. Parishioners and other appointments were to come in the front door, not the back—and certainly not when the kitchen was a mess from dinner preparations! Well, later I found out who he was, and realized that he’d be living there—so it was okay to come in the back door! But thinking about this many years later, I realize that Loops is truly a “back door” friend—one I wouldn’t mind seeing the real me, as well as a messy kitchen.

Bill Lupo is extremely supportive. He supported me in many ways throughout my high school years. Our parish had a very active youth group at one time, and I was involved with it from the start as was Loops and [ ]. I can remember going to Loops with a problem—generally a brother problem—and he’d listen and nod and say soothing things even though my problems (as I look back) were trivial and he probably had better things to do! I eventually became a lector at mass, and one day the other lector didn’t show so I was going solo. Loops knew how nervous I was, but he just patted my shoulder and told me he knew I’d do okay. Well, I didn’t—I skipped the second reading!! I was so terribly embarrassed, but all he did during mass was smile at me. After mass, he joked that probably not many people even noticed! That support saved me from feeling really down on myself.

Bill Lupo showed care and concern when it came to helping teens find faith. He’d give up much of his free time to come over to the youth center at night; he went on camping retreats and ski retreats with us; he’d drive us somewhere we needed to go; he would be our “on call” priest for any mass we wanted to have. And he did all these things because he knew that what we were getting from this youth group was more than laughs and new
friends—we were getting God and Jesus, and for the first time for many of us, we wanted God and Jesus in our lives. Sometimes we didn’t realize that that’s what was happening. Sometimes we did go on those retreats just for the fun. Sometimes we laughed at Loops and for their faith and their funny ways. But those two men never gave up on us and always tried new ways to involve faith in our lives.

Bill Lupo is friend I want in my life forever. I met my best friend, through the youth group. We had known each other slightly through the years—same parish, same park district—but she was a public school burnout and I was a Catholic school goody two shoes (according to her!). One week and her sister were grounded and part of their punishment was to come to a couple nights at the youth center. I still don’t know what it was that clicked with us, but before long we were great friends who would do anything for each other. Lupo suggested that we give a witness talk at mass one Sunday. That was very hard for us to do. We were—juniors—in high school, had never really talked in front of a group before, and were very uptight. Lupo calmed us a bit when he reminded us why we were there—to share the story of our friendship, and the youth group. I don’t remember a word of what we said, I couldn’t tell you the date—but I can say that we brought quite a few people to tears...even Loops.

Both of these friends shared in my wedding day in 1990. I was my matron of honor and Bill Lupo was the celebrant. I wouldn’t have had it any other way. I wanted a day to remember, and what better way to remember than with all my friends surrounding me with their love? Even though I’m not one to keep in touch, I still cherish the friendships I made in that youth group, and I try to see some of them sometimes. But Loops is persistent in keeping in touch, and when he calls he fills me in on the news—who’s married, who’s still a goof, who’s got kids, etc. I cherish those phone calls for two reasons: I love gossip and I love Loops.

I am greatly dismayed and confused over the allegations brought up by . We both worked in the rectory. Lupo is very affectionate—he hugs and kisses and tells of his love, but in a paternal/best buddy kind of way. It saddens me to hear that my friend has to prove his innocence, when his innocence is so obvious to me. I have nothing but good memories of Bill Lupo and will continue to rack them up over the years. I hope that this has shed new light on my friend and the allegations. Please feel free to contact me should Lupo need my help. Thank you for taking the time to read my memories of a great friend.

Sincerely,
MEMO

TO: FILE (PFR-23)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: June 11, 1993
RE: Phone calls to [redacted] and [redacted]

Regarding [redacted] evidence from Bill Lupo
and invited response from [redacted]/Providing
updated status of case to [redacted] and [redacted].

I called both [redacted] and [redacted] to inform them of the
current status of the Lupo matter. I spoke to both sisters in
separate phone calls.

I explained to [redacted] how Bill Lupo had presented me with
further evidence on May 24, 1993 in the form of

[redacted]. I told her
that I had told Lupo that I would inform her that he had brought
forward. I also told [redacted] that I told
Lupo that I would receive any response from her which she wanted to
give.

[redacted] basically stated that she would get back to me either
verbally or in writing with a response to Lupo submitting

[redacted].

She acknowledged that at the time she was very friendly to
Lupo, but that he did indeed end up manipulating her as a teenager
by taking advantage of his friendliness toward her.

I also
told [redacted] that Lupo and his attorney Pat Tuite, who was also
present when it was submitted to me, both felt that it was
significant.

==================================================================

PHONE CALL TO/FROM [redacted] 6-11-93
I called [redacted]. She was not in. She called me back. I
informed her that I had spoken to her sister within the hour. I also pointed out to her how Lupo had submitted as well.

I also pointed out to how I had also told her sister about the outcome of the suggesting by Fr. Charlie Ruby that Lupo may have violated his monitoring at St. Peter Damian's by meeting alone with teenage girls prior to Confirmation. Both and seemed to understand that once the allegations of sexual misconduct against Lupo were brought forward, he did not apparently meet alone with any teenage girls, according to St. Peter Damian Youth Minister Bob Newton, who is also helping out with the monitoring of Lupo.

I also noted to (and earlier) that to date I had not received any other information or phone call from the person had told me recently might be calling to bring further allegations of sexual misconduct against Lupo.

I mentioned to that Lupo intends to submit character reference letters on his behalf for the Second Stage Review. stated that she will likely submit such character letters as well.

stated that she and her sister, as well as her family, as this point now feel strongly that Bill Lupo should be withdrawn from his ministerial assignment. They intend to put those convictions into writing for the Review Board and the Second Stage Review. I did note to both sisters that Lupo has cooperated with our procedures to this point.

Both and thanked me for the call and the updated information. I informed both that I do not anticipate the Second Stage Review in this matter to proceed until at least mid to late July, 1993 or even later than that if necessary.
June 15, 1993

Mr. Steve Sidlowski  
25 W. Chicago Ste #440  
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Dear Mr. Sidlowski:

I am writing this letter on the behalf of Rev. William Lupo. I have personally known Rev. Lupo for 13 years a portion of those years being on a professional level. I worked directly for Father Lupo from 1985 to 1987. During my tenure with Father Lupo I never experienced any doubts regarding the character or moral standards for which he represents. I find him to be of outstanding nature and a truly genuine, nurturing human being. He has the exceptional ability to interact with all levels of people, to be supportive, responsive to their needs and interested in their well-being.

On a personal level, I have known Father for 13 years as I mentioned above. He has continually provided me with both spiritual and personal guidance throughout this time. There has never been any time in which I have ever felt threatened physically or mentally by any of his actions. I have the utmost respect and admiration for him.

In conclusion, I would be very willing to verbalize what I have stated in this letter to you. I would not hesitate for a moment to defend his character whole heartedly.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]

cc: Rev. William Lupo  
109 S. Crest  
Bartlett, IL 60103
MEMO
TO:       File
FROM:    Steve Sidlowski
DATE:    June 24, 1993
RE:    Phone Calls to [REDACTED] Family

I attempted to call [REDACTED] at his work place. There was no answer. I then called [REDACTED] at his home number. I left a phone message that he could call me if he chooses and that I would perhaps try to contact him or [REDACTED] through their car phone.

I tried the car phone number and [REDACTED] did answer. I explained to [REDACTED] how I had tried to get hold of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] apparently was not in the car with her. [REDACTED] told me that she believes [REDACTED] was calling to get some things straight. [REDACTED] stated that since the last time I spoke with her she has found a couple of things that she will be submitting to me (apparently a [REDACTED] as well as something else).

I told [REDACTED] that if her husband still wants to call me that would be fine.

[REDACTED] stated that legally she thinks she is entitled to a copy of her statement to me on April 1, 1993. She stated "I would like a copy of my statement." (I did not have a copy of this statement at the time this memo was written).

I did tell [REDACTED] that as this is a legal issue as well I would likely check with the Archdiocesan attorney and though I did not expect it would be a problem, I would let her know if it is.

We also agreed I would send her a copy of the xerox copy of [REDACTED] which Lupo has submitted to me.

[REDACTED] was also very interested in the character reference letter sent by [REDACTED], who she referred to as [REDACTED]. She was hoping the process would not come to this, i.e. in that Lupo would be sending such character type reference letters, but as such, she too is considering submitting such letters for further evidence, as stated.
June 25, 1993

Dear [Name],

As we agreed on the phone yesterday, I am sending you a copy of the [redacted] which Bill Lupo submitted to me on May 24, 1993.

Also, I have enclosed a complete copy of my notes pertaining to your statements of April 1, 1993 regarding your allegation of sexual misconduct by Bill Lupo when you were a minor.

As we have discussed, I remain open to receiving further information regarding this matter for the Second Stage Review. If you have any questions at this point, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
PHONE CALL FROM GERRY RIORDAN: 6-26-93

* He lost track of my home phone number.

* "As to his (Lupo's) days off for his vacation. It's at his cottage with classmates. I will check out who they are. I think it's the guy he owns the cottage with probably Jack Dewes - pastor of St. Ann's in Barrington. I almost know for certain that he knows the situation. I will do a little checking on that, and then I will get back to you." If he finds my home number, he'll get back to me.

PHONE CALL TO GERRY RIORDAN (THROUGH BEEPER): 6-26-93

* Golfing, boating, 3 or 4 classmates will be with Lupo and the foregoing will be their main activities.

* West end of Lake Geneva - "Something Bay".

* They do have a lake up there.

* Also note: There's a retired pastor - John Enright - Epiphany Parish - who's coming out to work in our area until Christmastime. He's looking for a place to live - not until August 15th. Would Jack be able to possibly move into St. Peter Damian's? Then at Christmas, Gerry would return. A friend at St. Ansgar's told Gerry.

* I asked Gerry, "You haven't noticed any problems, have you (regarding Lupo not being alone around those under 18)?" Gerry answered "No."

* The Convent also serves Gerry Riordan's meals.

* Gerry's is receiving the monthly pension but I did tell him I would send him the $200/month stipend/stole fee as per Pat O'Malley and I agreed such fees should come out of my Office's budget.

* He still needs copy of monitoring rules. He "must've misplaced them." I told him I'll tell my Assistant to mail him another copy.

* Gerry will make clear to Jack Dewes that Bill Lupo is not allowed around those under 18 without Jack's presence while they are on vacation and if any problems arise, Jack is to contact Gerry and Gerry Riordan to contact me.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

Date: June 29, 1993

Board Members Present:

Others Present:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski
Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.):

1. The Board completed a Second Stage Review in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.11 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

2. Determination: It is reasonable to allow W.L. to remain in ministry as a pastor in view of all of the facts and circumstances, giving appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest. Basis: Positive monitoring reports from three persons and continued monitoring of W.L. to ensure minors are not at risk in the un-monitored presence of W.L.

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon W.L. so that he is not alone with persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult; the live-in priest monitor and two other lay person monitors should continue in their roles; W.L. should receive
The Board further discussed some business matters, including setting next Board meeting for 8-21-93 and meeting beyond that for 9-18-93, both which appeared good for a Board quorum. The 8-27-93 possible meeting date was cancelled because not enough members could attend.

RespectfullySubmitted By
Steve Sidlowski
Administrator

Minutes Unanimously Approved By
Review Board
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, June 29, 1993:

The Review Board completed a Second Stage Review and their determination is that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry as a pastor in view of all the facts and circumstances, giving appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest. Basis: Positive monitoring reports from three persons.

The Board's recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Father Lupo so that he is not alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult; the live-in priest monitor and two other lay person monitors should continue in their roles.
July 7, 1993

Dear Steve,

Here is the letter from [redacted] that we spoke about.

Her work number is [redacted] and her home number is [redacted]. Her address is [redacted].

Sincerely,

Bill
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a phone call from the husband of Victim JO to Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, on July 7, 1993 in which Victim JO’s husband shared with Mr. Sidlowski his concerns about his wife’s case against Fr. William Lupo. Mr. Sidlowski explained the current status of the case to Victim JO’s husband.
Memo to File
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 7/9/93
Re: William Lupo

I spoke to Bill Lupo today concerning his situation. Lupo tells me that his case will be going before the Fitness Review Board on 7/24. He has tried to do everything he can to cooperate with Sidlowski. He even has had several women write to Sidlowski giving their point of view of Lupo and how he is behaving towards women and young girls. I told Bill that if I heard of any other steps that he could take before that I would be in touch with him.
July 9, 1993

Cardinal Joseph Bernadin
Archdiocese of Chicago
155 East Superior Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Your Eminence:

Enclosed please find a writing above the signature of . The content is self explanatory.

has requested that the communication be forwarded to you through this office.

Any response should be communicated to the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Enclosure
July 9, 1993

Mr. Steve Sidlowski  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
155 East Superior Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mr. Sidlowski:

Enclosed please find a writing above the signature of ____________. The content is self explanatory.

___________ has requested that the communication be forwarded to you through this office.

Any response should be communicated to the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Enclosure
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a letter written by Victim JN and sent to the Archdiocese of Chicago through her attorney on July 9, 1993, in which Victim JN summarized her contacts with the Archdiocese beginning in April of 1993 regarding her allegation of sexual abuse by Fr. William Lupo when she was a minor. As per Victim JN, the abuse occurred several times around 1984 while Fr. Lupo was at St. Mary in Des Plaines and included Fr. Lupo exposing himself to Victim JN. In her letter, Victim JN requests that the Archdiocese notify her of any developments in the investigation into her allegation against Fr. Lupo and expresses her opinion that Fr. Lupo should be removed from his pastorate.
July 11, 1993

Mr. Steve Sidlowski  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
P.O. Box 1979  
Chicago, IL  60690

Dear Mr. Sidlowski:

Peace!

I am Sister Edna Kazek, ssj tosf Pastoral Associate at St. Peter Damian Parish in Bartlett, Illinois where Rev. William Lupo serves as Pastor.

You and I had a telephone conversation shortly after Easter, 1993, during which you strongly recommended that I contact you should I observe a situation, RE: Fr. Lupo, which would warrant a report to your office.

Because no message has come forth from me is no indication that I have neglected this responsibility. The truth is that I pray incessantly that the truth in this case prevail and that this case be put quickly and quietly to rest.

Fr. Lupo is a warm, friendly personable person, and very affirming. His is a fine sense of humor and he applies it appropriately in his conversation and in his homilies.

He has a love for Scripture. His homilies at week-end Masses and daily Masses are simple and yet profound. I always believed that God reveals His deepest mysteries to His priests and Fr. Lupo is witness to this unique gift.

I have served here at St. Peter Damian since 1987 and all the years (three) that Fr. Lupo has been Pastor here. Except when Fr. Lupo is actively ministering he is a very private person. In either case he is always very proper.

He has handled himself well through this ordeal. There is a "business as usual" atmosphere for which he is to be commended.

Be assured that I continue to take my responsibility in this matter seriously and, my prayer continues that truth prevail, suffering be spared and justice be met. The Lord give you strength.

Sincerely in the Lord,

Sister Edna Kazek, ssj tosf  
Pastoral Associate

109 South Crest Avenue • Bartlett, Illinois 60103 • (708) 837-5411
July 13, 1993

Mr. Steve Sidlowski
Office of Professional Fitness
Archdiocese of Chicago
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, IL 60690

Dear Mr. Sidlowski;

My name is [redacted] and I am a Permanent Deacon at St. Peter Damian parish in Bartlett, where Fr. Bill Lupo is pastor. I was ordained in the Spring of 1986 and have served at St. Peter Damian since then, so I have been a deacon there the whole time Fr. Lupo has been pastor. I was recently made aware of charges being made against Fr. Lupo concerning alleged incidents occurring in one of his former parishes. I would like your office to know I have never heard from anyone directly, nor have I heard indirectly from anyone of any accusations of impropriety in our parish by Fr. Lupo, similar to what he is being accused of elsewhere.

I hope this information may help your office in its resolution of this issue. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any other questions I could answer.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Sidlowski  
Office of Professional Fitness  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
P.O. Box 1979  
Chicago, IL 60690  
Re: Rev. William L. Lupo

Dear Mr. Sidlowski:

As Business Manager since September, 1990 for St. Peter Damian Parish, I am regularly on duty at the Parish Office, which is located in the same building as the rectory. Because this is my own Parish, and because I live nearby, I frequently stop in the office on evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays in addition to normal, Monday - Friday, 9 - 5 office hours.

For almost all the three years he been assigned here, no one has been closer (certainly in physical proximity) to Bill Lupo or around him more than I. Consequently, I consider my observations relevant to this matter. In short, I have seen nothing even remotely resembling impropriety in Bill Lupo's behavior.

Further, as my pastor, my priest, and my supervisor, Bill Lupo has continuously demonstrated the highest integrity and character. I am proud to know him.

Let me add weight to my assessment. Even knowing the allegations made against Fr. Lupo, I would not hesitate entrusting any or all of my children into his care.

Please do not hesitate to call (Office: ; Home: ) if you require any further statement from me.

Sincerely,
When I spoke by phone with Jerry Riordan today he noted that on 7-26-93 he is leaving on vacation to Spain for three weeks and will return on August 16, 1993. On August 1, 1993 Lupo has told him he intends to go to Seattle, Washington for another vacation, this time with a couple, apparently a man and a woman, though Riordan is not sure. I explained that Lupo will need to explain his situation to at least one of those persons and ensure they agree to help monitor him while he is gone. I’ll need to communicate that to Lupo myself.

Fr. Ed Cronin is taking Lupo’s place while he is on vacation in terms of saying Mass at Church.

Fr. Riordan noted again that a Fr. John Enright, a retiring pastor of Epiphany Parish, is looking for a place to stay. He is in Panama until August 15, 1993 but after that will be working in Hispanic work until about 1-1-94. Riordan suggested that perhaps Enright could take Riordan’s place for awhile at St. Peter Damian’s as a monitor. I told him I would talk to POM about it.
Jerry Riordan noted that in terms of monitoring of Bill Lupo that all is fine.

Fr. Riordan emphasized that I can tell the Board "I have seen nothing." "I've seen no evidence of youth around here." Fr. Riordan pointed out that he is at St. Peter Damian Parish every day and that he and Lupo often chat at breakfast together.

Riordan noted that no women or teen-age girls work in the rectory. Also Fr. Riordan noted that he's seen no women enter or leave the rectory to see Fr. Lupo alone.

In short, Fr. Riordan stated "I see no kids around."

Jerry Riordan has seen no occasions where Lupo is alone with kids, though that is as far as the rectory is concerned, per Fr. Riordan, in that Father has not seen Lupo "in action" during or outside or after Mass.

Nonetheless, Fr. Riordan has seen no hugging by Bill Lupo toward minors or inappropriate touching.

Fr. Riordan pointed out, too, that there were no reports from Fr. Jack Dewes of any problems on Lupo's last vacation. (Fr. Dewes is aware of Lupo's situation).

I explained to Fr. Riordan that his stipend is going up to $300.00 a month that Bill Lupo is going to be referred for soon and that I would talk with Pat O'Malley about finding a temporary replacement for Fr. Riordan while he is gone. He noted that if upon his return he is still needed as a monitor for Lupo, he will be happy to continue to serve.
MEMO
TO: File (PFR-23)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: July 21, 1993
RE: Phone Call to [Redacted]
      Attorney for [Redacted]

I called [Redacted] Attorney for [Redacted], this afternoon. He was not in. I left a message with my name, title, and that it regards [Redacted]. His secretary said he should be in tomorrow and she would give him the message.
To: Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Reverend Patrick J. O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
Mr. John C. O'Malley, Director of Legal Services

From: Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor and Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board

Date: July 21, 1993

Re: Reverend William Lupo

Steve,

As the Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing to confirm that Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the recommendations of the Review Board concerning Reverend William Lupo as described in your letter to His Eminence dated April 19, 1993. Although I had conveyed the Cardinal's decision to you orally shortly after the Review Board conducted its First Stage Review on April 7, 1993, I am providing this written memo for your records.

It is my understanding that appropriate steps have already been taken to implement the Review Board's recommendations.

The work of the Review Board and yourself in this matter is greatly appreciated.
MEMO

TO: File (PFR-23)

FROM: Steve Sidlowksi

DATE: July 22, 1993

RE: Phone Call to [Redacted] Esq.

[Redacted], who is now representing [Redacted] in the Lupo matter as her attorney, asked what the status of the Lupo matter is. I explained to him that I had discussed the status of the situation with [Redacted] in the past and that the situation is basically the same. In other words, I explained Fr. Lupo continues to be under restrictions from the First Stage Review in that he is not allowed to be alone with those under 18 without the presence of a responsible adult and that we have more than one monitor in the parish ensuring that is the case. To date, he has basically complied with the monitoring, I explained to [Redacted]. Also, to date we have received no reports of any inappropriate acting out by Lupo.

I ensured that [Redacted] had told him that I sent her a letter following the First Stage Review. He said that he was aware of that letter. He asked if I would correspond to him following a further review. I said I would cc him a copy of the letter I send following the Second Stage Review. He appreciated that.

I explained to him that at this point we are hoping to conduct the Second Stage Review on Lupo on 7-24-93, although we may not get to it. I emphasized that [Redacted] told me previously that another person she knows may have further information about Lupo, and that Lupo may have engaged in inappropriate conduct with this other person. I told [Redacted] that [Redacted] had called here, said she’d spoken to this other person, and that we should expect a call. However, I told [Redacted] that when I recently spoke to [Redacted] I told her we had not received any communication from this other person, and that is also the case to date.

However, I told [Redacted] that if [Redacted] wants to provide me with the name, address and phone number of this other person who may have additional information regarding Lupo, that I would be happy to receive that information and would look into it, except if for some reason the Board directed me not, to which I told him I would not expect.

He said he would inform [Redacted] about the above paragraph and that he would likely provide me with that information about this other person.

The call was cordial was overall. [Redacted] said then he will be expecting to get the cc letter from me to [Redacted] following the Second Stage Review.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

Date: July 24, 1993

Board Members Present:

Others Present:

Steve Sidlowski
Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.):

1. The Board completed a Second Stage Review in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.11 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

2. Determination: It is reasonable to allow W.L. to remain in ministry as a pastor in view of all of the facts and circumstances, giving appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest. Basis: Positive monitoring reports from three persons and continued monitoring of W.L. to ensure minors are not at risk in the un-monitored presence of W.L.

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon W.L. so that he is not alone with persons under 18 yrs. of age without the presence of another responsible adult; the live-in priest monitor and two other lay person monitors should continue in their roles;
The Board further discussed some business matters, including setting next Board meeting for 8-21-93 and meeting beyond that for 9-18-93, both which appeared good for a Board quorum. The 8-27-93 possible meeting date was cancelled because not enough members could attend.

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski
Administrator

Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
MEMO TO FILE: PFR-23
FROM: Steve Sidlowski, Administrator
RE: William Lupo
DATE: July 24, 1993

Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, July 24, 1993:

The Review Board considered the matter of Father Lupo and completed a Second Stage Review. The Board determined that it was reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances.

In the Second Stage Review, the Board fully considered the Fitness Review Administrator's written and verbal reports as well as...
WRITTEN REPORT/SUMMARY FOR SUPPLEMENTARY STAGE REVIEW

REVIEW DATE: June 11, 1994 (2nd Stage Review Completed 7-24-93).


2. ORDAINED: 1965

3. PRESENT ASSIGNMENT OR RESIDENCE:
   St. Peter Damian Parish
   109 S. Crest Ave.
   Bartlett, Il.
   At St. Mary in DesPlaines: 1979-1986

4. ALLEGATIONS/INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Offense</th>
<th>Sex/Age of Child</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979 or 1980 until 1982</td>
<td>F/14-15 thru 17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1984</td>
<td>F/12-15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - 1985</td>
<td>F/16-18 2 mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. GENERAL NATURE OF OFFENSE(S): Allegation of exposure of full naked body in bed to fourteen year old girl in rectory and of partial nakedness to two other teen-age girls in/around his bedroom/shower; passionate kissing and hugging over approximately six years with at least 3 teenage girls (underline).

6. OTHER PROBLEMS DURING MINISTRY: Per POM, no other allegations of sexual misconduct.
8. **SPECIAL CONCERNS OR PROBLEMS (if any):** Rev. Lupo is only assigned priest in parish; no school though active CCD (700+ kids) program; strong denial. Lupo acknowledges some aspects of some incidents; one of the victims now working with an attorney.

9. **DATE OF FIRST STAGE REVIEW COMPLETION:** April 7, 1993

10. **REVIEW BOARD’S DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP/ARCHBISHOP’S DECISION:** Bill Lupo could have restrictions imposed upon him - no unsupervised contact with minors without presence of responsible adult; a full-time priest monitor should move into parish rectory to help monitor him; Cardinal fully accepted Board’s recommendations.

11. **REVIEW BOARD’S DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP/ARCHBISHOP’S DECISION IN 2ND STAGE REVIEW:** See attached letter (Cardinal Bernardin fully accepted Board’s determination and recommendations).
WRITTEN REPORT/SUMMARY FOR SECOND STAGE REVIEW

REVIEW DATE: July 24, 1993

1. NAME: Rev. William Lupo AGE/D.O.B. 53yrs. old

2. ORDAINED: 1965

3. PRESENT ASSIGNMENT OR RESIDENCE:
   
   St. Peter Damian Parish
   109 S. Crest Ave.
   Bartlett, Ill.

   At St. Mary in DesPlaines: 1979-1986

4. ALLEGATIONS/INFORMATION:

   Date of Offense                  Sex/Age of Child       Credibility
   _______________________________ ________________________ ________

   1979 or 1980 until 1982          F/14-15 through 17    X
   (approx.)

   1981-1984                        F/12-15                X

   Summer-'85                       F/16-18 2 mos.         X

5. GENERAL NATURE OF OFFENSE(S) Allegation of exposure of full, naked body in bed to fourteen year old girl in rectory and of partial nakedness to two other teen-age girls in/around his bedroom/shower; passionate kissing and hugging over approximately six years with at least three teen-age girls (one of these girls sometimes felt an erection against her body).

6. OTHER PROBLEMS DURING MINISTRY Per POM, no other allegations of sexual misconduct.

7. 
8. SPECIAL CONCERNS OR PROBLEMS (If any): Rev. Lupo is only assigned priest in parish; no school though active CCD (700+ kids) program; strong denial, Lupo acknowledges some aspects of some incidents; one of the victims now working with an attorney.

9. DATE OF FIRST STAGE REVIEW COMPLETION: April 7, 1993

10. REVIEW BOARD’S DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP/ARCHBISHOP’S DECISION: Bill Lupo could have restrictions imposed upon him - no unsupervised contact with minors without presence of responsible adult; a full-time priest monitor should move into parish rectory to help monitor him; Cardinal fully accepted Board’s recommendations.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS

The Board may recall that in the First Stage Review some felt Bill Lupo should immediately be withdrawn from his ministerial assignment in the interest of the safety of children. The Board determined that in this matter there should be very strict monitoring in that a fellow priest could move into the parish immediately to help out. It was accomplished through Fr. Jerry Riordan, a retired priest (ordained in 1943) who moved into St. Peter Damian Parish on Good Friday, April 9, 1993. Fr. Riordan has resided in the rectory with Bill Lupo ever since. Also, I requested the assistance of St. Peter’s Youth Minister Mr. Bob Newton and the Pastoral Associate Sr. Edna Kazek. The monitoring reports, in summary, have all been positive. I have spoken with Fr. Riordan on a regular basis and most recently on 7-20-93 he emphasized that I can tell the Board "I have seen nothing. I have seen no evidence of youth around here." He is at the parish every day and he and Lupo often converse at breakfast. He said "I see no kids around." He noted no teen-age girls work in the rectory. He has seen no occasion when Lupo was alone with kids, (he has not seen him outside of Mass on Sunday), he has seen no hugging toward minors or inappropriate touching by Bill Lupo. Bob Newton and Sr. Edna Kazek echo this view overall.

There was one report since the First Stage Review by Fr. Riordan to the effect that he had heard Bill Lupo was interviewing teen-age girls alone in the
rectory in preparation for Confirmation. I asked Fr. Riordan to look into the matter. It turns out I spoke with Bob Newton who also runs the Confirmation program and discovered that Bill Lupo had only interviewed the teen-age girls alone before the monitoring began; after the monitoring began, Bob Newton was present for all the interviews with the teen-age girls.

I have been in regular contact with both and . Please note that has now contacted an attorney, , and did issue statement (read statement if Board wants me to) to her attorney or summarize.

Summary: stated that at the time of coming forward she did not specify what to do with Fr. Lupo. Now she believes "that the appropriate Archdiocesan should be that of ....... the dismissal of Fr. Lupo from his current position with the Archdiocese." She also made reference to becoming "aware of others in the parish who had been victimized by Fr. Lupo" in early 1993. It does not specify that this was only or not. However, has called since the initial Review to state that there was another person who she expected would call me with more information and perhaps an allegation herself; to date that has not occurred. Basically stated the same about another person). asked to be contacted through her attorney about the current status of the matter. I have done that and invited through her attorney to provide any names, addresses, numbers of persons who may know more about the allegations or were possibly victimized themselves by Bill Lupo. Her attorney is to get back to me about this.

Bill Lupo has also turned in additional information. She acknowledges she was friendly to him, but that he did indeed end up manipulating her as a teenager by taking advantage of his friendliness toward her with the subsequent sexual misconduct.

has since requested my notes of her statements made to me about the allegation (the Archdiocesan attorneys have signed off on that). Her husband, , has also called to share concerns about the case.
they are disturbed that Lupo appears to be making it extremely legalistic and they are upset that the Archdiocese is funding his attorney. I told him I would express his feelings to the Board.

Bill Lupo also asked some persons to submit character reference letters on his behalf. I have received five such letters. Two of them are from current employees at St. Peter Damian - the business manager and a Permanent Deacon there. (Read letters to Board if they want; if not, I will summarize that each letter is very supportive. One person is a Youth Minister at St. Mary's Parish but apparently after the misconduct occurred. He was minister there from 1980 to 1983 so it does cover some of the time period of the allegations of the sisters. Identifies herself as a very good friend of Lupo who said she's very supportive of Lupo but noted that "Lupo is very affectionate - he hugs and kisses and tells of his love, but in a paternal/best buddy kind of way." Has known him for thirteen years and spoke highly of his character.

RECOMMENDATION: I continue to be extremely concerned about Fr. Bill Lupo's situation. At First Stage Review I mentioned that this case was not necessarily far from being a withdrawal. The nature of sexual misconduct and the number of persons involved, and the relatively recent nature of the incident (as late as Summer, 1985) are all serious matters.
information leads me to conclude that it would be very dangerous of the Board to not recommend that Fr. Lupo's strict monitoring continue at the very least. I would not recommend any reduction in the strictness of his monitoring. That is, I feel a priest monitor should remain in the parish with him, and the other monitors as stated continue to help out as well. Fr. Pat O'Malley and I have discussed Bill Lupo.

My sense is that Bill Lupo has minimized his conduct towards these three teen-age girls at the time throughout this process. Yet he did acknowledge that he was sitting naked within a few feet of a teen-age girl in his rectory bedroom. He seems to have no apologies for it, not to mention the substance of the other allegations (passionate kissing and hugging). Yet, his monitoring has been successful apparently to date. For these reasons, at this point I again recommend that his strict monitoring continue for several more months in the same way and that the Board wait to see if there is any progress to address his misconduct. In view of all the extra circumstances with due consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest at this point, I feel this is a reasonable recommendation. However, if further information is revealed such as other female victims in the past or currently coming forward with allegations against him - if such information was found to be credible - I could very well then recommend his immediate withdrawal from the parish in the interest of the safety of children.
MEMO
TO: File (PFR-23)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: July 28, 1993
RE: Phone Call to Bill Lupo Regarding Monitoring on his upcoming vacation and communication of Second Stage Review results.

I called Bill Lupo to discuss the above (see title). He was not in. His secretary told me he will be gone until late Thursday evening. I inquired further and learned that he apparently went to his cottage as is often his practice. However, I asked for Father Riordan, and as he said, he is gone on vacation.

I told his secretary that it is very important that he call me immediately upon his return to the parish and that I must speak with him before he leaves on his vacation. She told me she would leave the message to that effect. I left my name and number.

I put in calls to Youth Minister Bob Newton and Pastoral Associate Sr. Edna to inform them that as Fr. Riordan is gone, until Fr. Lupo leaves on his vacation, I would need them to try to monitor the situation with Bill Lupo more closely until then. I also wanted to inform them of the continuing monitoring and ensure they fully understand the monitoring rules.

PHONE CALL TO SR. EDNA KAZEK: 7-28-93

I informed Sr. Edna that I've been trying to get a hold of Bill Lupo. I thanked her for her letter of 7-11-93. I told her that I need to communicate the outcome of the Second Stage Review to Bill Lupo, but in the meantime, I am asking her if she would try to keep a closer eye in terms of the monitoring until/or if Bill Lupo leaves for vacation this weekend. She said she would be happy to.

She told me "I will do what is my responsibility - he's been a very private person, but when he's with us he is friendly and warm."

Sr. Edna noted that she has "never" seen any situations where Bill Lupo has been alone with teenage girls or other minors. Also, she is "never" seen him act inappropriately with teenage girls or other minors since the monitoring has begun.

We agreed that I would send on to her the updated monitoring guidelines in that the situation, in terms of monitoring, will be continuing for the time being.
PHONE CALL TO BOB NEWTON: 7-28-93
(Youth Minister)

I called Bob to inform him of the same information I informed Sr. Edna about. I called him at home. He was not in. I left a message with a family member with my name and number and told the person to please have Bob call me as soon as he could.
Memo to File  
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley  
Date: 7/28/93  
Re: William Lupo

The Fitness Review Board reviewed the Lupo situation on 7/24/93. They determined that there should be continued monitoring. Lupo is scheduled to be alone this week while Jerry Reardon is away. Steve Sidlowski will notify the other staff members at the parish to be even more on the alert in Bill's situation so that our monitoring obligations are covered.
Dear [Redacted]

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 24, 1993 and conducted a Second Stage Review in the matter involving the Rev. William P. Lupo.

The Board has recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed on Fr. Lupo and that he should not be alone in the presence of persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

I've asked our Assistance Minister, Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, to contact you to answer any questions you may have about the further review of the matter. You are also free to contact me about any questions as well at (312)751-5205/5206 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

SS/rm
cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley
9. **Education:**
   - Archdiocesan Seminaries - 12 years
   - St. Matthew grade school - 8 years

10. **Ministerial Assignments:**
   - O.L. Mother of the Church 1972 - 1979
   - St. Peter Damian 1990 - present
   - St. Mary, Desplaines 1979 - 1986

11. **Family Composition: (D - Deceased)**
    - Parents: [Blacked out]
    - Siblings: [Blacked out]

12. **Monitors:**
    - Address: [Blacked out]
    - Phone: [Blacked out]

13. **Emergency Contacts:**
    - **1st**
      - Dennis Kowalski
      - Relationship: Business Manager
      - Home #: [Blacked out]
      - Work #: [Blacked out]
    - **2nd**
      - Rev. John Dewes
      - Relationship: Best Friend
      - Home #: [Blacked out]
      - Work #: Same

14. **Other Concerns:**
Dear [Name]:

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 24, 1993 and conducted a Second Stage Review in the matter involving the Rev. William P. Lupo.

The Board has recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed on Fr. Lupo and that he should not be alone in the presence of persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

I've asked our Assistance Minister, Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, to contact you to answer any questions you may have about the further review of the matter. You are also free to contact me about any questions as well at (312)751-5205/5206 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

SS/rm
cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley
Dear Fr. Lupo:

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 24, 1993. In the meeting, the Board accepted the documents you authorized and fully considered my written and oral reports. The Board conducted a Second Stage Review pursuant to Article 4.11 of the Review Process For The Continuation Of Ministry.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow you to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed on you and, specifically, the monitoring of your activities should continue. As a result, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that you should continue not to be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board requested that I communicate its determination and recommendations to you. In addition, I will contact you to discuss the further action to be taken and any further review of the matter.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

July 28, 1993

cc: Rev. Patrick O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
Mr. Patrick Tuite, Esq.
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley
Dear [Name]

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 24, 1993 and conducted a Second Stage Review in the matter involving the Rev. William P. Lupo.

The Board has recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed on Fr. Lupo and that he should not be alone in the presence of persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

I've asked our Assistance Minister, Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, to contact you to answer any questions you may have about the further review of the matter. You are also free to contact me about any questions as well at (312) 751-5205/5206 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

SS/rm
cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley
July 28, 1993

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 24, 1993. The Board accepted the documents authorized by Rev. William Lupo and fully considered my written and oral reports. The Board conducted a Second Stage Review pursuant to Article 4.11 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to keep Fr. Lupo in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommends that restrictions should continue to be imposed on Fr. Lupo and, specifically, the monitoring of his activities should continue. As a result, the Board recommends that Fr. Lupo not be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board requested me to communicate its determination and recommendations to Fr. Lupo and I have done so.

The Board will report to you any further determination and recommendations following any Supplementary Review of this matter.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

SS/rm
cc: Members of the Review Board
    Rev. Thomas Paprocki, Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board
    bcc: John O'Malley
Phone Call to Fr. Bill Lupo: 7-30-93

I called Bill Lupo and informed him of the outcome of the Second Stage Review. He was disappointed.

I asked for his cottage number in Wisconsin. The cottage is in [redacted], Wisconsin. The number is [redacted]. I told him that there may be times as was the case earlier this week when I would need to contact him there.

We discussed his situation and his planned vacation for two weeks beginning Sunday, 8-1-93.

He explained he is going with a married couple - [redacted]. They are long time friends for the last ten years though not St. Peter Damian parishioners. He said that the couple does know about his situation. I explained that I would need them to help monitor his situation while he is on vacation. He didn’t have a problem with that. I told him if he wanted to speak with one of them first, that was fine, but I would like to speak at least with one of them before the vacation as well, as Jerry Riordan is now gone on vacation himself. He had no problem with that, told me he would call [redacted], and tell her to try to get back to me as soon as possible but in any event before they leave.

I told him I would be leaving about mid-afternoon today and I would like their phone number. (He said they live in [redacted], Ill.). He said he did not have their phone number on them, but he would call me back and either give it to me directly or leave it on the 06 Voice Mail, so that I could call [redacted] if she does not get a hold of me this afternoon.

I explained that he would need to keep a basic itinerary of his whereabouts on the vacation as the monitoring rules require. I told him especially he ought to note times that he would perhaps be in an event involving minors to note that either [redacted] or [redacted] or both were present. Also, if he felt that there was a situation that could be misinterpreted, he ought to note if [redacted] and [redacted] were present. I told him I would be telling either of the [redacted] that if there is a problem that I would be asking them to contact me directly (while he is on vacation).

He told me a little bit about the vacation. We’ll be in [redacted] with the family until Tuesday 8-2-93. Then we will leave for Seattle, Wash. on 8-2-93. Then they will be going on a cruise to the inner passage of Alaska for two weeks. They will be getting off at a few ports along the Alaskan coastline apparently; he anticipates return to St. Peter Damian the evening of 8-14-93 to be back for Mass on 8-15-93.

I explained that, in accord with the outcome of the Second Stage Review, and in that I have been informed that the Cardinal has
accepted the recommendations (verbally) he would still be getting a letter from me and also from Tom Paprocki announcing the Cardinal’s decision some time later.

I told him that [REDACTED] now has an attorney. He is aware of that and that the attorney sent him the same information he sent me, which includes the recent written statement by [REDACTED].

He wanted to know how long the monitoring situation would continue. I told him that I don’t know for sure but that there will be at least one or more Supplementary Reviews in the future. He talked about possibly addressing the Board directly, and I told him he could put that request in writing, or whatever he wants to request in writing for the Board or any Supplementary Reviews.

We talked about possible change of an in-house monitor, but he stated that in any event he and Rev. Jerry Riordan get along very well.
Bill Lupo informed me last week that he would be vacationing with Mr. and Mrs. [redacted] on their cruise into Alaska beginning 8-3-93. I told him I would like to speak with one of the persons accompanying him to ensure they understand his situation and to assist in his monitoring to ensure he not be alone with minors without their presence. Lupo said the couple was aware of his situation but that he would call [redacted] and have her call me. She called over the weekend on Voice Mail. I called her back on Sunday evening, August 1, 1993.

Mrs. [redacted] stated that she did understand Bill Lupo’s situation to the extent he has told her about it. I gave her the basic details and asked if she would be willing to assist us in ensuring Bill Lupo is not alone with those under 18 while on vacation or to let me know if a problem arose regarding inappropriate conduct on his part during the trip. I noted that in particular we would be concerned about his interaction with teenage girls. It is clear that Mrs. [redacted] is very supportive of Bill Lupo, but she did fully agree to assist in letting me know if a problem arises during the trip. I also asked her that if such a situation were to arise if she would please point it out to Bill Lupo, as that would be the normal procedure with his in/house priest monitor, Fr. Jerry Riordan. I explained that Fr. Riordan is on vacation now or else I would have hoped that Fr. Riordan and she could work out this arrangement and she would call him if a problem arose. However, I explained since he will be gone for three weeks, I was asking her to contact me if there is a problem. She has my phone number and assured me she would contact me if a problem with Bill Lupo’s monitoring arises.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a File Memo from Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, summarizing a phone call from Victim JO on August 19, 1993. Victim JO is concerned about situations where, because of her occupation, she may see Fr. William Lupo, as they sometimes attend the same meetings. Mr. Sidlowski tells Victim JO that he will informally mention to Fr. Lupo that he should not approach Victim JO if he should see her.
Memo
To: Rev. Kenneth Velo
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 8/20/93
Re: Fr. William Lupo

Fr. Lupo is a client of our office and recently expressed a strong desire to sit down with the Cardinal to explain his situation and to let the Cardinal know where he is at this time. Allegations have been made against Lupo in the past and he wants to make sure that the Cardinal understands his situation.

Could you arrange a meeting at some time in the near future? Bill is out at St. Peter Damian in Bartlett and would be certainly willing to adjust his schedule to the Cardinal's. You can of course contact Bill directly.

I received the notes below with Fr. Popocki on 9/7/93.

1. [Redacted]

2. [Redacted]

3. He feels the events happened but not as he related. He feels he has been misrepresented by them.

4. I think Fr. Lupo is honestly telling what he believes happened. I took him (an accused for his protection) to anywhere that I have accepted the Bd's recommendation.
Memo to file
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 8/20/93
Re: William Lupo

I spoke to Bill Lupo at length today.

Lupo is still uncertain as to what the Fitness Review Board wants. I tried to explain to him that what they are looking for is not so much __________, certainly a part of it, but also the whole question of celibacy and boundaries and style of presenting oneself. These need to be looked at in Bill's situation according to the Fitness Review Board.

Lupo would also like to have an appointment to see the Cardinal sometime soon. I will contact Velo and explain this to him.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

Office of the Archbishop

Post Office Box 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690

PENAL PRECEPT RESTRICTING REVEREND WILLIAM LUPO
FROM BEING ALONE IN THE PRESENCE OF A MINOR
WITHOUT ANOTHER ADULT PRESENT

In order to preclude scandal arising from allegations of sexual misconduct with a minor against you and in order to provide adequately for the safety of children and other minors (c. 277):

Mindful of my responsibilities to promote ecclesiastical discipline and urge observance of all ecclesiastical laws (c. 392) through the exercise of my pastoral office as diocesan bishop (c. 381, § 1);

Taking into account the common good of the Church, the rights of others and duties towards others (c. 223 § 1); and

Having heard those whose rights can be injured and having thoroughly considered the information and facts of the matter (cc. 50 and 1319, § 2);

Therefore, I, Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, by the grace of God and the Apostolic See Archbishop of Chicago, in accord with canons 49 and 273, hereby restrict you, Reverend William Lupo, as a matter of obedience, from being alone in the presence of any minor under the age of eighteen without another responsible adult present. Monitoring of your activities will continue in order to assure compliance with this precept.

In accord with canons 1317-1319 and 1371, § 2, you are warned that intentional or culpable violation of this precept could result in the imposition of a just penalty, including possible suspension.

Dated this 31st day of August, 1993.

Joseph, Card. Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago

Given at the Chancery

Thomas J. Paprocki
Chancellor
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
OFFICE OF THE ARCHBISHOP

THE FOLLOWING ENTRY SHOULD BE MADE IN THE CARDINAL'S SCHEDULE:

FR. WILLIAM LUPO

DATE: AUGUST 31, 1993
TIME: 1:30 p.m.

CORRESPONDENCE ATTACHED
PREVIOUS CORRESPONDENCE cc: Fr. O'Malley
VIA TELEPHONE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
Pat: Cardinal will most likely need a briefing re this situation.
MEMORANDUM

To: Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Reverend Patrick J. O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
    Mr. John C. O'Malley, Director of Legal Services

From: Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor and Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board

Date: September 7, 1993

Re: Reverend William Lupo

Steve,

As the Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing to confirm that Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the recommendations of the Review Board concerning Reverend William Lupo as described in your letter to His Eminence dated July 28, 1993 following completion of the Second Stage Review at the Review Board's meeting on July 24, 1993.

Cardinal Bernardin met with Father Lupo on August 31, 1993. In addition, I have written to Father Lupo to inform him in writing of the Cardinal's decision to implement the Review Board's recommendations. A copy of my letter is enclosed for your records.

The work of the Review Board and yourself in this matter is greatly appreciated.

TJP/tjp
September 7, 1993

Reverend William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo:

As the Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing to confirm that Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the recommendations of the Review Board following completion of the Second Stage Review at the Board’s meeting on July 24, 1993. These recommendations were communicated to you in writing on July 28, 1993 by Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator.

Specifically, Cardinal Bernardin accepted the Board’s determination that it is reasonable to allow you to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances. However, the Cardinal accepted the Board’s recommendation that restrictions should continue to be imposed on you and the monitoring of your activities should continue. In particular, you are reminded not to be alone with persons under eighteen years of age without the presence of another responsible adult. As directed by His Eminence, these restrictions are canonically binding as a matter of obedience.

It is my understanding that Cardinal Bernardin met with you on August 31 and discussed this matter with you personally. If you have any additional questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me or Steve Sidlowski.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki
Chancellor

cc: Reverend Patrick J. O’Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator
    Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
    Mr. John C. O’Malley, Director of Legal Services

TJP/tjp
I acknowledge that I have read and am familiar with the Archdiocesan policies and procedures regarding sexual misconduct with minors, adopted September 21, 1992.

Please send me a copy of these policies and procedures.

Signature: ________________________________
Name (printed): WILLIAM L. LUPO
Address: 109 S. CREST AVE.
City, State, Zip: BARTLETT, IL 60103

Date: 10-2-83
Diocesan Priests' File Checklist

- [ ] Acknowledgement of Misconduct Policies, dated 10/4/93
- [x] Curriculum Vitae, dated 7/14/87
- [x] Last Will & Testament, dated 2/3/60
- [ ] Personal Inventory, dated
- [ ] Photo (for assignment card kept in Suzie's office)

Please list any other important documents that are in this file:
Memo to File
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 10/31/93
Re: William Lupo

On Saturday, 10/30/93, I finally contacted Fr. Jerry Riordan about his staying at St. Peter Damian in Bartlett. Jerry told me that he, in fact, is willing to stay at Bartlett. There was a misunderstanding on our part thinking he wanted to get away.

I told him I would inform Sidlowski with whom he has already spoken. I also will inform the priest who was willing to go there.

In a separate issue, Fr. Riordan mentioned that there was some difficulty about him receiving stipends from the parish when he does extra work. He certainly is entitled to those stipends as would any retired priest coming in. I told him that rather than ask the parish for those stipends, he should submit to Steve Sidlowski, at the Professional Fitness Review Office, a memo detailing what is coming to him. Sidlowski and I had spoken about this as both of us agreed that we wished to keep the monitor as financially independent of the parish as possible. Sidlowski has no problem in adding an additional amount on to Riordan's $300 check.

After speaking to Riordan, I called Bill Lupo to inform him of the arrangement. He was quite pleased. When I had talked originally about someone else going in there, Lupo had mentioned that it would be quite difficult to explain to the parish why the change at this time. This works out much better for all of us.

The priest who had volunteered to take Riordan's place was informed of the unchanged situation.
I've been monitoring this site, the rectory of St. Peter Damian, since Easter 1993, to be precise, since April 10, 1993.

As far as the parishioners know, I'm a house guest who finds it convenient to stay here. Being a retired pastor from a neighboring parish who is acting as chaplain at a nearby convent (Immaculata, Sisters of St. Joseph, TOSF), it seems a natural enough explanation. Physically, I have a room at the foot of the stairs to the pastor's quarters and therefore I am in a position to know whether there are any visitors to his rooms. I would say negative totally with the exception of priest guests. The clergy quarters are well separated from the business section of the rectory. Therefore, I feel that I can state with a certainty, Fr. Lupo is keeping his agreement re contact alone with minors.

During the church functions I have not the same first-hand knowledge, but Sister Edna, the pastoral associate, observes these times and she assures me all is well. In the few parish functions I have attended, I've seen nothing untoward.

Jerome F. Riordan
Dear Steve,

I know you are very busy these days and therefore I will make this note brief. Enclosed is a brief report of my term on this job as per your request. I'm leaving Thursday, December 9th, to go to Florida to do a Saturday wedding at Boca Raton, and will return Tuesday, December 14th.

If you have any questions, you can reach me as soon as I return.

Sincerely in Christ,

Jerome F. Riordan

P.S. Sister Edna was recently operated upon but she is back on the job.

P.S. I'm back from Florida
MEMO
TO: File PFR-23
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: February 25, 1994
RE: Monitoring of Bill Lupo on upcoming vacation

Pursuant to the monitoring rules, Bill Lupo contacted me on 2-25-94 to formally notify me and seek my approval of his upcoming trip from 3-1-94 to 3-6-94. Bill told me that he hoped to go on a skiing trip with four other lay men - "ski buddies" - from the evening of 3-1-94 to the evening of 3-6-94 at the Motherlode in Park City, Utah.

I inquired from Bill as to the nature of the trip and the persons who were accompanying him, particularly in regard as to whether any of them were fully apprised of his situation in that he is not allowed alone with anyone under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult as well as a full awareness of the current monitoring restrictions which Bill Lupo lives under. Bill said that, indeed, one of the companions for the upcoming trip, a Mr. [ ], had been told about Bill’s situation by Bill a couple of months ago and Bill had since talked to [ ] about helping out with the monitoring during the upcoming trip.

I told Bill I would need a phone number at which to reach [ ] to confirm that he is fully aware of Bill’s situation and would be willing to monitor him while he was on vacation. Bill Lupo then provided me with [ ]’s work number which is [ ] and Bill noted that [ ] works in a department in which the person who answers will call it "Employee Assistance."

I told Bill that I would check the situation out with [ ] and assuming that he has been fully filled-in about Bill’s situation and is willing to ensure that Bill does not violate his monitoring restrictions during the upcoming trip, and that [ ] would probably be able to serve properly as his approved companion for the trip. I told Bill if there is a problem I will get back to him. I also told Bill that I would tell [ ] that if there is a problem that arises during the trip with Bill Lupo that I will ask [ ] to fully notify me about the details of any such situation.

While I had Bill on the line, I asked him [ ]
Bill Lupo was curious about any possible change in his future status regarding the restrictions/monitoring imposed upon him. I reminded Bill about Supplementary Reviews and if he eventually wants to bring his situation forward to the Board in a formal manner again that he would need to request that in writing.

Phone Call to Mr. [Redacted]: 2-25-95

At first, I was unable to get a hold of Mr. [Redacted], but he called me back at the Office once I had left a message for him at the number Bill Lupo provided.

[Redacted] assured me that he is fully aware of Bill Lupo’s situation based upon what Bill told him. I told [Redacted] that indeed there are monitoring restrictions imposed on Bill and that he is not allowed alone with anyone under 18 without the presence of another responsible adult, and without going into details, I told [Redacted] that Bill’s issue would primarily involve him not being alone with teen-age females although the general restriction for all minors does apply. [Redacted] fully understood the situation and told me that he would most certainly agree to keeping an eye on Bill during the trip and if a problem arises or an inappropriate situation in which Bill might attempt to be alone with any minors, [Redacted] assured me he will confront Bill about the situation and he would also contact me either during the trip or afterwards by phone or in writing. I confirmed that [Redacted] has my Office number. We agreed that if I do not hear from [Redacted] following the trip, I may assume that no problems with Bill Lupo arose.

He said that he did not have the actual phone number to the Motherlode in Utah but he would ask Bill Lupo to contact me immediately with the number, either directly or on the voice mail, as [Redacted] himself did not have the number available. He said he would be speaking with Bill Lupo tonight.

*** Note: Bill Lupo did call back and leave a voice mail message on 2-28-94 that the Motherlode Ski Resort phone number in Park City, Utah is 1-801-649-5124.
Thank you again for agreeing to assist in monitoring the priest in your parish and/or work or residential setting (whose situation we've already discussed). The Archdiocese of Chicago greatly appreciates your generous sacrifice of time and input into this difficult situation. On a monthly basis, we are requesting that you take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Report and mail it to the attention of:

Steve Sidlowski  
Professional Fitness Review Administrator  
1 East Superior  
Suite 504  
Chicago, Il. 60611

If I have not heard from you for several weeks, I will contact you by phone to check on the priest's overall compliance with the monitoring expectations.

As stated in the Monitoring Guidelines which you have received, however, please contact me immediately by phone if the priest clearly violates the Monitoring Guidelines or minimizes an inappropriate situation, particularly if the violation is that the priest is found alone with anyone under 18 years old without the presence of another responsible adult. My Office # is 1-312-751-5205 or 1-800-994-6200. If either my Administrative Assistant Rita Mongan or myself are unavailable, please feel free to leave a message on the security code-protected voice mail with your verbal report on the past month's monitoring. (Also, my Office FAX # is 1-312-751-5279.)

1. In the past month, have you seen or heard of any situations in which the priest you are monitoring was in the presence of any child under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult? (Yes or No - please circle). If yes, please explain briefly if the priest immediately removed himself from the situation or not upon being confronted or if he minimized the situation in your opinion in any way: (Note: That's hard:)

   -- That's all I can be-- I'm unable to-- because I'm living not so far from here--

   -- I'm not sure I'm un-- I'm far away

   -- No, not as inappropriate as for a distance.
2. Did the priest allow you access to his log book of whereabouts, if requested, and if not, please explain:

3. If the priest was going out of town for more than an overnight pre-approved trip (by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator), did he leave with you or one of the other monitors a basic itinerary of his whereabouts during the trip, including a phone number and site at which he could be reached, and the name of the adult who would be accompanying him during such a departure? (Yes or No - please circle). If no on any of the above points, please elaborate:

3a). If to your knowledge, the priest did not leave on any such trips in the past month, please mark an "X" in this line:

4. Do you believe that the priest has complied overall with his monitoring restrictions/expectations during the past month to your knowledge? (Yes or No - please circle). If no, please explain any problems or concerns with the priest which you have at this time regarding his monitoring compliance:

5. General Comments (or questions) you'd like me to get back to you about:

&

AOC 017319
Thank you again for your kind assistance!

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness
Review Administrator

Archdiocese of Chicago
May 2, 1994

Professional Fitness Review Board
c/o Mr. Steve Sidlowski
Archdiocese of Chicago
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, IL 60690

Dear Members of the Board:

I hereby request and apply for a Supplementary Review of the circumstances of my case. It is my hope that such a review would result in the lifting of the restrictions previously placed upon me and the closing of my file. I believe that further consideration of my character, my behavior, and my involvement in [redacted] for the past several months will show that such a resolution is indeed proper.

I further request that, as a part of this process, I be permitted to appear in person before the Board and that Drs. Robert Powers and Jane Griffith accompany me at this appearance.

With much respect, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Rev. William L. Lupo

cc: Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Mr. Patrick Tuite
MEMO from
CARDINAL BERNARDIN

To: Feste Poppeck  Date: 5/7/94

Tom,

Steve Sidlowski has undoubtedly told you about this. Please let me know the outcome of this request in case Fr. Zuppo contacts me.

Thanks

[Stamp: RECEIVED  MAY 9 1994  OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR]
The Board thoroughly discussed the Statistics Report to Cardinal Bernardin from the Office of Professional Fitness Review submitted to the Cardinal by the Administrator in a meeting in March 1994. Certain matters regarding the purpose behind the Report and its format as well as the various issues the Administrator raised in his Comments section were deliberated over. The Board members had various views on particular issues, and there was no complete consensus on whether all "old" pre-Board matters involving Archdiocesan priests sexual misconduct with minors matters should come to the Board at some point in the near future. The Board did conclude that the supervision and monitoring approaches in priest matters was directly connected to the transition issue and that the approaches taken to assessments and therapy programs for priest clients whose cases have come to the Board should be discussed further. The Board's consensus was that the Report would remain intact as the Administrator's Report for the entire Office of Professional Fitness Review. If any future Reports would be submitted, however, the Board concluded that it should probably discuss and formally approve any such Reports before they are submitted to the Cardinal. The Board decided it would prepare a separate document/statement/form of a report with the purpose being to perhaps highlight and summarize certain statistics as well as to address the Board's consensus view at some point regarding the key issues discussed by the Administrator in the comments section of the Report.
* Miscellaneous Information and Updates on Various Matters:

The Administrator informed the Board that there were other matters which were on the agenda which he intended to bring to their attention but which did not resolve a definite resolution or a formal Review at this time; the Board agreed that the Executive Sub-Committee would meet shortly following the meeting for the Administrator to inform them about those matters to seek any guidance, should he so desire. The Administrator did inform the Board that there would be a "60 Minutes" televised report on Sunday which could make reference to the Review Board and its work, although the telecast was expected to be directed toward another heretofore non-Board matter primarily.

(In the sub-committee meeting following the main Board meeting, the Administrator informed committee members that B.L. had presented a request letter for a Supplementary Review and request for a personal appearance before the Board which it was agreed would be considered by the Board at its 6-11-94 meeting;
Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski -
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
RE: Phone Call to Mr. Bob Newton
Part-time Youth Minister - St. Peter Damian Parish 6-7-94

Monitoring Report

Thank you again for agreeing to assist in monitoring the priest in your parish and/or work or residential setting (whose situation we’ve already discussed). The Archdiocese of Chicago greatly appreciates your generous sacrifice of time and input into this difficult situation. On a monthly basis, we are requesting that you take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Report and mail it to the attention of:

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
1 East Superior
Suite 504
Chicago, Il. 60611

If I have not heard from you for several weeks, I will contact you by phone to check on the priest’s overall compliance with the monitoring expectations.

As stated in the Monitoring Guidelines which you have received, however, please contact me immediately by phone if the priest clearly violates the Monitoring Guidelines or minimizes an inappropriate situation, particularly if the violation is that the priest is found alone with anyone under 18 years old without the presence of another responsible adult. My Office # is 1-312-751-5205 or 1-800-994-6200. If either my Administrative Assistant Rita Mongan or myself are unavailable, please feel free to leave a message on the security code-protected voice mail with your verbal report on the past month’s monitoring. (Also, my Office Fax # is 1-312-751-5279).

1. In the past month, have you seen or heard of any situations in which the priest you are monitoring was in the presence of any child under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult? (Yes or No - please circle). If yes, please explain briefly if the priest immediately removed himself from the situation or not upon being confronted or if he minimized the situation in your opinion in any way: "As far as I’m concerned, it’s gone excellent. We eliminated his interviews with the individual teens alone." Bob was referring to how an issue arose last year where it was alleged that Bill Lupo might be interviewing teenage girls alone in preparation for Confirmation. What was decided then was that Bob Newton (or another adult) would always now be present with the Confirmation candidates when the children would be interviewed before Confirmation. Bob noted that there have been no confrontations regarding Bill Lupo putting himself in an inappropriate situation with minors or being alone with any minors in the last several months that he has been monitoring Bill. Bob stated that "His conduct has been as good now" as Bob
felt it was when he first learned of this matter. Bob noted that Bill Lupo has not been alone with minors and "not even with adults" and as such, Bob is "suspect of nothing - he's been very conscious" of following the restrictions in Bob's view.

2. Did the priest allow you access to his log book of whereabouts, if requested, and if not, please explain: Bob stated, "When we have staff meetings once a month, if I wanted to look at it, I know where it's at; he'd let me. I'm sure," but Bob stated that he has felt no such need to look into Bill Lupo's log book.

3. If the priest was going out of town for more than an overnight pre-approved trip (by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator), did he leave with you or one of the other monitors a basic itinerary of his whereabouts during the trip, including a phone number and site at which he could be reached, and the name of the adult who would be accompanying him during such a departure? (Yes or No - please circle). If no on any of the above points, please elaborate: Bob was aware that Bill Lupo has been cooperating regarding vacations in contacting me and informing me of adults who would be present with him on such departures.

3a). If to your knowledge, the priest did not leave on any such trips in the past month, please mark an "X" in this line: ---

4. Do you believe that the priest has complied overall with his monitoring restrictions/expectations during the past month to your knowledge? (Yes or No - please circle). If no, please explain any problems or concerns with the priest which you have at this time regarding his monitoring compliance: "Yes - absolutely," Bob said. He has no concerns or problems or questions to ask me at this point. Bob responded "I feel that he (Rev. Lupo) is concerned about this and takes steps not to put himself in those "kinds of situations." Bob believes Bill is taking the monitoring really seriously and "has bent over backwards for what is expected."

5. General Comments (or questions) you'd like me to get back to you about:
   Bob Newton is willing to continue to help out with the monitoring as needed and further stated that "I like the idea of the written" monthly monitoring report that I explained would be coming out to him regularly, if the monitoring is to continue. I asked Bob Newton the extent to which Bill Lupo is involved with any youth events in the parish. He responded that Bill does "not usually participate" in youth activities unless Bob requests him to and then Bob or other adults would be present. Bob stated that "I make sure that any adult (not only priests) would never put themselves in a situation to be alone with a young person."
(Bob Newton)  
Name/Signature of Monitor  

Date: June 7, 1994  

Thank you again for your kind assistance!

Steve Sidlowski  
Professional Fitness  
Review Administrator  

Archdiocese of Chicago
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of phone calls between Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, and Victim JN on June 7 and June 8, 1994, in which Mr. Sidlowski informs Victim JN of Fr. William Lupo’s request that the Review Board conduct a Supplementary Review in his case. Victim JN expresses her opinion that the current monitoring protocols and restrictions should be the minimum and she would prefer Lupo being withdrawn from ministry completely. Mr. Sidlowski acknowledged receiving Victim JN’s letter though her attorney in July of 1993 which detailed her preference for complete dismissal of Fr. Lupo from his pastorate. Victim JN requests to appear before the Board if Fr. Lupo’s request to do so is granted and also requests that Mr. Sidlowski contact her after the Review Board meets on June 11, 1994 to discuss Fr. Lupo’s request.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a phone call from Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, to Victim JO on June 7, 1994, in which Mr. Sidlowski informed Victim JO that Fr. William Lupo requested that the Review Board conduct a Supplementary Review regarding his monitoring and restrictions. In response to Mr. Sidlowski’s request for Victim JO’s opinion on the appropriateness of Fr. Lupo’s monitoring and restrictions, Victim JO stated that she is concerned about the risk to other minor females if the Review Board recommends less restrictive monitoring and is in favor of keeping some sort of monitoring in effect. Victim JO requested notice from Mr. Sidlowski as to the outcome of the Review Board’s Supplementary Review and stated that she would be willing to appear before the Review Board if they were to grant Fr. Lupo’s request that he appear in person.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of phone calls between Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, and Victim JP on June 7 and June 8, 1994, in which Mr. Sidlowski informed Victim JP that Fr. William Lupo requested that the Review Board conduct a Supplementary Review regarding his monitoring and restrictions. In response to Mr. Sidlowski's request for Victim JP’s opinion on the appropriateness of Fr. Lupo’s monitoring and restrictions, Victim JO stated that she believes the current protocols should continue at the very minimum. Victim JO requested notice from Mr. Sidlowski as to the outcome of the Review Board’s Supplementary Review and stated that she might be willing to appear before the Review Board if they were to grant Fr. Lupo's request that he appear in person.
RE: Phone Conversation with Rev. Jerry Riordan 6-8-94

Monitoring Report

Thank you again for agreeing to assist in monitoring the priest in your parish and/or work or residential setting (whose situation we've already discussed). The Archdiocese of Chicago greatly appreciates your generous sacrifice of time and input into this difficult situation. On a monthly basis, we are requesting that you take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Report and mail it to the attention of:

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
1 East Superior
Suite 504
Chicago, Il. 60611

If I have not heard from you for several weeks, I will contact you by phone to check on the priest's overall compliance with the monitoring expectations.

As stated in the Monitoring Guidelines which you have received, however, please contact me immediately by phone if the priest clearly violates the Monitoring Guidelines or minimizes an inappropriate situation, particularly if the violation is that the priest is found alone with anyone under 18 years old without the presence of another responsible adult. My Office # is 1-312-751-5205 or 1-800-994-6200. If either my Administrative Assistant Rita Mongan or myself are unavailable, please feel free to leave a message on the security code-protected voice mail with your verbal report on the past month's monitoring. (Also, my Office Fax # is 1-312-751-5279).

1. In the past month, have you seen or heard of any situations in which the priest you are monitoring was in the presence of any child under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult? (Yes or No - please circle). If yes, please explain briefly if the priest immediately removed himself from the situation or not upon being confronted or if he minimized the situation in your opinion in any way: In responding to my question as to whether Rev. Lupo had been alone with anyone under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult, he said "Not that I know of; not that I've seen; I'm amazed at how many people don't come to the rectory." He re-iterated that he is living there on a daily basis and is with Bill Lupo for breakfast on most mornings. But overall, Rev. Riordan stated that "As far as I can see" he has seen "nothing inappropriate."
2. Did the priest allow you access to his log book of whereabouts, if requested, and if not, please explain: "It’s there." Father added that if he wants "to look at it, it’s right out in the open for me - he (Bill Lupo) pointed it out to me" regarding its location.

3. If the priest was going out of town for more than an overnight pre-approved trip (by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator), did he leave with you or one of the other monitors a basic itinerary of his whereabouts during the trip, including a phone number and site at which he could be reached, and the name of the adult who would be accompanying him during such a departure? (Yes or No - please circle). If no on any of the above points, please elaborate: Rev. Riordan confirmed that, as Sr. Edna Kazek had pointed out, that almost every week Bill Lupo goes to his cottage in Wisconsin from Wednesday until Thursday and usually goes with his priest classmate/co-owner Rev. John Dewes of St. Ann Parish in Barrington, Il.

3a). If to your knowledge, the priest did not leave on any such trips in the past month, please mark an "X" in this line:

4. Do you believe that the priest has complied overall with his monitoring restrictions/expectations during the past month to your knowledge? (Yes or No - please circle). If no, please explain any problems or concerns with the priest which you have at this time regarding his monitoring compliance: In terms of Bill Lupo’s overall compliance since Jerry Riordan’s last written report to me around the New Year, Fr. Riordan responded that "Yeah," Bill Lupo is complying.

5. General Comments (or questions) you’d like me to get back to you about: Fr. Riordan had no such comments; he thanked me for ensuring that he is receiving his monthly $300.00 stipend’s fee and re-asserted that assuming the restrictions/monitoring were to continue that he remains willing to "stick with it for awhile" in terms of remaining the main, live-in, full-time monitor of Rev. Lupo’s activities. (Please note that I also pointed out to Rev. Riordan that we would be utilizing a written form for monitoring in the near future and he thought that was also a fine idea).
(Rev. Jerry Riordan)  

Name/Signature of Monitor  

Thank you again for your kind assistance!

Steve Sidlowski  
Professional Fitness  
Review Administrator  

Archdiocese of Chicago  

June 8, 1994  

Date:
RE: Phone Conversation to Pastoral Associate
Sr. Edna Kazek, SSJ 6-8-94

Monitoring Report

Thank you again for agreeing to assist in monitoring the priest in your parish and/or work or residential setting (whose situation we’ve already discussed). The Archdiocese of Chicago greatly appreciates your generous sacrifice of time and input into this difficult situation. On a monthly basis, we are requesting that you take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Report and mail it to the attention of:

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
1 East Superior
Suite 504
Chicago, Il. 60611

If I have not heard from you for several weeks, I will contact you by phone to check on the priest’s overall compliance with the monitoring expectations.

As stated in the Monitoring Guidelines which you have received, however, please contact me immediately by phone if the priest clearly violates the Monitoring Guidelines or minimizes an inappropriate situation, particularly if the violation is that the priest is found alone with anyone under 18 years old without the presence of another responsible adult. My Office # is 1-312-751-5205 or 1-800-994-6200. If either my Administrative Assistant Rita Mongan or myself are unavailable, please feel free to leave a message on the security code-protected voice mail with your verbal report on the past month’s monitoring. (Also, my Office Fax # is 1-312-751-5279).

1. In the past month, have you seen or heard of any situations in which the priest you are monitoring was in the presence of any child under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult? (Yes or No - please circle). If yes, please explain briefly if the priest immediately removed himself from the situation or not upon being confronted or if he minimized the situation in your opinion in any way: "I could very honestly say that the picture has not changed here. The only time we mentioned this situation (i.e. monitoring) was at the one-year anniversary - the beginning of Holy Week but I have to say he’s been a priest in his place. When I see him, he’s very cautious. I still have not seen his room" in the rectory, however, and that still concerns Sister somewhat although it is not paramount to her. Sr. Edna did mention to the fellow sister she lives with, Sr. Mary Virgioso Ozog, that there have been allegations against Bill Lupo - this was apparently the result of necessity, living with her and the sudden appearance last year of Fr. Riordan for no real reason (please note that he is not officially listed in the Archdiocesan Directory as
a resident or priest in the parish formally). See "General
Comments" for more on this.

2. Did the priest allow you access to his log book of
whereabouts, if requested, and if not, please explain: "He brings it
(the date book) to the staff meetings" but he has not offered it to
Sister to see it.

3. If the priest was going out of town for more than an
overnight pre-approved trip (by the Professional Fitness Review
Administrator), did he leave with you or one of the other monitors
a basic itinerary of his whereabouts during the trip, including a
phone number and site at which he could be reached, and the name of
the adult who would be accompanying him during such a departure?
(Yes or No - please circle). If no on any of the above points,
please elaborate: The only time Sister knows Bill Lupo goes out of
town is to his Wisconsin cottage; he leaves normally on a Wednesday
and returns Thursday - sometimes early, sometimes later; she noted
that Bill Lupo gave his staff a tour of the place last summer, 1993. She noted it's "secluded, a very nice place. I think he goes
with his buddy - a priest classmate typically to the cottage -
apparently the classmate co-owns it; Sr. E. said that she has "no
contact with" the other priest although to her knowledge, Bill Lupo
is "mostly there with his friend."

3a). If to your knowledge, the priest did not leave on any
such trips in the past month, please mark an "X" in this line:

4. Do you believe that the priest has complied overall with
his monitoring restrictions/expectations during the past month to
your knowledge? (Yes or No - please circle). If no, please explain
any problems or concerns with the priest which you have at this
time regarding his monitoring compliance: "I think 100% - I really
think he wants this over with so he'll do anything to do what's
right" to reach that objective.

5. General Comments (or questions) you'd like me to get back
to you about: "No," Sr. Edna has none although she noted "It's been
like nothing has ever happened. This Fr. Riordan - when he moved
in here - he started getting phone calls so he got a beeper but
nobody has ever raised a question" in the parish about why he is
there and that it is not official. (i.e. a formal assignment). She
raised concern about Fr. Riordan's health

She is concerned about what would happen if there was a
change in the primary monitor (I explained what would happen).
Overall, Sister said about Bill Lupo "I don't see him particularly
clustered around minors. I cannot say there are any times I have
seen him alone with a teen-ager" over the last few months. "There's
been no ripples in the water" is the way she put it. Sister noted she is 69 1/2 years old, been at St. Peter's for seven years now and just signed a contract for at least an additional year. She likes it there and would like to remain. She said she would "of course" continue as a monitor.

I wanted to inquire that to date there are not any teenage girls working at the rectory or the parish and Sister confirmed that fact.

(Sr. Edna Kazek, S.S.J.)

Date: June 8, 1994

Name/Signature of Monitor

Thank you again for your kind assistance!

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
Archdiocese of Chicago
WRITTEN REPORT/SUMMARY FOR SUPPLEMENTARY STAGE REVIEW

REVIEW DATE: June 11, 1994 (2nd Stage Review Completed 7-24-93).

2. ORDAINED: 1965
3. PRESENT ASSIGNMENT OR RESIDENCE:
   St. Peter Damian Parish
   109 S. Crest Ave.
   Bartlett, Il.
   At St. Mary in DesPlaines: 1979-1986

4. ALLEGATIONS/INFORMATION:
   Date of Offense    Sex/Age of Child  Credibility
   1979 or 1980 until  F/14-15 thru 17  Yes
   1982 (approx.)     F/12-15            Yes
   1981-1984          F/16-18 2 mos.     Yes
   Summer - 1985      

5. GENERAL NATURE OF OFFENSE(S): Allegation of exposure of full, naked body in bed to fourteen year old girl in rectory and of partial nakedness to two other teen-age girls in/around his bedroom/shower; passionate kissing and hugging over approximately six years with at least 3 teenage girls.

6. OTHER PROBLEMS DURING MINISTRY: Per PCM, no other allegations of sexual misconduct.

7. 
8. SPECIAL CONCERNS OR PROBLEMS (if any): Rev. Lupo is only assigned priest in parish; no school though active CCD (700+ kids) program; strong denial, Lupo acknowledges some aspects of some incidents; one of the victims now working with an attorney.

9. DATE OF FIRST STAGE REVIEW COMPLETION: April 7, 1993

10. REVIEW BOARD’S DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP/ARCHBISHOP’S DECISION: Bill Lupo could have restrictions imposed upon him - no unsupervised contact with minors without presence of responsible adult - a full-time priest monitor should move into parish rectory to help monitor him; Cardinal fully accepted Board’s recommendations.

11. REVIEW BOARD’S DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP/ARCHBISHOP’S DECISION IN 2ND STAGE REVIEW: See attached letter (Cardinal Bernardin fully accepted Board’s determination and recommendations).
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD OF THE
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: June 11, 1994

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki

Steve Sidlowski

[OTHERS PRESENT DURING MORNING PORTION OF MEETING:]
Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.):

1.) The Board completed a Supplementary Review in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation of Ministry.

2.) Determination: The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow W.L. to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances. Basis: Positive monitoring report, completion and cooperation with suggested conditions; also, the Board declined W.L.’s request to appear in person before the Board because it would not be significantly helpful to its deliberations on the matter.

3.) Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon W.L. and specifically, the monitoring of his activities should continue in its current form to ensure he
is not alone with persons under 18 without the presence of another responsible adult.
The Board confirmed that its next meeting would be July 16, 1994.
MEMO TO FILE:  PFR-23
FROM:  Steve Sidlowski, Administrator
RE:  William Lupo
DATE:  June 11, 1994

Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, June 11, 1994:

The Review Board completed a Supplementary Review Board in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation of Ministry and their determination is that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupe to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances. Basis: Positive monitoring report, completion and cooperation with suggested restrictions also, the Board declined Father Lupe's request to appear in person before the Board in that the Board concluded it would not be significantly helpful to its deliberations on the matter.

Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Father Lupe and specifically, the monitoring of his activities should continue in its current form to ensure he is not alone with persons under 18 without the presence of another responsible adult.
The Board determines it is not reasonable to return the priest to ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances, having given appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest.

The Board determines it is reasonable to return the priest to ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances, having given appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest.

The Board determines it is reasonable to keep the priest in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances, having given appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest.

Recommendations to the Archbishop:

The Board recommends that the priest's withdrawal from ministry should continue.

The priest's withdrawal from ministry should not continue, but restrictions should be imposed on the priest. Restrictions should be:
The priest's withdrawal from ministry should not continue and no restrictions should be imposed on the priest.

The priest should remain in ministry, but restrictions should be imposed on him (or continue to be imposed on him). The restrictions should be:

1. Monitoring as previously required should continue.

The File should be closed at this stage of the proceedings.

The File should be held open (Board may provide reason(s) if it chooses):

The Board determines that the priest's conduct does not constitute sexual abuse of a minor but is otherwise inappropriate. As such, further action is desirable and the Board suggests the following action(s):

The Board recommends the following as to such other matters which it deems appropriate:
Reason(s) for Review Board's Determination(s) and/or Recommendation(s):
June 16, 1994

Dear [Name],

Please be advised that the Review Board met on June 11, 1994 and conducted a Supplementary Review in the matter involving the Rev. William Lupo.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Rev. Lupo to remain in his ministerial assignment in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Rev. Lupo and that he should continue not to be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult, with the current form of monitoring to continue.

Please know that our Assistance Ministry remains available to you. Ralph Bonaccorsi's Ministry # is 1-312-751-8267. You are also free to contact me about any remaining questions you may have at 1-312-751-5205/5206 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

SS/rm

cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley, Director
Legal Services
TO: File (PFR-23)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: June 16, 1994
RE: Phone Calls to Three Victims about Outcome of Supplementary Review

- Phone Call to [Redacted] (6-15-94): I informed [Redacted] about the outcome of the Supplementary Review in this matter at the Board meeting of 6-11-94. I explained how Rev. Lupo will be allowed to remain in his ministerial assignment although all of the current restrictions with the three monitors still remain in place. [Redacted] stated that she felt the Board's recommendations were "good" at this point. I reminded [Redacted] to feel free to contact Victim Assistance Ministry and that I had informed VAM to expect that [Redacted] will be contacting them to discuss options as to helping her in the near future. I also told [Redacted] that Bill Lupo's request for an in-person appearance before the Board was rejected in that the Board did not find that such an appearance would be helpful and as such, [Redacted] would probably not so desire then to go before the Board, I presumed. [Redacted] confirmed that presumption.

[Redacted] thanked me for informing her of the outcome, and as quickly as I did. She said that if she has any more questions, she will let me know. I told her I would follow up with a formal letter pertaining to the outcome of the Supplementary Review.

- Phone Call to [Redacted] (6-15 and 6-16-94): I attempted to contact [Redacted] directly on both dates to inform her also of the outcome of the Supplementary Review. On 6-15-94 I left a message on her home phone recorder with the basic information that the situation with Bill Lupo is not going to be changing and that perhaps I would be able to speak with her on 6-16-94.

I attempted to call her on 6-16-94. There was no answer at home so again I left a message on her home phone recorder stating again that the situation with Bill Lupo will not be changing and noting that I had spoken with her sister [Redacted] yesterday and that perhaps [Redacted] might want to contact [Redacted] about the outcome of the matter but that in any event I would not be present in the Office on Friday. I told her that if she would like to contact me in the Office next week, that would be fine, if she has any further questions. Otherwise, I left the message that I would be sending out a formal letter to her soon confirming the outcome of the Supplementary Review.
Phone Call to [redacted] (6-16-94): I informed [redacted] about the outcome of the Supplementary Review in this matter at the Board meeting of 6-11-94.

I also informed [redacted] that Bill Lupo’s request for an in-person appearance before the Board was declined in that the Board did not believe it would be helpful.

[redacted] was satisfied with the outcome of the situation at this point. She said that if she had any further questions she would get back to me. Otherwise, I informed her that I would be sending her a formal letter to confirm the outcome of the Supplementary Review.
June 16, 1994

Dear [Name],

Please be advised that the Review Board met on June 11, 1994 and conducted a Supplementary Review in the matter involving the Rev. William Lupo.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Rev. Lupo to remain in his ministerial assignment in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Rev. Lupo and that he should continue not to be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult, with the current form of monitoring to continue.

Please know that our Assistance Ministry remains available to you. Ralph Bonaccorsi’s Ministry # is 1-312-751-8267. You are also free to contact me about any remaining questions you may have at 1-312-751-5205/5206 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister
bcc: Mr. John O'Malley, Director Legal Services
Please be advised that the Review Board met on June 11, 1994. The Board accepted the documents you authorized and fully considered my written and verbal reports. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For The Continuation Of Ministry, as you had formally requested in writing.

Please know that the Board considered seriously your request for an in-person appearance before it, but declined your request.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow you to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon you and, specifically, the monitoring of your activities, in its current form, should continue. As a result, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that you should continue not to be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board requested that I communicate its determination and recommendations to you. In addition, I will be contacting you to discuss the further action to be taken.
If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness
Review Administrator

SS/rm

cc: Fr. Patrick O’Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Fr. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
    Mr. Patrick Tuite, Esq.

bcc: Mr. John O’Malley, Director
     Legal Services
Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, Ill. 60690

Your Eminence,

June 16, 1994

Please be advised that the Review Board met on June 11, 1994. The Board accepted the documents authorized by Rev. William Lupo and fully considered my written and verbal reports. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry, as Rev. Lupo had requested in writing.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to keep Rev. Lupo in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommends that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Rev. Lupo and, specifically, the monitoring of his activities, in its current form, should continue. As a result, the Board recommends that Rev. Lupo continue to not be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board will report to you any further determination and recommendations following any other Supplementary Review of this matter.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Cc: Members of the Review Board
Fr. Thomas J. Paprocki, Archbishop’s Delegate
to the Review Board

Bcc: Mr. John O’Malley, Director
Legal Services
June 16, 1994

Dear [Name],

Please be advised that the Review Board met on June 11, 1994 and conducted a Supplementary Review in the matter involving the Rev. William Lupo.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Rev. Lupo to remain in his ministerial assignment in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Rev. Lupo and that he should continue not to be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult, with the current form of monitoring to continue.

Please know that our Assistance Ministry remains available to you. Ralph Bonaccorsi’s Ministry # is 1-312-751-8267. You are also free to contact me about any remaining questions you may have at 1-312-751-5205/5206 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley, Director
Legal Services
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of two phone calls between the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review and the husband of Victim JL. Victim JL’s husband called the Archdiocese’s 800# on June 17, 1994 and reported to Rita Mongan, Administrative Assistant, that his wife was sexually abused by Fr. William Lupo approximately 13-14 years ago, when she was 15 or 16 years old. The abuse allegedly occurred several times while Fr. Lupo was serving at St. Mary in Des Plaines. Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator, spoke with Victim JL’s husband on June 20, 1994 to follow up on his allegation and go over the Protocols for investigating allegations of abuse against Archdiocesan clergy.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a File Memo from Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, summarizing a phone call to the husband of Victim JL on June 20, 1994 as a follow-up to a conversation that Victim JL’s husband had with Rita Mongan, Mr. Sidlowski’s Administrative Assistant, on June 17, 1994. Mr. Sidlowski and Victim JL’s husband discussed the details of the process for formalizing Victim JL’s allegation of sexual abuse against Fr. William Lupo when she was a minor and Victim JL’s readiness to engage in this process. Mr. Sidlowski also informed Victim JL’s husband of Fr. Lupo’s current monitoring and restrictions stemming from other allegations of minor sexual abuse.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a File Memo from Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, summarizing a phone call from Rev. Michael Bland of the Archdiocese’s Office of Assistance Ministry on June 21, 1994. Fr. Bland tells Mr. Sidlowski that he had spoken with Victim JL, who now wishes to move forward with a formal allegation of sexual misconduct against Fr. William Lupo. Victim JL tells Fr. Bland that the abuse began when she was either a freshman or a sophomore in high school and lasted for about two years. It consisted of hugging and kissing, as well as Fr. Lupo asking Victim JL to touch his genitals. At this time, Fr. Lupo was assigned to St. Mary in Des Plaines.
June 23, 1994

Dear [Censored],

I want to acknowledge and appreciate once again your contact to my Office and my discussion with [Censored] on June 17, 1994. I hope the conversation was helpful. As I noted to [Censored], my formal title within the Archdiocese is the Professional Fitness Review Administrator. Formerly, I represented hundreds of child sexual abuse victims as an Assistant Cook County Public Guardian. All allegations of sexual misconduct with minors by priests of the Archdiocese are referred to me for inquiry.

As [Censored] and I also discussed over the phone, I report to an independent Review Board, consisting of six lay and three clergy members. With respect to allegations against priests, the Review Board makes determinations and recommendations to the Archbishop (Cardinal Bernardin). The Board bases its determinations on whether the safety of children is adequately provided for and whether there is reasonable cause to suspect that the accused priest engaged in sexual misconduct with a minor.

As I'd noted to [Censored], I have additionally enclosed a copy of the Archdiocesan Policies in these matters entitled "Clerical Sexual Misconduct With Minors: Policy For Education, Prevention, Assistance to Victims and Procedures For Determination of Fitness for Ministry." We believe that our procedures are sound and that a person making an allegation will be dealt with fairly and objectively.

Also, I need to send along to you formally information as to how to contact the civil authorities should you ever so desire. Please know that you are under absolutely no obligation to sign the enclosed form, but if you should want to sign it and return it, please either mail it to me at the above address or should we end-up meeting in-person down the road, you might bring it along.
Regarding the possibility of a meeting with you, I spoke to Rev. Mike Bland of Assistance Ministry the other day and he confirmed that he and [redacted] had spoken about this matter. It would be most helpful if at some point [redacted] could provide me with additional information/further details pertaining to her allegation of sexual misconduct against the named priest. Our procedures typically suggest such a meeting at a time and place convenient for you. If you can make the trip downtown (please see my address above) that would be fine; however, if you prefer to meet in your home at some time, that, of course, poses no problem whatsoever. I understand that it would be okay for either Mike Bland or Ralph Bonaccorsi of our Assistance Ministry to be present at such a meeting.

If before any such meeting, either of you has any further questions about our policies or procedures, please feel free to contact either myself (see numbers above) or Mike or Ralph at Assistance Ministry (I believe you have their number - if not, it is 1-312-751-8267).

If at some point you do desire to further address this matter, I invite you to contact me at your convenience and when [redacted] feels comfortable dealing with it.

I realize how difficult this all may be for you. Please be re-assured that we at the Archdiocese take these allegations very seriously and will utilize our procedures to follow-up on such matters if you desire to provide us with further information and if at all feasible. Thank you again for notifying us about your concerns.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness
Review Administrator

SS/rm
Enclosure
MEMO
TO: File (PFR-23)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: June 24, 1994
RE: Phone Call from Rev. Bill Lupo regarding 6-11-94
Supplementary Review (and notice of probable, forthcoming new allegation)

Bill called regarding outcome of his Supplementary Review. He stated that he’s obviously disappointed, but more so angry at the tone of the wording of the letter he just received...It’s as if "they (the Board) accept the allegations at face value and that I’m guilty. That angers me," Bill said. I explained to B.L. that the Board considered all pertinent information it has received regarding the matter.

- After discussing the Supplementary Review for awhile with B.L. and noting I’d contact him later about [REDACTED], I additionally notified Bill that another woman has called stating that Bill engaged in sexual misconduct with her (POM and I agreed earlier today when Pat said B.L. had left a message with him that I would so inform B.L. of what I know thus far, but not yet identifying the alleged victim).

- "What you’re talking about of being 13 - 14 yrs. ago - That would’ve been St. Mary’s. The connection - it sounds like that this is part of their [REDACTED] doing."

- "The [REDACTED] girls and [REDACTED] and their mothers - I think that’s why they came together..." i.e. like they’re ganging-up on him with these several allegations.

- Bill later said, "My feeling is - I went along with everything that was asked of me...everything points to that this is not in" his "make-up..."(i.e. engaging in sexual misconduct with minors).

- Regarding not appearing before Board: "I just feel so left out of it (i.e. the Board’s process). I just think it should be part of the decision to sit down with the Board...and tell them my side of it." (I had explained to B.L. how the three victims noted each would almost definitely also then seek personal appearances to explain their side as well).
- Meeting with B.L. and POM at Vicar's Office set for Tuesday, July 5, 1994 at Noon.

- During week of 6-27-94 to 7-1-94, B.L. requested some vacation time at his cottage in Wisconsin. "A bunch of classmates will be there the entire time," he assured me. (S.S. ok'd it).
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: July 16, 1994

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski
Article 4.7(c) Reports to Board:

- The Administrator reported to the Board that there was a probable, upcoming, new allegation of clerical sexual misconduct against W.L. (PFR-23). The Administrator distributed pertinent written information to Board members, along with a brief explanation, which the Board took home with them. The Board deferred, due to lack of time, on discussion of __________________ until the next Board meeting.
1994 Review Board Meetings' Minutes for possible approval at the Board's August, 1994 meeting in that today's meeting had run overtime.

The Board also deferred on a discussion to be led by Board member [NAME REDACTED] on the Mental Health Sub-Committee's meeting with the Vicar for Priests on 7-8-94 - discussion will be deferred until the August, 1994 Board meeting.

The Board settled on its next three meeting dates as 8-27-94, 9-17-94, and 10-15-94.

Respectfully
Submitted By -
Steve Sidlowski -
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously Approved By
Review Board
To: Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Reverend Patrick J. O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
    Mr. John C. O'Malley, Director of Legal Services

From: Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
      and Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board

Date: July 19, 1994

Re: Reverend William L. Lupo

Steve,

As the Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing to confirm that Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the recommendations of the Review Board concerning Reverend William L. Lupo described in your letter to His Eminence dated June 16, 1994 following completion of the Supplementary Review at the Review Board’s meeting on June 11, 1994.

I have written to Father Lupo to inform him of the Cardinal’s decision accepting the Review Board’s determination and recommendations. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your records.

The work of the Review Board and yourself in this difficult matter is very much appreciated.
July 19, 1994

Reverend William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60176

Dear Father Lupo:

As the Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing to confirm that Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the determinations and recommendations of the Review Board following completion of the Supplementary Review at the Board’s meeting on June 11, 1994. These recommendations were communicated to you in writing on June 16, 1994 by Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator.

Specifically, Cardinal Bernardin accepted the Board’s determination that it is reasonable to allow you to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances. However, the Cardinal accepted the Board’s recommendation that restrictions should continue to be imposed on you while continuing in your ministerial assignment. In particular, you should continue not to be alone with persons under eighteen years of age without the presence of another responsible adult. Also, the monitoring of your activities is to continue in its current form. As directed by His Eminence, these restrictions are canonically binding as a matter of obedience.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me or Steve Sidlowski.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki
Chancellor

cc: Mr. Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator
    Reverend Patrick J. O’Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Mr. Patrick Tuite, Attorney at Law
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a File Memo from Steve Sidlowski, Professional Fitness Review Administrator for the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Professional Fitness Review, summarizing Victim JL’s allegation of sexual abuse by Fr. William Lupo given to Mr. Sidlowski and Rev. Michael Bland of the Archdiocese’s Victim Assistance Ministry on August 11, 1994. According to Victim JL, the abuse consisted of hugging and kissing as well as Fr. Lupo asking Victim JL to touch his groin area. The abuse occurred over a period of two years in the early 1980s, while Victim JL was a sophomore and junior in high school and Fr. Lupo was assigned to St. Mary in Des Plaines.
Memo
To: Cardinal Bernardin
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 8/16/94
Re: Rev. William Lupo

Recently another accusation has been brought against Fr. William Lupo. This allegation goes back some years ago but the woman bringing it has finally come forward. Fr. Lupo will meet with Steve Sidlowski on Friday, August 19.

In talking to Bill, he asked if it would be at all possible that he might be able to see you soon. I told him that your schedule is quite full but that I would pass this request on. Bill is feeling the necessity of telling you what is happening and how he is reacting to all of this. He, of course, has his own point of view.

There may not be much that you can do for him except to see him and listen to his story at this time. I would recommend a visit, if it is at all possible.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.
Confidential
MEMO
TO: File PFR-23
FROM: Steve Sidlowski, PFRA
DATE: August 22, 1994
RE: Meeting With Rev. Bill Lupo For Response to Latest Allegation of Sexual Misconduct Involving a Minor

I met with Bill Lupo today for the above purpose. Also present were his attorney Patrick Tuite, Vicar for Priests Rev. Pat O'Malley, and Bill's friend [REDACTED].

I thoroughly detailed the latest allegation of sexual misconduct against Bill Lupo by [REDACTED]. After meeting with Attorney Tuite, Rev. O'Malley and [REDACTED] for several minutes following the reading of the allegation, Bill Lupo provided the following response. Please note that Bill requested his attorney Mr. Tuite to provide the response.

Mr. Tuite stated, "Fr. Lupo categorically denies any of these allegations of sexual misconduct. If any hugging was done...it was done in a group." Mr. Tuite continued that Bill Lupo made no request for genital touching ever, no request for french-kissing, or requests for any other form of sexual contact with [REDACTED] as a minor.

Mr. Tuite stated that in Bill Lupo's opinion it is "equally important" to note that [REDACTED] which they would ask the Review Board to check out in detail before making any recommendations in this matter. Mr. Tuite added that

Mr. Tuite added that Bill Lupo did visit [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] although the year was not specified.

In his own words, Bill Lupo stated only "It really aggravates me—it seems so unfair people can do that to somebody." (i.e. referring to bringing this type of sexual misconduct allegation against him).
Pat Tuite stated that he will also submit a letter formalizing Bill Lupo’s response to the Review Board in this matter shortly.
August 24, 1994

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Board
One East Superior
Chicago, Ill.

Re: Father William Lupo

Dear Mr. Sidlowski:

Thank you for meeting with Father Lupo and me yesterday and discussing with us the allegations of [redacted]. We wish to make it abundantly clear, and Father Lupo has no doubt as to his recollection of his dealings with [redacted], that he categorically and unequivocally denies any of the allegations made against him. I think that the Review Board should consider the source of the allegation.

While there may have been hugs with [redacted] they were all in group sessions with teens [redacted]. He never kissed her in a passionate way nor did he rub his genitals against her or seek to have her touch his genitals. As stated above, he has a very clear recollection of his dealings with [redacted] and there is no doubt in his mind that none of the accusations she has made some 15 years later are true.

I would ask that [redacted] give consent to the Board for [redacted].
then they can evaluate the source of these accusations. Upon doing so, they can close his file with a finding that the accusations are totally unfounded.

Yours truly,

Patrick A. Tuite

PAT:jcs
CC: Father William Lupo
    Father Patrick O'Malley

12963
8/27/84  Maj. of Review Board - Fr. William Lupo

Responsible to keep in assignment w' monitoring restrictions.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: August 27, 1994

Board Members Present:


Others Present:

Thomas Paprocki  Steve Sidlowksi


Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.):

1. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation of Ministry.

2. Determination: The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow W.L. to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances. Basis: The Board had just conducted a previous Supplementary Review in this matter in last month's meeting in which it made the same determination. As such, W.L.'s circumstances have not changed in any significant way as regards his cooperation with previous restrictions and monitoring. However, this last seemingly credible allegation re-confirmed the need for restrictions and further action in W.L.'s situation.

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon W.L. and specifically, the monitoring of his activities should continue in current form to ensure W.L. is not alone with persons under 18 without the presence of another responsible adult.

4. 

AOC 017381
The Administrator reminded the Board that its next two regularly-scheduled meetings are September 17, 1994 and October 15, 1994. The Board then adjourned.
Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski -
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, August 27, 1994:

The Review Board conducted a Supplementary Review Board in the PFR-23 matter pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry and their determination is that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances. Basis: The Board had just conducted a previous Supplementary Review Board in this matter in last month's meeting in which it made the same determination. As such, Father Lupo's circumstances have not changed in any significant way as regards his cooperation with previous restrictions and monitoring. However, this last seemingly credible allegation re-confirmed the need for restrictions and further action in Father Lupo's situation.

Recommendations to the Archbishop: Restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Father Lupo and specifically, the monitoring of his activities should continue in current form to ensure Father Lupo is not alone with persons under 18 without the presence of another responsible adult.
Rev. Bill Lupo Supplementary Review  

- Reasonable to allow him to remain in ministry but keep current monitoring restrictions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PRIEST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>APPT</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>APPOINTED IN 1990 - 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIEST</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>WILLIAM LUPO '65</td>
<td>ST. PETER DAMIAN</td>
<td>1ST/96 - 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green - 1st term
Blue - 2nd term
Purple - 3rd term or retiring
Phone Call from Rev. Tom Paprocki: 9-6-94

- The Cardinal requests we (Fr. Paprocki and S.S.) review this case with him - I guess he’s heard Lupo’s perspective. He’d like to meet with us.

- Hold off on Lupo letter. Tom Paprocki gave the Cardinal his copy of latest allegation and Lupo’s response.

- (Fr. Pat O’Malley suggested to the Cardinal that he meet with Lupo).

- Tom Paprocki needs to check with Brother Dennis Dunne as to a date/time we can meet with the Cardinal (presumably Tom Paprocki will get back to me with this information).

- Tom Paprocki: Hold off on submitting Board’s determinations/recommendations letter to Cardinal on Bill Lupo’s last Supplementary Review (apparently per Tom, the Cardinal may not agree, or maybe re-considering Board’s recommendations, particularly ).

* Meeting set for Wednesday 9-14-94 3:30 p.m. in the Cardinal’s Office.
MEMO
TO: File (PFR-23)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski, PFRA
DATE: September 14, 1994
RE: Meeting with Cardinal Bernardin

Cardinal Bernardin, through his Delegate to the Board Rev. Paprocki, recently requested a meeting with Rev. Paprocki and myself on this matter following an in-person meeting the Cardinal had with Rev. Lupo shortly after the Board’s meeting of 8-27-94. I suggested Victim Assistance Ministry’s Rev. Michael Bland also be present and he was.

The resolution of the meeting is that Cardinal Bernardin will first send a letter to Rev. Lupo urging him to fully cooperate with the Board’s recommendation that [redacted] and that he continue to cooperate. Also, the Cardinal will note that he met with the above persons to discuss this situation in detail before reaching this position. The Cardinal then requested that following the sending of his own letter to Bill Lupo, that at that point I, as the PFRA, would then submit my formal letter to Rev. Lupo, the Cardinal, and [redacted], regarding the Board’s determination/recommendations in its latest Supplementary Review of 8-27-94 in the matter.
Dear Bill,

I am writing to report on the follow-up to our recent visit.

On September 14 I met with Father Paprocki, my liaison to the Review Board, Steve Sidlowski and Father Michael Bland. I discussed with them at length the substance of our conversation, in particular about the credibility of the person who recently brought an allegation against you. I presented to them as accurately as I could your strong conviction about your innocence.

I learned that at the most recent meeting of the Review Board at which they discussed the latest allegation, it was decided to recommend to me that . This will be communicated to you by Steve.

At first, my reaction was the same as I am sure yours will be: why? But then as I thought about it, I saw the value of it.

I realize, Bill, that this is not the outcome of our visit which you hoped for but, under the circumstances, I think it is the only realistic one. Be assured that I will personally follow the case very carefully. Be assured also of my continued prayers for you.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend William Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S. Crest Ave.
Bartlett, IL 60623

bc: Father Pat O'Malley
Mr. Steve Sidlowski
Your Eminence,

September 22, 1994

Please be advised that the Review Board met on August 27, 1994. The Board fully considered my written and verbal reports in the matter of the Rev. Bill Lupo. The Board conducted another Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Rev. Lupo to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommends that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon Rev. Lupo and, specifically, the monitoring of his activities, in its current form, should continue. As a result, the Board recommends that Rev. Lupo continue to not be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board will report to you any further determination and recommendations following any possible, future Supplementary Reviews of this matter.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

SS/rm
cc: Members of the Review Board
    Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley, Director of Legal Services
Dear Rev. Lupo:

Please be advised that the Review Board met on August 27, 1994. The Board fully considered my written and verbal reports in matter involving yourself. The Board conducted another Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow you to remain in ministry in view of all of the facts and circumstances.

However, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that restrictions should continue to be imposed upon you and, specifically, the monitoring of your activities, in its current form, should continue. As a result, the Board recommended to the Archbishop that you continue to not be alone with persons under 18 years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

The Board requested that I communicate its determination and recommendations to you. I will also be contacting you to discuss the further action to be taken.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
cc: Rev. Patrick O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
Mr. Patrick Tuite, Esq.

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley, Director of Legal Services
September 28, 1994

Dear Steve,

I wish to acknowledge your letter of September 22, 1994 regarding Father William Lupo.

As you know, we spoke about this prior to my receiving your letter officially notifying me of the Review Board’s recommendation. I do accept the recommendation. At the same time because of my pastoral concern for Father Lupo, after discussing the matter with you and Father Paprocki, I wrote to Father Lupo giving him positive reasons for accepting the Board’s recommendation and encouraging him to cooperate. A copy of that letter is enclosed.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

[Signature]
Archbishop of Chicago

cc: Father Paprocki

Enclosure

Mr. Steven F. Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
One East Superior St., Suite #504
Chicago, IL 60611
I spoke to William Lupo on 10/14/94. He expressed a great deal of misgivings about the process so far.

Bill detailed to me his meeting with the Cardinal. He felt that it did not accomplish very much. Bill himself feels that he should be able to get out from underneath this cloud at some time. While I sympathize with him, I cautioned him to the effect that this might not happen.
DATE: November 19, 1994

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

* The Review Board formally approved the Meeting Minutes for the Board meeting of October 15, 1994.
**Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.) Update:**

The Administrator informed the Review Board that W.L. has to date... The Board suggested that the Vicar for Priests be informed about this issue and ask him to speak with W.L. so that he might change his mind and so as to give him a bit more time to re-consider the situation.
5.

* The Administrator distributed some articles which had recently appeared in the newspaper on the subject of sexual misconduct with minors and the Board was reminded that its next meeting was set for December 17, 1994. The Board suggested that the Administrator ask Rita Mongan to check with Board members for Jan. 21 and Feb. 18, 1995 as possible meeting dates suggested by Steve S. (Addendum: Upon Rita checking subsequent to the meeting with Board members, it appears that a solid majority of Board members could make/prefer Jan. 21, 1995 and Feb. 18, 1995 as the next Board meetings).

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski -
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, November 19, 1994:

The Board suggested that the Vicar for Priests be informed about this issue and ask him to speak with Father Lupo so that he might change his mind and so as to give him a bit more time to re-consider the situation.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: December 17, 1994

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

* The Review Board formally approved the Meeting Minutes for its last Board Meeting of November 19, 1994.

Matter of PFR-23 (W.L.):

1. Pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation of Ministry in terms of exercising its responsibility to oversee the Board conducted a Supplementary Review.

2. The Board considered .

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: W.L. should

4.
Board Discussion on Deceased and Resigned Priest Matters:

The Board discussed Rev. Tom Paprocki’s ideas regarding possible, future changes to the policy on the above subject. The Board concurred that it should expand jurisdiction into/over deceased priest matters formally (although the Board has already been dealing with these matters in many respects since its inception); the Board noted that it is only accepting at this time the concept and that further discussion as to perhaps refining the language might be needed, including any proposed changes any Board members or others might want to suggest. The Board could not reach a consensus on how to approach resigned priest matters as yet.
The Administrator reminded the Board that its next two meetings are set for 1-21-95 and 2-18-95.

Respectfully
Submitted By,
Steve Sidlowski-
PFRA

These Minutes
Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board:
1-21-95
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, December 17, 1994:

Pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry in terms of exercising its responsibility to oversee Father Lupo's therapy program, the Board conducted a Supplementary Review Board.
Rev. William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S. Crest Ave.
Bartlett, IL. 60103

Dear Rev. Lupo:

Please be advised that the Review Board met on December 17, 1994. The Board accepted the documents you authorized and fully considered my written and verbal reports. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry in terms of exercising its responsibility to oversee [redacted].

Following the Board’s prior, two Supplementary Reviews in this matter, Cardinal Bernardin accepted the Board’s recommendation that [redacted]. The Board has considered [redacted].

The Board recommends that you [redacted].

The Board will report to the Archbishop any further determinations or recommendations following any other possible Supplementary Reviews of this matter in the future.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

Office of Professional Fitness Review
1 East Superior
Suite 504
Chicago, IL. 60611

Cardinal Joseph Bernardin
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, IL. 60690

Your Eminence, January 9, 1995

Please be advised that the Review Board met on December 17, 1994. The Board accepted the documents authorized by Rev. William Lupo and fully considered my written and verbal reports. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry in terms of exercising its responsibility to oversee [redacted].

Following the Board’s prior, two Supplementary Reviews in this matter, Your Eminence accepted the Board’s recommendation that [redacted].

The Board recommends that Rev. Lupo [redacted].

The Board will report to you any further determinations or recommendations following any other possible Supplementary Reviews of this matter in the future.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
SS/rm

cc:  Members of the Review Board
     Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board

bcc: Me. John O’Malley, Legal Services
MEMO TO: Reverend R. Peter Bowman, Dean

FROM: Reverend Edward F. Upton, Interim Director
Office of Appraisal and Evaluation

DATE: January 17, 1995

RE: Evaluation Process -- William L. Lupo

Father Lupo was named pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish on July 1, 1990. His term of office concludes on July 1, 1996. I am beginning the evaluation process.

The first step of the process is for the dean to select a team manager. Once you have secured a team manager you are asked to also inform him. I will then write the pastor to notify him that his evaluation process is beginning. He will then select another priest team member to assist the team manager in the evaluation process. The pastor must also agree to the team manager you have selected.

After the two priest coordinators have been selected, it is the team manager who takes responsibility for the process.

Please mail the team manager’s name back to my office by January 31, 1995. If you have any questions, please feel free to call.

Encls: Response Form
Return Envelope
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a summary of a phone call between Rev. Michael Bland, of the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Assistance Ministry, and Victim JL on January 21, 1995. Victim JL tells Fr. Bland that she does not feel Fr. William Lupo should be a pastor.
FAMILY:

Rev. Joseph Wilk

Parish:

St. Matthew, Schaumburg

Please return by January 31, 1995 to:

Reverend Edward F. Upton, Interim Director
Office of Appraisal & Evaluation
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1979

received
1/30/95
January 30, 1995

Reverend William L. Lupo, Pastor
Saint Peter Damian Parish
109 South Crest Avenue
Bartlett, Illinois 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

I am writing regarding your participation in the evaluation process for pastors. As you know, your term of office ends July 1, 1996.

As Director of the Office of Appraisal and Evaluation, I have some convictions about this process which I would like to share. I hope they set a context for the evaluation.

My first convictions is about the role of Pastor. In *Coordinating Parish Ministries (A publication written by the Department of Personnel Services, 1987)* the role of Pastor is defined.

"The Pastor serves the Christian community by sharing with them graces which God has given him and which are revealed in his spirituality and leadership, as well as in his limitations and inadequacies. 'To be' means 'to be with.'"

You have a critical and demanding role in the life of our community. I hope the process enhances your role. The second conviction revolves around the evaluation process. The National Association of Church Personnel Administrators in a handbook on performance appraisal, describes the appraisal process. They suggest it to be:

"supportive of people" (so those involved are affirmed and challenged) and is "implemented in a flexible way" (so the process is able to serve the individual).

Thus, the context out of which I work is to encourage your role as Pastor, and to provide a structure to affirm, support and challenge. Hopefully, you will be renewed to continue your ministry in newer and more effective ways.
The evaluation process is more fully explained on the enclosed sheet. The first step is for you to approve the Team Manager selected by your dean. Father Peter Bowman, Dean, selected Father Joseph Wilk as your Team Manager. If you have any concern about that selection please indicate so on the form. You are asked to select one priest to work with Joe in conducting the evaluation.

Your staff and twelve to fifteen lay leaders, whom you designate, will be asked to complete evaluation forms. The evaluation team will discuss and share this material as well as the final report. Copies of the final report will be given to the Vicar, Dean, Diocesan Priests' Placement Board.

I ask that you return the green form as soon as possible. The process will continue when I receive this information.

Sincerely,

Reverend Edward F. Upton, Interim Director
Office of Appraisal and Evaluation

EU:jw
Encs:  Process Information
       Return Response/Return Envelope

cc:  Reverend R. Peter Bowman, Dean
     Reverend Joseph M. Wilk, Team Manager
Memo

To: Father Paprocki
From: Cardinal Bernardin
Re: Father William Lupo
Date: February 7, 1995

I have received the letter of January 9 from Steve Sidlowski regarding Father William Lupo. I am in accord with the Review Board's recommendation and I have learned from Father O'Malley that it is already being implemented.

Copy sent to Steve Sidlowski for the Review Board's records.

TMR
DATE: January 30, 1995

RE: William L. Lupo, Pastor

Please select the name of one priest that you would like to serve on your Evaluation Team.

FATHER JOHN DEWES

ALTERNATE

THE EVALUATION TEAM MANAGER SELECTED BY YOUR VICAR IS:

Father Joseph Wilk

If for some reason you would prefer someone other than the above on your Team, please notify our office.

PLEASE RETURN WITHIN 10 DAYS TO:

Reverend Edward F. Upton, Interim Director
Office of Appraisal And Evaluation
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
P.O. BOX 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1979

William L. Lupo

DATE 2-26-95

received 3/3/95

AOC 017419
Memo to File
From: Rev. Patrick O’Malley
Date: 2/28/95
Re: Rev. Bill Lupo

I spoke to Bill Lupo today to check in and see how he was doing. Lupo himself still finds it difficult to deal with the fact that these allegations are always hanging over his head. It has been two years since they came forward, in Holy Week of 1993.

Towards the end of our conversation, Lupo informed me that he has been pastor now for five years and will be beginning a sixth year evaluation. That brings up the question of whether the Cardinal wants to reappoint him for six years given the present circumstances. This needs to be talked about with the Advisory Board and with the Cardinal. I did not mention that to Lupo. He said that Bishop Ray Goedert had spoken to him about it a year ago and said that as he drew closer to the time of the evaluation of his six years, they should have a conversation. Bishop Kicanas will have to be brought in on this as well.
MEMO from
CARDINAL BERNARDIN

To: Fr. Paprocki  Date: __________

For:  Information
      Comment
      Approval
      Signature
      Please draft a reply for my signature.
      Please reply in your own name.
      Please return
      Per conversation

Remarks:

Would you prepare the letter Pat suggests?

Thanks
MEMORANDUM

TO: Rev. John W. Dewes, Team Member
FROM: Rev. Edward F. Upton, Director
       Office of Appraisal and Evaluation
DATE: March 3, 1995
RE: Pastor Evaluation Process - William L. Lupo

Father Lupo is concluding his term as pastor. The evaluation process is now beginning.

Bill has asked you to serve on the team with Fr. Joe Wilk, Team Manager. I presume you have agreed.

In order to review the process as well as serve as resources to one another, I would like to invite you to a meeting:

Wednesday, March 29, 1995
1:30 to 2:30 P.M.
Office of Appraisal and Evaluation
Archdiocesan Pastoral Center
155 East Superior, 5th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60611

At this meeting, I will also distribute the evaluation materials. Please call my office at 312-751-5265 to R.S.V.P. If you are unable to attend, please call so we can make an alternate arrangement for distribution of the materials.

Please accept my thanks for your work in this process.

CC: Rev. R. Peter Bowman, Dean
MEMORANDUM

TO: Rev. Joseph M. Wilk, Team Manager
FROM: Rev. Edward F. Upton, Interim Director
       Office of Appraisal and Evaluation
DATE: March 3, 1995
RE: Pastor Evaluation Process - William L. Lupo

Father Lupo is concluding his term as pastor. The evaluation process is now beginning.

Father Peter Bowman, Dean, has asked you to serve as team manager. I presume you have agreed.

In order to review the process as well as serve as resources to one another, I would like to invite you to a meeting:

Wednesday, March 29, 1995
1:30 to 2:30 P.M.
Office of Appraisal and Evaluation
Archdiocesan Pastoral Center
155 East Superior, 5th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60611

At this meeting, I will also distribute the evaluation materials. Please call my office at 312-751-5265 to R.S.V. P. If you are unable to attend, please call so we can make an alternate arrangement for distribution of the materials.

Please accept my thanks for your work in this process.

CC: Rev. R. Peter Bowman, Dean
Phone Call to Rev. Gerry Riordan: 3-8-95

- He (G.R.) did receive my pages from previous days. He tried returning the calls, but said the line was busy (practically impossible). Fr. Riordan informed me that Bill Lupo is gone on vacation - left last Thursday 3-2-95 and will return 3-9-95. Fr. R. said he asked B. Lupo if I, Steve, had approved it (as his monitoring restrictions require) and Bill did not confirm I had been so informed.

- I inquired if Fr. Riordan had received the name and # of where it was B. Lupo had gone to for vacation and he said he did have that information. Fr. R. added that he would ask B. Lupo tomorrow the name of the priest who had accompanied Bill on vacation and mention to him I had called. Fr. R. added that the priest is one who Bill socializes with regularly and knows that Bill is under the restrictions not to be alone with minors. Fr. R. specified that Bill is "gone skiing in Colorado" and felt the timing of Bill's departure occurring during Lent seemed inappropriate.

- I informed Fr. R. that the main purpose of my call was that beyond inquiring as to how B. Lupo has been complying with his monitoring restrictions since we last spoke, that we had not been receiving Fr. R.'s "Monthly Monitoring Reports" regarding Bill Lupo which we'd discussed a few months back. I would be needing him to start completing, and I reminded Fr. R. that our Office had sent him blank copies of to use, a few months ago.

- Apparently, Rev. R. (again) misplaced the forms and said he's been feeling "guilty" about not having sent them in to me. But in any event, we agreed I'd mail him more blank forms to utilize for regular monitoring purposes. (Several forms were mailed on 3-9-95 in fact).

- Moreover, I asked Rev. Riordan if there had been any inappropriate situations/monitoring violations which he might have observed or heard about regarding Bill Lupo wherein Bill would have been alone with any persons under 18 without the presence of another responsible adult to his knowledge in the past few months since we'd last talked.

- Fr. Riordan responded that he had "not" noticed or heard of any such situations re. Rev. Lupo.

- I mentioned to Rev. R. that I expected Bill Lupo's monitoring would be continuing and that regarding another aspect of his situation (i.e. ..., although I did not tell Gerry that) the Cardinal was apparently still arriving at his decision following a recent Supplementary Review of Bill's matter.
3/13/85

Memo for the Ed. re renewal of Fr. Sypo's term:

Request supplementary review.
Focus question: should he be renewed for 2nd term? Associate Pastor?
Bill Lupo will soon be coming up for an evaluation. His six year term as pastor is up in 1996.

Under the circumstances, should Fr. Lupo be appointed to a second six-year term as pastor of St. Peter Damian in Bartlett?

Depending on the recommendation of the PFR Board, Lupo should be informed as soon as possible. If the answer is no, then he should not go through the evaluation.

Again, if the answer is no, there is a follow up question: If not as pastor, should Fr. Lupo be serving in a parish as an associate? We probably need to talk about when this question should go before the PFR Board.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

Monthly Monitoring Report

Subject: Rev. William Lugo
Date: March 15, 1995

Thank you again for assisting to monitor the priest in your parish and/or work or residential setting (whose situation we've already discussed). The Archdiocese of Chicago greatly appreciates your generous and difficult sacrifice of time and input. On a monthly basis, we are requesting that you take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Report and mail it to the attention of:

Steve Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
1 East Superior
Suite 504
Chicago, IL 60611
(Phone: 1-312-751-5205
1-800-994-6200
Fax: 1-312-751-5279)

If I have not heard from you for several weeks, I will contact you by phone to check on the priest's overall compliance with the monitoring expectations.

As stated in the Monitoring Guidelines which you have received, however, please contact me immediately by phone if the priest clearly violates the Monitoring Guidelines or minimizes an inappropriate situation, particularly if the violation is that the priest is found alone with anyone under 18 years old without the presence of another responsible adult. Phone or FAX. If either my Administrative Assistant Rita Mongan or myself are unavailable, please feel free to leave a message on the security code-protected voice mail with your verbal report on the problem and your phone number/s if you need to be at a different location.

1. In the past month, have you seen or heard of any situations in which the priest was in the presence of any child under age 18 without the presence of another responsible adult? Yes or No (please circle).

Did he remove himself from the situation upon being confronted? Yes/No.

Did he minimize the situation in your opinion in any way? Yes/No.

Details/Comments: 


AOC 017427
2. Did the priest allow you access to his log book of his whereabouts? Yes/No. Details/Comments: Not the log book, but we meet each other every morning after Mass to start casually what the day will be like and work specifically, if necessary. Generally his is easily reached by internet.

3. (a) If the priest was going out of town for more than an overnight pre-approved trip (by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator), did he leave with you or one of the other monitors a basic itinerary of his whereabouts during the trip, including a phone number and site at which he could be reached, and the name of the adult who would be accompanying him during such a departure? Yes/No. 

If no on any of the above, give details/comments: Informed we, well in advance of the trip, he will be away for how long, responsibilities will be covered and what may or may not be added responsibilities might be. Since the last month, since no adult factors he is well informed.

3. (b) If to your knowledge, the priest did not leave on any such trips in the past month, please mark an "X" in this line: 

4. Do you believe that the priest has complied overall with his monitoring restrictions/expectations during the past month to your knowledge? Yes/No.

If no, please explain any problems or concerns regarding his monitoring compliance:

5. General Comments (or questions) you’d like me to get back to you about: 

Many thanks,
Steve Sidlowski

Monitor Signature: 
Date: March 15, 1995
April 5, 1995

Reverend John W. Dewes, Team Member
Saint Anne Parish
120 N. Ela Street
Barrington, IL 60010

Dear Father Dewes:

Re: Father William L. Luppo - Pastor Evaluation

I am sorry we were not able to meet for the Team Managers’ meeting on Wednesday, March 29, 1995. The purpose of the meeting was to walk through the evaluation process. I am sending you background material to review. The appraisal instruments have been given to Father Joseph M. Wilk, the Team Manager.

Thank you for your willingness to serve in this process. If after you have reviewed the materials you have additional questions, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

Reverend Edward F. Upton, Interim Director
Office of Appraisal and Evaluation
EFU:jmw

Enc. 1 Evaluation Packet

cc: Reverend Joseph W. Wilk, Team Manager
Dear Steve:

Father William L. Lupo's six-year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish in Bartlett, will conclude on July 1, 1996. Given the allegations that were brought against him and the fact that he is presently being monitored and , the question of whether he ought to be renewed for another term as Pastor needs to be discussed.

Accordingly, I am asking the Professional Fitness Review Board to conduct a Supplementary Review with the following specific focus questions:

Under the circumstances, should Father William L. Lupo be appointed to a second six-year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish in Bartlett, Illinois?

If not, is it suitable for him to be assigned to another Parish as Associate Pastor?

The advice and recommendations of the Review Board on this matter will be very helpful to me in making a decision about Father Lupo's future.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

[Signature]

Archbishop of Chicago

Mr. Stephen F. Sidlowski
Professional Fitness Review Board Administrator
One E. Superior, Suite 504
Chicago, Illinois 60611

cc: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
and Archbishop’s Delegate to the Professional Fitness Review Board
Rev. Patrick J. O'Malley, Vicar for Priests

Question - should he be named for 2nd term as pastor in July, 1986? If not, could he be assigned as associate pastor elsewhere?

In order to answer this question, Board would need the following from Fr. Jugo for a Suggestion Review:

1) Some statement from Fr. Jugo as to his wishes.
2) Some feedback from St. Pius X.
3) Invite Fr. Pat O'Malley to discuss this with the Review Board, if he wishes.

5/15/85  O'ni will discuss w/ him.
DATE: May 13, 1995

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

ALSO PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki

* The Review Board approved the Minutes of the March 18, 1995 meeting. The April 29, 1995 meeting was postponed until this date due to lack of a quorum.

Matter of PFR-23 (B.L.):

The Board received the Cardinal’s request for a Supplementary Review. The Board asked that the Administrator schedule that review after providing for three types of information. One, the Administrator will request [REDACTED] Two, the Administrator will invite W.L. to send a written statement. Three, the Administrator will invite Fr. Pat O’Malley to the Review to discuss background information.
Respectfully
Submitted By:
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, May 13, 1995:

The Review Board received the Cardinal’s request for a Supplementary Review. The Board asked that the Professional Fitness Review Administrator schedule that review after providing for three types of information. One, Two, the PFR Administrator will invite Father Lupo to send a written statement. Three, the PFR Administrator will invite Father Pat O’Malley to the Review Board to discuss background information.
May 30, 1995

Bishop Gerald Kicanas
200 North Milwaukee Avenue
Libertyville, Illinois 60048

Dear Gerry,

Greetings and I hope things are well with you especially now that the Confirmation season is coming to an end. I hope it will give you a little more free time at any rate. But enough small talk - now down to business.

As you undoubtedly are aware, one of the pastors in your Vicariate, Fr. William Lupo of St. Peter Damian parish, is due to begin evaluation soon since his first six year term will be up in July, 1996.

At this time, may I ask you to instruct your evaluation team to hold off on this particular one since there is a previous question about his eligibility for a second term that needs to be resolved? I would be happy to share the details of the previous question by phone. Take care and enjoy the Summer.

Fraternally yours,

Rev. Patrick O’Malley
Vicar for Priests
Memo to File

From: Rev. Patrick O’Malley
Date: 5/30/95
Re: William Lupo

I met with Fr. Lupo and [REDACTED] today in my office. There were two reasons for this meeting:

1. [REDACTED]

2. I informed Lupo that the Cardinal had brought a request before the PFR Board regarding him. His first six year term of office as pastor is up in July, 1996, and the evaluation of those six years is soon to begin. The Cardinal did not know whether he should consider reappointing Lupo to a second term if there was a possibility of him needing a monitor and being under the supervision of the PFR Board. The Cardinal, therefore, submitted this question to the PFR Board.

Their response was that Lupo should write a letter asking for a second stage review of his situation including the reasons why he is asking for it.

Lupo will prepare a letter for the Board with [REDACTED]’s help and will ask me to look it over before submitting it.

I shared with Lupo what I felt were some of the concerns of the Board.
I spoke with Rev. Pat O’Malley today about Bill Lupo writing the Review Board. Pat O’Malley met with Bill Lupo on 5-30-95. Bill Lupo confirmed that he would be sending out a letter to the Professional Fitness Administrator requesting the Board’s recommendation for renewal as Pastor of St. Peter Damian. Also,
Dear Members of the Board:

With this letter I am requesting permission to continue in ministry as pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish without monitoring. I believe that I am ready for this step now in the light of conversations with friends and my own new self-understanding.

During Holy Week 1993 I heard for the first time the allegations brought against me concerning my conduct at St. Mary's Parish during my term as associate pastor there. I was shocked, ashamed, angry, confused and frightened at the time. I had no memory or recollection of the allegations.

I came to understand how my casual attitude towards touch and embracing could be misconstrued. I now see that whatever I did and how I was experienced by these young girls had an adverse affect on them. Believe me, it was never my intention to cause them any harm, but I now know that my behavior was detrimental to them. I deeply regret these behaviors and the hurt I have caused.

During these two-plus years I have tried with all my strength to cooperate. I have imposed restrictions on myself. There are no minors employed at the parish. I have filled in certain members of the staff about my situation and they have been a marvelous support and also a further monitoring situation for myself. In January 1994 I brought in a professional speaker to address all of our catechists, nursery staff and others who deal with minors, on the topic of what is and is not appropriate behavior in our respective roles.

109 South Crest Avenue  •  Bartlett, Illinois 60103  •  (708) 837-5411
Pat —
For your approval, OK from T.P. — Bill
Return to R200
Personally I do not consider myself at risk with minors. However, I have made assurance doubly sure by avoiding any and all contact with minors. Further, as I mentioned some persons on the staff know about the allegations, and they continue as additional safeguards. I would like to continue my work at St. Peter Damian Parish without monitoring. I believe that I am ready for this step. At the same time I will continue with a kind of self-monitoring. My closest friends and my staff will continue to be included in my progress. In addition, I intend to discuss the whole matter with the new local vicar, Bishop Kicanas. Finally, I will check in every couple of months with the vicar for priests.

Again, I deeply regret what has happened and the suffering I have caused these young women. I wish I had then the insights I have today. All I can do now is continue with my own recovery, monitor myself, and never put anyone in a compromising situation again.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. William L. Lupo
COPY

7/15/95

Dear Donald Witty - Ren Wm. dope

Read recommendations that management shall terminate immediately with his plan as evidenced in his letters 7-6-10-95, 7-6-10-95. That he is capable of another team as soon as possible.

I support this. For Bill to modernize with me a quantity of time is not known. How it is managed.

7/15/95

Pat O'Malley will inform the Viceroy. By reason of Rogers is capable for another team. TR will inform management equally that called for amount. 

F. P. Knoblen

AOC 017441
DATE: July 15, 1995

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki    Bernadette Connolly

* The Review Board approved the Minutes of the June 17, 1995 meeting pending Bishop Goedert’s notes to the Cardinal.

* Cardinal Bernardin formally accepted the Review Board’s recommendation of Bernadette Connolly as the Professional Fitness Review Administrator effective July 1st, 1995.
(F) Matter of PFR-23 (B.L.):

1) Pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry, the Board completed a Supplementary Review, 2) the Board considered and W.L.'s own statement, and 3) Recommendations to the Archbishop: the Board determined that it is reasonable to allow W.L. to remain in ministry and that W.L. is eligible for a second six year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian. The Board also recommended that W.L. continue to for one more year and that his file remain open for one year to evaluate and review his progress. The Board also requested that the Professional Fitness Review Administrator visit B.L. every 3 months.
MEMO TO FILE: PFR-23
FROM: Bernadette Connolly, Administrator
RE: William Lupo
DATE: July 15, 1995

Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, July 15, 1995:

Pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry, the Review Board completed a Supplementary Review Board. Recommendations to the Archbishop: the Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry and that Father Lupo is eligible for a second six year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian. The Board also requested that the Professional Fitness Review Administrator visit Father Lupo every 3 months.
Dear Bishop Goedert,

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 15, 1995. The Board fully considered all oral and written reports in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Rev. Lupo to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances and that Rev. Lupo is eligible for a second six year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian.

The Board also recommends that the restrictions imposed on Rev. Lupo be discontinued. The Board accepted Rev. Lupo’s commitment to [redacted] for one more year. Lastly, the Board recommended that Rev. Lupo’s file remain open for one year for further evaluation of his progress [redacted].

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

bc/rm

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki, Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board

bcc: Mr. John O’Malley
Legal Services
Bishop Gerald Kicanas
200 North Milwaukee Avenue
Libertyville, Illinois 60048

Dear Gerry,

Sometime back, I believe you and I talked about one of the pastors in your Vicariate, Fr. Bill Lupo. I mentioned to you at that time that he was a client of our office and that there was some question as to whether he would be eligible to seek approval for a second six-year term as pastor.

I am writing to inform you that, the Cardinal, through Bishop Ray Goedert, has received the recommendation that Lupo be allowed to apply for a second term and has accepted that recommendation. This would mean that the evaluation for Fr. Lupo for his first six-year term could proceed at this time. It would also mean that Bill has the Cardinal’s permission to seek a second six-year term. It doesn’t, of course, mean that there is an automatic renewal. That, as is customary, depends upon the evaluation and your process.

If you have any questions about this matter, please do not hesitate to call me. I hope everything is going well and that you had a good vacation.

Fraternally yours,

Rev. Patrick O’Malley
Vicar for Priests
August 4, 1995

Rev. Jerome Riordan

Dear Jerry,

By this time you have probably heard the good news that the Professional Fitness Review Board has ruled positively on Bill’s request to be off monitoring. I know that Bernadette Connolly has talked to Bill by phone and I know that the Cardinal, through Ray Goedert, has accepted the recommendation of the Professional Fitness Review Board. I talked to Bill last week and he was, of course, very pleased.

So that effectively puts an end to your monitoring. I just want to take this opportunity to thank you for the immense service that you rendered Bill and the Archdiocese. I can’t imagine too many other people who would have been open to it. Your availability was a wonderful break for Bill. According to everything he has told me, the two of you have gotten along very well.

One of the delights of this office is running across people like you who are willing to make sacrifices to help their brother priests. I find that tremendously edifying.

You’re footloose and fancy free once again to roam about doing good wherever you go. I hope that the last couple of years haven’t been too much of an inconvenience for you. Again, I can’t thank you enough for what you did. Take care, enjoy your retirement and stay cool. God bless.

Gratefully yours,

Rev. Patrick O’Malley
Vicar for Priests
MEMORANDUM

To: Ms. Bernadette Connolly, Professional Fitness Review Administrator
and members of the Professional Fitness Review Board

cc: Cardinal Bernardin
Most Reverend Raymond E. Goedert, Vicar General
Reverend Patrick J. O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
Mr. John C. O'Malley, Director of Legal Services

From: Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
and Archbishop's Delegate to the
Professional Fitness Review Board

Date: August 15, 1995
Re: Reverend William Lupo

Bernadette,

As the Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing on behalf of Cardinal Bernardin regarding the determinations and recommendations of the Review Board in the matter of Reverend William Lupo, described in your letter to Bishop Goedert dated July 20, 1995, following completion of the Supplementary Review at the Review Board’s meeting on July 15, 1995.

Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the Board’s determination that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry in light of all the facts and circumstances, and that he is eligible for a second six year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish. The Cardinal also accepted the recommendation that restrictions imposed on Father Lupo be discontinued. His Eminence agrees with the Board in accepting Father Lupo’s commitment to [REDACTED] for one more year. Accordingly, his file should remain open for one year for further evaluation of his progress [REDACTED].

Please inform Father Lupo, the persons who made the allegations, and the Review Board of the Cardinal's decisions as indicated above.

The work of the Review Board and yourself is very much appreciated.
Message from Fr. Thomas Paprocki Regarding Bill Lupo: 8/12/95

Tom Paprocki informed me (B.C.) that the Cardinal has accepted the Board’s recommendations regarding Bill Lupo and his status in ministry. Tom Paprocki instructed me to speak with Bill Lupo and inform him orally about the Cardinal’s acceptance.

Phone Call to Rev. Bill Lupo: 8/16/95

I (B.C.) phoned Bill Lupo regarding the Cardinal’s acceptance of the Board’s recommendations. Bill Lupo was unavailable. I was informed to call him on Friday 8/18/95.
I (B.C.) called Bill Lupo today and informed him that the Cardinal has officially accepted the Board’s determinations and recommendations. I told Bill Lupo that I would be sending a letter confirming this agreement. Bill Lupo seemed very pleased. I informed Bill that I would be scheduling a meeting with him sometime in October.
Dear [Name],

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 15, 1995 and completed a Supplementary Review in the matter involving Rev. William Lupo.

The Cardinal has accepted the Board’s determination that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry and that the restrictions imposed on Fr. Lupo should discontinue specifically, that the monitoring of his activities should cease.

However, the Cardinal has also accepted the Board’s recommendation that Fr. Lupo will _______ for one year and his file will remain open during this year to further evaluate his progress _______.

Please know that our Assistance Ministry remains available to you. Ralph Bonaccorsi’s/Michael Bland’s/ministry number is 1-312-751-8267. If you have any other questions at this point, also feel free to contact me at 1-312-751-5205 or 1-800 994-6200.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

bc/rm

cc: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Assistance Minister
Rev. Michael Bland, Assistance Ministry

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley, Legal Services
Dear Rev. Lupo,

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 15, 1995. The Board accepted the documents you authorized and fully considered all oral and written reports. The Board completed a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry.

Cardinal Bernardin accepted the Board’s determination that it is reasonable to allow you to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances and that you are eligible for a second six year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian. The Cardinal also accepted the Board’s recommendation that the restrictions imposed on you should be discontinued and the monitoring of your activities should cease.

Cardinal Bernardin and the Board have accepted your commitment to for one more year and that your file will remain open for one year for further evaluation of your progress.

The Cardinal requested that I communicate his acceptance of the Board’s determinations and recommendations to you. As we agreed, I will be scheduling a visit with you in the month of October at St. Peter Damian.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
cc: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
    Rev. Patrick O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Mr. Patrick Tuite, Esq.
August 23, 1995

Dear Father Riordan,

Please be advised that Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the Board’s recommendation that the restrictions imposed on Rev. Lupo have been discontinued and the monitoring of his activities have ceased.

The Professional Fitness Review Board and myself, would like to thank you for all of your assistance in this most sensitive matter. Your hard work and respect for confidentiality is most appreciated.

Once again, thank you.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

bc/rm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 11, 1995
### 6 YEAR PASTORS - 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6 YEAR PASTORS - 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 YEAR PASTORS - 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/ 2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- I spoke with B.L. and we arranged to meet after the Christmas holidays. B.L. reports that things are going well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 5, 1996

Dear Father Wilk,

A very blessed New Year!

Now that the hustle and bustle of the Christmas season are past and a new year lies ahead, I would like to ask you to include the completion of Father Lupo's evaluation process in your current priorities.

If my records are correct, you have received a number of completed evaluation forms which need to be tallied and summarized into a report for presentation to Father Lupo. You will then submit the final report to the Vicar, the Dean and the Priest's Placement Board. Since the evaluation is an essential component in the renewal process, it is important that the report be submitted early in the process.

Please let me know if you are experiencing any difficulty or if I can assist you in any way with this important responsibility.

Sincerely

Mary F. Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw

Rev. Joseph M. Wilk, Team Manager
St. Matthew Parish
1001 E. Schaumburg Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60194

cc. Rev. John W. Dewes, Team Member
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT. DATE</td>
<td>PASTOR</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notations on Process Progress
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT. DATE</th>
<th>PASTOR</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st - 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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February 8, 1996

Dear Father Wilk,

Just an alert that the target date for returning a completed evaluation report for Father Lupo to the Diocesan Priests’ Placement Board is March 31, 1996.

I know from our conversation last month that you have been working on the report. I hope that this target is in keeping with your progress so far. If you anticipate any difficulty in completing the process by the target date, please let me know so that I can alert the Board. Also, if you would like to discuss the report, please feel free to call.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary F. Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw

Reverend Joseph Wilk, Team Manager
Saint Matthew Parish
1001 E. Schaumburg Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60194

c: Reverend John Dewes, Team Member
Reverend John Hurley, Dean
Reverend William Lupo, Pastor
### 6 YEAR PASTORS - 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 YEAR PASTORS - 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpt: Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, 02/16/1996

REPORTS: (02/16/96)

1. 

2. **St. Mary/Des Plaines:** At the parish consultation the parishioners expressed the desire for the following priests as pastor.

   - William Lupo '65
   - 1 mention

3. 

   7
MINUTES

Meeting: #21st - Fifteenth Board

Date: February 16, 1996

Place: Priests' Placement Board/Pastoral Center

Present:
Reverends: Jeremiah M. Boland (arriv. 10:20), Kevin J. Feeney, John M. Collins, Joseph J. Kinane, Robert E. McLaughlin, Steven W. Patte, John S. Siemianowski, Kenneth J. Velo.

I Opening Prayer: Rev. John Siemianowski 10:15 A.M.

II Acceptance of Minutes: Accepted 7 - 0 - 0

III Reports:

1.

2. St. Mary/Des Plaines: At the parish consultation the parishioners expressed the desire for the following priests as pastor.

William Lupo '65 1 mention
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 YEAR PASTORS · 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2 07/01/90 Bill L. Lupo '65 St. Peter Damian 1st · 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 YEAR PASTORS · 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: OFFICE OF APPRAISAL AND EVALUATION

THE EVALUATION FOR Rev. William Lugo IS COMPLETE.
IT WAS SHARED WITH THE PASTOR ON 2-20-96.
IT WAS SENT TO:

EPISCOPAL VICAR __________ Bishop G. Kicanas
PLACEMENT BOARD __________ Fr. J. Boland
DEAN __________ Fr. John Hurley

[Signatures and dates]

Report to PPB

received 2/29/96
Check 3/4/96
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 YEAR PASTORS - 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U/ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 12 YEAR PASTORS - 96 |
1. The report was completed by 16 out of the 17 staff persons and parishioners.
2. They have all known the pastor for about six years.

A. Evaluation-Pastor

1. Overview: The information collected indicates a pastor who is a good administrator. He is supportive of staff and parishioners. The people who participated in the evaluation seem to truly care about him and their parish. Although they see the pastor as doing a good job, they perceive that he could be more present to the people and active in parish life.

2. Areas of Strength--Areas of Growth

As Teacher: The comments are generally favorable regarding his support of catechists. Many thought that he could give more of his time to the religious education program, to visiting classes, and just “being around” more. More needs to be done for the youth as a whole.

As Spiritual Guide: Most responses to the pastor’s contribution to the spiritual life of the parish were positive. He is viewed as a prepared and good homilist. He shows concern for his people. He is viewed as friendly and outgoing in his approach to parishioners. Some concern centered on the liturgy and music. Several people thought that he should show a more “personal” interest in the faith lives of his people, visibly supporting their spiritual lives.

As Community Leader and Counselor: The pastor seems to be very pastoral to people and families in times of crises. But on an average, he seemed lacking in his presence to the sick, elderly, and homebound. Most responses to his and the parish’s response to inactive parishioners and new families were negative. He is also not seen as involved in community affairs outside of the parish.

As Organizational Leader: The pastor is seen as an excellent administrator. He does a good job “running” the parish. He chooses good people to assist him and supports them, especially the staff. He is a good communicator. There were some concerns regarding the way he interacts with people. It was noted that he does not listen as well as he could. In conflict situations he avoids the issues or hides from them completely--staying as neutral as possible. There is a certain stubbornness portrayed by the pastor when he is given feedback or criticism.

B. Evaluation--Parish

1. The people seem to be proud of their parish. One of the biggest strengths is the Religious Education Program. The staff seems competent and dedicated. The buildings are well maintained.
2. In terms of weakness, there seems that not much is taking place other than the Religious Education Program—-at least not much is mentioned in the evaluation forms. Much more needs to be done in terms of outreach to newcomers, the sick, the homebound.

3. One of the largest areas of concern involved the youth. Some activities or programs are needed for this age group. There also seems to be a great need for just bringing people together socially to celebrate and bond in friendship.

4. Perhaps lay leadership seems to be empowered more and tapped. The people need a sense of vision and direction, not just the maintenance of the status quo.

C. Overall Themes
Two themes emerge in these responses. The majority of responses said that they would like Fr. Lupo to be more present and visible in the parish. The second theme seems to be that he is a good administrator but needs to be more of a "pastor" or "spiritual leader" to the parishioners.

D. Special Concerns
There didn't seem to be any special needs or concerns that require the action of the Archdiocese.

E. Conclusion
1. We recommend that the pastor continue on for a second term. With the information reported in this evaluation, we feel that Fr. Lupo can continue to grow in his ministry as well as feeling affirmed by the people's affection for him.

2. It's easy to get into ruts and form habits within the priesthood. The people seem to be saying that the pastor has many gifts, but that these gifts are sometimes not visible to the wider community. His compassion and sense of humor are valuable assets to his ministry. If he became more present on a day to day basis to his people, he could accomplish much more. He needs to empower lay leaders and excite his parishioners with new possibilities, ministries, programs and social activities.
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March 4, 1996

Dear Father Wilk,

I have received the summary report for Father Lupo’s evaluation. Thank you so much for the time, thought and care which you gave to the process. I am sure that the task was not easy, given your other responsibilities and commitments.

I hope that the review of ministry was a beneficial experience for you and for Father Lupo. I appreciate your investment in the evaluation.

Continued blessings in your ministry.

With appreciation,

Mary F. Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

Reverend Joseph Wilk, Team Manager
Saint Matthew Parish
1001 E. Schaumburg Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60194
March 4, 1996

Dear Father Dewes,

I received the summary report for Father Lupo’s evaluation. Thank you so much for the time and energy which you gave to the process. I hope that the review of ministry was a beneficial experience for you and for Father Lupo. I appreciate your investment in the evaluation.

Continued blessings in your ministry.

With appreciation,

Mary F. Yunger
Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

My/jw

Reverend John W. Dewes, Team Member
Saint Anne Parish
120 N. Ela Street
Barrington, IL 60010
William L. Lupo ’65

St. Peter Damian

1st - 57

AWAITING PASTOR'S RESPONSE
6 YEAR PASTORS · 96

1/2 07/01/90 William L. Lupo '65 St. Peter Damian 1st · 57

Awaiting Pastor's Response

12 YEAR PASTORS · 96
Excerpt: Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, 03/22/1996

6 YEAR PASTORS - 96

I/2 07/01/90 William L. Lupo '65 St. Peter Damian
AWAITING PASTOR'S RESPONSE

12 YEAR PASTORS - 96

1st - 57
March 26, 1996

Dear Members of the Board:

I hereby formally request to be assigned for a second term as pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. William L. Lupo
March 28, 1996

Most Rev. Gerald F. Kicanas, Vicar
Vicariate I
200 No. Milwaukee Ave.
Suite 200
Libertyville, IL 60048-2250

Dear Bishop Kicanas,

The evaluation for Father William L. Lupo, Pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish/Bartlett, has been completed. The Priests' Placement Board received a letter from Bill requesting a second term. Before making a recommendation to Cardinal Bernardin, the Board needs to know if you support his request.

I look forward to receiving your response as soon as possible, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

Reverend Jeremiah M. Boland, Executive Secretary
Diocesan Priests' Placement Board

JMB/ljb
March 28, 1996

Rev. John J. Hurley, Dean
Deanery I-B
St. Edna Parish
2525 N. Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Dear Father Hurley,

The evaluation for Father William L. Lupo, Pastor of St. Peter Damian Parish/Bartlett, has been completed. The Priests' Placement Board received a letter from Bill requesting a second term. Before making a recommendation to Cardinal Bernardin, the Board needs to know if you support his request.

I look forward to receiving your response as soon as possible, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Reverend Jeremiah M. Boland, Executive Secretary
Diocesan Priests' Placement Board

JMB/jjb
April 1, 1996

Reverend Jeremiah M. Boland
Office of Diocesan Priests' Personnel
Post Office Box 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Dear Jerry,

I support Bill Lupo's request for a second term as Pastor of Saint Peter Damian Church in Bartlett.

Very sincerely yours,

Reverend John J. Harley, Dean

JJH:md
MEMORANDUM

TO: Cardinal Bernardin
FROM: Bishop Kicanas
DATE: April 2, 1996
SUBJECT: Renewal of Fr. Bill Lupo as Pastor of St. Peter Damian, Bartlett

Fr. Joe Wilk and Fr. Jack Dewes reviewed the evaluations in preparing a recommendation for Father Bill Lupo’s renewal as pastor of St. Peter Damian in Bartlett. Their recommendation is that he be given a second term of six years.

Fr. John Hurley and I met with Bill recently. At that time, we reviewed the recommendation of the committee and the suggestions that were made to him about the renewal.

Both the dean and I support Bill’s renewal for a second term. We have made the following suggestions to him:

1) Consider the hiring of a pastoral associate to assist him in being present at parish events. It would also make possible the development of new pastoral initiatives that are being called for by some of the responses.

2) It was suggested that Bill consider hiring a full time director of religious education. While the current part time leaders are doing an effective job, one person might bring greater continuity to the work of religious education.

3) We encouraged Bill to complete his work at establishing a Parish Council to work with him in responding to the pastoral needs of the community.

4) We encouraged Bill to work with a pastor mentor, to help him keep fresh and current in carrying on the work of being pastor.

We will continue to talk with him about these areas. While the majority of the responses were positive, it was suggested that Bill be more present and take a more active part in the life of the parish.

I understand you will be sending a letter to Bill confirming his appointment for a second term.

cc: Jerry Boland
    Mary Yunger
MEMO from
CARDINAL BERNARDIN

To: For: Information
     Comment
     Approval
     Signature
     Please draft a reply for my signature.
     Please reply in your own name.
     Please return
     Per conversation

Remarks: ____________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

AOC 017491
NAME: REVEREND WILLIAM L. LUPO '65
PARISH: ST. PETER DAMIAN PARISH
109 S CREST AVE
BARTLETTE, IL 60103

PHONE: 708 837/5411 VICARIATE: I DEANERY: 

EVALUATION RECEIVED: 2/29/96
FIRST TERM ENDS: 07/01/96 AGE IN: 57 (05/12/39)
LETTER TO PASTOR REQUESTING SECOND TERM: 3/11/96
REQUEST RECEIVED: 3/28/96
LETTERS TO:
VICAR: 3/28/96
DEAN: 3/28/96

VICAR'S LETTER RECEIVED: 4/8/96
DEAN'S LETTER RECEIVED: 4/3/96
BOARD MEETING: 4/12/96
WSR TO CARDINAL: 4/12/96

April 4, 1994
M. Six Year Pastors:

1. William Lupo '65:
   MOTION: That William Lupo be recommended for a second term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian/Bartlett effective 07/01/96.
M. **Six Year Pastors:**

1. **William Lupo ’65:**
   
   **MOTION: 6-0-0** That William Lupo be recommended for a second term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian/Bartlett effective 07/01/96.
April 22, 1996

Dear Father Lupo,

In light of the recommendation of the Diocesan Priests’ Placement Board, which reflects the endorsement of your Episcopal Vicar and Dean, I am pleased to appoint you to serve a second term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian/Bartlett, commencing July 1, 1996, the date your previous term ended. Your term of office will be for an additional six years, but will officially remain in effect until you are reappointed or transferred or your successor is named.

The support you have received for this reappointment is an indication of the fine pastoral leadership you have rendered to the people of St. Peter's as you have proclaimed the Gospel message through your time and effort these past six years.

Bill, it is my hope that this will be a time of renewal for you personally as you continue to offer your priestly gifts with the people of God who have been entrusted to your care.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Reverend William Lupo
St. Peter Damian
109 S Crest Ave.
Bartlett, Illinois 60103

Ecclesiastical Notary

Archbishop of Chicago

Sincerely yours in Christ,
MEMORANDUM

To: File
From: Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor/ Archbishop's Delegate to the Professional Fitness Review Board
Date: July 12, 1996
Re: REVEREND WILLIAM L. LUPO, Class of '65 - REVIEW BOARD MEETING

The Review Board considered the request that Father Lupo's file be closed. Bernadette Conolly concurred with this recommendation but indicated she would like to have continued contact with him. The Board accepted this recommendation.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
PROFESSIONAL FITNESS REVIEW BOARD

Meeting, July 12, 1996
Office of Professional Fitness Review

M I N U T E S

Board Members Present

Others Present:
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
Bernadette Connolly

I. Approval of Minutes
The Review Board approved the Minutes of the May 18, 1996 meeting.

II. Review Board Matters
A.

B.
E. **Matter of PFR-23, WILLIAM LUPO**

The Board completed a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Review Process for Continuation Of Ministry in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. The Board recommended the restrictions imposed on Fr. Lupo be discontinued and Fr. Lupo's file be closed at this stage of the proceedings.
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, July 12, 1996:

The Review Board completed a Supplementary Review Board pursuant to Article (1104.11) of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry in the matter of Father William Lupo. The Board recommended the restrictions imposed on Father Lupo,
July 24, 1996

His Eminence
Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, Illinois 60690

Your Eminence,

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 12, 1996. The Board fully considered all oral and written reports in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry.

The Board recommends the restrictions imposed on Rev. Lupo, [redacted], be discontinued. As such, the Board recommends Father Lupo's file be closed at this stage of the proceedings.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness
Review Administrator

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board

bcc: Mr. John O'Malley
Legal Services
July 26, 1996

Bernadette,

I am writing in response to your letter of July 24, 1996 regarding the matter of Father William Lupo, following the Supplementary Review conducted by the Review Board on July 12, 1996.

In light of the facts and circumstances as presented to me, I have accepted the Board's recommendation that the restrictions placed on Father Lupo, called restrictions, be discontinued, and that his file be closed.

Please inform Father Lupo of this decision.

I am deeply grateful for the work of the Review Board and yourself.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago

Given at the Chancery

Thomas J. Paprocki
Chancellor

Ms. Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
1 East Superior, Suite 504
Chicago, IL 60611

cc: Most Reverend Raymond E. Goedert, Vicar General
Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, Vicar for Priests
Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
Mr. John C. O'Malley, Director of Legal Services
August 26, 1996

Reverend William L. Lupo, Pastor
St. Peter Damian Rectory
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

Please be advised that the Review Board met on July 12, 1996. The Board accepted the documents you authorized and fully considered my written and oral reports. The Board completed a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

Cardinal Bernardin accepted the Board’s recommendation that the restrictions placed on you, [REDACTED], be discontinued and that your file be closed.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to call me.

Very truly yours,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a letter written by Victim JL and addressed to Bishop Kicanas, dated September 22, 1998, in which Victim JL tells of her concern that Fr. William Lupo is being restored to unmonitored ministry and that he may victimize other minor females if people are not aware of the danger he poses.
Memo

To: Bernadette Connolly
From: Dan Coughlin
Date: September 29, 1998
Re: Bill Lupo

I regret that we were not able to talk by phone before I realized this was due to the fact of your doctor's appointment. I hope you are doing better.

The enclosed letter was sent to Bishop Kicanas. He believes it is because he is the lady's Episcopal Vicar. He does not know the woman. He knows Bill Lupo slightly and thinks he is simply surviving or mildly depressed. This came out in conversation as he gave this letter to me on Friday, September 25, 1998.

Please leave it to you as to whether you would respond to the woman yourself or review this matter with the Board before writing. Please copy myself and Bishop Kicanas.

tm
MEMO

TO: File

FROM: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor

DATE: October 17, 1998

RE: Rev. William Lupo – Review Board Meeting


The Board directed Bernadette to talk with [redacted] to ask what prompted her letter and also speak with Fr. Lupo to inform him about the letter from [redacted]. Bernadette will also caution Fr. Lupo about being alone with minors. At the next board meeting, Bernadette will report on these conversations. The Board will then consider whether a supplementary review is needed.
MINUTES

Members Present:

Others Present:
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki

Bernadette Connolly

I. Approval of Minutes
A. The Review Board formally approved the August 22, 1998 and the September 19, 1998 Minutes with one correction noted.

II. Review Board Matters
A. Matter of PFR-23, Bill Lupo
   The Administrator shared a letter from [redacted], an alleged victim, who reported an allegation of sexual misconduct with Fr. William Lupo. [redacted]'s letter was written to Bishop Kicanas where she indicates her concerns regarding Fr. Lupo's monitoring situation. The Review Board had ceased monitoring and closed Fr. Lupo's file in August of 1996. No new information was provided, but [redacted] did feel some type of monitoring should occur. The Administrator shared her letter to [redacted] from August, 1995 where it indicates Fr. Lupo's monitoring was ceased. After much discussion, and in light of our current Policies & Procedures regarding Monitoring, the Board recommended the Administrator meet with Fr. Lupo to discuss the letter and speak with [redacted]. The Board requested a response from the Professional Fitness Review Administrator at its November meeting.

B. 

C. 

D. 

Our next regularly-scheduled meeting is Saturday, November 21, 1998. As a reminder, on December 19, 1998 Cardinal George will meet with the Review Board. A luncheon will follow.
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, October 17, 1998:

The Professional Fitness Review Administrator shared a letter from an alleged victim, who reported an allegation of sexual misconduct with Father William Lupo. The letter was written to Bishop Kicanas where she indicates her concerns regarding Father Lupo's monitoring situation. The Review Board had ceased monitoring and closed Father Lupo's file in August of 1996. No new information was provided, but did feel some type of monitoring should occur. The PFR Administrator shared her letter to from August 1995 where it indicates Father Lupo's monitoring was ceased. After much discussion, and in light of our current Policies and Procedures regarding Monitoring, the Board recommended the PFR Administrator meet with Father Lupo to discuss the letter and speak with. The Board requested a response from the Professional Fitness Review Administrator at its November meeting.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

Office of the Chancellor

MEMORANDUM

TO: File

FROM: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor

DATE: November 21, 1998

RE: Review Board Meeting, Supplementary Review – Rev. William Lupo

The Review Board conducted a Supplementary Review in light of the letter of [redacted] to Bishop Kicanas dated September 22, 1998. As the Review Board requested at its last meeting, Bernadette Connolly met with Fr. Lupo. He is open to having his case reopened and is willing to have a restriction reinstated that he is not to be alone with minors.

The Review Board accordingly reopened Fr. Lupo’s case and imposed the minimum level of the protocol established by the Monitoring Subcommittee. Among these restrictions, he is not to be alone with minors without another responsible adult present, the parish secretary and business manager have been informed of the circumstances, and Fr. Lupo is to be interviewed by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator periodically.

The Administrator will write to [redacted] regarding these determinations after the Cardinal has indicated whether he accepts the Review Board’s recommendations.
MINUTES

I. Approval of Minutes
A. The Review Board formally approved the October 17, 1998 Minutes with one correction noted: Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi did participate as a member of the Search Committee.

II. Review Board Matters
A. Matter of PFR-23, William Lupo
   The Board reviewed Father Lupo's case and conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Review Board Process For Continuation of Ministry. The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Fr. Lupo to remain in ministry. However, the Board recommended that Fr. Lupo not be alone with minors unless another responsible adult is present. The Professional Fitness Review Administrator will communicate with Fr. Lupo regarding this matter.

B. 

III. Other Matters

Our next regularly-scheduled meeting is Saturday, December 19, 1998.
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, November 21, 1998:

The Review Board reopened Father Lupo’s case and conducted a Supplementary Review Board pursuant to Article (1104.11) of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry. The Board determined that is reasonable adult is present. However, the Board recommended that Father Lupo not be alone with minors unless another responsible adult is present. The Professional Fitness Review Administrator will communicate with Father Lupo regarding this matter.
November 24, 1998

Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
Archbishop of Chicago
155 East Superior Street
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Cardinal George;

Please be advised that the Review Board met on November 21, 1998. The Board fully considered all oral and written reports in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

The Board determined that it is reasonable to allow Fr. Lupo to remain in ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances.

However, based upon new information received and for the protection of Fr. Lupo, the Board recommends Fr. Lupo’s file be reopened and that he should not be alone with persons under eighteen (18) years of age without the presence of another responsible adult. The Board also recommends that the Administrator meet with Fr. Lupo two times per year.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness
Review Administrator

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board
Vicar for Priests
December 14, 1998

Dear Bernadette,

I am writing in response to your letter of November 24, 1998 regarding the matter of Reverend William Lupo following the Review Board’s Supplementary Review conducted on November 21, 1998.

In view of the all the facts and circumstances in this matter, I accept the Board’s determination that it is reasonable to allow Father Lupo to remain in ministry at his current assignment. However, I also accept the Board’s recommendation, based upon new information received and for the protection of Father Lupo, that Father Lupo should not be alone with persons under eighteen (18) years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.

Please communicate this decision to Father Lupo.

I am grateful to you and the members of the Review Board for your assistance.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
Archbishop of Chicago

Given at the Chancery

Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki
Chancellor

Ms. Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
676 N. St. Clair, Suite 1910
Chicago, IL 60611

cc: Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, Vicar for Priests
    Reverend Lawrence P. McBrady, Vicar for Priests
    Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister
    Mr. John C. O'Malley, Director of Legal Services
December 16, 1998

Reverend William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Rectory
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

As we discussed, I have enclosed a copy of your Individual Specific Protocol. Please sign the Protocol and return to me in the enclosed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Bernadette Connolly
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board
Vicar for Priests
I have reviewed, understood, and agree to all requirements of this Protocol.

1) Fr. Lupo is not to be alone with persons under eighteen (18) years of age without another responsible adult present.

2) In order to change this Protocol, prior approval must be obtained from the Professional Fitness Review Administrator.

3) This is a working document which can be changed, altered or superseded when there is an indicated need to do so.

4. A copy of this Protocol will be kept on file at the Offices of Professional Fitness Review and Vicar for Priests.

Signed: William L. Lupo Date: 1/4/99

Printed Name: WILLIAM L. LUPO

(Professional Fitness Review Administrator) Date: 12/16/98

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board
Vicar for Priests
INDIVIDUAL SPECIFIC PROTOCOL
for
REVEREND WILLIAM LUPO

I have reviewed, understood, and agree to all requirements of this Protocol.

1) Fr. Lupo is not to be alone with persons under eighteen (18) years of age without another responsible adult present.

2) In order to change this Protocol, prior approval must be obtained from the Professional Fitness Review Administrator.

3) This is a working document which can be changed, altered or superseded when there is an indicated need to do so.

4. A copy of this Protocol will be kept on file at the Offices of Professional Fitness Review and Vicar for Priests.

Signed: William L. Lupo Date: 1/4/99

Printed Name: WILLIAM L. LUPO

(Professional Fitness Review Administrator) Date: 12/16/98

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
    Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board
Vicar for Priests
January 7, 1999

Reverend William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Rectory
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo:

Since Bernadette Connolly is no longer serving the Archdiocese of Chicago as Professional Fitness Review Administrator, I am following up on her letter to you dated 12/16/98 enclosing your Individual Specific Protocol for signature (copies enclosed).

I realize the influx of mail during the holidays, however, I would appreciate if you could sign and return this document to me as soon as possible. If you have questions regarding your Protocol, please do not hesitate to call me (312-751/5206).

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator
MEMO TO FILE:  PFR-23  
FROM:  Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator  
RE:  Bill Lupo  
DATE:  January 16, 1999  

Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, January 16, 1999:  


Review Board recommendation for letter to be sent to Bill Lupo by Professional Fitness Review Administrator about meeting with Father Lupo 2 times per year (cc to Vicar for Priests and PFR Board).
REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Saturday, January 16, 1999
Office of Professional Fitness Review

AGENDA

I. Approval of Minutes
   A. November 21, 1998
   B. December 19, 1998

II. Review Board Matters
   A. [Redacted]
   B. Matter of PFR-23, William Lupo
   C. [Redacted]
   D. [Redacted]
   E. [Redacted]
   F. [Redacted]
   G. [Redacted]
   H. [Redacted]

III. Other Matters
    A. Office Coverage

Our next regularly-scheduled meeting is February 20, 1999
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
PROFESSIONAL FITNESS REVIEW BOARD

Meeting, Saturday, January 16, 1999
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM
Office of Professional Fitness Review

MINUTES

Members Present:

Others Present:
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
Kathleen Leggdas

I. Approval of Minutes given for:
   A. November 21, 1998
   B. December 19, 1998

II. Review Board Matters
   
   A. 

   B. Bill Lupo, PFR-23
      File reopened, protocol signed and returned 1/7/99.
      Board recommendation for letter to be sent to Bill Lupo by PFRA about meeting
      with BL 2x's per year (cc to VP and PFRB).

   C. 

AOC 017520
III. Other Matters:

A.

B. PFRA job responsibility extended to include allegations of sexual misconduct with minors and/or adults for lay employees of the Archdiocese.

*Next regularly-scheduled meeting is February 20, 1999.*
January 19, 1999

Reverend William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo:

When the Professional Fitness Review Board conducted a Supplementary Review in November of 1998 your file was reopened and the Board recommended to Cardinal George that you were not to be alone with persons under eighteen (18) years of age without the presence of another responsible adult. The Cardinal has accepted the Board’s recommendation.

With the reopening of your file, the Board has also recommended that you meet with the Professional Fitness Review Administrator two (2) times a year.

I have replaced Bernadette Connolly as Professional Fitness Review Administrator and look forward to meeting with you in order to facilitate development of a working relationship. Please call me at your earliest convenience so that we can set a date and time which will be mutually convenient (312/751-5205).

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas Paprocki
   Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board
Rev. Lawrence McBrady
January 29, 1999

Dear [Name],

Bishop Kicanas forwarded your letter to the Office of Professional Fitness Review. I apologize for the delay in writing to you regarding the disposition of this matter. I can assure you it was dealt with in a timely manner and in keeping with the Policies and Procedures related to allegations of sexual misconduct with a minor by a priest serving in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The Professional Fitness Review Board (PFRB) is composed of nine (9) members appointed by the Archbishop. Six (6) members are lay Catholics who are not employees of the Archdiocese, and three (3) are clerics. Three of the members, representing the Church at large, include a parish council member, a parent, and a victim/survivor or a parent of a victim/survivor of child sexual abuse.

The content of your letter was shared with the PFRB. Discussion followed, and upon recommendation of the Board to the Archbishop, the protocol for Fr. William Lupo was reviewed in light of your concerns. The Board recommended that:

- Fr. Lupo should not be alone with persons under eighteen (18) years of age without the presence of another responsible adult.
- Fr. Lupo meet with the Administrator twice a year.

Fr. Lupo has signed the protocol which is on file in the PFR Office and will be reviewed periodically.

Thank you for your concern. If you have further questions, please call me at 312-751-5206.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas,
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

CC: Bishop Kicanus
   Vicar for Priests
   Chancellor’s Office
February 2, 1999

MEMORANDUM

To: File
From: Kathleen Leggadas
Re: PFR-23, Bill Lupo

I received a telephone call from [redacted] today. I had called and left a message last week in response to Fr. Dan Coughlin’s request that I make direct contact.

[redacted] had not yet received my letter regarding Professional Fitness Review Board recommendations concerning Fr. Bill Lupo.

I gave her general information and she seemed satisfied.
MEMORANDUM

TO: File

From: Michael J. Bland

RE: Meeting with

Date: May 11, 1999

Today, May 11, 1999, I met with [redacted], her husband, [redacted], and [redacted] for an hour-and-a-half. This meeting was at the request of [redacted] who wanted “to know Fr. Lupo’s position in the church.”

After seeking clarification from Kathleen Leggdas, PFRD, I was able to explain to [redacted] that:

- Fr. Lupo’s case remain open with the PFRB
- Fr. Lupo is being monitored and will until he dies
- Fr. Lupo is not allowed to be alone with a minor
- Fr. Lupo has cooperated with all recommendations of the PFRB
- Fr. Lupo has cooperated with all [redacted] recommendations
- Cardinal George is aware of Fr. Lupo’s case

[redacted] explained that she felt good that Fr. Lupo was “still being watched” [redacted] [redacted] explained that she [redacted] would “prefer to see him doing something in the Archdiocese that would not put him in contact with people, especial young woman and girls.”

No further follow-up or contact is needed, or is being requested, at this time. [redacted] was invited to call me if she had any further questions.

cc: Ms. Kathleen Leggdas, PFRD
OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL FITNESS REVIEW
CLIENT INFORMATION SHEET

FILE #: PFR-23

REVIEW STATUS: (DATE)
1st Stage: 4-7-93
2nd Stage: 6-29-93
Supplementary: 6-11-94
8-27-94
12-17-94
5-13-95
7-15-95
10-17-98

Opened Date: 4-1-93 Reopened 11-21-98
Closed Date: 

1. Name: William L. Lupo Date Ordained: April 29, 1965
Birth Date: 
Current S/S #: 

Telephone: Home: 630-837-5411
Office: 
Pager: 

3. Ministry: Pastor Status (Check one) Date: 5-25-99
Active: 
Deceased: 
Resigned: 
Withdrawn: 
Other: 

4. Allegation(s):
Date: 1979 – 1980 Date of the Offense(s): Unknown Sex/Age: F/14-15 Credibility: Yes

Date: 1981 – 1984 Date of the Offense(s): Summer, 1985 Sex/Age: F/16-18 Credibility: Yes

5. General Nature of Allegation(s):
Exposure of self to 14 year old girl, passionate kissing, hugging with other teenage girls.

6. Protocol: on file Original Date: 1993
Review Dates: 12-16-98
11-16-99
Review Dates:
July 9, 1999

Rev. William Lupo, Pastor
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S. Crest Ave.
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo:

Next month the Office of Ministerial Evaluation will be starting your Second Term Pastor Review. This review process ordinarily includes two types of feedback:

a) feedback from approximately 40 staff and parishioners compiled into a report by a team of priests and lay persons (systematic feedback);

b) feedback sent directly to your Episcopal Vicar in response to a letter which he places in the parish bulletin.

I would like to invite you to consider using the new Periodic Review of Ministry for the systematic feedback part of the process. This review process offers:

• an up to date feedback survey designed by a representative group of Archdiocesan priests
• feedback from staff, parish leadership, and sampling of 20-30 parishioners selected randomly from a pool of names submitted by you and the parish staff
• the assistance of a priest colleague who has experienced the process, and who has been trained to guide you in working with the feedback,
• a comprehensive feedback report of both statistical data and key information from comments
• an outline for setting goals and directions for the future.

A sample of the feedback survey and information regarding the process is enclosed for your consideration. If you have questions, I'll be happy to discuss them with you. Or I can refer you to priests from the pilot group who can tell you of their experience.

Please look over the enclosed materials. Give me a call if you have questions. If I have not heard from you, I will be calling you in mid August to discuss your decision regarding the process you prefer to use.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunker, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

Encl.
The Individual Specific Protocol (ISP) reflects the primary goal of protecting minors and the integrity of the Church. Additionally, the ISP serves as a safeguard for the individual priest/deacon with regard to the possibility of subsequent allegations.

Professional Fitness Review clients will be subject to appropriate restrictions and monitoring by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator throughout the life of the individual as a priest/deacon in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The ISP for Fr. William Lupo includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Restricted from being alone with minors without the presence of another responsible adult.
2. Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator a minimum of twice a year.
3. This is a working document which can be changed, altered or superceded when there is an indicated need to do so.
4. In order to change this protocol, prior approval must be obtained from the Professional Fitness Review Board.
5. A copy of this Protocol will be kept on file in Professional Fitness Review and Vicar for Priests Offices.

I have reviewed, understand, and agree to all requirements of this Protocol.

Signed: William L. Lupo

Printed Name: William L. Lupo

Signature of PFRA: Kathleen M. Leggeler

Date: 11/16/99
Memorandum

Memo to File: PFR-23
From: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator
Re: Rev. William Lupo
Date: November 17, 1999

PFRA and Fr. Lupo met at his parish office at St. Peter Damian in Bartlett, Illinois.

The conversation focused on the long-term effects allegations made against him have had on his life. The trauma of being accused, living with lifetime knowledge that even simple expression of affection can be misread or misinterpreted. He stated that this experience has left him guarded and that the restrictions he places on himself are even more exacting than those in the protocol.

Client fact sheet was reviewed and necessary changes made. Protocol was reviewed and signed.

Cc: Review Board Members
Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
March 2, 2000

Rev. William Lupo
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

The Review Board was recently asked to consider the need/efficacy of monitoring Internet access for Professional Fitness Review clients. Out of concern to take precautions against inappropriate sites being visited by priests under protocol, the Review Board made the following recommendations:

That all protocols with priests who use the Internet be amended to add a provision requiring them to provide the Administrator with a monthly printout of Internet sites visited.

Effective March 1, 2000 please be advised that you are required to send this printout to my attention by the fifth (5th) of the following month, April 5th being the first due date.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

If you have questions regarding this change in Protocol, call at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

KL/lnp

Cc: Review Board Members
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
Vicar for Priests Office
May 3, 2000

Most Reverend Gerald F. Kicanas
Vicariate I Center
200 No. Milwaukee Ave., Suite 200
Libertyville, IL 60048-2250

Dear Bishop Kicanas,

It is time to initiate Father William Lupo's second term pastor review. He has chosen to use the traditional second term process.

In order to initiate the review I will need your assistance. The Vicariate I review team includes a priest coordinator and another priest selected by you, a priest selected by the pastor and the dean. At this time, I am writing to Father Lupo requesting the name of his representative. I will also inform the dean.

Please inform me of your selections by sending or faxing the enclosed form(s) or by calling the office.

Once the teams are in place, I can meet with them to acquaint them with the process.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger
Mary Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw
Enc.
May 3, 2000

Reverend William Zavaski
Deanery I-B
St. James Parish
820 N. Arlington Heights Rd.
Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Dear Father Zavaski,

It is time to initiate Father William Lupo's review of his ministry. He has chosen to use the traditional second term process.

The Vicariate I review team includes four members: two priests selected by Bishop Kicanas, a priest selected by the pastor, and the dean. I have written to Bishop Kicanas and to Father Lupo requesting the names of their representatives. When I receive these names, I will meet with the team to initiate the process. As part of the team, you will be invited to that meeting.

I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunker, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw
May 3, 2000

Reverend William Lupo, Pastor
Saint Peter Damian Parish
109 South Crest Avenue
Bartlett, Illinois 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

It is time to initiate your second term pastor review. As envisioned by Archdiocesan policy and the Presbyteral Council, the primary purpose of this review is to begin looking toward the future. It is not intended to make a case for or against another term.

The enclosed materials describe the process. The first step is to form the review team. In Vicariate I, the team consists of two priests selected by Bishop Kicanas, Episcopal Vicar, a priest selected by you, and the dean. I have asked Bishop Kicanas to select his representatives and I will notify your dean.

With this letter, I am asking that you recruit a priest to serve on your team. The commitment of this team member involves the following: an initial meeting to review the process; one or two meetings to review the feedback and draft the report; and possibly, attendance at the parish meeting where the process is introduced to those completing the feedback forms.

When you have recruited your representative for the team, please complete the enclosed form and return it in the envelope provided, fax it, or give me a call. When the team is in place, I will schedule an orientation meeting with them.

Please contact me if you need clarification or for more information after reading the enclosed materials.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger
Mary Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw

Enc.
**Watt, Jacquelyn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Fr. Lupo's 2nd term Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due Date:</td>
<td>Friday, May 05, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Complete:</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Work:</td>
<td>0 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Work:</td>
<td>0 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Watt, Jacquelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested By:</td>
<td>Yunger, Mary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ok**

Father Lupo has chosen the traditional second term review. Please send appropriate letter to Bp. Kicanas (for two team members), Fr Zavaski (Dean who will coordinate) and Fr Lupo (for his designate). I believe we have standard form letters. We just need to add a sentence to let each know that Fr. Lupo has chosen traditional review process.

If you want me to review the three letters, send them and I'll look them over.

*Signature*

5/1/00 Waiting for signature

Date
Phone Conversation – PFR-23

Date: 5/24/00  Time: AM
From: Fr. Vince Costello/PFR Board member
- Bill Lupo finishing term as pastor at Peter Damian in Bartleet
- Put on agenda for 6/17/00
Second Term Pastor
RETURN FORM

Rev. William Lupo, Pastor
St. Peter Damian Parish
Term Ends, July 1, 2002

Please indicate the name of the priest whom you have recruited for your review team.

John Dewes
St. Anne's
Priest Team Member
Parish

St. Anne
120 N. Lake St.
Barrington 60010
847-382-5300

William L. Lupo
Signature

May 30, 2000
Date

PLEASE RETURN IN 10 DAYS

To
MARY YUNGER, DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF MINISTERIAL EVALUATION
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
PO BOX 1979
CHICAGO IL 60690-1979

Rec: 6/2/00

AOC 017536
Meeting Reminder

To: Rev. Denis Conlon, Coordinator
    Rev. John Dewes, Team Member
    Rev. Mark Canavan, Team Member
    Rev. Vince Costello, Team Member

From: Mary Yungier, Director
     Office of Ministerial Evaluation

Date: Wednesday, June 07, 2000

Re: In-Service for Father Lupo's Second Term Term Pastor Review

Just a reminder that we are scheduled to meet at the Barn of Barrington at Noon on Friday, June 23. The Barn is located at 1415 S. Barrington Rd. in Barrington. In case there is need to telephone, the number to the restaurant is (847) 381-8585.

I look forward to meeting with you.

Cc: Rev. William Lupo, Pastor
    Rev. William Zavaski, Dean

Mr. Lupo,

If you would like to join us on the 23rd, just give me a call. You are welcome to attend.

Mary
Memo To: Fr. Denis Condon  
Review Team Member

From: Mary Yunger  
Director

Date: June 19, 2000

RE: Father Lupo's Review

I am sending the feedback forms for Father Lupo's review process prior to our meeting on June 23, since they are very cumbersome to transport. I will bring the information packets along with me on Friday.
Memo to: Most Rev. Gerald Kicanas  
Episcopal Vicar, Vicariate I  

From: Mary Yunger, Director  
Office of Ministerial Evaluation  

Date: June 23, 2000  

Re: Second Term Pastor Review  

I recently met with Father Lupo's review team. For your reference, I am enclosing a copy of the Parish Profile and a list of the team members/phone numbers.  

As you know, the pastor involved will be expecting your letter (sample enclosed) for placement in the parish bulletin about the time of the parish meeting. As the coordinator, Father Condon will contact you once a meeting date is determined.  

Please call if you have questions.  

Thank you.  

Enc.  

Cc: Rev. Denis Condon, Coordinator  
Rev. William Lupo, Pastor
Memo to: Rev. William Zavaski, Dean
From: Mary Yuager, Director
      Office of Ministerial Evaluation
Date: Tuesday, June 27, 2000
Re: Second Term Pastor Review

I recently met with Father Lupo's review team. For your reference, I am enclosing a copy of the Parish Profile and a list of the team members/phone numbers.

Have a wonderful summer!

Enc.

:jw
July 18, 2000

Rev. William Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S Crest AVE
Bartlett, IL 60106

Dear Fr. Lupo:

Our records indicate that you are in or entering the tenth year of your pastorate. In March of 1997 the Presbyteral Council endorsed the polices of the Priests' Personnel System. One of the policies endorsed had to deal with pastors completing their second term. The policy reads "After two terms (six years each) as a pastor in a parish, the pastor's term concludes in that specific pastorate.

Special consideration will be made for an exception based on:

a) **AGE**: age may be a factor in considering a waiver of this policy, but if a person is aged 59 or younger at the time of completion of his second term as pastor, it is recommended that age alone should not be the basis for an exception to this policy. (This does not mean that a pastor is automatically extended to a third term if over 59.)

b) **PARISH SITUATION**: unique circumstances in the life of a parish may indicate the need for a waiver of this policy.

c) **FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND CULTURAL AWARENESS**: these may be determining factors.

d) **ETHNIC, RACIAL OR CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS**: these may suggest a waiver of the two term policy.

e) **SPECIAL PROJECTS**: some project within the parish that might necessitate an extension.

f) **HEALTH**: Particularly health problems would be a factor in considering a waiver of this policy.

The Office of Ministerial Evaluation will be contacting you if they haven't already done so, to conduct an evaluation. The purpose of this evaluation is not to determine whether you should stay or go. The purpose is to assist you in better appreciating your gifts and talents as a pastor. The feedback from the evaluation process will be very beneficial in helping you to get a sense of what kind of placement in the future will build on your strengths.

- over -
I write you now on behalf of the Board to advise you of the following practical considerations.

1) If you will celebrate your 65th birthday by the end of your 12th year as pastor, you may ask that your pastorate be extended.

2) If for some personal reason you feel an extension of your pastorate is needed, you may ask for an extension.

3) If there is, in your estimation, a need at your parish that warrants an extension of your pastorate you may seek the extension.

(In each of the preceding instances, consultation and evaluation will take place as previously mentioned.)

If you are not planning to seek an extension or one is not granted, there are various options to consider:

A) A new pastorate which you would begin actively seeking now
B) A new pastorate which you would seek when your term is completed. This could mean extending your pastorate in your current term for one or two years.
C) Being assigned as an Associate Pastor either temporarily or for a term of office depending on your wishes.
D) Seeking a three to six month sabbatical and being reassigned before, during or in the one month after your sabbatical, dependent on your wishes.

I have enclosed a form for you to complete. If you return it by August 17, 2000, the Board will be better able to assist you in the future.

Thank you for your time, I hope all is well with you in your parish. I offer you the prayers of the entire Board at this time of decision in your life. We are grateful for all you have done in your ministry as pastor.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Reverend Jeremiah M. Boland
Executive Secretary
Diocesan Priests’ Placement Board

Enc:
July 19, 2000

Rev. William Lupo
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

It hardly seems possible that it has been more than six months since we last met. As you may recall, the protocol requires that we meet a minimum of twice annually. This gives us an opportunity to discuss your protocol restrictions in light of your current status and enables me to more clearly relate your progress, needs and concerns to the members of the Review Board.

With the arrival of Father James Kaczorowski, some of you have been assigned a new Vicar. For your information, your current Vicar is now Father Larry McBrady. He and I would like to meet with you at my office before September 15, 2000. This will allow for summer vacations not yet taken and enable us to find a time that is mutually agreeable to each of us.

Please call me with a couple of dates at your earliest convenience.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this matter. If there are other ways our office can be of assistance to you, I would be happy to hear from you at this time as well.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

KL/lnp

Cc: Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
Phone Conversation – PFR-23

Date: 7/24/00  Time: AM
- Appointment set to meet with PFRA and Vicar for Priest on August 29th at 1:00 p.m.
### PRIESTS WITH EXTENDED 2ND TERMS / 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/ YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>WAS X-10-ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### APPOINTED/1990 - 12 YEAR TERM ENDS/ 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/ YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>WAS X-10-ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONSES:**

**LEAVING**

**RESPONSES:**

**WANTS AN EXTENSION**
August 16, 2000

Reverend William Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Bill,

Thank you for your "Twelve Year Pastorate Form."

As a rule a pastor completing his second term or anticipating retiring needs to meet with the Cardinal six months before his term ends; or, if you are seeking an extension you need to share your plans with your Vicar and Dean.

In the meantime, please keep in touch with the Placement Board. Be assured I will be available for whatever help I can be to you.

Ken Velo is your Board Contact, and you may reach him at 312/236-7240.

Fraternally yours,

[Signature]

Reverend Jeremiah M. Boland
Executive Secretary

JMB/ljb

cc: Most Reverend Gerald Kicanas, Vicar
Reverend William Zavaski, Dean
Msgr. Kenneth Velo, Board Contact
Office of Ministerial Evaluation
NAME: William L. Lupo '65  
PARISH: St. Peter Damian Parish  
109 S Crest Ave  
Bartlett, IL 60103

PHONE #: 630/837-5411  
VICARIATE: I  
DEANERY: B  
SECOND TERM ENDS: 07/01/02  
DOB:  
AGE: 63

EVALUATION COMPLETED:  
LETTER & FORM REQUESTING INTENSIONS OUT: 7/8/02

RESPONSE DEADLINE: 8/17/00
RESPONSE RECEIVED: 8/16/00  
** If leaving parish, consultation scheduled for:  
Who is doing the parish consultation:  
COPY SENT TO:  
VICAR: Gerald Kicanas  
DEAN: William Zavaski  
BOARD CONTACT: K Velz

VICAR'S LETTER RECEIVED: 3/21/01  
DEAN'S LETTER RECEIVED:  
COMPLETED EVALUATION RECEIVED:  
BOARD MEETING:  

NOTATIONS:  

August 7, 2000
TWELVE YEAR PASTORATE FORM

Fr. William Lupo '65
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S Crest Ave
Bartlett, IL 60103

Term Expires: 07/01/02
Vicariate: I
Deanery: B
Phone #: 630/837-5411

Dear Bill,

1. If you intend to seek an extension as pastor please check whichever is/are appropriate:

   (□) A. I will have celebrated my 65th birthday by the end of my 12th year as pastor.
   (X) B. I have personal reasons to seek an extension.
   (□) C. There is a need at the parish that warrants an extension of my term.

   (In each of the preceding instances, consultation and evaluation will take place.)

2. If you do not receive an extension at the end of your term, there are various options to consider:

   (□) A. I intend to actively seek a new pastorate now.
   (□) B. I intend to actively seek a new pastorate at the end of my present term.
   (□) C. I intend to seek an associate pastor position either temporarily or for a term of office depending on desires/needs.
   (□) D. I intend to seek another form of priestly ministry.
   (□) E. I intend to seek a 3 or 6 month sabbatical and be reassigned before, during or in the one month after my sabbatical.
   (□) F. I intend to seek resignation from my parish before the term is completed.

3. If you have not made a decision regarding these matters please check here. (□)

4. Please indicate which Board member you would like to have as your contact with the Board:

   (□) Jeremiah Boland '81 (□) Kurt D. Boras '81 (□) David A. Jones '89
   (□) Joseph P. Grembla '57 (□) Daniel P. McCarthy '67 (□) Martin E. O'Donovan '78
   (□) Michael J. Shanahan '92 (□) Michael J. Shanahan '92 (□) Kenneth J. Velo '73

   We welcome your comments.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please return this completed form by August 17, 2000

MAILING ADDRESS: Archdiocese of Chicago
Diocesan Priests' Placement Board
P O Box 1979
Chicago, IL 60699-1979
(FAX # 312 / 751-5281)

This form must be returned before you seek an appointment with the Cardinal.
**APPOINTED/1990 - 12 YEAR TERM ENDS IN 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>X-10-ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**RESPONSES:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAVING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONSES:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WANTS AN EXTENSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I/B 07/01/90 William L. Lupo '65 St. Peter Damian 2/9/09 63
Wants an extension 08/16/00 KV
Memorandum

Memo to File: PFR-23
From: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator
Re: Rev. William Lupo
Date: August 29, 2000

Discussion focused on realization and acceptance of the fact that this file will remain open for as long as Father Lupo serves in the Archdiocese of Chicago. While aware of this, Father Lupo indicated that he no longer agonizes over the fact, but has come to terms with twice annual meetings with Administrator, Protocol, etc.

He seems very aware of the need to not put himself at risk by being alone with minors or working with youth groups.

PFRA pointed out that Father Lupo's is the least restrictive of any currently in place. He has only the required, basic elements in his Individual Protocol.

Cc: Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/ YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2/9/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 Wants an extension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wants an extension
September 18, 2000

Rev. Denis Condon
Review Coordinator
St. Marcelline Parish
822 S. Springinsguth Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60193

Dear Father Condon,

In light of our conversation on September 11 regarding the start of Father Lupo’s pastor review, the revised deadline is February 28, 2001. This should give you ample time to complete the process.

Thank you for updating me.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw

Cc: Most Rev. Gerald Kicanas, Episcopal Vicar
Rev. William Zavaski, Dean
Rev. William Lupo, Pastor
Rev. Jeremiah Boland, Executive Secretary, Priests' Placement Board
Rev. Mark Canavan, Team Member
Rev. Vince Costello, Team Member
Rev. John Dewes, Team Member
TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/YR 70</th>
<th>AGE NOW</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a statement written by Victim JM which she allegedly used during a telephone conversation with Fr. William Lupo in October of 2000. This statement refers vaguely to events leading up to Victim JM’s wedding in 1984 involving herself and Fr. Lupo. Victim JM alleges that she told several family members about the events at the time but was immediately blamed for them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM/ YR 70</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;/09</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 Wants an extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM/ YR 70</td>
<td>AGE JN 02</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2/20/99</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo to: Rev. Denis Condon, Review Team Coordinator

From: Jacquelyn Watt, Secretary

Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2000

RE: Survey Forms: Fr. Lupo's Review

As instructed by Mary Yunger, I am enclosing 35 review feedback forms and postage paid envelopes for Father Lupo's Second Term pastor review process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd/09</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Term Ends in 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 02</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
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November 9, 2000

Rev. William Lupo
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

It has been a year since we last reviewed your Individual Specific Protocol for the Professional Fitness Review Board. Since this needs to be updated annually, I have enclosed the most recent for your signature.

One addition has been made to the standard requirements: “Submit a list of all sites visited on the Internet to the PFRA monthly.” Needless to say, this is meant only for those of you who “surf the net.”

Any changes made as a result of a Supplementary Review by the Board have been incorporated into your protocol. If you have any questions about content or interpretation, please call to clarify before you sign.

Return the signed Protocol to me by December 1, 2000. Retain a copy for your file.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggda
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

KL/lnp

Enclosure

Cc: Review Board Members
    Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
    Vicar for Priests Office
The Individual Specific Protocol (ISP) reflects the primary goal of protecting minors and the integrity of the Church. Additionally, the ISP serves as a safeguard for the individual priest/deacon with regard to the possibility of subsequent allegations.

Professional Fitness Review clients will be subject to appropriate restrictions and monitoring by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator throughout the life of the individual as a priest/deacon in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The ISP for Fr. William Lupo includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Restricted from being alone with minors without the presence of another responsible adult.

2. Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator a minimum of twice a year.

3. Submit copy of all sites visited on the Internet to PFRA monthly.

4. This is a working document which can be changed, altered or superceded when there is an indicated need to do so.

5. In order to change this protocol, prior approval must be obtained from the Professional Fitness Review Board.

6. A copy of this Protocol will be kept on file in Professional Fitness Review and Vicar for Priests Offices.

I have reviewed, understand, and agree to all requirements of this Protocol.

Signed: William L. Lupo Date: 11-14-00

Printed Name: William L. Lupo

Signature of PFRA: Kathleen Leffler Date: 11-9-00
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63 Wants an extension
March 14, 2001

Rev. Jeremiah Boland
Priests Personnel Board
APC
P. O. Box 1979
Chicago, IL 60690

Dear Fr. Boland:

Recently, Fr. William Zavaski and I met with Fr. William Lupo. At that time, we reviewed the evaluation done by Fr. Denis Condon and the priests of the Evaluation Team.

That report strongly recommended that Fr. Lupo be re-appointed for a third term based on many positive comments on his ministry of the past eleven years. His current term ends in July of 2002.

The Dean and I would support Father Lupo receiving a third term. He will be 63 at the time of the completion of his second term. It was suggested to Fr. Lupo that he identify some pastoral goals that he would plan on completing during his third term. He intends to do that in a letter to the Personnel Board.

While there have been some concerns raised that not enough is happening pastorally, at St. Peter Damian, I am pleased that he recently hired a Pastoral Associate and now has the services of a permanent deacon to assist him. St. Peter Damian is growing, and the parish needs more than one priest to respond to the diverse pastoral needs of the community.

While there are some reasons why a change in pastors would be advisable, weighing all sides, it appears that the best decision would be to renew Fr. Lupo for a third term.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Gerald F. Kicanas
Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago

E-mail: bpkicanas@juno.com
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March 22, 2001

Reverend Jeremiah Boland
Archdiocese of Chicago
Diocesan Priests' Placement Board
P.O. Box 1979
Chicago, IL 60690-1979

Dear Father Boland:

As I approach the completion of my eleventh year as pastor of St. Peter Damian parish, and after much prayerful consideration, I respectfully request that I be granted a third term.

My evaluation process has been completed and I have the strong support of my vicar and dean in this regard.

By the end of my twelfth year I will be sixty-three years old. Neither the thought of taking on a new pastorate nor that of becoming an associate again has any appeal for me. I have worked hard over the past several years to bring this parish up to speed in a number of areas. With the help of some truly dedicated lay people we have been quite successful.

As the only priest in the parish it has been my goal to bring out the leadership and creative qualities of the laity. I have done this very well. We have over thirty active ministries in our parish and there's room for even more. I would like to have the opportunity to continue to build up this worshipping community.

There are a number of goals and projects which I would like to see become a reality in the coming years, including: a more viable youth ministry; more opportunities for adult education and catechesis; the revamping and updating of our Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults; the formation of a bereavement ministry; the completion of phases two and three of the racial sensitivity program. All of these and others besides are challenges which face us in the next several years. I have brought new people on staff to assist in these efforts. I very much want to be a part of them myself.

I tend to dig in and really become a member of the parishes I serve. In the first twenty-one years of my priesthood I had
just three assignments. I believe I was the only one around my time to serve seven years in each of those assignments.

It is extremely important to me and my very strong desire that I be granted a third term as pastor of St. Peter Damian. I trust you will let me know whether it is recommended or necessary to appear before the Board in this regard, and also how to go about arranging a meeting with Cardinal George to discuss these matters.

Thank you so very much for your consideration.

Gratefully yours in Christ,

William L. Lupo

cc: Most Reverend Gerald F. Kicanas, Vicar
    Reverend William Zavaski, Dean
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 01</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Requests an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 03</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2003

Wants an extension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2001

TERM ENDS IN 2002

Wants an extension
IV
Acceptance of Agenda: 6 - 0 - 0

V
Business:

A.
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   e) St. Peter Damian / Bartlett: William Lupo '65 [Pastor] will probably be asking for a third term. The Bishop would support this.

   f)

   g)
### TERM ENDS IN 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
<td>APPT DATE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>PARISH</td>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>AGE IN 01</td>
<td>X-10-ED TO</td>
<td>START PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Wants an extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Twelve Year Pastors:

1. **William Lupo '65:**
   
   **MOTION:** That Rev. William Lupo '65 be recommended for a second six year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian effective 07/01/02 until his retirement in 2008-9.
2. Twelve Year Pastors:

2. William Lupo '65: 
   MOTION: 0-8-0 
That Rev. William Lupo '65 be recommended for a third six-year term as Pastor of St. Peter Damian effective 07/01/02 until his retirement in 2008-9.
April 16, 2001

Dear Father Lupo,

Recently you applied for a third term for the pastorate of St. Peter Damian Parish in Bartlett. As you know, the current policy of the Archdiocese limits the assignment of a pastor to two six-year terms. In a few instances, I have made exceptions, but generally I have implemented the current policy. The Presbyteral Council continues to endorse the current policy.

Bill, I know you have done a wonderful job as pastor of St. Peter Damian. You can take pride in all that has been accomplished under your leadership.

The prospect of change is never easy. But there is plenty of time between now and the end of your term July 1, 2002 to prepare yourself and the parish for a change.

Thank you for your fine work at St. Peter Damian. It is my hope these next years will be filled with much satisfaction for you and those entrusted to your care.

Be assured of my continued encouragement and support, as well as my gratitude.

Fraternally yours in Christ,

[Signature]

Francis Cardinal George O.M.I.
Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend William L. Lupo
St. Peter Damian Parish
109 S Crest Ave
Bartlett, IL 60103

Ecclesiastical Notary
Reverend William L. Lupo  
April 16, 2001 – Page Two

cc: Most Reverend Raymond E. Goedert, Vicar General  
     Mr. Jimmy Lago, Chancellor  
     Reverend Lawrence McBrady, Vicar for Priests  
     Reverend James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests  
     Most Reverend Gerald Kicanas, Vicar  
     Reverend William Zavaski, Dean  
     Diocesan Priests' Placement Board  
     Office of Ministerial Evaluation
April 17, 2001

Rev. Denis Condon
Review Team Coordinator
St. Marcelline Parish
822 S. Springinsguth Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60193

Dear Father Condon,

I recently received notice from the Diocesan Priests' Placement Board that Father William Lupo's Second Term pastor review is complete.

Thank you so much for your assistance. This process certainly requires insight, sensitivity, care, honesty, and a prayerful spirit with a great deal of commitment. I'm very grateful to you for your willingness to share these gifts with Father Lupo and the Church of Chicago.

May the Lord be with you in your ministry.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw

Thank you for all your work.
April 17, 2001

Rev. John Dewes
Review Team Member
St. Anne Parish
120 N. Ela St.
Barrington, IL 60010

Dear Father Dewes,

I recently received notice from the Placement Board that Father William Lupo’s Second Term pastor review is complete. Thank you so much for your assistance. As you know, the process requires insight, sensitivity, care, honesty, a prayerful spirit, and a great deal of commitment. I’m very grateful for your willingness to share these gifts with Father Lupo and the Church of Chicago.

May the Lord be with you.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

My/jw
April 17, 2001

Rev. Mark Canavan
Review Team Member
St. Emily Parish
101 Horner Ln.
Mt. Prospect, IL 60056

Dear Father Canavan,

I recently received notice from the Placement Board that Father William Lupo’s Second Term pastor review is complete. Thank you so much for your assistance. As you know, the process requires insight, sensitivity, care, honesty, a prayerful spirit, and a great deal of commitment. I’m very grateful for your willingness to share these gifts with Father Lupo and the Church of Chicago.

May the Lord be with you.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger
Mary Yunger, Director
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw
April 17, 2001

Rev. Vince Costello  
Review Team Member  
Our Lady of the Wayside  
432 W. Park St.  
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Dear Father Costello,

I recently received notice from the Placement Board that Father William Lupo’s Second Term pastor review is complete. Thank you so much for your assistance. As you know, the process requires insight, sensitivity, care, honesty, a prayerful spirit, and a great deal of commitment. I’m very grateful for your willingness to share these gifts with Father Lupo and the Church of Chicago.

May the Lord be with you.

Sincerely,

Mary Yunger  
Mary Yunger, Director  
Office of Ministerial Evaluation

MY/jw
Excerpt: Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, 04/20/2001

AGENDA

Meeting: #59th - Seventeenth Board
Date: April 20, 2001
Place: Priests' Placement Board

Present: Rev.: Jeremiah M. Boland, Kurt D. Boras, John W. Clemens, David A. Jones, Robert G. Mair, Daniel P. McCarthy, Martin E. O'Donovan, Michael J. Shanahan

Absent: Rev. Joseph P. Grembia

I Opening Prayer: Rev. Martin O'Donovan TIME:

II Acceptance of Minutes: VOTE:

III Reports:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5. William Lupo '65: The Cardinal has written to Bill stating the current policy on term limits for pastors; and has decided not extend his term as pastor of St. Peter Damian/Bartlett stating there is plenty of time between now and the end of his term 7/01/02 to prepare himself and the parish for the change.

6.

7.
Excerpt: Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, 04/20/2001

IV  Acceptance of Agenda: VOTE:

V  Business:

A.

B.

C.

D.

E.  Priests:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.  William Lupo '65

6.

7.

8.

F.
9. **William Lupo '65**: Bill met with the Cardinal. The Cardinal is not open to a third term, but may do something with an extension.

G.
June 27, 2001

Dear Father Lupo,

In consultation with the Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, your Episcopal Vicar and Dean, I am pleased to extend your current term as pastor of St. Peter Damian in Bartlett for three-years. As provided by canon 186, you can remain in office until July 1, 2005.

Bill, I am grateful for all you have done at St. Peter’s these past 11-years. It is my hope these next years will be filled with much satisfaction for you and those entrusted to your care.

Be assured of my continued encouragement and support, as well as my gratitude.

Fraternally yours in Christ,

Francis Cardinal George O.M.I.
Archbishop of Chicago

cc: Most Reverend Raymond E. Goedert, Vicar General

Mr. Jimmy Lago, Chancellor
Reverend Lawrence McBrady, Vicar for Priests
Reverend James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Most Reverend Gerald Kicanas, Vicar
Reverend William Zavaski, Dean
Diocesan Priests' Placement Board
Office of Ministerial Evaluation
Thomas Brennan, Financial Operations
9.

10. **William Lupo '65**: The Cardinal has extended Bill's term as pastor of St. Peter Damian/Bartlett for three years effective 07/01/02 until 07/01/05.

11.
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a letter, written by the ex-husband of Victim JM on September 20, 2001 and addressed to the “Archdiocese of Chicago,” in which Victim JM’s ex-husband alleges that Victim JM told him that she had had a sexual encounter with Fr. William Lupo prior to their marriage. Per Victim JM’s ex-husband, both he and Victim JM have since contacted Fr. Lupo (separately) to discuss this situation.
AGENDA

Meeting:       #7th - Eighteenth Board
Date:          September 28, 2001
Place:         Priests' Placement Board

Present:       Rev.: Kurt D. Boras, John W. Clemens, Joseph P. Grembla,
                David A. Jones, Robert G. Mair, Daniel P. McCarthy,
                Martin E. O'Donovan, Michael J. Shanahan

Absent:        Rev.

I Opening Prayer: Bishop Gerald Kicanas  TIME: ________________

II Acceptance of Minutes: VOTE:

III Reports:    

IV Acceptance of Agenda: VOTE:

V Business:

A. Bishop Kicanas' Agenda:

1.  

2. Priests:
   a) 
   b) William Lupo '65
5. TERMS
TERM ENDS IN 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 02</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(NO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM ENDS IN 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 03</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2
b) **William Lupo '65**: Bill was given a 3-year extension beginning next year.

3.

4.

5. **TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM ENDS IN 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM ENDS IN 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: File
FROM: Larry McBrady
RE: Bill Lupo
DATE: October 5, 2001

Today, I contacted [redacted] and explained that [redacted] had a sexual relationship with Bill Lupo prior to her wedding.

When I contacted [redacted], he told me that when his former wife sought out Bill Lupo for guidance, he led her into a sexual relationship.

I explained my interest in speaking with [redacted] and asked [redacted] if he could contact her and ask her to contact me. [redacted] contacted me several hours later. Her cell phone number is [redacted]. She told me of her willingness to meet with me and we arranged a meeting for Friday, October 12th, at St. Mary, Des Plaines. I asked Kathleen Leggdas to participate in this meeting.
Phone Communication – PFR-23

Date: 10/8/01       Time: 10:05 a.m.
From: Rev. Larry McBrady/Vicar for Priests
- Would like you to come along for allegation against Fr. Bill Lupo
- Woman coming in from [redacted] and will be meeting in [redacted]
- It’s an adult case bordering on minor.
- Would really like you to accompany him.
- 10:00 a.m. on Friday, October 12th.
- Please confirm
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces the summary prepared by Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator of the Archdiocese of Chicago's Office of Professional Fitness Review, of Victim JM's statement, given to Ms. Leggdas on October 15, 2001, formalizing her allegation of inappropriate sexual behavior against Fr. William Lupo. According to Victim JM, the incidents occurred when Victim JM was 23 years old, in 1984, and consisted of one incident of Fr. Lupo kissing Victim JM and one incident of sexual intercourse between Fr. Lupo and Victim JM.
MEMORANDUM

TO:          File
FROM:        Larry McBrady
RE:          Bill Lupo
DATE:        October 16, 2001

Kathleen Leggdas and I met with Bill at this office to make him aware of the recent allegation concerning [REDACTED].

After Kathleen presented the allegation, I met with Bill privately.
October 16, 2001

Rev. William Lupo
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crestwood Avenue
Bartlett, Illinois 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

November marks a period of one year since you signed your Individual Protocol for the Office of Professional Fitness Review. As these need to be reviewed and revised annually, please call at your earliest convenience so that a meeting date and time can be designated. The Vicar for Priests will again be in attendance.

There are standard protocol items for all priests monitored by this office. These include the following:

- Restriction from being alone with minors without the presence of another responsible adult
- Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator twice annually (PFRA)
- Submit copy of all sites visited on the Internet to PFRA monthly

And recently added to all protocols by the Review Board:

- [Redacted]

The Review Board determines other protocol items based on the individual priest and the nature of the allegations brought against him.

I can be reached by telephone at 312-751-5205.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

KL/lnp

Cc: Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Memorandum

To: File – PFR-23
From: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator
Re: Rev. William Lupo Response to Allegation of of Sexual Misconduct
Date: October 17, 2001

Present at Meeting:

Rev. William Lupo, accused
Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator [PFRA]

According to his recollection Father Lupo [WL] received a call from an ex-husband of at the end of last year or early in 2001. was asking for help from Father Lupo. said "he knew about what happened between and WL." He gave no further details. WL said sounded angry or like he had "a chip on his shoulder." A few weeks later called and reviewed the script of her telephone statement with WL. She did not mention sexual intercourse according to WL. WL listened, thinking was going through some kind of therapeutic healing process. He said he apologized if he had done anything to cause her pain. He has not heard from either of them and thought the matter over.

Father Lupo denies having had sexual intercourse with but did say that he was affectionate with her and others during the years in question. He admits kissing her and adds "more than a peck on the cheek." He said he embraced her and was affectionate with her but adds that she was needy and flirtatious.

He says that he did meet with her in his rooms but that it was not unusual at St. Mary’s for the priests to do so. He said “had a big crush on me.”

Father Lupo said he is more strict in his relationships now than even required by his Protocol. He acknowledged poor judgement and boundary violations relative to the women who have made allegations against him.

Cc: Review Board Members
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
John O’Malley, Office of Legal Services
Dr. Michael J. Bland, Victim Assistance Ministry
Memorandum

To: File

From: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Archbishop's Delegate to the Professional Fitness Review Board

Re: Review Board Meeting – Case Review

Rev. William Lupo

Date: October 20, 2001

The Review Board conducted a case review in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. Father Lawrence McBrady, Vicar for Priests, was present for the discussion. There is a new allegation of sexual misconduct with an adult against Father Lupo. Since this involves adult misconduct, jurisdiction for this allegation pertains to the Vicar for Priests. However, since the Review Board is responsible for monitoring Fr. Lupo, the Review Board was informed of this allegation.

Fr. McBrady will keep Kathleen Leggdes informed of the progress of the inquiry and the Review Board will be informed of the outcome of this investigation.
Professional Fitness Review Board

Saturday, October 20, 2001
10:00 – 12:00

MINUTES

Review Board Members Present:

Absent:

Non-members present:
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator

I. Approval of Minutes from September 15, 2001 Meeting
   • Add: [name] will be vice-chairperson of Board

II. Case Reviews
   A. Board members reviewed resume of [name].
      Recommendation that Father Paprocki interview him before accepting to the Board.
   B. Victim Assistance Office provided names of two parents of victims of clerical sexual misconduct. Board recommended that Father Paprocki interview each prior to choosing for Board membership.

III. Case Reviews
   A. [description]
B. In the Matter of Rev. William Lupo, PFR-23

The Review Board conducted a case review in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. Father Lawrence McBrady, Vicar for Priests, was present for the discussion. There is a new allegation of sexual misconduct with an adult against Father Lupo. Since this involves adult misconduct, jurisdiction for this allegation pertains to the Vicar for Priests. However, since the Review Board is responsible for monitoring Fr. Lupo, the Review Board was informed of this allegation.

Fr. McBrady will keep Kathleen Leggdas informed of the progress of the inquiry and the Review Board will be informed of the outcome of AOC 017616.
Next regularly scheduled meeting is November 17, 2001 at 10:00 a.m.

Cc: Members of the Review Board
    Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to Review Board
    Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
Professional Fitness Review Board

Saturday, October 20, 2001
10:00 – 12:00

AGENDA

I. Approval of Minutes from September 15, 2001

II. Case Reviews
   A. 
   B. In the Matter of Rev. William Lupo, PFR-23
      • Adult allegation of misconduct – Rev. Larry McBrady to attend discussion
   C. 
   D. 
Memorandum

To: File – PFR-23

From: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator

Re: Rev. William Lupo

Date: October 25, 2001

A summary of the discussion from the Professional Fitness Review Board Meeting on October 20, 2001:

The Review Board conducted a case review in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. Father Lawrence McBrady, Vicar for Priests, was present for the discussion. There is a new allegation of sexual misconduct with an adult against Father Lupo. Since this involves adult misconduct, jurisdiction for this allegation pertains to the Vicar for Priests. However, since the Review Board is responsible for monitoring Fr. Lupo, the Review Board was informed of this allegation.

Fr. McBrady will keep Kathleen Leggdas informed of the progress of the inquiry and the Review Board will be informed of the outcome of AOC 017619.
November 1, 2001

Rev. William Lupo
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, Illinois 60103

Dear Father Lupo,

Since you and Father McBrady and I met on October 16th, there is no need to set an additional meeting to review your Protocol.

I have enclosed the original for you to sign and return to me. Retain a copy for your records.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Enclosure:

Cc: Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
B.

C.

5. TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/D</th>
<th>APPT DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>AGE IN 01</th>
<th>X-10-ED TO</th>
<th>START PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/B</td>
<td>07/01/90</td>
<td>William L. Lupo '65</td>
<td>St. Peter Damian</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3 yr extension (NO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Individual Specific Protocol (ISP) reflects the primary goal of protecting minors and the integrity of the Church. Additionally, the ISP serves as a safeguard for the individual priest/deacon with regard to the possibility of subsequent allegations.

Professional Fitness Review clients will be subject to appropriate restrictions and monitoring by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator (PFRA) throughout the life of the individual as a priest/deacon in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The ISP for Father William Lupo includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Restricted from being alone with minors without the presence of another responsible adult.
2. Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator (PFRA) a minimum of twice a year.
3. Submit copy of all sites visited on the Internet to PFRA monthly.
4. This is a working document which can be changed, altered or superceded when there is an indicated need to do so. In order to change this Protocol, prior approval must be obtained from the Professional Fitness Review Board.

I have reviewed, understand, and agree to all requirements of this Protocol.

Signed: [Signature]
Printed Name: William L. Lupo
Date: 11/13/01

Signature of PFRA: [Signature]
Date: 11/15/01

A copy of this Protocol will be kept on file in Professional Fitness Review and Vicar for Priests Offices.
The Individual Specific Protocol (ISP) reflects the primary goal of protecting minors and the integrity of the Church. Additionally, the ISP serves as a safeguard for the individual priest/deacon with regard to the possibility of subsequent allegations.

Professional Fitness Review clients will be subject to appropriate restrictions and monitoring by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator (PFRA) throughout the life of the individual as a priest/deacon in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The ISP for Father William Lupo includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Restricted from being alone with minors without the presence of another responsible adult.
2. Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator (PFRA) a minimum of twice a year.
3. Submit copy of all sites visited on the Internet to PFRA monthly.
4. This is a working document which can be changed, altered or superceded when there is an indicated need to do so. In order to change this Protocol, prior approval must be obtained from the Professional Fitness Review Board.

I have reviewed, understand, and agree to all requirements of this Protocol.

Signed: William L. Lupo  Date: 11/13/01

Printed Name: William L. Lupo

Signature of PFRA: Kathleen Legg  Date: 11/15/01

A copy of this Protocol will be kept on file in Professional Fitness Review and Vicar for Priests Offices.
December 16, 2001

Rev. Lawrence McBrady
Archdiocese of Chicago
Vicar for Priests
645 N. Michigan Ave. Suite 543
Chicago, Il. 60611

Dear Larry,

Bill was extended for two years at the completion of his twelve years. This was a difficult decision since there are mixed opinions about the work he is doing at St. Peter Damian. The majority of parishioners who responded to the inquiry about his work were positive. I was told later he put a request in the bulletin asking for support since there were some parishioners out to get him. I told Bill that I did not think that was a good idea.

The Personnel Board did not recommend an extension. Bill went to see the Cardinal. I indicated to the Cardinal and Board that while there were reasons not to extend Bill, I did not have any concrete reasons why, at his age, he could not be continued. In the end the Cardinal acquiesced with an extension for two years.

I did meet with Bill recently because after his extension his three deacons resigned or left the parish. They indicated to Fr. Ed Salmon that part of their decision was Fr. Bill Lupo. However when I met on two occasions with Bill, his deacons, and staff they felt Bill was doing an adequate job and that some parishioners, friends of Fr. Jerry Klug, continued to give Bill a hard time.

The complaint you continue to hear is that Bill does little or nothing at the parish. He simply keeps the place running. In his favor, he did recently hire some staff members who seem to be initiating new programs. His staff is fully supportive of him and they resent the negative comments that are said about Bill.
During the most recent meeting, Bill broke down in tears expressing frustration that some people in the parish just do not give him a chance. Even after twelve years, he believes that Jerry Klug influences a number of people. Bill simply does not understand nor accept the concerns people raise about him. He dismisses them as fed by Fr. Klug.

Those who have been critical seem small in number but they persist in expressing their frustration. The deacons at the meeting denied any problems or concerns about Bill but privately maintain that he does little or nothing.

Bill is a very private person. Even after he was renewed, he did not inform the parish or staff about the extension but kept it to himself. He does not communicate easily with others. He is very friendly and enjoys a friendly give and take, but he remains rather enigmatic.

Bill regularly comes to the priest cluster meetings and seems to get along with the other priests. He enjoys hosting gatherings at his parish.

It would be very helpful for him to have an opportunity to talk personally with someone. The times I have engaged him, I always felt he was trying to be open and self-disclosing. He did inform me about the accusations that were brought against him. These seemed very painful to him and he assured me that they were not accurate.

Let me know if I can be of any other help.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Rev. Gerald F. Kicanas, Vicar for Vicariate I

E-mail: bpkicanas@juno.com
St. Peter Damian/Bartlett: William Lupo's '65 [pastor] health is better.
PFR-23  Rev. William Lupo

Four allegations of sexual misconduct with female minors (ages 12 – 17) have been made against Father Lupo. Behavior included exposing himself to one of the girls, passionate kissing, hugging, etc. Allegations made cover the years between 1981 and 1985. Information was originally presented to the Board in 1993. File remained open until 1996 when Supplementary review of status of Father Lupo resulted in closing the file. The fourth allegation was made at the end of 1998 and subsequently his case file was reopened and a protocol established. Father Lupo is in full, active ministry at St. Peter Damian and has no on-site monitor.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

COMPLIANCE WITH MONITORING PROTOCOLS

Name of cleric: William Lupo

Year of ordination: 1965  Age: 63

Current ministerial assignment (if any): Pastor

Current place of residence: St. Peter Damian, Bartlett, Illinois

According to Archdiocesan policy §1104.12.2, a cleric who has engaged in sexual misconduct with a minor will be subject to appropriate monitoring for the remainder of his life as a cleric of the Archdiocese and his file shall remain open. Policy §1104.12.3 provides that monitoring programs and protocols should be applied on a case by case basis but must include certain essential components. This worksheet indicates whether there is compliance with these essential elements, as follows:

- Continuing jurisdiction and oversight by the Review Board with periodic evaluation and reports to the Archbishop: (circle one)  YES   NO
  Description of continuing oversight: Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator semi-annually
  Date of last evaluation and report: November 15, 2001

- A written protocol signed by the cleric, which sets forth the particular requirements applicable to him: (circle one)  YES   NO
  Date of current written and signed protocol: November 15, 2001

- Restrictions from being alone with anyone under the age of 18: (circle one)  YES   NO

- Communication with leaders and others as appropriate in the cleric's residence or place of ministry in order that they are meaningfully apprised and able to assist in the program: (Circle one)  YES   NO
  With whom? Dennis Kurvaski to be considered as monitor. He is Business Manager ( )
  Board asked (2/16/01) that the Business Manager, Dennis Kurvaski be considered as monitor (initial).

- Does the cleric use the Internet? (circle one) YES   NO
  If yes, does he provide the Professional Fitness Review Administrator with a monthly printout of Internet sites visited? (Circle one)  YES   NO

Other monitoring provisions or restrictions: A priest in residence is to serve as monitor by July 1, 2002. If not, Fr. Lupo is to be removed from parish ministry.

Signature of Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Date

March 15, 2002
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

COMPLIANCE WITH MONITORING PROTOCOLS

Name of cleric: William Lupo
Year of ordination: 1965 Age: 63

Current ministerial assignment (if any): Pastor
Current place of residence: St. Peter Damian, Bartlett, Illinois

According to Archdiocesan policy §1104.12.2, a cleric who has engaged in sexual misconduct with a minor will be subject to appropriate monitoring for the remainder of his life as a cleric of the Archdiocese and his file shall remain open. Policy §1104.12.3 provides that monitoring programs and protocols should be applied on a case by case basis but must include certain essential components. This worksheet indicates whether there is compliance with these essential elements, as follows:

- **Continuing jurisdiction and oversight by the Review Board with periodic evaluation and reports to the Archbishop:**
  - (circle one) **YES** **NO**
  - Description of continuing oversight: Meet with Professional Fitness Review Administrator semi-annually
  - Date of last evaluation and report: November 15, 2001

- **A written protocol signed by the cleric, which sets forth the particular requirements applicable to him:**
  - (circle one) **YES** **NO**
  - Date of current written and signed protocol: November 15, 2001

- **Restrictions from being alone with anyone under the age of 18:**
  - (circle one) **YES** **NO**

- **Communication with readers and others as appropriate in the cleric's residence or place of ministry in order that they are meaningfully apprised and able to assist in the program:**
  - (Circle one) **YES** **NO**
  - With whom? Dennis Kurvaski to be considered as monitor. He is Business Manager

- **Does the cleric use the Internet?**
  - (circle one) **YES** **NO**
  - If yes, does he provide the Professional Fitness Review Administrator with a monthly printout of Internet sites visited? (Circle one) **YES** **NO**

Other monitoring provisions or restrictions:

March 15, 2002

Signature of Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Date

3/15/02
At the request of Cardinal George, the Review Board conducted a supplementary review of Father Lupo's protocol.

The Board asked that the Business Manager, Dennis Kowalski, serve as his interim monitor and file periodic reports with the Professional Fitness Review Administrator. If there is a youth minister, he or she should be informed as well. However, the Board recommends that priest in residence (either a retired priest or a resident priest, associate pastor or extern priest) serve as a monitor. If a resident priest is not in place by July 1, 2002, Father Lupo is to be removed from parish ministry.
Professional Fitness Review Board

Saturday, March 16, 2002

MINUTES

Review Board Members Present:

Absent:

Non-members present:
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board
Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator

I. Case Reviews in light of Cardinal's request for Supplementary Reviews

A.

B.
In the Matter of Rev. William Lupo, PFR-23

At the request of Cardinal George, the Review Board conducted a Supplementary Review of Father Lupo’s monitoring protocol.

The Board asked that the Business Manager, Dennis Kowalski, serve as his interim monitor and file periodic reports with the PFRA. If there is a youth minister, he or she should be informed as well. However, the Board recommends that priest in residence (either a retired priest or a resident priest, associate pastor or extern priest) serve as a
monitor. If a resident priest is not in place by July 1, 2002, Father Lupo is to be removed from parish ministry.
II. Budget Review Postponed to April Meeting

Next regularly scheduled meeting is April 20, 2002

Cc: Members of the Review Board
    Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to Review Board
    Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
    Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Professional Fitness Review Board
Saturday, March 16, 2002
10:00 – 2:00

AGENDA

I. Approval of Minutes from February 16, 2002

II. Case Reviews
   A. 
   B. 
   C. 
   D. In the Matter of Rev. William Lupo, PFR-23
   E. 

III. 

IV. Other Business
   A. 
   B. 

March 25, 2002

Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
Archbishop of Chicago
155 E. Superior Street
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Cardinal George,

Please be advised that the Review Board met on March 16, 2002. The Board fully considered all oral and written reports in the matter of Rev. William Lupo. The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Policies and Procedure for Determination of Fitness for Ministry.

Based on that review the Board recommends the following:

- That the Business Manager serve as interim monitor and file monthly reports with the PFRA.
- That a monitor be assigned by July 1, 2002 or that Father Lupo be withdrawn from ministry.

If you have questions or comments, please call at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggadas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Cc: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
    Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
April 1, 2002

Ms. Kathleen Leggdas  
Administrator  
Office of Professional Fitness Review  
676 N. St. Clair, Suite 1910  
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Ms. Leggdas,

I received from you the review of all the outstanding cases of reported sexual misconduct with minors by members of the Archdiocesan clergy. I thank you sincerely for the good work of the Office and your own dedication to a task so important for the Church’s ministry.

I accept all the recommendations in the letters that you sent me, dated March 25, 2002. In the case of accusations against priests who are now deceased, I would like to know how it is that we are going to be of service to the victims who have brought the allegations forward at this time.

This acceptance of all recommendations made will be seconded to all parties concerned, so that the recommendations can be implemented as quickly as possible. Again, thank you for your dedication and for the help you bring to victims and clergy.

Sincerely,

Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.  
Archbishop of Chicago

cc: Most Rev. Raymond Goedert  
Rev. Thomas Paprocki  
Rev. James Kaczorowski  
Rev. Lawrence McBrady  
Mr. Jimmy Lago
Memorandum

To: File - PFR-23
From: Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator [PFRA]
Re: Rev. William Lupo
Date: April 5, 2002

A summary of the discussion from the Professional Fitness Review Meeting on March 16, 2002:

At the request of Cardinal George, the Review Board conducted a Supplementary Review of Father Lupo’s monitoring protocol.

The Board asked that the Business Manager, Dennis Kowalski, serve as his interim monitor and file periodic reports with the PFRA. If there is a youth minister, he or she should be informed as well. However, the Board recommends that priest in residence (either a retired priest or a resident priest, associate pastor or extern priest) serve as a monitor. If a resident priest is not in place by July 1, 2002, Father Lupo is to be removed from parish ministry.
Phone Communication – PFR-23

Date: 3/22/02 Time: AM
To: Bill Lupo – 630-837-5411
- Regarding results of Supplementary Review of March 16th
- Left message

Date: 4/23/02 Time: 2:30 p.m.
To: B. Lupo
- Called to set appointment with Kowalski

Time: PM
To: Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
- Regarding Bill Lupo
-
April 25, 2002

Rev. John Clemens  
Priest Placement Board  
155 E. Superior Street  
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Father Clemens,

At the March 16, 2002 Review Board meeting the Board conducted a Supplementary Review of all case files as directed by Cardinal George. Given today's media coverage and close scrutiny of supervision for clergy accused of sexual misconduct with a minor, the Board recommends that a priest in residence (either a retired priest, or a resident priest, associate pastor or extern priest) serve as an on-site monitor for Father William Lupo at St. Peter Damian in Bartlett.

If a resident priest is not in place by July 1, 2002, the Board recommended that Father Lupo be removed from Parish Ministry.

Well aware of declining number of priests available for parish assignments the Board asks that you give consideration to placement of someone who could serve as on-site monitor for Father Lupo.

Address questions and concerns to Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator at 312-751-5205.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas  
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Cc: Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests  
Rev. William Lupo

AOC 017641
Four allegations of sexual misconduct with female minors (ages 12-17) have been made against Father Lupo. Behavior included exposing himself to one of the girls, passionate kissing, hugging, etc. Allegations made cover the years between 1981 and 1985. Information was originally presented to the Board in 1993. File remained open until 1996 when Supplementary review of status of Father Lupo resulted in closing the file. The fourth allegation was made at the end of 1998 and subsequently his case file was reopened and a protocol established. Father Lupo is in full, active ministry at St. Peter Damian.

Father Lupo says incidents of exhibitionism were inadvertent, admits to kissing and hugging.

Review Board recommended that Business Manager serve as on-site monitor until a priest can be assigned to the Parish. If no priest is assigned by July 1, 2002, Father Lupo is to be withdrawn from ministry.
May 15, 2002

Mr. Dennis Kowalski
Business Manager
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Mr. Kowalski,

As promised, I have enclosed copies of the Monthly Monitoring Report that you have agreed to complete on Father William Lupo, Pastor.

When you receive these please call and we can discuss the monitoring process in detail.

Thank you for offering your services at this time.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Enclosures
May 29, 2002

Mr. Dennis Kowalski
Business Manager
St. Peter Damian
109 S. Crest Avenue
Bartlett, IL 60103

Dear Mr. Kowalski,

As promised, I have enclosed copies of the Monthly Monitoring Report that you have agreed to complete on Father William Lupo, Pastor.

When you receive these please call and we can discuss the monitoring process in detail.

Thank you for offering your services at this time.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review Administrator

Enclosures
D.

E.

F. Priests:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. William Lupo '65
9. 
10. 
11. 
12. 

G.

H.
F. Priests:

1. Martin Borowczyk '42: Marty will be going to live with William Lupo '65 [Pastor] at St. Peter Damian/Bartlett.
5.

6.

7.

8. William Lupo '65: There have been several complaints about Bill's pastorship. John Clemens will talk to the Cardinal and Larry McBrady [Vicar for Priests].
Professional Fitness Review
Monthly Monitoring Report

Client Name: William L. Lupi
Monitor: Dennis Komski

Month/Year of Report: MAY 2002

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a monitor in your parish, work or residential setting. The Archdiocese of Chicago greatly appreciates your generous offer of time and your willingness to assume this responsibility.

Please complete this form monthly and mail or fax to the attention of Kathleen Leggda by the 10th of each month.

Professional Fitness Review
Archdiocese of Chicago
676 N. St. Clair St., Suite 1910
Chicago, IL 60611
Fax: 312-751-5279

During the course of the month, you may contact the PFRA by telephone should any situation arise regarding status of client in monitor program at 312-751-5205 or the toll-free number 1-800-994-6200. Messages are received 24-hours a day and are confidential.

1. In the past month, were you aware of any situations in which the priest you are monitoring was in the presence of a minor or minors without another responsible adult present?

   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

   If yes, describe the situation and priest's action(s):
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. Did you have access or were you informed of the priest's schedule?

   YES [ ]
   NO [ ]

   If no, explain ______________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
3. If the priest was going out of town for more than an overnight trip, pre-approved by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator, did he leave you a basic itinerary of his whereabouts during the trip and a copy of the Vacation Form?

   YES   NO

4. To your knowledge has the priest complied overall with his monitoring restrictions/expectations during the past month?

   YES   NO

If no, explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Other comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature of Priest:   
Date: 6/3/02

Signature of Monitor:  
Date: 6/3/02
Diocesan Priests' Placement Board, 06/07/2002

F. Priests:

1. William Lupo '65

2. William Lupo '65

3. William Lupo '65

4. William Lupo '65

5. William Lupo '65

6. William Lupo '65
William Lupo '65: Bill (pastor of St. Peter Damian/Bartlett) is in trouble and in needs of our prayers. We will wait on dealing with this on the request of the Vicars for Priests.
June 24, 2002

Your Eminence,

The following two pages contain the letter which you recommended that I compose instead of speaking to the people in person. This is what you and I and Larry McBrady agreed upon, you will recall, at the convocation.

Please do me the favor of reviewing this letter to see whether it meets with your approval, and please let me know as soon as possible. Call me at this number: [redacted]. I will be at the doctor’s office this afternoon between 2:30 and 3:30. I will be anxiously awaiting your call after that.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

[Redacted]

Bill Lupo
June 24, 2002

Dear Friend,

In the late sixties Sunday homilies were determined by a syllabus of subjects suggested by the Archdiocese. I recall one weekend in 1968 preaching a homily on why so many men were leaving the priesthood when I suddenly realized that everybody was sitting on the edge of their pews hardly breathing. I said, “Oh, I'm not leaving the priesthood...” There was an audible sigh of relief. I was twenty-nine-year old.

At the age of sixty-three years I find myself trying to explain to you why I am leaving the priesthood now. About nine years ago allegations of sexual misconduct were brought against me by three women who maintained these alleged events had taken place between nine and fourteen years prior to that, when they were teenagers.

The allegations, in my judgment, were not true and I remember thinking, naively, that it would be relatively easy to demonstrate that. I was wrong. Besides being given the opportunity to respond orally to these allegations I was required to live in a monitored situation. I agreed never to be in the presence of a minor without another responsible adult present. This was my “protocol”.

After two and one half years, the monitoring was discontinued. I was told by the then administrator of the fitness review office that the file was “closed”, but the protocol would continue. Each year I was asked to sign an affidavit renewing my intention to abide by the protocol. I took this as a sign that I was deemed worthy to remain in my ministry as a priest, which in fact I did.

As the present crisis began to erupt on the East Coast it was unclear just how far it would reach. I, like many others, felt that the Archdiocese of Chicago had kind of set the pace ten years ago by Cardinal Bernardin’s establishing the professional fitness review board. When the U.S. Bishops met in Dallas recently the outcome of that meeting was the unanimous adoption of the policy that virtually any priest who was accused of sexual misconduct with a minor would be removed from ministry. Furthermore, this “zero tolerance” policy is to be enforced both in the future and retroactively. Hence, cases which were thought to have been dealt with satisfactorily in the past would be held up to a new scrutiny.
Here follows the way in which this new policy will be implemented, as I understand it. Now every priest has the right to defend himself before a tribunal of judges in an ecclesiastical court trial before he can be removed from the priesthood. He can, in fact, appeal a negative decision as far as Rome, if he so desires. Before this can be done, however, the priest must be “temporarily” removed from ministry, placed in a monitored situation, and would be forbidden to function as a priest in any way whatsoever. This process could take anywhere from several months to a few years or longer, more likely the latter.

After a lengthy discussion with Cardinal George last week, it became clear to me that the stress involved in going through the juridical process would be more than I would care to chance. My primary concern has to be for my own health. I have no other real option than to resign my pastorate and to leave the priesthood. This is an enormously difficult decision for me. I’ve loved the priesthood since I was in fourth grade. Ordinarily I love a good fight, too. Maybe if I were ten years younger when this option was offered I would have taken it. Instead I have regretfully offered the Cardinal my resignation. He has been very saddened and sympathetic about this, but sees no other way to deal with it.

Let me say a couple more things. First of all, I have absolutely loved my twelve years at St. Peter Damian: the opportunities, the challenges, the successes, the failures, the rewards and punishments, the fights and the make-ups, the giving and the forgiving. In short, all that it means to have been your pastor. But don’t worry about me. Never stop praying for me, as I will not for you, but don’t worry too much. I will not dry up and blow away. I will survive!

Finally, if you are saddened by all this, please do not take it out on my successor. Gather around him. He will lead you in prayer. Hopefully, some of it will be for me. I love you and I will miss you!

May God Bless Us All,

Father Luke
June 27, 2002

Your Eminence:

As per our conversation one week ago, and at your request, I hereby formally and with enormous regret and sorrow ask that you petition the Holy See for my laicization.

It hurts me deeply inside just to push the buttons that form these words, but I wish to restate that I take this formidable and drastic step solely for the purpose of avoiding the further and substantial stress that going through the appeal process would place on my health. If there were a viable and realistic alternative I would certainly have taken it.

Taking this step is in no way to be regarded as an admission to the truth or the validity of the allegations made against me.

Respectfully and sincerely,

Rev. William L. Lupo
June 27, 2002

Your Eminence:

As per our conversation one week ago, and at your request, I hereby formally and with great regret resign the pastorate of St. Peter Damian Parish.

I wish to restate that I take this step solely for the purpose of avoiding the further and substantial stress that going through the appeal process would place on my health. It is in no way to be regarded as an admission to the truth or the validity of the allegations made against me.

Respectfully and sincerely,

Rev. William L. Lupo
G. Vicar for Priests Agenda:

   1. Priests:

   a)
   b)
   c)
   d)
   e)
   f)
   g)
   h) William Lupo '65
   i)
g) [Redacted]
h) **William Lupo '65**: Bill resigned from the priesthood.
Enclosed is a copy of Father Lupo’s letter of June 27, 2002 to Cardinal George, requesting that the process of laicization be initiated on his behalf. I would appreciate it if you would assist Father Lupo in the preparation of his petition to the Holy Father.

cc: Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: JULY 11, 2002
TO: REVEREND PATRICK LAGGES, OFFICE FOR CANONICAL SERVICES
FROM: BISHOP RAYMOND GOEDERT
RE: REVEREND WILLIAM LUPO/RESIGNATION

Enclosed is a copy of Father Lupo's letter of June 27, 2002 to Cardinal George, resigning the pastorate of St. Peter Damian Parish, Bartlett, Illinois. I would appreciate it if you would draft a response for the Cardinal's signature accepting Father Lupo's resignation.

cc: Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
July 17, 2002

Rev. William L. Lupe
c/o Vicar for Priests Office
645 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 543
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Bill:

I received your letters of June 27 in which you asked to resign from the pastorate of St. Peter Damian Parish and asked that I petition the Holy See for your laicization. I apologize that it has taken me this long to respond.

I accept your letter of resignation from the pastorate of St. Peter Damian Parish. I also accept your resignation from active ministry, as indicated by your decision to seek a dispensation from the obligations of the clerical state. I know this has been a very stressful time for you, Bill. Please be assured that you have been in my prayers as you have gone through this process of discernment.

Since the process commonly called “laicization” is the only true way to be relieved from the obligations of the priesthood, I am grateful that you have already considered this. I urge you to speak further with Father Pat Lagges about this matter.

Since you may have some questions about what you can or can’t do as a priest who has left the active ministry, I have asked Father Lagges to write to you about this.

Thank you for your years of ministry in the Archdiocese, Bill. It is always painful for me to accept the resignation of one of my priests. However, I believe you have made the correct decision, both for yourself and for the Church. You will remain in my prayers. I ask that you remember me in yours.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
Archbishop of Chicago
19 July, 2002

William L. Lupo
c/o Vicar for Priests Office
645 N. Michigan Avenue. Suite 543
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Bill:

Cardinal George has asked me to write to you about the practical implications of your decision to leave active ministry. In the letter he sent me, he indicated the reasons you have given for seeking laicization. Although this has been a very painful decision for you, Bill, I hope it is one that will lead you to the Lord’s peace.

With regard to what leaving the active ministry means in practical terms, it means that you are no longer authorized to exercise public ministry in the name of the Church, or to present yourself as a priest or a representative of the Archdiocese of Chicago. It also means that you are no longer authorized by the State of Illinois to witness marriages. However, you may still administer the sacrament of Penance to someone who is in danger of death.

Although your ministry as a priest is restricted, you can most certainly participate in the life of the Church in the same way that any baptized person can. It is probably even more important in this time of transition that you feel a strong sense of God’s presence in your life, and feel the support of God’s people.

With regard to your request for laicization, I ask that you contact me as soon as possible. I can help you to prepare your petition to Rome and let you know more of the details of the process. I would not be handling the case myself, since I prefer not to work on files of diocesan priests. We have a couple of religious order priests with experience in assisting with these petitions. Please call me first, though, so I can explain the process to you.

I am sure this is still a very stressful time in your life, Bill. I pray that as time goes on, God will raise you up from this present moment, so you will once again see the great hope to which he calls you.

Fraternally,

(Rev.) Patrick R. Lagges
Vicar for Canonical Services
DATE: AUGUST 16, 2002
TO: FILE
FROM: BISHOP RAYMOND GOEDERT
RE: REVEREND WILLIAM LUPO

During the management meeting this morning I asked Cardinal George whether or not he had the opportunity to call Father Lupo. He said that he did. He told him that he would have to leave the rectory. Father Lupo said it might take a few days but he definitely got the message to vacate the premises.
Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification

Name (If joint names, list first and cross all names of the person or entity whose number you enter in Part I below. See instructions on page 2 if your name has changed.)

William L. Lupi

Business name (See proprietor see instructions on page 2.)

Part I Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)

Enter your TIN in the appropriate box. For individuals, this is your social security number (SSN). For sole proprietors, see the instructions on page 2. For other entities, it is your employer identification number (EIN). If you do not have a number, see How To Get a TIN below.

Note: If the account is in more than one name, see the chart on page 2 for guidelines on whose number to enter.

Part II For Payees Exempt From Backup Withholding (See Part II instructions on page 2.)

Section references are to the Internal Revenue Code.

Purpose of Form—A person who is required to file an information return with the IRS must get your correct TIN to report income paid to you, real estate transactions, mortgage interest you paid, the acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, or contributions you made to an IRA. Use Form W-9 to give your correct TIN to the requester (the person requesting your TIN) and, when applicable, (1) to certify the TIN you are giving is correct (or you are waiting for a number to be issued), (2) to certify you are not subject to backup withholding, or (3) to claim exemption from backup withholding if you are an exempt payee. Giving your correct TIN and making the appropriate certifications will prevent certain payments from being subject to backup withholding.

Note: If a requester gives you a form other than a W-9 to request your TIN, you must use the requester's form if it is substantially similar to this Form W-9.

What Is Backup Withholding?—Persons making certain payments to you must withhold and pay to the IRS 31% of such payments under certain conditions. This is called “backup withholding.” Payments that could be subject to backup withholding include interest, dividends, broker and barter exchange transactions, rents, royalties, nonemployee pay, and certain payments from fishing boat operators. Real estate transactions are not subject to backup withholding.

If you give the requester your correct TIN, make the proper certifications, and report all your interest and dividends on your tax return, your payments will not be subject to backup withholding. Payments you receive will be subject to backup withholding if:

1. You do not furnish your TIN to the requester, or
2. The IRS tells the requester that you furnished an incorrect TIN, or
3. The IRS tells you that you are subject to backup withholding because you did not report all your interest and dividends on your tax return, your payments will not be subject to backup withholding.

For Payees Exempt From Backup Withholding (See Part II instructions on page 2.)

Part III Certification

Under penalties of perjury, I certify that:

1. The number shown on this form is my correct taxpayer identification number (or I am waiting for a number to be issued to me), and
2. I am not subject to backup withholding because: (a) I am exempt from backup withholding, or (b) I have not been notified by the IRS that I am subject to backup withholding.

Certification Instructions—You must cross out item 2 above if you have been notified by an IRS that you are currently subject to backup withholding because of underreporting interest or dividends on your tax return. For real estate transactions, item 2 does not apply. For mortgage interest paid, the acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, contributions to an individual retirement arrangement (IRA), and generally payments other than interest and dividends, you are not required to sign the Certification, but you must provide your correct TIN. (Also see Part II instructions on page 2.)

Sign Here

William L. Lupi

Date 12/27/02
Specific Instructions

Name.—If you are an individual, you must generally enter the name shown on your social security card. However, if you have changed your last name, for instance, due to marriage, without informing the Social Security Administration of the name change, enter your first name, the last name shown on your social security card, and your new last name.

Solo Proprietor.—You must enter your individual name. Enter either your SSN or EIN in Part I. You may also enter your business name or "doing business as" name on the business name line. Enter your name as shown on your social security card and business name as it was used to apply for your EIN on Form SS-4.

Part I—Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN)

You must enter your TIN in the appropriate box. If you are a sole proprietor, you may enter your SSN or EIN. Also see the chart on this page for further clarification of name and TIN combinations. If you do not have a TIN, follow the instructions under How To Get a TIN on page 1.

Part II—For Payees Exempt From Backup Withholding

Individuals (including sole proprietors) are not exempt from backup withholding. Corporations are exempt from backup withholding for certain payments, such as interest and dividends. For a complete list of exempt payees, see the separate Instructions for the Requester of Form W-9.

If you are exempt from backup withholding, you should still complete this form to avoid possible erroneous backup withholding. Enter your correct TIN in Part I, write "Exempt" in Part II, and sign and date the form. If you are a nonresident alien or a foreign entity not subject to backup withholding, give the requester a completed Form W-9, Certificate of Foreign Status.

Part III—Certification

For a joint account, only the person whose TIN is shown in Part I should sign.

1. Interest, Dividend, and Broker Exchange Accounts Opened Before 1984 and Broker Accounts Considered Active During 1984. You must give your correct TIN, but you do not have to sign the certification.

2. Interest, Dividend, Broker, and Broker Exchange Accounts Opened After 1983 and Broker Accounts Considered Inactive During 1984. You must sign the certification or backup withholding will apply. If you are subject to backup withholding and you are merely providing your correct TIN to the requester, you must cross out item 2 in the certification before signing the form.

3. Real Estate Transactions. You must sign the certification. You may cross out item 2 in the certification.

4. Other Payments. You must give your correct TIN, but you do not have to sign the certification unless you have been notified of an incorrect TIN. Other payments include payments made in the course of the requester's trade or business for rents, royalties, goods (other than bills for merchandise), medical and health care services, payments to a nonemployee for services (including attorney and accounting fees), and payments to certain fishing boat crew members.

5. Mortgage Interest Paid by You, Acquisition or Abandonment of Secured Property, Cancellation of Debt, or IRA Contributions. You must give your correct TIN, but you do not have to sign the certification.

Privacy Act Notice

Section 5109 requires you to give your correct TIN to persons who must file information returns with the IRS to report interest, dividends, and certain other income paid to you, mortgage interest you paid, the acquisition or abandonment of secured property, cancellation of debt, or contributions you made to an IRA. The IRS uses the numbers for identification purposes and to help verify the accuracy of your tax return. You must provide your TIN whether or not you are required to file a tax return. Payers must generally withhold 31% of taxable interest, dividend, and certain other payments to a payee who does not give a TIN to a payer. Certain penalties may also apply.

What Name and Number To Give the Requester

For this type of account: Give name and SSN of:

1. Individual
2. Two or more individuals (joint account)
3. Custodian account of a minor (Uniform Gift to Minors Act)
4. a. The usual, irrevocable savings trust (grantor is also trustee)
b. Stock, bond, or other trust (not a legal or valid trust; under state law)
5. Sole proprietor
6. Sole proprietorship
7. A valid trust, estate, or pension trust
8. Corporate
9. Association, club, religious, charitable, educational, or other tax-exempt organization
10. Partnership
11. A broker or registered nominee
12. Account with the Department of Agriculture in the name of a public entity such as a state or local government; school district, or persons that receive agricultural program payments

The owner

* List first and circle the name of the person whose number you furnish.
* Circle the minor's name and furnish the minor's SSN.
* You must show your individual name, if you may also enter your business or "doing business as" name. You may use either your SSN or EIN.
* List first and circle the name of the legal, trust, estate, or pension trust. Do not furnish the TIN of the personal representative or trustee unless the legal entity itself is not designated in the account title.

Note: If no name is circled when more than one name is listed, the number will be considered to be that of the first name listed.
May 12, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to advise that William Lupo, a former priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago, resigned from the priesthood on December 17, 2002, and was removed from the Archdiocese’s payroll at that time. William Lupo did not receive a salary from the Archdiocese of Chicago in 2003.

Sincerely yours,

Very Reverend John F. Canary
Vicar General
Victim Statement Abstract:

This abstract replaces a memorandum written by Mayra Flores of the Archdiocese of Chicago’s Office of Assistance Ministry to Rev. Vincent Costello, Vicar for Priests, and dated March 23, 2007. Ms. Flores summarizes for Fr. Costello a phone call from Victim JL on March 19, 2007, in which Victim JL inquires as to the health status of former Fr. William Lupo, a resigned priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago, and how she might deliver a message to him. Ms. Flores was unable to give Victim JL any details on Lupo’s health but indicated that Fr. Costello might be able to contact Lupo, if Lupo was willing to speak with him. Victim JL spoke with Ms. Flores again on March 22, 2007 to inquire as to Lupo’s restrictions. Ms. Flores explained that because Lupo is a resigned priest, the restrictions placed upon him can no longer be enforced by the Archdiocese. Ms. Flores promised to contact Fr. Costello to discuss how best to get a message from Victim JL to Lupo. In a telephone conversation with Fr. Costello on March 23, 2007, Ms. Flores agreed to phone Victim JL on March 30, 2007 (as previously agreed with Victim JL) and invite Victim JL to forward any message for Lupo to Fr. Costello, who will attempt to contact Lupo to determine whether he will agree to receive the message.