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COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you St. Charles community for coming out tonight. Thank you commissioners for coming out tonight. This is the official call to order of the twelfth Ferguson Commission meeting. Today is June 8, 2015. We are assembled here at St. Charles High school. And for the record, I would like to establish the roll call to establish attendance of the Ferguson Commission members. At this time, commissioners, if you would please signify by saying aye if you are present.

Reverend Starsky Wilson.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Rich McClure.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Aye.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Kevin Ahlbrand has an excused absence. Rasheen Aldridge.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Aye.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pastor Traci Blackmon has an excused absence. T.R. Carr.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Aye.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Dave
COMMISSIONER GORE: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Becky James-Hatter.
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Daniel Isom?
COMMISSIONER ISOM: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Scott Negwer.
COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Brittany Packnett.
COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Felicia Pulliam.
COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pat Sly.
COMMISSIONER SLY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Grayling Tobias has an excused absence. Byron Watson.
COMMISSIONER WATSON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And Rose Windmiller.
COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: All right. Have I gotten everybody? Okay. With that, it's my pleasure to ask Dr. Javier Orozco to please come. He's the executive director of intercultural and interreligious affairs with the archdiocese of St. Louis who will provide us with our invocation. Please welcome Javier as he comes. Thank you.

DR. OROZCO: Good evening, and thank you for having me here today and giving me the opportunity to open our conversation with an invocation. Holy one, we gather with histories in our hearts and hope in our imagination. The histories that bring us together is our story, our journey, our walking in this place. Holy one, the hopes we imagine take us to a different song, to a different walk, to a different way of being together. Holy one, today, you give meaning to our actions. Today, you give movement to our cadence. Today, you give might to our rest. Holy one, because of you, our pain finds comfort, our restlessness enjoys direction, our brokenness becomes whole again. Holy one, in you, our different languages speak truth. In you, our skin tone reveals justice. In you, our common struggle discovers peace. Holy one, how good it is to gather
in your presence, how good it is to be transformed, 
how good it is to be with you. Amen.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you, Dr.

Orozco. Thank you for that welcome and that very 
thoughtful invocation. We are very grateful. We 
are pleased to be in St. Charles County and at St. 
Charles High School. We are very grateful for the 
opportunity to be here. To talk about issues that 
are important to our region. To do that, we have 
some extraordinary individuals who are leaders in 
St. Charles County that are here to share some of 
their perspectives with us. I'm going to introduce 
the county executive, and he will introduce the 
folks that are with him. So commissioners, we 
welcome your attention. And to the audience, we 
thank you for being here and for participating with 
us tonight in so many different ways as you'll see 
the evening unfold. My name is Rich McClure, I'm 
pleased to be a co-chair of the commission, along 
with my partner and brother, Reverend Starsky 
Wilson.

Steve Ehlmann is the county executive 
of St. Charles County. And Steve has a 
distinguished history of public service, including 
representing this area in Missouri General Assembly
as a distinguished member of the state senate. He also served as a circuit judge. He is a lawyer by training and now as county executive. Steve has a number of interests as you will quickly see from listening to him. But most importantly, for this audience and for the commission to know tonight is that County Executive Ehlmann has a record as a regional statesman and someone who cares deeply about the region. While representing St. Charles, he does so very effectively in the context of those regional issues and regional concerns. And throughout the civic and business and political community, he has maintained that record of a very strong regional spokesman. So, Steve, thank you for your hospitality and being willing to be here with your team tonight.

MR. EHLMANN: Chairman, members of the commission, thank you for being here. Thank you for the time that you are putting in on this effort. I know it's very time consuming, and we do appreciate your efforts. On behalf of the people of St. Charles County, I want to welcome you here. And first thing, what we're going to do, is present to you several things that we have been doing in keeping with your topic tonight, which is children.
We are going to present to you several things that we've been doing for the children in this county. We think some of them might be useful, if you agree, in other parts of the region. We're also interested in the suggestions you might have of how we do a better job. So without further adieu, I'm going to introduce the first person. We're going to come up, one at a time, they are going to introduce themselves; but before we do that, I'm going to introduce the mayor of St. Charles, Sally Faith.

MAYOR FAITH: Thank you Steve. Good evening. My name Sally Faith and I'm the mayor of the City of St. Charles. We welcome the Ferguson Commission, who has reached out to hold this June meeting in St. Charles County. A special thanks to Dr. Marion and the staff of the St. Charles High School for hosting tonight's session. This represents a unique opportunity to cover two things that are near and dear to my heart. One of them is communication, and one of them is relationship building.

St. Charles School District supports a school resource officer at both of the two high schools for the nine months that they are in session. In addition, St. Charles City Police
police fund, funds out of their budget, the D.A.R.E. program. And I like, specifically to talk about the police officers and how close and up and personal this can make it. And so we've got a similar relationship with the D.A.R.E. program in the schools. In fact, just recently I had the pleasure of talking with our police chief, Randy McKinley, about a young man who made police work his career choice as a direct result of these in-school interactions with the police. Chief McKinley has also introduced opportunities, whereby our officers routinely visit the elementary schools in St. Charles and they have a good personal rapport with their D.A.R.E. officer.

As the new school year begins in August, Chief McKinley has 35 of his officers, police officers, that have volunteered to read programs and read books in a reading program that was set up by Chief McKinley and Dr. Marion as a joint collaboration. It is this type of communication and hands-on interaction that will serve our communities. We also are in the progress of having coffee with a cop and sitting out and meeting and talking to the businesses over a cup of coffee. I like coffee, break bread, have coffee.
And, ultimately, these programs of reaching out will underscore the importance of us all working together for the benefit of the City, St. Charles County, of the region. So, I want to, again, welcome you and thank you for this opportunity to participate tonight. Thank you.

SUPERINTENDENT MARION: Good evening.

Thank you for being here. My name is Jeff Marion. I am the superintendent of the St. Charles District. And I just want to personally thank you for the work you are doing. And it's my pleasure to have you here with us tonight. Because I do believe very strongly as you will see what I'm going to stress is, I believe very strongly that it takes all of us working together if we are going to make a real difference. And that's not just St. Charles. That's St. Charles, the whole St. Louis region, and in fact, the country. So I think it's important that we all view it that way. The first thing I want to do, if you will flip to the next slide. Oh, that's it. Nope, go back. You were right, you were ahead of me. Good job. I think one thing we are focusing on that I think is relevant to the topic tonight is like every school district in America, we have the same challenge with closing the minority
achievement gap. And we're working hard to do that. And we're making good progress, in fact. I will tell you that we're doing something that I think, fundamentally, will help us identify children who may be falling behind quickly. And that's our standard based grading system. That changes, fundamentally, how we will assess student learning and puts less emphasis on busy work and puts more emphasis on what they can actually know or be able to do and be able to practice and give them a chance to retake, retest, until they get it. Because if they leave us without their academic skills, we have failed them. So that's something -- and I don't have long. I would love to talk longer about it; but, I think, fundamentally, that's going to be huge in our efforts to close that gap and help all children learn.

If you will go on to the next one, please. As I said before, it's very, I believe, that strong communities require strong schools and strong schools require strong communities. It's a partnership that's for better or worse. You can't separate the two. If you want a good school district, you have to have a good community. If you want a good community, you have to have a good
school district. And I have to use the mike, apparently. Thank you. And the next slide, the next few slides will show some things that we are doing to make sure we engage the whole community in helping the whole child. We have an unprecedented coalition in St. Charles County. Matt Miller is here tonight. Wave your hand, Matt. He was instrumental in getting this together from faith based organizations. But this is our coalition of school personnel and all the agencies in the county, churches, all the mental health providers in the district or in the city. We all work together for a common goal, that when we have a family, a child that is not being able to succeed in school, for whatever reason, they are hungry, they don't have adequate support at home, they don't have clothing, whatever they need, we try to bridge that gap and meet their needs through the neighbor helping neighbor coalition. So it's a way to connect people with services. And most importantly, it's -- to help those, we have a service coordinator that walks side by side with those families in crisis and mentor them to help them get out of the cycle of living crisis to crisis. So if we provide help and assistance to them, we don't just say, good luck,
take care, we continue to work with them with the hope that they can break that cycle and not repeat that. So we are really trying the focus on that.

We've paired that with our care to learn program. And here's some examples. I won't speak to this, other than there is a list of all of our partners with Neighbor Helping Neighbor. And I think you will get a copy of this, too. It's quite impressive. Now, Care to Learn is, it's really, it's a 501C3. It was started by Doug Pitt. Yes, that's Brad Pitt's brother in Springfield. He started it there, but it was the same thing. This is a nonprofit that is focussed solely on helping students with health, hunger, and hygiene. And they can fund -- it's a big organization that we take donations and we immediately, with no red tape, get assistance to students for health, anything health, hunger, hygiene related, so they can be successful in school. That, and working with our Neighbor Helping Neighbor, has really enabled us to, basically, meet whatever the needs are of our families that is keeping the kids from getting to school or learning.

Next slide, finally some other additional things that we are doing. We have a
1 truancy diversionary process, where we have kids, we
2 identify them early, they are starting to have
3 chronic absences, and we try to have diversionary
4 conferences. That does include juvenile justice
5 officers; but also includes social workers, so that
6 we can try and identify what is causing the
7 absenteeism and how can we interject and connect
8 with services, so they don't get to a truancy
9 referral in the court system. Teen court, another
10 thing started at Hardin Middle School, and Dr.
11 Gettemeier is the principal there. Try -- but we
12 have kids that get into trouble in school that
13 ordinarily they get arrested and be sent to juvenile
14 court, we have a program where they can go before a
15 jury of their peers in school and get consequences,
16 rather than referral to truancy. It keeps them out
17 of the system. And that's our goal, to try and
18 interact with them positively, rather than getting
19 them into the juvenile system, which can lead to
20 more interactions with the juvenile system.
21 And, finally, Mayor Faith mentioned our
22 police reading to elementary students to help build
23 positive relationships and contact between the
24 police and our students. So we're very proud of the
25 things we're doing. That's just a few. I'm talking
really fast; but absolutely, I would be happy to
talk to any of you in more depth about any of these
and many other great things we are doing. Thank
you.

MR. LEAVELL: Good evening. My name is
Craig Leavell. I'm the executive director of the
Boys and Girls Clubs here in St. Charles County.
St. Charles, like now, yourselves, is very fortunate
to have a Boys and Girls Club in the community. And
I hope and I'm sure you've become aware of the
services that we provide. Our mission is to enable
all young people, especially those who need us most.
Not only those that are in risk situations; but
especially those to reach their full potential as
productive, responsible, and caring citizens. Very
broad, very lofty goal, but we have taken that on
and we do add to the programs and services that we
provide. And we, especially, can only do it through
the collaborations that we have formed with other
local agencies, with the school system, with St.
Charles Parks and Recreation, Boy Scouts, Girl
Scouts, and, particularly, with the child's parents.
We are there to support the parents and all these
agencies to make our youth caring, responsible,
productive citizens.
We serve youth age six to 18. We've been doing so here in St. Charles since 1955 in our two clubs, one here in St. Charles, one in St. Peters, O'Fallon area. Last year, we served over 1500 kids through our programs and services. We are currently serving over 250 a day. We provide those services after school and all day during the summer and weekends. At those times when kids are out of school and most likely to get involved in risk behaviors. And so I would like to say, when school is out, the clubs are in. We provide some of those basic necessities. We served over 32,000 hot meals last year to our kids. And again, have gone -- put a big emphasis on educational support systems. One of our programs in particular, our reading program, our kids have shown an average improvement at over 43 percent. So we are more than just a swim and gym, as clubs used to be known for. We provide a lot of cultural, character, sports, arts, all of our different programs. I think we have others. There are our buildings, our two facilities. We are very happy to have just opened up a new facility last year, 28,000 square feet facility, that has allowed us to expand or programs and services. And a list there of our different program areas, that all of
our programs fall under. Again, thank you very much.

MR. SIMMONS: Good evening, my name is Ken Simmons. I am the juvenile officer with Family Court Administrator, St. Charles County. And I wanted to talk to you a little bit about what we're doing with the juvenile detention alternative initiative, JDAI for short. St. Charles County officially adopted the JDAI philosophy in 2011 when we began receiving federal funds to implement the philosophy. There are several different, I guess, tenents of the philosophy, but primarily, what we wanted to do was to reduce the number of youth that were going into detention, as well as the amount of time that those youth were spending in detention. I think all the research will tell you, you put a juvenile in detention one time, then that juvenile is at a higher risk to go back to detention. So we -- and we also wanted to make sure that we improve the overall conditions of our detention center. Rather than having a facility that just simply housed juveniles, we wanted to make sure that we were providing the appropriate services for them while they were there.

Colleen. The -- we wanted to make sure
that we also involved the community in providing
those services for the juveniles. We began a
collaborative in which we had participation from the
school district and from other service providers in
the community. And we gathered on a regular basis
to discuss some of programs and some of the things
that we could institute. For a long time, St.
Charles County was -- and the juvenile justice
facility was kind of separate from everyone else.
And, again, we wanted to involve the whole community
and form a collaborative by which we could provide
better services for the kids. As a result of that,
we have now inhouse medical services. So all the
juveniles that are detained, compliant with the
supreme court rule, those juveniles receive the
appropriate medical services while they are in
detention. Also, mental health services. We
collaborated with the department of mental health
and the Crider Center to have a psychiatric nurse
come and provide specific counselling services for
the juveniles.

We have also expanded our use of
volunteers. We've collaborated with both St.
Charles County Community College as well as
Lindenwood, and we've had them come and provide
services of mentoring. Often times, just playing board games with the kids. Again, just providing some of the examples of positive interaction. And as a result of our implementation of JDAI and our collaboration, the number of juveniles that were detained in our detention center, as well as the amount of time that they were detained, has decreased significantly, as evidenced by the chart. And, again, with the collaborative, we meet now on an every other month basis. And we've kind of expended this collaborative and include several different service providers that are in the community. Mental Health Collaboration. Neighbor Helping Neighbor is kind of a similar type example of some of the collaboratives that we wanted to develop. Again, we understand that for us, it's not just a matter of a deputy juvenile officer just wagging a finger in a child's face once a week for an hour telling them don't do wrong, don't do wrong. It's more of a situation where we have to develop the whole family. We have to provide the services to help the mother, to help the father, and to help the juvenile. Because the parents are the ones that are ultimately going to be the most effective as far as raising their children. Again, thank you. And I
will be here, also, to answer any questions or
provide any other information.

MR. LOHMAR: Good evening members of
the commission, Reverend Chairman, Mr. Chairman. My
name is Tim Lohmar. I’m the prosecuting attorney of
St. Charles County. And I would like to take just a
moment to talk to you about a brand new initiative
that we have just begun as of last month. No secret
that heroin is a major problem, not just in our
community, but, of course, in all of our
communities, unfortunately, around, not just the
metro area, but the entire country. Several
different ways of attacking that problem have been
discussed and tried over the years. We, here in
this county, have different groups that try to go at
that their own way, without much collaboration,
without much coordination.

And it was only recently that we began
to discuss an idea, why do we need to reinvent the
wheel? Why do we need to recreate the same program
for the youth that these different groups give. And
I do need to mention that, obviously, with the
heroin program, a problem I should say, education is
the whole key. And we feel like we need to get to,
not the high school kids, I should say, not just the
high school kids; but we need to go down lower, to
the middle school and even to the elementary
schools. And what we've done here, you'll see,
CRUSH is the acronym, Community Resources United to
Stop Heroin. This is a collaboration of law
enforcement professionals, treatment providers,
community leaders, health care organizations and
local school districts, all of whom are part of a
coalition, designed to educate and empower our
community's youth. We have several events that we
have in place.

One event that we've already
experienced and we've experienced tremendous
success, was our teen drug summit. That was this
past fall. We invited over 300 local 6th through
8th grade students. And those students got to see
some things I don't think they've never seen before.
They got to hear from some actual recovering heroin
addicts. They got to hear from undercover drug
enforcement officials. They got to hear from me.
They got to hear from families of victims of heroin
overdose. All of which was designed to give these
kids a very real dose of what heroin is and the
danger it is to them and to the community.

Next slide. We have been fortunate
enough to partner, not only with the professionals and the organizations in our community; but we've also been supported by the drug enforcement administration. The local 7th State District has agreed to help underwrite our teen drug summit and provide other financing options. So we feel like we've got a great idea that's just getting off the ground. It's got a lot of room for growth; but we're very exited about the directions that it may take for our community. Thank you.

MR. SOWATSKY: Welcome. My name is Bruce Sowatsky, I'm the executive director of the Community and Children's Resource Board in St. Charles County; and we oversee children's mental health and substance abuse treatment services here in St. Charles. My first and second slide will share some of our history, some of our partnerships, and some of our outcomes that we've achieved since 2004 when we passed the one, eight cent sales tax. As you've heard from my colleagues and partners, we are not immune to the challenges and the real problems that our young people face, heroin, juvenile delinquency, sexual abuse and trafficking, mental illness, cyber bulling, homelessness and the dissolution of home life, which can be the result of
parent, parental divorce, and incarceration. We have made many strides in the last 15 years to address many of these issues, but we still have thousands of children in our community who have these challenges and threats every day. We are a work in progress, and we are proud of what we accomplished, and we are sticking to stand to help address additional gaps.

We frequently hear from colleagues who reside or work on the other side of the river that what sets St. Charles County apart is the true collaborative spirit and practice amongst our local and state government leaders, our business community, our schools, our hospital systems, our churches and our nonprofit community. We have a long history of responding to these needs of our children and families, tapping into the resources and strength of all these communities. We've heard a number of these collaboratives mentioned today, already, but I also would include St. Joachim & Ann Care Services, who works with the homeless; The Child Center, who works with sexually abused victims, so they only have to testify once; the Shower of Love, which is a community-wide baby shower; the task force to reduce disproportionate
minority representation in the juvenile justice system; Partnership With Families who works with kids with serious emotional disturbances; the Saturday Jubilee, which started here, which is a seven county-wide food collection a day; and the Crisis Nursery expansion, in terms of respite beds, for kids who are at risk of child abuse.

In addition, we have been proactive in response to tragedies that have occurred in other communities, after the Sandy Hook tragedy in Connecticut two years ago, a group of local political leaders, school personal, mental health leaders, law enforcement convened to develop a plan to reduce the risk of school violence. Lastly, we are not only a community that looks inward. When Joplin was ravished by tornadoes five years ago, our community responded with food and clothing donations. Last winter, Harvester Christian Church provided thousands of diapers to families in Ferguson. We want to be part of the solution. And if we can assist in finding solutions for our neighbors in north county, we want to help. It's why we have assisted in all the county's campaigns to pass measures to create localized funds for children's mental health services and why we are
helping to initiate the regional grade by 21
collective impact effort for children and youth.

As you can see in my third and fourth
slides, we've achieved many impressive results.
However, we will not rest, because there are still
families in our community who are struggling. With
an ever growing population, we will continue to
expand programs and seek solutions and additional
partnerships. I share these figures to demonstrate
hope. All change starts with strong leadership, a
group of committed people to make a change and the
belief that change can occur. We have seen this
phenomenon occur repeatedly in our county and it is
our hope that these things can happen in Ferguson as
well. I thank you for your time and your
commitment. Thank you.

MR. EHLMANN: I'd like to thank all of
our presenters. And thank you for your attention.
I've been asked to sort of pull everything together
here and talk about how these various programs do or
may impact policy. And I think, the first thing I
want to emphasize, I think everybody up here at some
point in your presentation used the word,
cooperation or collaboration. Okay. And as Bruce
suggests, we are very proud of the fact that we have
been able to work together, to cooperate with the schools, the not-for-profits, the various governmental entities.

But one of the reasons we can do that, one of the reasons we can have school resource officers in every school, one of the reasons we can have a heroin task force, like Tim told you about, is because we have seven police departments. Okay? We can get seven police chiefs together and talk about doing a heroin thing. Okay? We only five -- we had five entities and two school resource officers. Okay? But you know what, all those entities are large enough they can afford to finance half of the cost of the school resource officer and the school does the other half. I've been doing some checking around and as far as I can tell, the only high school in the region that doesn't have a school resource officer is Normandy High School. Okay? How ironic, but why is that? Well, I don't think it's because people didn't want a school resource officer. It was probably because all those little municipalities, none of them had the resources to go to the school and say, hey, how about you pay half, we'll pay half and we'll have a policeman in your school every day. And I can't say
enough about the job that the various police
departments do in this. And most importantly, it's
an opportunity for kids to meet law enforcement
officers in a nonthreatening situation. If the
first time, their first contact with law enforcement
is when they are pulled over for doing something
wrong, or stopped in the park for doing something
wrong, it's just, it's not a very good beginning.
So we think school resource officers are a very big
part of solving the problem.

Obviously, Boys and Girls Club, when we
invited Craig, I didn't know that the St. Louis Club
was actually coming to Ferguson. I read that in the
paper the other day. That's a great thing. I was a
member of our club out here when I was in high
school. Some of my best friends were from Normandy,
went to Normandy High School, they played
basketball. They didn't have a Boy's Club. They
drove all the way out to St. Charles to play
basketball at our Boy's Club. Okay? I think that
having a club like that could really be important
for that part of our region.

Obviously, the juvenile courts. Again,
you have to cooperate. The facilities are owned by
the county, but the courts are run by the judges.
So you have to have a good relationship between your county government and your circuit court. We do. I think from everything I've heard, St. Louis County does as well. But I think that's very important.

Finally, CCRB, we're very proud of what CCRB has done. One of the things that we have done differently than St. Louis County, with the CCRB is that we set it up, so that myself and the county council appoints the members. But then the members hire an executive director, which is Bruce, who spoke to you just a while ago. Once we interview candidates, once they are approved, it's -- they are on their own. And we try to make it that way. When we interview people, we try to find people who will be, who ask tough questions, who will make sure that these agencies that come in and ask for money aren't just there because they got money the last year. They are there to prove that they did a good job and need to be trusted again. So, we think it's very important the way that organization is set up and the way it functions.

Finally, I would simply direct you to this map. It's one of my favorites. And it's one of the reasons I am very hopeful that we can avoid some of the problems that happened in Ferguson in
our county. And people say, well, why are you concerned? Well, I tell Mayor Slay and County Executive Stenger all the time that my office is closer to Ferguson than theirs. Okay? And my office, if you don't know, it's in a beautiful hundred and ten year old building up on the bluffs, it overlooks the river. I can look out my window and see St. Louis County.

We spend a lot of time looking out the window and thinking, how can we duplicate the successes in St. Louis County and how can we avoid some of their problems. One of the problems, I think, they had, again, we're going back the to the 91 municipalities. I think we've learned from that. We've got seven municipalities in St. Charles County. We've got some smaller ones. Every one of them has some very nice neighborhoods. It has some low income neighborhoods. But if you look at the map there, we've got -- look at the red dots, we've got them all over the county. In St. Louis County, they are all in one place. I'm very hopeful that in the future, because we have that dispersion of low income people around the county, we won't have some of the problems that you all are looking at and dealing with. And, of course, again, we can do that
because we've got large size municipalities. And they can go ahead and make sure that each city, there's all types of neighborhoods for all types of people. Having grown up in a community here, I look at St. Louis County, I don't understand why some of the west county neighborhoods, basically, zone in such a way that when your child goes off to college and gets his first job and comes back, he can't afford to live in the neighborhood he grew up in. He can't afford to live in the community he grew up in. So I think that's one of the problems in St. Louis. It's something I hope we can avoid in St. Charles. Again, thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you, County Executive, for your leadership and for bringing together this embarrassment of riches and collaborative leadership and all of you here. To Sally, to Jeff, to Bruce, to Ken, to Tim, all, thank you very much for your presentation to us. We look forward to taking these things into account. And into sharing, as we talk about child well-being for the rest of the evening and our ongoing policy conversation. My name is Starsky Wilson. I am pleased, honored, and challenged to serve as co-chair of the commission with our dear friend and
brother, Rich McClure. And I'm really here to kind
of set the stage for tonight. You've already seen a
good bit of what we are going to be doing.

As we talk about the work of the
commission, it really takes interest -- as we talk,
think about the last few presentations. It takes
more significant interest in the structure and the
systemic and the policy recommendations that are
made because this is our charge. To give a sense to
study the root causal and systemic and structural
inequities in our entire region. So inasmuch as we
hear about solid positive things happening in one
location, we also have responsibility for being
thoughtful about the entire metropolitan area. So
we want to shine a light and we also want to hear
from people throughout the entire region.

So tonight, we'll take some
opportunity, with this being our first time in St.
Charles, to ask some of you who are here questions
that we have asked folks in St. Louis City, folks in
St. Louis County, those who have participated to
date and we've been able to get their feedback. We
are going to take the opportunity today, not only to
focus on child well-being, but also to ask you some
of the same questions we've asked others, so that we
have a full data set, if you will, of the perspective of the people in St. Charles, as well. As we are undertaken to do this to date, we focus on the areas of municipal courts and governance, on civics and law enforcement relations, on economic inequity and opportunity and on child well-being and educational equity.

As we do this work, we are consistently reminded of the far reaching impact that an investment in our youth can have in all of these areas. The county executive got into it at the end as he began to talk about the economic impact of neighborhoods and what impact that has on collaboration and St. Charles being able to move forward. It is fitting for us to be here, because as you have heard and as you saw in Bruce's latter slides, as we look at the kids count report, of the 115 counties in the state of Missouri, St. Charles consistently ranked first or second in child well-being. Well, of course, there are all kinds of reasons for that. Some of it has to do with the collaborations we have heard about. Some of it has to do with the economics of the region and the opportunities thereof. So we recognize all of these inputs for child well-being; and we are thoughtful
about them as we order our own work and make a
commitment to those who we serve in this region,
particularly, those under the age of 25.

In our work today, we've been
thoughtful about how these young people thrive in
their daily lives, including growing and developing
to their full potential, retaining the ability to be
children, and preparing to become fully contributing
adults. Child well-being occurs, and we've noted
this from leadership of our co-chair in this area,
Ms. Becky James-Hatter, when there is both the
absence of deficits, as well as the presence of
assets. It is not enough to address one end of the
scale and not the other. Our region's youth, 25
percent of the population for the region, face a
number of negative trends when it comes to
investment in their future. Even here in St.
Charles, the region starred for child well-being,
1735 children and youth receive mental health
services subsidized by public support. One in five
youth in the state of Missouri still live in
poverty. Two in five African American children
still live in poverty in the state. And a recent
study shows that not addressing the economic
mobility of poor children would decrease United
States gross domestic product by 4 percent per year over the lifetime of those same children. That's seven trillion dollars. So as we focus on children, recognize not only that we must care for all children and each child, own that they are all of our children. But we also recognize that as we care for our children, we care for our entire community and care for the economics thereof.

Now, I want to take a point of personal privilege here. I'm reminded on this particular day, I came here today from New York City. And I had the occasion yesterday to be with a historic congregation there where an elected official visited the congregation. And this elected official came talking about the way things had been done in the recent weeks in the U.S. Senate, particularly for the African American community, big wins for the African American community. In the past of this historic congregation, almost 200 years old, more than 200 years old now, was very appreciative of that. But when that elected official began to walk away and pack his things up to leave church, because, you know, come in give the announcement, then you leave, that pastor was concerned to ask that elected official who was a statewide elected in
the U.S. Senate about one thing. He asked him about accountability for Officer Pantaleo, who was the officer who choked Eric Garner to death. That community gathered in this historic position in the African American community for the entire nation, was pleased with things like the appointment of Loretta Lynch because they were concerned about the status of that officer and reform in the New York police department.

With are thoughtful about this, especially as we think about children. I'm very, personally moved by this, because this weekend we also saw, and just before I came here, I heard a report of Brandon Brooks. Brandon Brooks is the 15 year old white male who was at a swimming party on Friday and decided to use his phone to make You Tube videos of his friends to find out about the party on Twitter. When he got there, he began to see an argument between a mother and her daughter. And the police came to be called. The police seemed to respond to everyone around, but him. Locking up students, and ultimately taking a 14-year-old, swimsuit clad, young black girl, slamming her on the ground, sometimes by her hair and sitting on her. That didn't happen in Dallas, where I'm from, it
happened in McKinney, just outside of Dallas.

Dallas, where I grew up is more like north St. Louis and north county. McKinney is much more like St. Charles.

So we're reminded that these issues are everywhere. And the impact of the work that we have must be relevant for our region first, but there are people watching throughout the nation. And this work must remember where it began and where it can go at any given point throughout time. It could go back to the park in Cleveland, where Tamir Rice, the 12-year-old, as we talk about child well-being, was shot by police. And it can create more work for Nicole Lee, one of our visitors here today, who is a coordinator, former president, of Transafrica, now coordinating with the Black Movement Lawyers Group, that has been trouncing across the nation from place to place being thoughtful about police accountability, because they know it impacts the next generation of children.

So as we are thoughtful about this work and as we open up to your comments on tonight, we want to remember the great things that we are doing and shine a light, that we are going throughout the region, in particular places and know that we must
do them throughout our entire region, for the sake
of all of our children, the 624,000 children of the
region. Not just those in a particular place. And
know that the great collaboration and coordination
of our programs is good, but the accountability for
policy is what will make their lives better. So we
thank you for being here on tonight. And we invite
your perspective and public open mike, and the
portions that will come next, and in our small
groups, where we'll seek your perspective on the
intersections of these issues to inform our
communications to make policy recommendations for the
betterment of our children. Thank you very much.

MS. FRANKS: Good evening everyone.
How is everybody doing tonight? Great. So as
Reverend Starsky Wilson just said, we are going to
do public open mike. We have about ten minutes.
I'm trying to get through these as fast as I can.
Everyone will have two minutes. Please keep in mind
two minutes, as we are trying to get everyone to
speak, as many people to speak as possible. And we
do record your complaints as well. This is
something we do include in the report. So please
keep in mind two minutes. And I also ask that you
introduce yourself, first name, last name and also
if you could, spell your first name for our court reporter, so that we make sure to acknowledge you correctly, okay? First, we will have Scotty Addison. And right after Scotty Addison, we will have, is it Brandon Rodiger? And right after Brandon Rodiger, we will have Nicole Lee. Again, please keep in mind, two minutes as we want to have as many people speak as possible. Okay? Thank you. Scotty?

MR. ADDISON: Good evening. I've seen you before, but thanks for the opportunity to address what I've come to call the Ferguson omission. Because the course of these proceedings is becoming more and more defined about what is being left out. And part of this observation comes from experience through the course of these proceedings over a number of months. Close to the question of how public input is garnered and what is done with that information. And I kind of go back to beginnings of public participation, I didn't invent it, but I was kind of close. And I am a planner, so that's very much the heart of that practice. And I'm concerned that, basically, the participatory process is kind of designed to pull in buzz words, then translate them into something else.
And by the time they get to the table, they are not recognizable as to the original ideas that came in. That's going to be happening a lot. I'm seeing a lot of it. There's one instance that came to concern in a meeting, in a working group meeting a couple weeks ago, with regard to a recommendation on mass demonstrations. And it had something to do with minor reforms to the role of incident command in mass demonstrations. And that kind of threw me for a loop. Some nice young fellow was brought up from some organization to convey these points and he had never been on the ground with incident command, like I have for 20 years.

And I have been very strong on the record with regard to the First Amendment issues that underlie a lot of these concerns and have really, really amplified these concerns when we saw the events in Ferguson. My message was that I'm of record, I've brought correspondence, that I sent to the governor last November. Speech is not an emergency. And incident command, which is a collaboration of police agencies when some disturbances is alleged, basically, creates a police riot. And that's what's been happening. So I'm really concerned that somehow that kind of precept
sneaks into the agenda in contrast to a lot of the
evidence we've seen. That's just one point. I have
others. And I've been keeping up with my
participation here. I'm going to be doing some
writing. But it's kind of like I'm throwing this
stuff over the wall into a black box, and we don't
know what's going on inside. That's been my concern
about the nature of the public participation process
here. Thanks for your patience.

MS. FRANKS: Thank you. And Brandon Rodiger. Brandon?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Brandon stepped out.

MS. FRANKS: Okay. Okay. We'll go ahead and have Nicole Lee.

MS. LEE: Hi, Nicole Lee. N-I-C-O-L-E, L-E-E. And as Reverend Wilson said, I am the former President of the Transafrica and the coordinator of the Black Movement Law Project. I had no idea I was going to be speaking this evening, and I feel completely underdressed to address you. But it really is an honor for me to be here. I am a civil and human rights attorney and have been a national spokesperson, but I'm really nervous. In part, because I think this is a sacred space; and the work that you all are doing here is so important to the
rest of the country. I do not live in St. Louis County. I don't presume to understand all of the issues; but I do know that you have been the greatest teacher in the last year for our society, for our communities all over the United States. And I thank you for that.

    I stepped to the podium tonight to say, I have learned so much and have tried to provide a little bit of my understanding about human rights and civil rights to the region through my work with Arch City Defenders. I have been sitting through interviews with people all over St. Louis County about the impacts of the municipal courts, not just on their civil and political rights, but on their economic rights. And what I have found through my work is that so many, especially woman with children, have had their lives completely decimated by their interactions with the municipal courts. So, I look forward to hearing the conversation about the municipal courts this evening.

    And a caution, from my perspective, having worked in every country, except my own, for the past 15 years and now coming back and looking at my country, a caution about the municipal courts. As I look at how the courts have perhaps not been
designed, but have been used, I think about countries that I've seen on the continent of Africa. And I have seen our government caution other countries in using some of the exact same methods that are used in St. Louis County. And so in some ways, if we were, if St. Louis county were a country, the state department would be wagging its finger at us, saying, what are you doing. Even taking away aid, even if we really needed it. And so I caution because I know that the people of St. Louis County are much better than the results that they are getting from the municipal court system. So I really look forward to hearing the conversation about that.

MS. FRANKS: Has Brandon returned from the bathroom, restroom? No? Okay. I thought I would give him a chance.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Is that actually in the transcript now?

MS. FRANKS: I just wanted to give him a chance. Next, we will have Reverend Carl J. Bill. Bell, I'm sorry. And after the reverend, we'll have Bob Miller and Don Mobe. Please keep in mind two minutes as we would love everyone to speak, and if you can also spell your name for the court reporter.
MR. BELL: Okay. My name is Carl J. Bell. B-E-L-L. And I would like to say while we were showing you -- I live in St. Charles here, formerly from St. Peters and formerly from Prudigo (ph sp). So I know a loop. And I would like to say, while we are showing you our plethora of riches, we forgot to introduce someone from our police department. Who we need to hear from. And if you don't think we need to hear from him, this is a black man who will tell you a story. And how he was sitting there on Martin Luther King Day, watching the football game. And his neighbor, who happens to be white, lives downstairs beneath him, called the police, said his stereo was too loud. And the first police officer came and said, oh, it's not too loud, would you just turn it down a little. And, I said, okay. That didn't -- didn't satisfy my neighbor. He called the police again. And this time, a little lady about your height came and you could tell she was frightened. And she called for backup. And I called, asking for a captain or a sergeant to be sent out. Well, what I got was the tactical force sent to my house. And you know what happened after that. How I left with the tongs in my back. Yes, okay.
And the second would be the St. Charles police, where I live now. Now, I had to call the police. Now, just twice in one day, the guy called the police on me and I got tasered, drug out to the hospital, and jailed overnight and paid all these fines. When they say, do you want to hear about the fines? They will mess you up out here. And then the St. Peters, St. Charles police. I had to call 27 times for my neighbor, for them to take action against my neighbor. What were they doing? You name it and they were going it over there. Heroin, fighting in the streets, right here on 5th Street. Now, I ask you -- and I'm raising my granddaughter. And fortunately, she didn't see the first incident, but she got to see the other incident on 5th Street. If she walks -- as she grows and sees the police treating her grandfather like this, coming in the house, manhandling him, and he has no authority and no say-so in his house, for doing what, playing music too loud? And then, for 27 times they said, we'll take care of it. How is she supposed to grow up in this community and hold her head up high? And she goes to this school right here. So, I would like to see you guys address that. Oh, St. Charles.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you.
MS. FRANKS: Bob Miller and then if Don Mobe would go ahead and just kind of standby.

MR. MILLER: I only know a little bit about education. Robert Miller. I wanted to talk first of all a little bit about school transfer. We're playing Russian roulette with these kids. We've been doing this for three years. Now, we know that Governor Nixon has until the middle of July to veto it. The parents don't know what's going on. Let's get with it. I think that parents, if children have the capability, they should be able to go to an accredited school. Now, the latest issue is, what? Charter schools, virtual schools. The board of education, Missouri State Board of Education, oh, they get up in arms. Well, they can't even keep accredited schools. It's either their way or no way. Well, let's get this thing straight and give kids, if they qualify, and parents want, get them out of this until we get these schools corrected where they should be corrected in the neighborhoods.

And then I want to talk a little bit about No Child Left Behind, which was started by President Bush. That's why it's bad. But President Obama, President Obama has never wavered on his
education. I remember two zero zero seven, where he beat out Hillary Clinton. And he said on the stage at the, in Iowa City in Iowa, the caucus up there, we need teacher accountability. We need student accountability. We need common core. Well, No Child Left Behind is what we want to keep. President Bush was for it, now President Obama and he has not wavered. Versus the Student Success Act, which will turn control back to the states, bad. End of common core, bad. It will squash any attempt to bring civility to the seniority tenure. Seniority tenure is not a guarantee for teachers, a job for life. It's for other purposes. We need to talk about this. But they won't talk. You can't talk and discuss. Well, then, you litigate. That's what we're doing now, litigating.

And anyway, let me suggest everyone listen to Tim Cook, Ken Burns. Ken Burns gave the Washington University address. That brought me to tears. Tim Cook did the commencement address two zero one five at George Washington University. That brought me to tears. I was born and raised -- one second here. I was born and raised across the river here. Golden Eagle Bridge, Calhoun County. When I was six and seven years old, I was told, there are
no African Americans staying in this county overnight. We have a bridge there in Hardin, Illinois. If they don't get out of here by midnight, they'll be in the river, off the bridge. That's how I grew up, but I have changed. And we need the whole country to change. Racism, racism, racism. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

MS. FRANKS: I am going to wrap up with Mr. Logue if you just --

MR. LOGUE: Don Logue. Last name is spelled, L-O-G-U-E. I just want to pose the question or make the statement that I was surprised that health and wellness, particularly behavioral health, was not identified as a major strategic issue in what I've seen in the report so far. I come at this with over 30 years background in human services delivery, rather. As well as, time as an economic development official. And the fact of the matter is that people who are experiencing health challenges do not make good students, do not make good parents, and do not make good employees. And that is one of the pillars of success. We have to -- and we saw some great
metrics in terms of the outcomes that St. Charles has been getting and underlying. Through all these reports, we saw health care as part of all those programs. So that would be my comment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Logue.

We'll take just a quick opportunity because we have a lot of new audiences as well, to note, but one of the things we are doing, the two categories was racial equity and reconciliation and health and public health. That we are being thoughtful about, as a crosscutting issue, across the different working groups. Particularly, those in education and economics. So this is something that we are taking really seriously. Our last meeting was dedicated, wholly to health and public health. And had great presentations there. The way we've set up the groups is just based upon the ranking of community input. But we do see health as so important that we are looking at it as a crosscutting issue. So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And for the audience and Don, for you, the presentations from that meeting focussed on health and wellness are on the website. We welcome you to go to STLpositivechange.org and pull down those
presentations. And any comments you have, we would welcome.

MS. FRANKS: Again, we are short for time; but you will have an opportunity to speak more during our breakout sessions. So please keep all your thoughts in mind. Now, we will turn it over to Monique for audience polling.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Out of courtesy, Brandon, you were called. Would you like to speak? No? Okay. Thank you.

MS. THOMAS: All right. Good evening. How is everyone again? All right. So you'll see you have volunteers and staffers who are going to be giving out key pads right now. So as Jerrica shared, Monique Thomas, the, excuse me, assistant director, Ferguson Commission. And I, typically, do the polling. So you'll see later on in the recap report, we typically ask and get a sense of who is in the room. And also get your opinions, your thoughts, on some of the topical considerations. This time we are doing something a little bit as a retrospect to give us a little bit of a cross section of St. Charles. So Reverend Starsky Wilson alluded to the fact that we are -- he actually directly mentioned that we are going to be going and
recapping, reviewing, past questions that we've asked in other regions in the case, that we have a little bit more representation here of St. Charles folks. But, generally, even if that's not the case, we are about 100 days away from our final report submission. And we want to get a sense for, get a sense of how true or how real, how consistent the questions we originally had are here and now. And so, this is -- does everyone have a key pad in hand? Raise your hand if you do not. Okay. So we'll get that. We'll wait a moment until everyone has. While we're waiting, I will note because, we are doing questions -- Danielle, do you have the other slide? Danielle, the other slide, right here. Because we are going back, this is going to be a longer process. And so, I ask you to recall when you were in high school, so appropriate. And you had a great big test, that would determine your future. But this may be the future of a region, not completely, but if you can put that pressure in your mind as you are going through, because it's going to be a little longer. But bear with us, because it is important and we do want to get your thoughts. All right?

So now, I'll ask again, who does not
have a key pad? Raise your hand. All right. So I think we're ready. So who has never used a key pad before? It's okay. Fair enough. It's fairly easy. If you'll look at the key pad, you'll see that there are numbers and there are letters. The letters and numbers, I think it's usually letters, correspond to an answer choice for a question that we'll ask. We're going to ask you to pick the best answer choice by indicating, so if it's an A and your answer is yellow and A is labeled next to yellow, you press A. If you change your mind for whatever reason, while polling is open, you have an opportunity to put the right answer. And so the last thing you saved before we closed polling is what will captured as your answer.

I'll also note that there are going to be -- there is going to be an opportunity or rather, there are going to be some questions we'll ask where they will require multiple answers. Just press three answers or four answers, and it will be captured before polling is closed. All right? So are we ready? Are we fairly energized, despite it being the time? We'll see, right? Me too.

So we have a practice question. This is just a practice question. What is your favorite
color? You'll note that in the top right-hand side, polling is closed. But when polling is open, that's when it will start to count. Okay? I'll just say that. What is your favorite color? A, black; B, brown; C, blue; D, green; E, orange; F, purple; G, red; H, yellow; I, white; and J, other. Polling is now open. Select your answer choice. On the bottom right, indicates how many seconds you have left until the polling is closed. So you have about 15 seconds left. And Jerrica, based on the glare, I am not able to see how many respondents we have. So I'll just look to you to -- all right. Polling is now closed. Okay. So there's a majority blue. From a distance, I won't be able to actually read the actual letters, I mean, excuse me, the percentages, but we'll just be able see spatially where we are on the chart. We have a majority. That's a consistent answer, by the way, generally people who come to Ferguson Commission meetings like the color blue. I don't know. All kinds of learning.

So we'll start with demographic questions. So now these actually count. Okay? All right. So in what geographic area is your primary home or residence located? A, St. Louis City; B,
St. Louis County; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair County, Illinois; Madison County is G; H, Monroe County; I, other. Polling is now open. One second left. All right. Have nearly four out of ten of you in St. Charles County. And that is a significant over representation of St. Charles County. Typically, it's the city and the county. So we do have who we need in the room to get a sample for the rest of the questions.

All right. Let's go the next. What geographic area is your primary work and/or school? A, St. Louis City; B, St. Louis County; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair County; G, Madison County; H, Monroe County; I, other. If you are retired, you can indicate I, as other. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Okay, that's consistent with the last question. About 40 percent St. Charles County.

Next question. With which gender do you identify? Please select one. A is female; B is male; C is other and D is decline. Polling is now open. About ten seconds left. We have most responses locked. Okay. Almost directly split. A few declined to answer; but generally, we are split
fairly equally between males and females.

In what age group do you belong?

Select one. I like to caution that this is, again, anonymous. So you can feel free to tell the truth.

Select one. A, under 21; B, between 22 and 34; C, between 35 and 44; D, 45 to 54; E, 55 to 64; F, 65 and over and G, you can choose to decline. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Thank you. Okay.

So 34 percent of you are between 55 and 64, generally split. Only 5 percent are under 21.

Next question, how would you describe your ethnicity or race? A, white; B, black, African American; C, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin; D, Asian; E, American Indian or Alaskan native; F, native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; G, other; H, decline. Polling is now open. And here I'll note that we haven't noted before that we are asking you, I believe, to chose one. Okay. Sixty-six percent of you are white, have identified as white.

Okay. Now we're going into our engagement and outreach questions. Basically, how did you get here. So we'll just go to the next -- this is the twelfth meeting of the Ferguson Commission. How many previous meetings have you attended? Here, we're talking about the full
Ferguson Commission meeting with the commissioners present. Not the working group meetings. So this is just Ferguson Commission meetings, the full ones. So how many previous meetings have you attended? A, none, this is this your first meeting; B, one to two; C, three to four; D, five to six; E, seven to eight; F, nine to ten; and G, eleven, you've been to all of the full Ferguson Commission meetings.

Polling is now open. About ten seconds left. Okay. Welcome, about 60 percent of you, this is your first meeting.

All right. Let's go to the next question. How did you learn about today's meeting?

You can check all that apply. So here, if you enter multiple, when the polling is open, that will count. Okay? So A, Facebook; B, Twitter; C, email; D, newspaper; E, radio; F, word of mouth, that's a friend, coworker, relative, someone you know; G, Ferguson Commission website, that's STLpositivechange.org; and E, other. Polling is now open. Select all that apply. All right. Polling is now closed. So we have a smattering. The biggest one looks like it's word of mouth, followed by email and then visiting both the websites. We thank you for those hits.
All right. Next. How would you rate your interest in the work of the Ferguson Commission? A, I am very interested; B, I am generally interested; C, I am not really interested.

Polling is now open. About ten seconds left. Okay. Polling is closed. Most -- excuse me, 70 percent of you are very interested 24, generally interested and 3 percent of you were invited by your friend, that you heard about the meeting and you have no interest in being here, but kind of thought it was a free kind of a Bar-b-que or something, got lost. All right.

So next, how would you rate your interest in the work of the committees? Committees here are the working groups. Okay? A, I am very interested; B, I am generally interested and C, I am not really interested. Polling is now open. About ten seconds left. Okay. Sixty-six percent of you are very interested. Thirty percent, generally interested, and more people not interested in the work of the committees at 6 percent.

Okay. How would you rate your involvement in the work of the Ferguson Commission working groups? A, I am very involved, indicated by attending most or all meetings; B, I am occasionally
involved, attending a few meetings; and C, I am not involved at all, so you have never been to a working group meeting. The polling is now open. Okay. A little over 50 percent of you have never been to a working group meeting. They are also posted on STLpositivechange, if you are interested.

Okay. So now we're getting into -- so stretch if you need to a bit, we're getting into the topical considerations. We've viewed some of these questions historically to frame our work; but we also want to hear, especially now, knowing that St. Charles is over represented here, we want to know what you have to say about these questions. And even if you are not from St. Charles, likely based on this data, you are new to the meetings, so you haven't been polled. So we want to poll you again.

So going to the next round. This is the first question we asked, at the first meeting in December. Because of Michael Brown's death and its aftermath, the Ferguson Commission is, excuse me, accessing citizen law enforcement interactions -- I think it's assessing -- assessing citizen law enforcement interactions and relations. The municipal court system, and how municipal court --
excuse me, municipal government is organized. Which of these three focus areas is your highest priority? Select one. A, citizen law enforcement interactions and relations; B, municipal court system; C, municipal government organization. Polling is now open. About ten seconds left. Most of you, 64 percent of you, have ranked citizen law enforcement, interactions and relations, followed by the government and then courts. Okay. You can scroll back down. I got it.

In addition to addressing citizen law enforcement interactions and relations, the municipal court system and the organization of municipal government, which three areas of disparity are also important to you? Select three. A, business ownership; B, child care; C, economic opportunity; D, education; E, family and community stability; F, health care; G, housing; H, racial and ethnic relations; I, transportation. Polling is now open. Select three. Okay. The top seem to come in. There's a tie between education and racial and ethnic relations, followed by economic opportunity.

Next question. On a scale of one to five, with five being very likely, how likely is it that racial and ethnic relations in the St. Louis
region will improve over the next three to five years?  A, very unlikely; B, unlikely; C, somewhat likely; D, likely; E, very likely.  Polling is now open.  About ten seconds left.  Nearly 50 percent of you think it's somewhat likely to change.

Next question, do you think racial and ethnic relations will always be a problem in the United States or that a solution will be worked out eventually?  A, will always be a problem, racial and ethnic relations; B, will be worked out eventually, racial and ethnic relations in the U.S.  Polling is now open.  Seventy percent of you think it will always be a problem.  So I will let you know that the next set of question will continue to ask about racial and ethnic relations.  As one meeting was completely dedicated to racial equity and reconciliation.  So we are interested in these.  I come to -- those are statements, for the sake of time, I'm going to read the A through E choices once.  So you choose your best answer.  So the first one, I tend to avoid conversations about race.  A is strongly disagree.  Meaning, I will talk about it any time; B, disagree; C, unsure; E, agree, excuse me, D, agree; E, strongly agree.  So I would rather not talk about it, conversations about race.  Okay.
A, strongly disagree; B, strongly agree. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. So 42 percent of you are very comfortable talking about race. About two percent of you are really not as comfortable talking about race.

I think reverse discrimination exists.

A, strongly disagree; B is strongly agree. If you are unsure what that is, put unsure. About ten seconds left. So nearly split between 33 percent strongly disagree and then there are 31 percent that do agree that reverse discrimination does exist.

I'm confident the St. Louis region will see improvements in race and ethnic relations.

Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Okay. So about 22 strongly disagree, nearly 30 are unsure and 33 percent agree that there will be improvements.

It is important to focus on black-white relations, given the racial demographics of this region. A, strongly disagree and E is strongly agree. Polling is open. Remember you have B, C and D. About ten seconds left. Polling is closed.

Forty-five percent agree, actually most of you agree, the majority of us agree.

It is important to -- this is the next question. It is important to focus beyond
black-white race relations. A, strongly disagree; B, disagree; C, unsure; E, agree -- D, agree, excuse me; E, strongly agree. Polling is open. The last one you enter is saved. About ten seconds left. Again, consistently we found this the last time that most agree with that, even though it is almost like a flip of the last one, to focus beyond black and white.

So the goal of our work should be achieving a colorblind society. A, strongly disagree; B, disagree; C, unsure; D, agree; E, strongly agree. Polling is open. Almost ten seconds left. Five seconds left. The get your answers in. Most strongly -- well, 40 percent strongly agree and then you have a range across. Excuse me, strongly disagree. Someone is up and someone is tired. You are staying with me, that's good. It was a test. You all passed.

Okay. The achievements of the civil rights era successfully eliminated racial barriers and created an even playing field. A, strongly disagree; E, strongly agree. Polling is open. Less than ten seconds. Most answers look like they are in. Seventy-two percent of you strongly disagree that we're not done.
People of color sometimes carry negative beliefs about themselves and other members of their race. A, strongly disagree; E, strongly agree. In that range. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Okay. Most agree with the statement, a majority.

White people in the United States enjoy benefits and privileges that people of color do not have. A, strongly disagree; E, is strongly agree and then the range between that. Polling is now open. About ten seconds left to have it answered. Okay. Most people agree. A majority agree, a clear majority.

What comes closest to your definition of racism? Pick the best one for you. A, prejudice plus power; B, overt discrimination from one person or group to another person or group; C, negative attitudes and behavior; D, prejudice. So we are asking you to pick one, your best answer. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Five seconds for those two people. Okay. Nearly 60 percent of you have identified prejudice and power as your definition of racism.

What comes closest to your definition of privilege? A, systematic advantage; B, being
blessed; C, getting lucky; D, unearned benefits.

Polling is now open. Please select one. About ten seconds left. Five seconds. Nearly 85 percent of you identified systematic advantage as the definition of privileged. Okay.

Now, we're getting into the health. So we completed the racial and ethnic ones. So for those three percent that are very uncomfortable discussing race, that is kind of put to the side for a moment and now we are going into health. Okay. So I'm not making fun -- So what three issues have the greatest impact on our community's health and well-being, three issues. So I'll read it slowly because there are three. A, insurance coverage; B, ability to pay for health services; C, environmental hazards, like air pollution; D, neighborhood safety; E, distance to the health care provider; F, ability to understand and use health information; G, access to fresh fruits and vegetables; H, stress; I, healthcare that is sensitive to cultural differences. Do people feel like they have the three in their minds? Should I read it again? Do people feel good about that? Okay. Let's open it. Polling is now open. Please select three. Remember, A, insurance; B ability to pay; C,
environmental hazards. About ten seconds left. It looks like some people have just abstained. Five seconds. Okay. So our top issues, it looks like the ability to pay is first, followed by neighborhood safety, followed by stress. Which is closely followed by insurance coverage, if we had four, but we don't.

All right. Next. What three issues have the greatest impact on our community's ability to access health care services? So here we are looking at ability. A, having health insurance; B, cost of healthcare; C, transportation; D, finding a provider or doctor that will see you; E, understanding how to find your way through the healthcare system; F, limited hours of clinics or doctors; G, being able to get time off from work and H, how long -- excuse me, long wait before the doctor will see you or before seeing the doctor.

People got that? All right. Polling is open. You have about 20 seconds left. I think it's about the same for the last question. I think we can stop it. Okay. The top answers, the first answer is cost of health care is number one followed by having health insurance and then following, is understanding how to find your way through the health care system, is
-- those are the clear three. So now we have about
14 more questions. Just kidding. Just kidding.
Polling is now done. Okay. It wasn't so bad.
Okay. So if you can raise your hand,
if you have a key pad in hand, please return those.
So we'll have lovely volunteers, if you can pass it
to your aisles. Not the center, but to your sides.
We have volunteers that will be collecting them. We
do have to count those. They don't do anything, but
work the polling. So, thank you. Tap your neighbor
if they forget. All right. Thank you. Now, I'm
going to leave you in the very capable hands of our
managing director, Bethany Johnson-Javois, to give
you the recap from the last meeting.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: We're
going to change that due to time. Please feel free
to stay, because we are going to start doing
breakouts. So for tonight, again, my name is
Bethany Johnson-Javois, Managing Director of the
Ferguson Commission. And we want to now shift.
It's time to hear from community. So we thank all
of those who signed up for open mike. And just
imagine that for the next 30 minutes you are going
to do open mike, but in three specific small groups.
So we're going to explain it in this way. We will
have one breakout that focuses on one of our topics, that is crosscutting racial equities and reconciliation. That working group is number -- which one, Monique? Okay. So racial equity and reconciliation is meeting number one. And before you move, just hold on just a second. Number two, we are intersecting two of our working groups, because this work does intersect. There is a lot of cross-pollination with the issues. So economic and equity and child well-being are infused into one breakout session. So for economic and child well-being infusion, that is breakout number two, which is here to my left. Breakout number two, economic and equity and child well-being together. And the final one, citizen law, for citizen law relations and municipal courts and governance are infused as well in number three.

We would like to say this, you can absolutely self-select; but we would love for each of the breakout groups to reflect the diversity in the room, however that meets. Whether it's experiential or physical diversity, we would love to see that. So please do self-select, but it's important that we capture various perspectives and voices. So please, at this time, facilitators, if
you would take your place at one, two, and three.

And please do, audience and commissioners, go one, two, or three for our discussion for 30 minutes.

(Breakout sessions).

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: How many had good contented conversation coming from your working groups? Did you get your point across? Were you able to express yourself St. Charles people? The answer is yes. I'm happy to hear that.

Great. Okay, will do. Being in a gymnasium probably contributed a little bit to that as well.

Absolutely, good feedback. So again, my name is Bethany Johnson-Javois. We have reached the portion of each commission session, just a little bit of context as our commissioners finalize their comments. Each time that we meet in a different location, we share the information that was gathered at a prior session, we talk about. So the feedback that you have presented tonight will be typed up and will be put into public record. It also will be infused into the thoughts of our working groups that continue to meet and convene over the next month and a half to finalize calls to action and recommendations. You'll also notice that all the comments that you made in public open mike are typed
up for the public record and will be shared at our
next Ferguson Commission meeting so that people
understand what happened here in St. Charles. And
that information is up, so if you have additional
comments to share or you have other information for
us, please fell free to see one of the staff and to
write up your public comment. So at this time, this
is the commission planning and administration
section of the meeting. This is the time in which
commissioners get a chance with audience seeing and
viewing the content to take a look at what has been
generated out of our working groups.

Tonight, we will be looking at
information provided by Citizens From Child
Well-Being & Educational Equity. And if you will,
Ms. Becky James-Hatter, raise your hand so that
people can see that Ms. Hatter is the c-chair for
the Child Well-Being working group for which, we're
grateful. Second, we will also hear from Citizen
Law Enforcement Relations. Chief Dan Isom and
Commissioner Brittany Packnett are the co-chairs.
If you would, raise your hand, so that people can be
familiar with you. We will hear a constant detail
from them as well as from Municipal Courts and
Governance calls to action. Commissioner T.R. Carr
is co-chair who is here tonight. If you would, please T. R., raise your hand, so that people can identify you. In addition to those three things, will be two final action items tonight, the approval of minutes from our last meeting and approval of the revised budget. With that, I would like to turn it over to the co-chairs to provide context and to shepherd us through this process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very much Bethany. We will take on the three work groups that have been named. We're actually going to take them in a bit of a different order. So we have some recommendations from some things that have worked through the working groups and have bubbled up. We have been a committed since the beginning that as things have been legislated and processed through working groups, we will present them as they are ready and provide some process of base to the commission and to the community about the discussions that are going on within working groups. In order to provide that opportunity tonight, there are a number of things that have come up from working groups, and some of them are timely. So we want to create space to discuss those. We recognize and appreciate the members of each of these working
groups here tonight. So what we're going to do is actually we're going to start with the Municipal Courts and Governance working group. We recognize that one of our co-chairs, Reverend Traci Blackmon is not with us. She had to have a decent reason not to be with us. She's in meetings with the Pope in the Vatican. I mean, I tried hard, you know; but she is out of the country. And so, we do have a block of recommendations from the Municipal Courts and Governance working group.

Commissioners, we note that there may be some issues that you need more information on. So as we go through each of these, we'll ask you to give attention. If there's something you want to pull out because you need further information, please note that. If there's something that you are unready on, then we will not move things that the commission is not ready for or ready to move on. So some of this stuff you have heard in conversation and dialog before. Some things you have not. So if there is any unreadiness, we will ask each time, if there is any unreadiness within the block, we can take things out, table them, get you more information, and save those for action on June 22. What we will attempt to do is make sure we can
answer any questions in interim, such that on June 22, because there will be more issues, we can move these items as consent if they have not been amended. And if it's just something where you need more information. Does that make sense to everybody? I want to check with Commissioner Gore because he knows his legal stuff.

COMMISSIONER GORE: Yes, sir. So I'm a member of the municipal courts working group and I was not able to attend last week because I was out of town. But having spoke with some working group members this evening who were there, it's my understanding they didn't understand that there were going to be any -- they thought there was going to be another meeting before calls to action were put forward. So I'm just concerned about that point.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I think there's a couple of working group members here who can speak to that if given the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I think this is a good point for and I was just made aware of a little confusion in communication personally where I wasn't in the loop here. Perhaps that is something we can have a co-chair, T. R. Carr, to present; and then we
can talk about, perhaps begin talking about process before getting into the calls to action. Is that okay, Mr. Carr?

COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay, good. We invite Commissioner Carr to come to present for his group, Governance and Courts working group beginning with some conversation about process and where we are before we get to calls of action.

COMMISSIONER CARR: What I might begin by saying is that this has been one of the more interesting processes that we've ever been involved in, in terms of diverse opinions, differing attitudes, the issues, trying to find agreement. Trying to find common ground, where in many respects, common ground is, in fact, elusive. We've had a number of working group meetings. At everyone one of those working group meetings, I think I used the word, interesting, engaged, to describe the level of discussion that occurred. Interesting and engaged means that there was significant viewpoints that were not, that were not consistent. This group did not participate in what I call group think. We were individuals. And the groups, in fact, did
represent a fairly diverse opinion. One of the issues that we have grappled with, is how do we come together with a set of recommendations by tonight that would we could present to the commission. We have a list. Traci prepared this following a meeting that I had with her after our last work group session. The -- we sent a little email out to the different members of the commission. My understanding is not everybody received it, so probably might be wise for me to get together with Monique to do another final poll of members of the work group. What I can say, is what we present this evening doesn't please anybody completely. Items that are on their recommendation, some people like, some people don't like. What I can say is that as you go down the list, we have decided that this is probably the best that we can do. At the same time, I would not minimize the extent of change that can be achieved as a result of these -- as a result of these recommendations.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So Commissioner, there was question Commissioner Gore asked about process on the recommendations; and I think there was a question, also, about meetings.

COMMISSIONER CARR: The question is
should we have a follow-up meeting. Following our last meeting, a number of individuals indicated they will be out of town. Summer vacation is beginning to hit. We were initially trying to schedule a meeting for June 16. We don't know that will, in fact, be possible. Any follow-up meeting will probably have to be after the next commission meeting, and that will be after June 22 and probably sometime into July. That's probably what we are looking at. At the same time, if you, if the members of the commission look at the comprehensiveness of the listing of recommendations, there's all kinds of room for interpretation for expansion of these recommendations. So what might be an appropriate approach; and I, you know, it would be to send out another poll to members of the work group to confirm whether or not these recommendations represent a final set of recommendations that we can live with and that we can submit to the commission for its consideration. That would be my recommendation this evening.

   CHAIRMAN WILSON: So I want to just go back to Commissioner Gore and ask, has your question been -- has your inquiry been satisfied?

   COMMISSIONER GORE: I think, actually,
Brendon and Thomas might be the right people to speak to this, because I wasn't at the meeting last week. So I wasn't there when things were agreed to; but my general concern is that there is working group members who put a lot of time in this who don't feel that it's at the point where it's ready to be submitted to the commission. That's my primary concern.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Can I speak? I was at that particular meeting and feel that I have to speak as well that I was not again on the email for the vote for this particular issue. And I have spoken with Commissioner Carr on this. And I think that there was some miscommunication. I don't think anything was maliciously done. I think it was just, basically, bad communication where everyone didn't get the input that I think is necessary on something of this importance. So, I think we should go forward with our next meeting as already been approved by our working groups to try to clear up those loose ends. That was the decision that we made at the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I would like to just to make a comment here; and first of all, say that this working group has been very vigorous in
examining the issues. We put lots of issues on the
table. I think they’ve been moved forward to a
certain degree. I think Senate Bill 5 was a step
forward in response to some of the early calls to
action. So I have both a process suggestion and a
substantive suggestion. Speaking as one
commissioner, my view is that we don't go nearly far
enough in these recommendations and transformational
structural change. My own view is that there is
little chance that 82 municipal courts will be able
to implement even the provisions of Senate Bill 5
effectively and fairly. So several recommendations
deal with the supreme court, and asking the supreme
court working group to look at several things. But
I think, we can challenge both the supreme court
working group that's been announced as well as
potential subsequent legislative action to really
look at a transformational change in the structure
of our municipal courts in such a way that the
associate circuit court takes direct supervision in
order to address the separation of powers question
which was discussed earlier in one of the public
comments as well as efficiency in operating courts
in a way that provides fairness in equity, that I
think is just impossible in the current structure.
And the working group may not be able to come to an agreement on that point. In fact, I kind of hear that as part of the comment here. So my thoughts from a process point would be to ask -- as one commissioner and we will see if others have any agreement -- to ask the working group to do one more meeting. I think it will probably need to be face-to-face or at least a telephonic conference call where you can get everybody to the table and try to tackle this question of transformation change and structural change. That would be my thought. So that issues like unconstitutional jailings and issues about does Senate Bill 5 go far enough. And issues should the supreme court as a matter of their authority, which they have, restructure the courts under the associate circuit court, so that separation of powers and efficiency and fairness come to the table. If you all can wrestle with those and come to a conclusion, realizing you have tried mightily so far, that would be great. If not, come back and say we couldn't really come to some place on this. And then, I think it can come upon the full commission to take on that task and decide whether we wish as a commission to make that as an amendment to the recommendation. So both a process
point and a substantive point.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very much,
Commissioner McClure. I think I would agree about
what the principles are on making sure that we go
and live up to the values that we laid out up front,
right? They've got to be unflinching, that we are
focused on transformational change, that we won't to
be intentional about community input and take it
seriously. While we do not delegate the work of the
commission just to the work groups, we do want to
take that work seriously. Brendon on Thomas, I do
want you all to be able to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Too far away to
be heard by the court reporter) we agreed to meet
again. I'm happy to hear the commission say that
we're going to meet again. We agreed last time that
we were going to meet on June 16. Everybody agreed
to it; and then there was a subsequent meeting,
apparently, among the co-chairs, and an email sent
out, not to everybody. I appreciate everything you
all said. I'm glad we're going to meet again and
take this issue seriously, as we've been charged to
do. It's the one issue that this commission has a
genuine chance to make real transformational change.
And I feel like the proposals we put forth so far
are cowardly and don't go nearly far enough. And
don't even barely begin to reflect the concerns of
the community that we're supposed to represent, that
you are supposed to represent, asked us to address
so thank you so much for seeing that and recognizing
we need to meet again, at least one last time, to
try to do something right.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you, very much.

So we have two parts here. We have a proposed
course of action for the commission itself.

COMMISSIONER CARR: If I might
interrupt you, then what we will do is we will seek
to reconvene and make then this presentation on June
22. That would probably be the most appropriate
course of action. At that time, we will look at the
issue of consolidation, looking at recommending
consolidation of municipal courts such as, I don't
know, Kirkwood and Webster Groves, other municipal
courts. I don't know, but we will reconvene the
group; and we will see what we can do in terms of
recommendations that may or may not be appropriate.
We'll go as far as we can go, and we will give a
report to the commission that reflects the attitudes
that are expressed by the members of the working
group. Because these individuals were selected.
Everybody was selected. We have individuals from our city embedded together from municipal courts or mayors. We have everybody. We have citizens on this group, they put a lot of the work into it, and we're trying to do our best the arrive at something, number one, justice; and number two, confidence in this court system. That's our unflinching command.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Just so there's no confusion, my thought on this, speaking just as one commissioner is that we're not talking about combining a couple of three municipal courts. Twenty-four-one is working on that. Good for them. I think that's good progress, but I think the separation of power issue, the issues of fairness and efficiency call for a much more transformational approach. Again, just my view; and I would encourage the working group, if you can, to continue to wrestle with that. And if you can get to a conclusion, that would be great. If you can't, come back and tell us and we'll take it up to the commission level and work and see what the commission's will is. That's my thought.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Okay. We'll make a presentation then on June 22. And with the permission of the commission, we will reconvene our
working group and see what we can come up with.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: My thought would be

let's let working with the staff determine what the
right timing is. So you make sure you get all the
views at the table; and if that can happen by the
22nd, that would be great. The staff will shoot me
for saying it because Bethany, Monique and others
are pushing this toward time lines and deadlines.
And that's what all the working groups have felt,
but I think it's important that we get this one
right.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner

Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Just one
further clarification. When I read through the
proposed calls to action -- and I realize that there
will be another working group meeting, which I'm
very pleased to support -- the language is not
particularly reflective of anything that I would
call to be prescriptive. So when legislation is
introduced, in order for it to go into effect, the
word, shall, is used. Everything in these call to
action recommendations is should. It's very weak
language. And if that is not reflected or if that
is reflected in the total feelings of the work
group, then that's something as a commissioner, I'll have to deal with. And I'm curious about how that came to be, that the language is relatively weak, and it's not particularly prescriptive.

COMMISSIONER CARR: What I would do is respond saying that's the language that was used in the work group itself. And if the commission wants stronger language, we will deal with that, present that as an alternative for members of the work group to see if they want to go in that direction. I'm not sure that we will be able to move in that direction, but we will deal with this. Part of it is nothing effects the public more than looking at the structure of government. Nothing effects the public more than dealing with these things and trying to decide the issue of local control. Just to -- at our meeting back at St. Louis University, you pointed out that municipal governments do have this -- they do have the power under the Constitution of their state law to create courts. Citizens do have the power of the ballot box to disincorporate their cities. City -- citizens have that power.

There's no reason for any municipality to exist if the citizens do not want that
municipality to exist. They can vote to
incorporate. Most of these cities were incorporated
before 1940. They've been inherited. They still
exist and they can go away within a very short
period of time. We've had a couple of
municipalities disincorporate in St. Louis County by
a vote of the public. That's an option. You know,
we will look at that and bring that back. We'll
look at the issue in terms of separation of powers.
Just to deal with that, most municipal governments
--- I'm not defending municipal courts. What I'm
saying is that, if you look at the model that is
followed by the United States, the President
nominates and the senate confirms members of the
judiciary. At the state level, we follow a similar
model, where the executive nominates, the senate
confirms. We follow that same model at the
municipal court level. It's nominated by typically
the mayor and approved by the council. It's the
executive branch nomination, the city counsel
affirmation. So we have that issue. One of the
issues that we have is -- and I'll say one of the
questions that we have is, is that particular
approach sufficient. The question is, if you are
not going to have elected officers nominate -- you
have some courts in which the judge is in fact elected. I believe the City of Florissant, the public elects the municipal judge. In some cases. But at the same time, the Missouri plan, if I were to ask members of the commission, at the last general election, when you went down the list looking which judge to retain, you know, are you aware of those judges. Most people are not aware of the role of a judge, because judges keep themselves out of politics.

In Illinois, for example, at the last general election, one of the members of the Illinois Supreme Court was re-elected by a vote of, I think, 66 percent, something like that. But the requirement for retention was a little over 60 percent. You know, so, he won by a very narrow margin. So one of the issues -- and I'm not minimizing. Please understand I'm not minimizing the issue of separation of powers, nor am I minimizing the issue of accountability. The question is, how do we do this. And our -- if this is the will of the commission, we'll take it back and we will look at it and come back with recommendations. Because any time we deal with these things, the heart of the matter is in the
CHAIRMAN WILSON: And this is where we greatly appreciate and want to express appreciation for the work of the members of the working group and you, as the co-chair of the working group. And on the process point, while a co-chair speaks respectfully with one voice, you have also noted on the process point, that it will go back to the working groups. Rather than further legislate this, since we have so many actions to bring forward, we'll appreciate and respect that decision from you as one of the co-chairs of the working group. And invite, of course, robust, continued engagement from the working group; and for commissioners, who have already received a set of recommendations, which we honor are not quite ready for recommendation at this point to be able to provide feedback to you and to Reverend Blackmon and other members of the working group. So that you might bring back these kind of transformative recommendations consistent with the values that were laid out as a commission. And do so in an unflinching manner. Which he is a word we continue to use.

COMMISSIONER CARR: We will, in fact, do that. And as we look at the issue of the
structure of the municipal courts, we will look at possible recommendations for the commission to consider. We'll have a laundry list, you know, so that you can look at what might this thing look like. Because we have to be very, very careful. I live in the real world of politics as a former mayor. So, what are we going to do? It's one thing to be generous.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Respectfully, Commissioner Carr, if we're not going to move on this, let's move on to the things we can move on. But we note, we've laid out principles. We follow those principles. We recognize there are all kinds of implications. And yes, the commission is ready to act on the models that are sent. That's what we asked for. And if there's not agreement and consensus within the working group, that's what we're here for. So we ask you to process it, bring it to us, and then we will be able to make some decisions about the policies, recommendations, and the models. Some of us perhaps are -- maybe we're not, because we don't live in that same world. But our call and our commitment is to work toward transformation, and to do so and not think about what can happen but what should happen. That's what
we'll work to. We do appreciate your work.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll just apprise the commission that a lot of changes are in play right now in terms of municipal courts. Senate Bill 5 passed and is awaiting the governor's signature. That will involve a series of rules to be issued by the state supreme court to implement. Because the law is passed, but it requires supreme court rules to actually implement the provisions of Senate Bill 5. I attended a conference of 385 municipal court judges around the state. The chief justice of the Missouri Supreme Court and several members of the supreme court were there. They have created a blue ribbon panel of individuals to look at operations of municipal courts. There will be a significant change in the offering there. The Administrative Office of State Courts has created a secured funding to look at three municipal courts, one in St. Louis, one in central Missouri, one in southern Missouri, to issue a report looking at best practices for a municipal court. So we have a whole series of external events that are, that will have a profound impact on it. And St. Louis County has secured a grant to look at unnecessary incarceration.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We honor those events
and we are going to move to the next item on the agenda. We honor those events. Those events do not stop us from needing to do our work. They create a context in which we still need to make recommendations and we still push forward and put forth models that are consistent with our values. So we honor those events. Some of us, and I think you know, are engaged in those events. But this commission still has to do its work in putting forth unflinching recommendations for transformation that will change for this community and we'll do that. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER CARR: That's the context with which we share a recommendation.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: I'm just curious whether or not there's been any consideration around eligibility, appointment, election of municipal judges and prosecutors in the working group. If there's a discussion. Or are we addressing that at all? The qualifications of municipal judges and prosecutors, is that part of this work? I'm just curious.
COMMISSIONER CARR: (The court reporter is unable to hear the commissioner's response.)

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So, it's noted they have to be determined by state law. There is some consideration of that in the recommendations here; but again, we note that they are not ready. So we'll ask now for the co-chairs from Citizen and Law Enforcement Relations to come to present.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Chief Isom and I just had a quick chat. We already knew we were going to have a second meeting, not a second, an additional meeting in the coming week. We haven't kind of finished working through some additional bases that are not getting addressed in the calls to action we have before you. We also realize we wanted to make sure that there was a time to add more specific language to what is in front of you. Right now, we're asking for approval of general principles of calls to action. And that we are going to take these back to the working group and propose some more specified language that we will bring back to you on June 22. But any feedback you have on these particular calls to action will be informative for that conversation.

Here are our working group members. I
will move quickly forward given the hour. Did I do that? Thank you. I will move quickly forward given the time. We previously approved calls to action in the areas of use of force, civilian oversight, anti-bias and other police training. There are also items related to these four bullets here and the proposed calls to action. And they will be continued to be discussed in our future meeting. We have decided to leverage consensus-based decision making, given this would is the number one issue for folks across all the counties and municipalities. And we are also seeing that was confirmed this evening. So reaching a point of consensus in both the spirit of the call to action and the actual letter and language of the call to action has been important to us. We've been leveraging many experts and staff that have submitted recommendations grounded in preliminary research that were then discussed, amended, and approved. And then, also, public input with real-time community polling has been leveraged in our working group meetings, as well.

So first priority area around use of force, we have a couple of, again, not exhaustive calls to action that we would like for your approval
of. Again, the spirit and the principle of them and any feedback that you have as we return to our working group with conversations. The first is police departments should revise their policies on use of force to authorize only the minimal force necessary to achieve law enforcement goals and protect officer and citizen safety. I think perhaps there is a discussion around more specific language around law enforcement goals. But the spirit of this is that we will be encouraging police departments to authorize minimal force instead of maximum force.

The second in this section is that police departments across the state should revise policies on use of force in instances when officers should withdraw from dangerous situations rather than engage, right. So using the opportunity to call for back-up, etc. It's -- the technical term is tactical withdraw. We want to make sure that is duly highlighted into department policies. And last in this section, that Missouri should make a publicly available statewide data base on use of force policies both for internal use and the general public's use. I'll stop -- should I -- there's a big block here. Should we stop here maybe and
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I think as a matter of approach and to reiterate the process that Starsky outlined, we'll take these each individually, highlight them quickly, in these. And if you would like more information on any one of them, if you have a question you would like to ask now, that's perfectly appropriate. If you would like to follow-up with email to the staff, that's appropriate. What I hear you asking for is, is the commission ready to directionally approve these and say these are the spaces we want you in, subject to the wordsmithing. Or would you prefer to just do it all at one point down the road. So I'll just open it to the commission for questions on use of force or comments. Commissioner Gore.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I just have a comment. When I looked at these, one point of confusion I had was, this is not inclusive of all of the calls to action that have been made by this group. This is just the calls of action that are being put forward this evening. For instance, I know early on, we put forth the call for action to have the statute, the use or force statute amended in order to bring it into compliance with the
Constitution and supreme court rulings. That's not in here, but that's because that's already been put through the group.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I'm looking at this one, but.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes, exactly.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I was just pointing out that it's a point of confusion.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: To build on that point, there was a recommendation, call to action, already approved and announced on police training as it relates to use of force tactics.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Which doesn't mean, again, that we have exhausted all of the calls to action in any particular priority area; but we are putting forth the ones that we've discussed with the working groups since that time.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other questions or comments on use of force? Felicia, Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: I would just like to know if these calls to action, because I know that you've done a lot of really good work around enhanced training, professional development.
So like in this call to action, is there a complementary training for de-escalation or tactical withdrawal embodied in that somewhere. So we've got a policy complemented by training.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I think it is probably implied but not necessarily explicit, so we will take that back to the working group. I appreciate that suggestion.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other questions of comments? Okay. So what is the rule of the group? Are you ready to approve this as directionally correct? Okay, let me ask one of the co-chairs to make a motion to that effect.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Motion.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay, there's a motion to second. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Board members respond aye).

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: The Next area is first and mass demonstration. Of course, this is a very important topic to both the community and the
Citizen Law Enforcement Relations group. I will say that as recent as last week, Brittany and I had a meeting with the coalition to get their comments about what needed to be added to -- the Don't Shoot Coalition -- adding to this area. So similar to the other calls, there will be some either added language an maybe even some added action items in this area as we kind of collate all the information that they provided because our meeting lasted for, I think, almost two hours. So it was a lot of information to process. But what we have so far is that police departments across the state should clarify incident command systems for the public in situations where multiple law enforcement agencies and first responders are present. So there's a lot of discussion.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: It's on the bottom of the slide.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: So, of course, there was a lot of discussion and confusion about incident command systems, not only from the public standpoint; but also within police departments as well. So that's the first call to action. The second one is police departments across the state should enter into mutual aid agreements with
neighboring agencies in other jurisdictions. So there should be some kind of formal process in which police departments who will enter into these incident command or mutual aid structures will have a game plan in place before an incident occurs. So we would have that call to action as well. And then, in the last portion, we ask that police departments across the state should implement community-wide reality based training for incidents requiring the involvement of multiple law enforcement agencies. So a lot of discussion about police departments' training for these types of events together. It's consistent with natural disasters, where police departments have these mock training sessions. We believe these three -- and we will have more to add to this area -- these three are very important calls to action that will help in this issue of approaches to mass demonstration.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Over my dead body. (Speaker continues to speak but is too far away for the court reporter to hear.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Why don't we let the commissioners ask questions here and see if the direction of the commission.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm going to
present a letter I sent to the governor outlining
the problems why -- (Speaker continues to speak but
is too far away for the court reporter to hear.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: We're very pleased
to have the letter and we will certainly take it
into consideration. Let's see if the commissioners
have questions of comments on this section.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I have a question and
I recommend that we do something similar here that
we did before. I think you've already kind of
teased it up, because more conversation happened.
So I'll just get to the process point first. I
think this is an appropriate area for us to go do
more work, as you've noted you would already in your
conversation with the Don't Shoot Coalition and
others to do so. So, invite us to prepare it and
bring it back rather than acting on it today from a
process standpoint, if you are open to that.

The second thing I want to ask, because
of recent incidents with smaller groups,
particularly when grassroots actions have dissipated
is whether we have a definition for mass to go with
demonstrations. And I would invite us to be
expansive -- not exactly expansive. Expansive in
how we think about mass demonstrations; but
actually, to be thoughtful about smaller groups and having rules of engagement for smaller groups that apply as well. I don't know if there's something that triggers it being mass.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: It might be better to just eliminate the mass and just say approach to demonstrations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Civilians should make those decisions on policy.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So we're civilians here. I would agree with that. Because I think the concerns raised about small group actions and police activity should be able to be addressed in the actions.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: That's also the reason why we want to review the use of force with additional specificity. Because the incident to which you are referring, that actually wasn't a small demonstration. That was people leaving a demonstration. At which time, these added recommendations wouldn't be applicable. So, both of those places are things we are going to revisit.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So as I understand, the suggestion here is to pull this out and not take a vote on the directional, because you are working
on model policies, you are thinking about different elements of this. So we perhaps see it in a little more detail, we'll do that then.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Next area.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Sharing is caring. Okay. So to Commissioner Gore's question, we are now adding some additional things to an area of police training specifically around anti-bias and cultural competency training. The first suggested call to action is that police departments across the state revise their policies to emphasize experience-based self-awareness through continually different personal interactions with community representatives, leaders, and youth. So this call to action is essentially a recognition of the fact that the best anti-bias and cultural competency training does not happen in a classroom or in a textbook but is based on the relationships that are built and the experiences that are had across diverse communities.

The second one is that police departments across the state should revise their anti-bias training protocols by applying new
learning approaches to understand bias and its influence on community service. Once again, recognizing that as a scholarship and academic work on anti-bias training has continued to evolve, that the practices of local police departments should evolve as well. So that one is now open to discussion.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Questions or comments here? I would note that this was also a topic of the police training proposal that's already been agreed to by the commission and announced.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So, we're looking for directional approval if this is where the commission believes the working group should be headed. So I will take your statement as a motion to that effect. Is there a second? Second. All those in favor please say aye.

(Board members respond aye.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And opposed.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: The next priority area is specific to community policing. And the first call to action is that police departments should integrate independent civilian evaluation into routine departmental operations,
including input on individual officer citizen interaction and policing strategic plans. So this is different than the -- sorry, I thought there was another one. This is different than kind of a typical civilian review board, right. We're talking about a civilian evaluation process for routine departmental operations and kind of day-to-day operations as well as individual interaction.

The second is that police departments should revise policies directing internal administration to facilitate more positive police community interaction, social service experience for officers and required community building field time. So in the same way that officers are building tactical skills in the field, they should be building relationship building and community oriented skills in the field as well. Lastly, that police departments across the state should implement community-wide, reality-based training for incidents requiring the involvement of multiple law enforcement agencies. This is similar to what was in the last section, yes, on demonstrations. But specifically, around, again, day-to-day community oriented policing and making sure that law enforcement agencies are being collaborative in that
training. So this section is now open for
discussion.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Could you
elaborate on point nine? I'm not quite sure how
that would work.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Sorry, which
one is point nine? I don't have it in front of me.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: I'm sorry, the
police departments across the state would integrate
independent civilian evaluation into routine
departmental operations. Just that -- I'm not sure
what the intent is or what's the.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: So, it is
essentially this idea that actually was just given
from Scotty. That the community should have input
or what those policies and practices are and should
also periodically be providing evaluation about how
those practices are going in their community. So
versus a civilian review board that reviews very
specific incidents that are brought before it, the
community should have a consistent input and
evaluation process to say here's how I feel my
department is doing. Here's how I feel that they
are being community oriented or not. And here are
the suggestions I have moving forward.
COMMISSIONER ISOM: So in some way, the community should have a way of evaluating the police department that serves them. And then, more specifically, there should be a process where on an ongoing basis that police departments are able to evaluate individual police citizen contacts. So I'm a police officer on the street. How do I evaluate how I'm interacting with the public as an individual officer. So it's two levels. A broader level, how is the police doing. Independently evaluating that, getting citizen feedback like we're doing here, and then there's more specifically those one-on-one officer citizen contacts. Periodically or in some ways evaluating those to see how individual officers are relating to the public.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Is this model being used anywhere else?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: The City does a little bit of this. In terms of individual contact, they are starting to do it. Most police departments will do some kind of annual or bi-annual community evaluation of their police department. So it's fairly common. I think St. Louis County --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: (Court reporter unable to hear the commissioner's comments).
COMMISSIONER ISOM: So it's a way of the police department to evaluate itself, and the citizens get feedback on how the police department is doing.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: The individual citizen evaluation does happen at the federal level, so that's a bit of what we talked about replicating.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other questions.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Quick question. A number of these police departments across the state, was there consideration given to prioritizing of the rankings for police departments since that is kind of stratified based upon county size? So was it thought in the working group to making it specific to police departments within our county designation? I'm not suggesting there should be. I just want to see if that was part of the consideration.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I think you can, you can add to this, but I think the consensus is generally that a lot of what we're talking about here is how to find best practice. So what is good for one should be good for all.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: One thought to build on that would be, however, to express that this would be good for ever police department; but
particularly for police departments of this kind or with these populations. I think what helps us get to a prioritization. So they are focused, first would be on these; and in fact -- I have a question on call to action regarding policies. It seems to me that there are a number of really good models on community policing and, Commissioner Isom, this has been a part of the study that you and your colleagues have done at the University of Missouri St. Louis. I think we're going to have the opportunity to hear from Cincinnati and see their model policy. So, we talked about revising policies. I wonder if we might not as a further iteration that might move us into implementation but even as part of the working group, consider model policies, because we've already called for training to those policies. If we might make some suggestions here that might help police departments move this down the road.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Be more specific, yes.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Absolutely with that.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay, so the same question would be before us here. I'll take
co-chairs presentation as a recommendation that the
direction of this is the way we wish to ask them to
precede with the changes we've made. Is there a
second? Second. All those in favor, please say,
aye.

(Board members respond aye.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And opposed?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: So the last to
areas, accreditation, which has been an issue that
has come up. This has largely been taken care of by
the legislation, but we decided to go ahead and
enter it into our recommendations. And at a
minimum, police departments across the state should
be required to adopt community oriented policing
standards endorsed by CALEA. CALEA is the
commission on police department accreditation. It's
the largest accreditation body for police
departments. We recommended that police departments
-- and this would be that community policing model
piece, that police departments would at least adopt
their community policing model. Which would be
integrated into these other calls to action in terms
of community policing.

The last area is civilian oversight.

And this is broken up into a couple of different
categories. There was some discussion about how these should be structured. We have 61, 62 different police departments. We have civilian office oversight bodies for all 61. One was that municipalities, community organizations, municipal government should establish independent, civilian oversight boards designed to meet the unique needs of each municipality. And then the other call to action was counties across the state should establish independent civilian oversight boards designed to manage municipal oversight boards and civilian investigations, particularly when local efforts cannot sufficiently address incidents under review. So we added two layers. One for the local level, but also another layer at the County level to assist in that process of oversight. Because there was a lot of discussion about independence. Is there sufficient independence if you have an oversight body simply within the local municipalities. So the call to action was a two-tiered system. Then finally, the Ferguson Commission should exercise its influence in a national platform to support the passage of the Protecting Communities and Police Act of 2015. The ones proposed by senator Claire McCaskill.
What I might add before we go into these other two areas -- well, before we discuss these last two areas -- is that we didn't have anything either in the community policing space or accreditation about consolidation of police forces. So I just mention that to the commission as another item that is kind of looming out there that really has not been addressed. And in thinking about it, I think it should be something that we address in our recommendations. Just as we've tried to address it in the court process as well.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So why don't we divide the questions here. We have two areas that are here, the minimum standards on community oriented policing, which you said is largely taken care of by the legislation but you wanted to call out, particularly, the community oriented policing which relates to the prior point; and then the civilian oversight. Why don't we see if there are questions or comments in those areas. And then perhaps, well, you started down the road, what should we add. Commissioner Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: My question, in terms of what you just mentioned, we've been focusing on the municipal courts as being too many
of the municipal courts. And recommendations have been asked about consolidation of some of those courts. Have -- in your commission meetings, has that issue came up that anybody has proposed that or is that -- I mean, I think, it's 61 police departments. I was just listening to the county executive here in St. Charles County, and he says he has seven police departments to have to deal with. I think that would be a luxury for most people to have to just deal with seven verses 61.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I would say it hasn't kind of systematically come up in our working group meetings, but as you just addressed, it has come up in full commission meetings and other working groups. We want to make sure that it's on the table at our next meeting given we have not gotten to that particular priority area.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Just a quick question about the municipality should establish independent civilian oversight boards designed to meet the unique needs of each municipality. Was it the intention of the work group that it should be read that way as opposed to just establishing
civilian oversight review boards? Why do we need --
why do they need to be designed specifically to meet
unique needs of each municipality? It seems to me
that we are, again, getting into a discussion where
we are specializing and sort of boutiquing civilian
review boards.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Well, I mean our
preference was that we could provide a strict model
policy for civilian review, but the problem is that
each municipality sometimes has a very unique
governing structure. And there is isn't one
particular way that you establish civilian
oversight. In St. Louis County, civilian oversight
might be a board of police commissioners. In Kansas
City, there is one administrator who basically runs
their sort of civilian oversight. There could be,
like in St. Louis, an independent body that is
formed. And so, we couldn't come up with a process
that wouldn't be unique to everybody; but I
understand. Maybe we should just eliminate that.
Why do we have to even say that.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: I think my
question is, why do we need to call that out?
Because, obviously, if everyone is going to develop
their own civilian review board, they will be unique
to each municipality or entity that develops them.

Maybe I'm splitting hairs here.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: We'll do some more work on that.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Are there other comments or questions from the commissioners.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Again, I think this is reflective of not my complete understanding, but on 13 and 14, it's calling for the munies to establish the independent civilian oversight. And then the next one is about the counties. And so that seems -- and I'm, obviously, in favor of civilian oversight. It seems to be a doubling up in some ways. Maybe I'm missing the intersections. So, I just want to make sure we get that one really right as we are making. Because that's a pretty significant call.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: That essentially came out of a discussion around the concern of independence and trust that people had in their own municipalities to run a fully independent civilian review board. So the working group wanted to move forward with establishing kind of another body that would supercede the one in their own
municipality, so there would be some opportunity for correction, etc., if people deemed that necessary.

Did that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Sort of an appeals process. You have one layer, if you are not satisfied, you can go to the next.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: And also an accommodation for the citizens. Is that what I'm also hearing?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: So, could you be specific with the intent that there's an appeals process? Because it's sort of implied here, but if you said that the County was available like an appeals court -- that may not be the language you want -- but so that it's a step up in oversight.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: We'll absolutely put that forward. That's helpful, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And a further question that kind of relates to just the practicality of the authority that you create that it's got to have some authority. Right now, it wouldn't have authority over municipal courts. That may be implicit in your call.
COMMISSIONER ISOM: You are right. I don't know that there is any legal structure to establish this; but, you know, I don't know that we can necessarily be concerned with that other than to say that we have a call to action that municipalities would enter into agreements with the County to have this additional layer that citizens can go to to have, you know, have their voices heard.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I see.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: But it also could be an additional call to action to say there should be some types of legislation that would enable them to do this without sort of the blessing of the municipalities.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I have one question. A question and a bit of a correction, I think. On the question on the civilian oversight, whether you thought about defining power. Defining or considering models of civilian oversight. So do these need to have minimum standards if you are going to call it oversight. Does it need to have subpoena power? Does it need to have -- so are those things being considered? Is that something you want to, your goal is to kind of bring up as you
define civilian oversight as a model. And the other
was actually related to the last point. I think we
have our accountabilities a little off there. That
the accountabilities for the Protecting Communities
and Police Act should likely be the U.S. Senate and
the U.S. House of Representatives and also the
President, rather than these kind of state officers,
because it's federal legislation.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Oh yeah.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Could I make a
suggestion here subject to you all wanting to
approach it differently. There are, obviously,
several questions around this and I, for one, don't
know that I have enough information on the
Protecting Communities and Police Act of 2015. I
think I understand it, but I think it might be
better to have a little bit more. So, with your
approval, maybe we'll send this one back and not
take a directional vote now. If that's okay. Are
you all right with that?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I heard one area
that you are still working on, this is the whole
question of consolidation of police departments.
Are there other areas that any commissioner would
suggest that should be viewed here, so we can get them on the table at this time? Or certainly, a follow-up communication would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I'll just say one note we could add specifically. We've got a pretty detailed piece on the protecting police and communities that staff has that we can get out to everyone pretty quickly. So we can do that.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: One suggestion I would have is to building on the recommendation we've already made the call to action on officer wellness and support and the training on mental health issues. Just to make sure that gets here in the right place. It may be a separate area, or it may fit nicely into one of the areas altogether. But my suggestion would be to pull up the officer wellness and support work you've done and build on this.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: That's helpful. We will consider that as well. And then the bill, the federal bill we were discussing, I know it hadn't been mentioned, but that particular bill does cover issues of use of military weaponry by police departments. That is why you do not hear that specifically called out because it is included in
that bill. That was the greatest part of the
conversation around whether or not we were going to
approve that particular call to action in the
working group.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Good, thank you.

All right. Thank you, co-chairs. We appreciate the
hard work of this group as well as the others.

Child Well-Being & Educational Equity.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Good evening,
commissioners and St. Louis community and others.

Thank you, on behalf of the Child Well-Being &
Education Equity workforce. I am honored to present
for your review and acceptance 13 recommendations.

There are a couple of our recommendations that are
on a high level, that in the coming weeks and
certainly by June 22, we plan on giving you more
specifics. And in other areas we have very specific
calls to action tonight. I would like to remind you
of a couple of things, that five months ago our work
group came together and one of the first things that
we tackled was the idea of what is education equity.
The definition that we arrived at as a group, what
is it -- it is a measure of fairness, opportunity
and achievement. And I would like to ask you to
understand the sequence of those three words. That
we start with fairness, which leads you to
opportunity, which sets forth a real opportunity to
achieve. And as we went through our work, we did
that, pulling it through the eye of that needle to
decide where we would end. And so tonight, we have
five recommendations under the priority area of
fairness, opportunity, and achievement.

So our first recommendation is to ask
the governor to veto House Bill 42, the transfer
bill. Several months ago, our commission agreed to
send five requests to Jefferson City. And one of
the number one requests that we had was to please
cap the transfer, the tuition, put in the tuition
cap, to follow the vic. rate. We also said we
wanted high accountability and a number of other
things. The final bill is on the desk of the
governor, and we do not believe it meets the
standard of fairness. And we don't believe that it
presents an opportunity or a path for achievement
for all of our children. We do agree that children
who are not in accredited schools should be able to
go to an accredited school. We just don't believe
that the children who are left behind, should be
left out. And on top of those concerns, there are
new concerns in the bill that we could outline
tonight; but the truth of the matter is, we believe that this bill is not fair for the children that need us the most.

But in addition to that, we do believe that there are school districts that will come to the aid of these children. And we, therefore, ask, that the school districts negotiate reasonable transfer rates in the interest of all children. Allowing children that would go to the schools, accredited schools, from the unaccredited school districts and present a fair rate, so those that are left behind in the district, will not be in bankrupt districts and not have the support that they need.

The third recommendation we have regards the reform of rules that are disproportionately addressing concerns of behaviors, suspensions, expulsions. And, although, we do not have a complete list of recommendations at this time, we had a very successful meeting on Friday. We will be bringing those specific recommendations, not only based on the input of the expert testimony, but also we will be bringing it based on models from across the United States. And I will alert you that the same disproportionality that we are seeing in school -- I mean, in school behavioral referrals and
suspensions, are the same type of disproportionality we are seeing in municipal tickets and fines. And we look very forward, by the 22nd, to bring you specific recommendations.

Number four, we ask this commission to address, support the expansion of Access Missouri, which is a need-based scholarship. Last time, the economic equity and opportunity called for the child development account to give children an early start. Access Missouri will give our children a fair shot at the kind of opportunity they need to move forward. And number nine -- I mean number five, we are prepared and ask your support as we select and/or create a model that really sets forth a path for equity and excellence. We will be reviewing five different models funding the foundation formulas, revising the tax allocations, consolidating schools, unifying school districts or open enrollment zones. We are not prepared for that tonight, but I do want you to know that we will be selecting a model to ensure that. Those are our five recommendations tonight for fairness, opportunity and achievement.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Are there questions from any commissioners, regarding the
recommendations on House Bill 42, the negotiation of
transfer rates, the multitiered level of support for
students, reforming rules pertaining to
disproportionality of behavior, expansion of Access
Missouri? Those are the ones. Because the model is
not up, right?

MS. JAMES-HATTER: The model is not.
The meeting is on the 19th.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any questions?

Commissioner Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I have one
question about five, and I know that you are not
prepared to kind of walk us through what discussion
has been so far. Is there any reason why, like a
recovery school district model is not one of the
models we considered?

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Just hadn't made the
list, but it just did.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: So recovery
school district is new Orleans or --

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Got it.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: -- achievement
school district in Memphis. I'm not recommending
these necessarily.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Please put it on the
list. We will go through each one of them.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you. Other questions?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Two questions, while we are on five, and giving you some feedback. The first would be to incorporate a discussion or thought about outcomes. Part of what we are trying to get here is educational achievement and eliminating the achievement gap. So defining that and defining the focus on outcomes and how we get there. Those inputs would be one thought. On the second thought, I don't know if it fits here, we've had lots of discussions about school leadership, whether that maybe fit in a separate area that's another scenario you all are working on. The question is, how can St. Louis become a model for training great school leaders and retaining them in our schools. It may fit there or it may fit somewhere else. That would just be my thought to put on the record.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yeah, so we have five meetings scheduled over the next two weeks that pick up a number of issues, including human capital in education. And I think that we'll probably, certainly, these all overlap and intersect in
1 different ways. That may come into the real
2 innovation space as it goes to support this.
3
4 COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Does that -- is
5 the plan for those conversations, in particular on
6 human capital, be discussing anything around
7 evaluation or equality of human capital?
8
9 MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yes, ma'am.
10
11 CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Gore,
12 did you have a question?
13
14 COMMISSIONER GORE: Yes, sir. So my
15 question is kind of a process question. On number
16 five, where you have (inaudible) work, you are not
17 asking us to approve anything, you are just putting
18 us on notice that this is an area that you are going
19 to do additional work in.
20
21 MS. JAMES-HATTER: That's correct.
22
23 COMMISSIONER GORE: Okay.
24
25 MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yes. Well, I guess
26 we're asking you to support us going down this road.
27 That we are going to undertake it, undertake the
28 review of all of these models and come back with a
29 model that really guarantees equity.
30
31 COMMISSIONER GORE: And in addition to
32 whatever other models might come up during the
33 course of your work?
MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GORE: Then on bill, HB 42, I know that at a prior meeting you went over it with a bit more detail when it first kind of became public. Could you just give me a little bit more on that? So you object to -- they kept the transfer rate at the rate that it was currently, kind of what Normandy went through. Is that what the bill does?

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yes, so just -- our work group, yes, brought forth five different recommendations in order to -- that we were supporting in the transfer bill, to strengthen that bill, so that it would allow children to move from the unaccredited school district of Normandy or Riverview Gardens; but at the same time, would not bankrupt and further compromise the children that were left in those school districts. And on the five recommendations, only one was fully accepted. And then there were other things that were put in the transfer bill that gave us even more concerns. One of the clauses, which is called the clawback. Which is children that have already gone to accredited school district, according to House Bill 42, would be brought back to these unaccredited school districts for potentially, at least one
semester. Which we think, probably is going to be a legal challenge when you try to bring them back once they've gone to their school district. So there's a number of other things in there. I will just address virtual schools. I'm not -- I would say that our group is not anti-virtual schools or anything progressive, but there is certainly no accountability in there. So they did not put in place the accountability where it needed to be and certainly when they added in new ideas, they didn't put the accountability in there. So the cost, lack of accountability, and the clawback. And there's probably about ten other things that you could go to. But the commission approved, unanimously, the five recommendations we had; and the current bill sitting on the governor's desk, does not pick up where we left off in anyway. And therefore, for the children that will be left in the unaccredited school districts, our sense is that it's not fair, they won't have an opportunity and they will not achieve if we keep stripping them of any type of resources. CHAIRMAN WILSON: Other questions from the commissioners? So the working group is asking the commission to act on recommendations for the
veto of HB 42 the negotiation of reasonable transfer
rates among districts, really, kind of pursuant and
connected to that, the reform of rules pertaining to
school disproportionality and behavior referrals
suspensions, explosions, special education, advanced
courses and the expansion of Access Missouri. If
there's no unreadiness, then we'll take these as a
block. Is there any unreadiness on any of these
points? Then we'll take them as a block, receive
the recommendation from the work group. Is there a
second?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: All those in favor,
please notify by saying, aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any opposed? Any
abstentions? Thank you very much.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: And our second
priority area, child well-being, which we have
defined it as thriving youth. And you'll remember
that we've talked a lot about, that we've got too
many kids existing and our children need to be
thriving. And so we have four recommendations
there. The first one is to conduct a thorough and
inclusive review of the current operating model and
outcomes of the Missouri Family Support Division.
There was a lot of conversation in our work group, a lot of conversations from the medical community about access to the public supports and the new design of the family, Missouri Family Support. And so we know that this is a complicated system. And so we do not have recommendations on what needs to exactly happen, but we do ask that there be a thorough and inclusive review of the current model, the outcomes because we know that we are very concerned about the SNAP program, childhood subsidies, medicaid or the children and families that are in the most need, are they getting what they need? So we call for this review. The next one is to expand family -- parent supports education engagement and training. We've talked a lot about building adult capacities. This is that call to action, and certainly there will be more. We know that we have young people that are not getting the opportunities they need. We call for more. The expansion of internships and apprenticeships for our high school students and our college students to really give them those opportunities, again to thrive.

And the last one in this area, and I must disclose that I do have, albeit a very defined
and narrow conflict of interest here, as the CEO of Big Brothers Big Sisters, the word monitoring is in there, so I have to bring that to your attention. But we are asking for the promotion of volunteer paid time off, for employees, not limited to expert giving, which is a very exciting idea coming out of our work group that has all kinds of technology opportunities. But paid time off, so that children can also have more mentors and more tutors in their lives, giving them more adults, so that they have a safe and sure path to adulthood. So these are our four requests.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very much. Any questions on these four recommendations from the Child Well-Being and Education Equity work group?

COMMISSIONER SLY: If I can get the mike out. The last one, Becky, the volunteer time. The accountable bodies, I don't think that's something you should legislate. I think that should be the business community, period.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: So I would only say that, both at the State of Missouri, at different municipalities across the country and police departments, they do have executive orders that have
been given, both at the State of Missouri where
three hundred employees have been allowed to be
volunteers in the community. Police departments
allow their police officers paid time off. So I
don't know if it's much about heavy legislation,
although, there are states that do have legislation
that has passed to give their government employees
paid time off. And it happens in police
departments. St. Louis Police Department, Maryland
Heights, give their police officers an hour off of
paid time to be mentors. So I just ask --

COMMISSIONER SLY: Yeah, I totally
understand that. I think that's a great idea. I'm
just talking about the business community, not to be
told by the governor.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Oh, okay. Good.
Sorry, I misunderstood that. I'm trying to see
where the call to action ends. I think the
accountable bodies is, the business community
decides itself, the governor would decide or the
general assembly would decide for the State. So it
wasn't just, say the governor legislates it to the
business community. That's a misunderstanding.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Now, this gives a
very good clarifying point. This is -- where ever
there is executive authority, so if the governor has
those for state employees and that's where he has to
decide.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Theo has it for his
office. Theo has it for their nonprofit, yes.

Executive authority. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you. Other
questions about these four recommendations,
regarding thriving youth? Is there unreadiness? Is
there need for more information before acting on
these recommendations? Hearing none, we note that
we have recommendations for the conducting of
thorough and inclusive review of the Missouri Family
Support Division of the expansion of parent support
and education and engagement training. Expansion of
internships and apprenticeships opportunities for
eligibility high school and college students and the
promotion of volunteered paid time off. We receive
this as a recommendation FROM the Child Well-Being
and Educational Equity work group. If there is a
second from the commission?

CHAIRMAN WATSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: It's moved AND
properly seconded. All those in favor, please
notify by saying, aye.
(Board members respond aye.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE:  Opposed, say nay.

Any abstentions?  Motion is carried as a block.

Thank you very much.

MS. JAMES-HATTER:  And then third priority area is coordination and innovation. We again have four recommendations there. In addition to the definitions, one of the, absolutely one of the first things that our work group called for is for our region to have a shared vision, a shared score card and a way of coordinating services for children in this community. And so we are calling for that to develop, a shared vision, a community score card and system for coordinating the important but fragmented efforts while valuing diversity, inclusion, and transparency.

And we are prepared tonight to recommend a model, which is Ready by '21. The reason why we are recommending Ready by '21 is because the community has already gone through a process of supporting Ready by '21. And the very, very good news about this is that in this phase, our region is starting to act like a region. St. Louis City, St. Louis County and, thank you, St. Charles County for being a part of the support of Ready by '21. So
tonight, we are ready to call for that model.

The second coordination and innovation is to advance science around measuring Child Well-Being. Adopt new coordinated scaleable models for collecting data, in particular subjective well-being. You will remember, many times we have talked about the objective data and needs of children, whether it's food, housing; but as you know, that we've also said, if you want to know how the kids are doing, you have to ask them. So this is the ask them recommendation. We are blessed to be in this community with some of the smartest people at the universities that really know how to do it. They just need, they really just need our nod to let's get this done. And we are on the cutting edge of this. So we call for that.

Number 12, to create the Missouri Innovation Fund. What we have to do in this region is not simply legislate. And we need to better legislate, but we need to activate that entire community. To be innovative about how we are going to do this work over the next 20 to 30 years. And I would also say that the Missouri Innovation Fund is really an inclusive fund because we have very bright people in lots of places that can come up with great
ideas. They just don't have the capital to get it done. So this Missouri Innovation Fund is the opportunity to bring public and private together. We don't have the models, but they are fantastic models, across this country, in Washington DC, across this world, that we really need to look at. And we are doing that right now. So the Missouri Innovation Fund would bring real progress here.

And number 13, again I have to out myself, this is a substantial conflict of interest here for me. But we know, not because of what we say in my office, but the newest coming out of education right now is to invest at school levels on these early warning systems. Where we see that there are children, individual children, in need and we can find a way to coordinate rapid response around these children and their families immediately. And I will say to you, this call to action just came out through our GradNation. The White House has just identified 20 districts across the country to put these in. And there will be an executive order soon. We need to be the first ones in the country to move on this, this early rapid -- this rapid response system. Those are our four recommendations for coordination and innovation.
CHAIRMAN WILSON: I just want to note transition of the chair. With kind of, more than a narrow conflict of interest, our foundation is significant in funding and driving in the Ready by '21 conversations. So I'm passing the chair to our co-chair, and I will silence myself during this dialog.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So are there questions, comments, amplifications that, in this is set for recommendations? Yes, Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: The Missouri Innovation Fund, is it specific only to Education and Child Well-Being? I'm wondering about the innovation, because we have a lot of fairly sophisticated investor pool and angels and activities in that space. So is this a limit dollars? Or when you say, inclusive, what does that mean?

MS. JAMES-HATTER: So I would say, obviously, from our work group, we are a bit biased on innovation and child well-being and education; but certainly it is not intended to be that. So when we talk about inclusive, we've got young people all over this region that have really bright ideas about how to make things better. But they don't
have capital to get things done. We want to open this up. We want to have a very robust innovation fund that is not just built for those of us that have ideas and probably can get capital without this. We really want to figure out what this model is. So, Commissioner, we've got a lot of different ways we can go with this, but it really is to get us back in the business of prosperity, not just legislation, and come up with great ideas. We are known for that in this region. We just want it to come out in this space as well.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Questions, comments?

Yes, Commissioner PACKNETT.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: This is a really tiny word thing -- on ten. And I think that it's implied, so I'm really thankful that you guys called out the value of diversity, inclusion and transparency given our commission work as seeing racial equity as a crosscutting priority. I think the word equity might just be important to add in. Which I know that your Ready by '21 as the selected models are already geared toward it, but I just think that explains the connection.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Thank you. The only other thing that I would add about the Missouri
Innovation Fund, this state needs to get innovated. We think we can. And we think we can lead it right out of this commission.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Yes, Ms. Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So, just not to belabor the point about the Innovation Fund, but that word is used extensively, particularly in the Biotech fields. So I think we need to be very careful about the meat on the bones in that. And we need to be more descriptive about what a Missouri Innovative or Innovation Fund as it relates to this recommendation. I just don't want it to be confused with the many innovation funds that are currently either being contemplated or have been funded by the state.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Could I suggest this, that you are hearing support for the concept.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: That we pull this one out for a couple of things. First of all, it may be crosscutting. There my be, across several working groups, where we want to suggest an approach to innovation that would be helpful here. And secondly, get a bit more definition, so there's not confusion. So with your permission, perhaps we'll
just pull number 19.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: I am very comfortable with you pulling out, understanding the crosscutting piece; but you should know, we have five good models that we can all look at together to make it bigger and more robust.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: What I'm hearing is, let's do a little bit of a deeper dive and let's look at the models that you have.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: In full support.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I'll end with this comment, and then we'll see if we are ready for a vote. So the conflicts that have been mentioned, just to be clear, are not personal conflicts in anyway. That is, that neither Commissioner Hatter nor Commissioner Wilson in any way personally benefit from anything having to do with these recommendations. Their organizations have been advocates and supporters and donors to these causes and in some cases, pioneers. And so, they are simply disclosing that their organizations have been intimately involved.

When I've been asked about this by both of these commissioners, my reaction has been, this is a benefit to the commission. That you have the
expertise and you can comment on this. It's up to
the commission to determine the validity of them,
but in my mind, Ready by '21 is a landmark program.
And what we're saying is, we don't want it held in
the silo any longer. We want it expanded and seen
more broadly. And similarly, we are national
leaders in this potential opportunity for early
warning systems and we should maximize and leverage
that. So I just want to make that comment for the
benefit of the commission and those in the audience.

Yes, Commissioner Gore.

COMMISSIONER GORE: I have just a very
basic question. I am not familiar with Ready by 21.
Could you just tell me a little bit what that is,
what it's about?

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Yeah, I think the
best way do describe it is a system level
coordination, where Ready by 21 is with a robust
group of system-wide coalitions, your regional
health coalitions and others. And I don't have all
the details. But they will be -- what they have --
we will have a community score card that says, this
is where we are and this is where we are going. And
on a system level, we will be trying to figure out,
or they will be trying to figure out, how do we put
more resources to improve those. So it is exactly
the call to action around coordination that we have.
I will also tell you, it was, when our work group
voted, and we had very strong representation from
our work group, it had the highest rating of the
call to actions. Both the coordination at the
system level, Ready by 21, and the early warning
system. So our work group fully understood the need
for coordination. So it's a system level
coordination, where your early warning system is a
individual child coordination model.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I might ask, well --

MS. THOMAS: Is Katie here? Katie

Coffman?

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Would you like to
take an answer from Katie Coffman? She is the most
knowledgeable.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: If we could do this
in the interest of time. If you will be available,
we could perhaps have folks, they can check that
resource afterwards. And also, let's circulate some
information by email. We can certainly do that.

Thank you. Thank you for your interest and
availability from the United Way team. Additional
questions or comments? Okay. So what we have on
the table are the recommendations regarding the score card and Ready by 21. The coordinated scaleable models for collecting data. We're going to pull off the Innovation Fund. And then the quarterly early warning coordinated community response system. So those are -- the questions are directionally. Are we willing to proceed to endorse these? So I will take your recommendation into a motion. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Second. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Board meembers respond aye.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And opposed. Thank you.

MS. JAMES-HATTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you Commissioner and Ms. James-Hatter. Okay. I want to thank the commission and those in the audience remaining for your patience and tolerance. We do have one more item of commission business, actually two. And we don't get together often enough to do all of our work. So we wanted to do this tonight. The budget was circulated on, I think over a month ago, at our last meeting. Our commissioners had the
opportunity to review and ask questions; but if
there are other detailed questions that needed to be
asked, we are certainly prepared to do that and
Bethany will present this.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Before
the commissioners first is the approval of the
minutes that we developed that are in your
commission packet from May 11. I'll need commission
approval for that, please. A motion and a second.
And approval of the May 11.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: We have a motion,
from Mr. Negwer. Is there a second? Second from
Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Are there detailed
-- any questions or comments from members of the
commission? Okay. We have a motion and a second.
Let me ask all those in favor of approving the
revised budget, please say, aye.

(Board members respond aye.)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And those opposed,
please say, no.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Second, I
won't belabor the point. The May 11 meeting we
spent some considerable time to review the line
items of the new budget. What I will point out is,
one, that this budget has been prepared in
consultation with the United Way, our fiscal agent,
with the advisement of the co-chairs and presented
on May 11 with two changes, since May 11. One, on
the income side, we received $5000 in private funds,
provided by the Jewish federation and on the expense
side, specific line item, travel and meeting
expenses for national experts increased from 3000 to
20,000, which is an approved expense to be covered
by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Other than
those two changes, the budget is as presented May 11
with total revenue now at 1.267 million and total
expenses at nine thousand four -- nine hundred four
-- sorry, I'm tired, $904,319. At this time, I turn
it back over to the commissioners for discussion and
approval.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I have a question.
More the question deals with in-kind spending. This
budget involves six -- if you look at the data, it
shows 60 percent of our spending is various in-kind,
it's unspecified. I've never seen a budget where 60
percent of our spending is not detailed. What do
you mean by in-kind spending?
COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: In-kind expenditures are those that -- so here's the process, at the very beginning of the Ferguson commission, before the funds, before the fundings from the State of Missouri came in, we leveraged and asked for quite a bit of in-kind support from various organizations that provided in-kind that included legal services. In-kind that included other expenses, particularly, the highest line item of in-kind came by $91,000 from the University of Missouri. These are not revenues that the commission spent but were captured in-kind costs from some of the organizations that volunteered to provide either support of some kind or a consultant of some kind for the budget. So we captured that in. That is information that is captured by the Ferguson Commission office and not the United Way.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Will that be repaid to those entities?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: No.

COMMISSIONER CARR: It's listed as an expense in terms of our $595,000 total expense.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: It's captured as income and expenses just so we could capture that. Which is something the governor's
office asked us to do.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: My thought would be
these are, in effect, donated services.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: A hundred
percent are donated services.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: These are folks who
are willing to give their services to the
commission. So maybe the word expenditure is what's
troubling us, here. Maybe we'll change the
nomenclature and classify it differently. It's not
a bookable item on the income side or expense side.

It's simply a tracking that the governor's office
asked us to do for people who are donating.

University of Missouri in St. Louis has donated, as
you all know, meeting space and all kinds of things,
legal services. Maybe we'll just change the
categorization.

COMMISSIONER CARR: So our real cash
outlay would be $248,000. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I can't
see from here. That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CARR: And then our income
is estimated at $917,000.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Total
income, revenue should be 1.2.
COMMISSIONER CARR: What is our plan for the remaining?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: So the delta that we now have.

COMMISSIONER CARR: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yeah. So the delta between those two is $362,681.00 difference. Those are funds that right now, according to bottom note, if you scroll down so the audience can see, too, are funds that may be available for translation work. What we need to do in order to make that happen is there would be a separate budget that would be developed by the Ferguson Commission and approval of the bodies that provided that funding. That would be the thought of which we had that conversation in January when we approved the initial budget as well.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any other questions regarding the budget?

COMMISSIONER CARR: In terms of some of the donations that are not specified, I believe, you said some of the donors don't want to be identified. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: That is correct and consistent with when asking the United
Way about the process of naming specific donors, donors are privy to be able to share, if they want that information released; or if they would like to keep that private. And many have asked to keep that information private.

COMMISSIONER CARR: But as a public agency, I don't think we can do that. I think income coming in to us has to be clearly specified and I think if there's any restrictions, that has to be clearly specified. Because we are a public agency. We are not a nonprofit. Were are not a private corporation.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: That is an assumption that when I checked up against what was required for us to do, that is not a requirement. If that is a position that the commission wants to take, that would be an act of the commission. But our current status is accountable and transparent according to what needs to happen for the United Way and per the State of Missouri.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Let me jump in here. My view on this is that these donors have with great generosity donated these services; and like in any donation to a foundation or a not-for-profit if
their donor intent and their request is to remain anonymous, then we should welcome that. There have been no restrictions. We would not accept a donation that came with some restriction or caveat that we did something. Every donation has been -- or service, has been made without condition or proviso.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any more questions related to the budget? Do we have a motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: (Inaudible).

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We do have a motion to approve the revised budget. Is there a second? There is a second. Is there any further discussion.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I would call a roll call vote.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay. There's been a request for a role call vote. I believe we have a list for the sake of attendance. In fact, we'll use the same list in order, then we'll do so. If I recall correctly, I'm first in that order. Don't
ask me why I know that. I just happen to remember.

So it's consistent, we'll use the same order. As soon as I call your name, please use the sign, aye, if you are voting to approve the revised budget, nay, if you are voting not to approve the revised budget, or abstain. You can choose to abstain.

Reverend Starsky Wilson. Aye. Let me also ask if Monique Thomas could record the vote and share the tally back. Reverend Starsky Wilson. Aye.

Co-chair, Rich McClure.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Kevin Ahlbrand is absent. Commissioner Rasheen Aldridge, Jr.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Traci Blackmon is absent. Commissioner T. R. Carr.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Nay.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Gabe Gore.

COMMISSIONER GORE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Becky James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Daniel
COMMISSIONER ISOM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Scott Negwer.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Brittany Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Felicia Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Pat Sly.

COMMISSIONER SLY: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Grayling Tobias is absent. Commissioner Byron Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Ms. Thomas, could you please tell us the tally?

MS. THOMAS: One absence, 11 --

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Eleven ayes, one nay.

Is that correct?

MS. THOMAS: Twelve ayes, three
abstentions and one nay.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Twelve ayes, three

absences and one nay. Motion carries. So the

revised budget has been approved. We approve with

thanks to the staff for their work on keeping us up
to date on this and making revisions as they come
in. It has been -- is there any other business to
bring before the commission? Seeing none and not
leaving a whole lot of time for anybody to think of
anything, we invite you to stand.

With thanks to all of you citizens of
this community, our host, we thank Mayor Faith for
being with us, staying with us the entire time. We
greatly appreciate the hospitality of the high
school and of this entire community. It has become
our tradition to close or meeting with a moment of
silent, pretentious meditation and perhaps
reflection on the work we have done, or just the
clearing of our hearts and our minds, so that we may
go back returning to our families with the great joy
that we left with. We invite you to a centering
silence.

(Silence).

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very much.

We stand adjourned. We bid you good evening.
(WHEREIN, the deposition was concluded at 9:30 PM.)
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