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MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Good afternoon everyone, and to the Commissioners.

For those that don't know me I'm managing director Bethany Johnson-Javois, I'd like to start by calling this meeting to order, this portion of the meeting starting with roll call. If you will at this time Commissioners let me know that you're present.

Reverend Starsky Wilson.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rich McClure.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Kevin Ahlbrand is joining us by phone. Is Kevin on the phone? We need to get him on the phone.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rasheen Aldridge, Jr.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Traci Blackmon.
1 COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Present.

2 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

3 T.R. Carr.

4 COMMISSIONER CARR: Present.

5 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

6 Gabe Gore is excused.

7 Becky James-Hatter.

8 COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Present.

9 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

10 Daniel Isom.

11 COMMISSIONER ISOM: Present.

12 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

13 Scott Negwer.

14 COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Present.

15 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

16 Brittany Packnett.

17 COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Present.

18 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

19 Felicia Pulliam.

20 COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Present.

21 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

22 Pat Sly is excused.

23 Byron Watson.

24 COMMISSIONER WATSON: Present.

25 MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
And Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: At this time I'm asking if poet laureate Michael Castro would join us by giving us the invocation.

MR. CASTRO: Thank you. I want to thank the Commission for their efforts. I and our whole community are looking forward to your recommendations and hopeful they would be enacted and lead to needed changes.

I want to offer two poems this afternoon, two brief poems. This is called Double Kwansaba After Michael Brown.

When police are the threat who's there to protect. When walking in the street can get you busted, shot or beat just for being black, talking back, looking wrong or looking strong how can we really be a viable city where people can live in harmony. A free country with tanks in the street who or what do they defeat. No good results only bad. Fear is what drives us mad and fear the root of hate becomes the police state. Instead of tear gas hear us. Let's relate for a start human to human, heart to heart.

This is called We Need To Talk.
I'm more than your idea, I am tangible, touchable, a human being like you. We breathe the same air, want the same things. We need to talk. I am more than my skin tone, more than the weight I bear, more than the clothes I wear, more than my hair, more than who I sexually prefer, more than my accented speech, hear me, we need to talk. So get out of your closed mind, it's claustrophobic in there, thoughts fester if they can't expand. Let's meet, get out of your car, come into the street, let's discover each other on common ground. We need to talk. I say take off your armor, put away your gun, don't just stare into your smart phone, hello, or as they say in the east Namaste and Savati, the God in you honors the God in me. We need to talk.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Good afternoon. My name is Starsky Wilson, I am pleased to serve as co-chair of the Commission and with this wonderful body of people who committed such time to the work of the region to co-chair with my friend and brother Rich McClure and we are pleased that each of you has joined us on today for this work that we must indeed do together and on this unique occasion about which we've been given to do so.
We are reminded today that we do this work on the eve of the anniversary of the tragic loss of Michael Brown to his parents, Leslie McFadden and Michael Brown, Sr., to his colleagues and community, those who are graduates of high schools around this community in 2014 and each and every one of us as any time there is a loss of one the inescapable bond of mutuality is broken, we all suffer such a loss. We do so with the hope of the fact that we gather here a year later with a common table still before us and a constant communication and dialogue about the tragic issues, both the urgent and immediate, but also the ongoing and underlying that caused these things to happen. And so as we do so we do not rush into the work today without a pause to remember that which brought us here and the reality of the difficulty of those tragic circumstances, the voices of young people who gathered in grieving and rose up in mourning to call us all to these important issues. Inasmuch as we remember that work we also know that this weekend for many will be a time of organized resistance and we do not disrespect that, we note that sometimes we get to important policy conversations based upon the cries of protests,
that has been the case here and so as others gather
to do so we note and we thank them for doing so
peacefully and exercising those rights that are
given as part of the great American tradition of
protect leading back to and beyond the Boston Tea
Party. So in as much there will be those that
resist and we make sure to remember we know that
we've got to talk for the sake of reconciliation
and so much of the work around this table is work
to the end of reconciliation but not domesticated,
not overly simplified or spiritualized but rather
knowing that reconciliation happens among equals,
that policy helps to make equitable circumstances
possible for our entire community and throughout
our region and so we are here having policy
discussions and making policy recommendations that
will get us to a more equitable and inclusive
society and region here in the St. Louis area.
We're pleased that you have been a part of that
work, many of you for the many open meetings that
we've had, some of you who have served on working
groups and, the Commissioners who are here as well.
So we're thankful for your time, we're also
thankful today uniquely for the presence of our
governor who has, who called and Commissioned this
body into being on November 18th, charged us to
work and has not been absent from the work but has
been constantly in communication and support
through his office hearing the recommendations that
are being progressed, hearing the opinions and the
perspectives of those in the working group and the
community as you spoke and providing an opportunity
to act. Most notably we suggest this week we saw
just yesterday, perhaps he'll speak to this as he
does in a moment, his response and ongoing
engagement around the police training that members
of the citizen-law enforcement working group led by
Brittany Packnett and Dan Isom made recommendations
regarding use of force standards, cultured
competency and officer wellness. In the just last
24 hours we've seen the active engagement of the
Governor on that recommendation, even following up
on the suggestions for municipal court reforms. So
we thank for him his presence and long-term
engagement in this work up and to this point and
that which we'll be committing on forward as well.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you to my
friend and partner in this working journey Starsky
Wilson and to my fellow Commissioners thank you for
your continuing hard work and very deep and
intensive engagement and to members of the community who have come to be with us and in fact over 2,200 of you plus have been at our 15 meetings, many of you have contributed what we count as over 14,000 hours between the work of the Commission and the work of citizen volunteers that are contributed volunteer hours by well over 100 individuals who have been at tables working through issues.

Governor welcome to you, thank you for being here and thank you for calling us into being and for your support and engagement. Since you appointed this group in November we have sought to model the process of seeking common ground and seeking the path of positive change. We believe we have become the region's kitchen table, a place where people can come together, very different views and work together in a very thoughtful sometimes intense, sometimes emotional, but very reasoned and passionate dialogue in order to find the opportunity to drive change and there have been a couple of instances already where we've seen that change in municipal court reform which we believe has started us down a path which has the opportunity to create a much more fair and just
system. The work done on police training and on food search and summer feeding has already begun to very vitally and thoughtfully to show results and so we really trust and believe that this model can take a group of 15 very diverse people with very different views and coming from very different backgrounds and can show our region through the work of our working groups and what has come to this table how in fact we can proceed and do this differently than any other state in the nation has done and have a much more positive result. But, you know, I have to stop and observe, still we know that there are many in our region, many in our state who are not engaged, for whom these issues are still foreign and still not understood or are still ignored and we see it as our role, we see it as the region's role to focus attention on what we have found and know are wide systematic disparities, in some case systematic racism that we have learned about and documented and we welcome the support of the community in engaging a more, a region more broadly in this discussion and that will be a mission that we will all have to take on after our report is digitally produced and sent out and for wide and thorough distribution and we
commend your help and seek your help as we seek to engage the region much more broadly. And the second thing we know is that we must balance our sense of urgency to drive these actions and drive this exchange with a sense of the long term nature in true form, generational nature of many of the changes that need to take place and that we need to call our region to deal with the issues of the heart that put us in places where we are not listening to each other and more importantly we're not acting as My Brother's Keeper and we're not acting in a way that says we are all responsible for the success of all in our region.

So we look forward to today's work which as you know is about prioritizing our recommendations that have been in the broad areas that Starsky's outlined and our community told us those priorities in our very first meeting in Ferguson where they said we want you to focus on citizen-law enforcement relations and municipal court reform, we want you to focus on racial equity and disparity, on education and child well-being, on health, on economic and equality and opportunity. And this group and many in the audience have taken those priorities seriously and
have some very thoughtful recommendations in that area.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Rich, Starsky respect, Governor, we need to talk. We need to talk about the amount of money spent on military and police and nothing on education. We need to talk about Senate bill 42 sitting on your desk and another year in the Normandy School District. We need to talk. Respect.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you for that comment, sir, we appreciate it and we hear you.

What we need to do today is prioritize our recommendations and then realize that this gives us the opportunity to more broadly address our community in ways that will yield for real action. So we thank you for being here, we welcome your comments and your thoughts and we appreciate you. Thank you Governor.

GOVERNOR NIXON: Thank you. And I want to thank the co-chairs and all the members of the Commission for your hard work. I'll try to keep my comments brief as you've got a very busy schedule this afternoon to achieve what you need to get done.

Kind of one simple message to the
Commissioners first of all. Thank you. I mean this is, the process we went through to try to put together this group was challenging to make sure that we reached out and really reflected the community, I think we did and I tremendously appreciate everybody's hard work. I remember that day nine months ago at the Missouri History Museum, at that time the emotions of the community were still raw in a lot of ways and they still are in some ways but it was a very charged moment but thanks to the people in this room, leadership and a lot of other folks of goodwill. My sense is that folks are listening to each other much better, we're learning a lot and people are committed to making things better. So it's important that ultimately this process leads to a stronger, more united region.

Let me introduce two people real quick before I make some very short comments about a couple of concrete things and then one closing comment. First of all with us today is a former Senator Maida Coleman who's the head of the Office of Community Engagement, one of the things that we did after this to make sure we were out there, unfortunately or fortunately for folks who pay
utility bills next week she takes a position of the Missouri Public Service Commission so if anyone has complaints about your electric bills or anything else please refer those starting on Monday, Monday morning to the COMMISSIONER of the Public Service Commission. But I think it's a great place for her to continue her public service and I appreciate your willingness to serve in that important position.

Stepping up to take over the Office of Communication will be Judge Marvin Teer, Judge has been working in the office over the last seven months and I think is incredibly well prepared to keep us moving forward.

But Maida, congratulations on your appointment, thank you for your continued service to the state and you're still the OCE head until Monday morning, so you've got this weekend.

But, you know, you all have laid out the depth of the commitment here, the 14,000 volunteer hours, the 63 committees, the goal being to make, lay out a clearer path with specifics on it of measurable steps we can take that would make a difference and I appreciate that. Most importantly though I just want to tell you
something important from all around our state,
quite frankly talking to people all around the
country your efforts have inspired a lot of other
people to help in a lot of ways. Yesterday as was
mentioned by Starsky and Rich the concrete movement
forward of the Police Officers Standards And
Training Commission. Adding five new memberships
including Reverend Emanuel Cleaver, III as a member
of that Commission with 120 day time frame to hit
the targets outlined by the preliminary
recommendations that have been laid out by this
Commission and others as to the necessity to move
forward in police training and expand police
training opportunities and continuing education
opportunities in those tactical matters, in those
interactions and in officer wellness. All of those
are tremendously appreciated.

I should also note publicly that when
Chief Isom started this he did not have a gray
beard, it's starting to show. It's out just a
little bit but I appreciate your aging right in
front of all of us. And for someone of his, that's
the level of intensity that's been put on that
important area by Ms. Packnett, he and other
members of that subcommittee, we really appreciate
the specificity of those recommendations and they will play out in a series of formal hearings for the way the Post Commission has to do it and rules, these are executive branch rules that will be filed by December 1st of this year laying out new training requirements in the state of Missouri. Once again we appreciate your focus on that and clearly the energy, effort and specificity with which your subcommittees responded to the call was of great help in the process and also led as I said many folks in the law enforcement community come forward to ask to serve and so those new members and public members on that particular board have an important job to get done and they will hit those targets within the time frame.

I think it's also important to note that one of the things that was important when this started and I had a long series of discussions with your two co-chairs before I would say appointed them, before they were willing to accept the appointment, it was a little bit like a, felt a little bit like a college basketball coach recruiting there for a while but one of the things that we agreed on was that as good actionable items came up during the process of getting to your final
report that we would not wait until September 15th
as if that was some sort of magic day, that we
would communicate where you were seeing cohesion
and that we would try to show that strength in
direct action and I want to give two examples of
that where public policy has dramatically shifted
because of that communication and the specificity
of the work.

The municipal court reform bill we passed this year is historic. People should not
underestimate what a significant shift it will be
to remove from the resume of police officers the
responsibility of being revenue agents and in turn
turn them back to what their profession has
designed them to be, folks that are community
policing and enforcing the laws as needed that. Is
a significant and historic shift in a bill passed
with significant teeth that will accomplish. Its
goal I think of shifting significant portion of
the, of the focus in that area.

One of the other portions of that
bill should not be forgotten and I think in an old
hear me now believe me later part one of the
proudest parts of signing that bill is not only
municipal court reform but also the requirement
that police agencies in St. Louis County within a six year period be certified. That may sound like a long time but CALEA certification takes at least three years to get done and that process when of the 52 departments only 14 are currently certified will really I think have a significant long-term affect also. It's one of those portions of the measure that did not get a great deal of attention but it was a focus of mine and others to, I mentioned Chief Isom before, one of the things we talked about last year at great length was that that requirement not only to enhance the individual requirements and support of officers but also to look at departments as a whole to make sure that you had standards of practice in place for those and that secondary piece of that is extremely important and I think will make a real and lasting difference.

Just a couple other things that have happened over this last few months that your action and willingness to keep these matters in the public and action forward has helped us on. You know, we have some educational challenges in this region, greatly heartened by the 26 school districts that stepped forward to, committed to get the two
districts that are unaccredited in North County accredited and the resources that they're making available and the action plans, we have a report on that on Tuesday of this week with those superintendents in person, the action plans for each of those districts and the commitments by those other districts for direct help and very specific action items and the extra million dollars we were able to put together for reading programs in those districts will make great long-term effort, getting kids to read and then having the support of the other districts will make a huge difference, I tremendously appreciate them stepping forward.

I should also note Senator Coleman, the head of Office of Community Engagement has been running not only here this region but in Kansas City our summer jobs league which means that thousands of kids have had jobs this summer, thousands, in both St. Louis and Kansas City and that is making a difference in their lives individually, we appreciate that significantly.

We also appreciate the Federal government's help, the promise on designation for the region is helpful, the streets designation on
West Florissant is helpful, the $5 million Department of Labor grant to make sure we have worker training is going to make a real and lasting difference, the businesses that have come up with dollars to help that small business relief fund as well as the businesses that are continuing to make commitments in this region and investments to add jobs, all of those have happened in a context of needing short term deliverables but not forgetting long term challenges and so I look forward to, really look forward to the final report and you all's determination after the thousands of hours that have been spent and the blood, sweat and tears that has been cast and used to lay out what you think are the most priorities. That's why your co-chairs have pushed so hard I think to look at these priorities because it's just exceptionally important.

So I'll commit to you all that this is a calling to some, a challenge for others, use whatever words you want, everybody comes at this a little different, but in my line of work sometimes you choose history and sometimes history chooses you and whichever one of those lanes you're in you are tested not by the first step you take but by
the destination you get to. We've got to change
direction on a number of issues in this region,
this Commission is a vital centerpiece to making
sure that calibration begins but all of us, me as
your governor, you all as Commissioners, elected
officials, appointed officials, individuals out
there all have a joint responsibility to make these
long term changes that will make a difference.
So that's why I'm looking forward to reading your
final report, assuming we've been bouncing, back
and forth, they want to deliver it in some kind of
electronic fashion, I'm kind of a book guy, I'm not
completely a luddite, I'll have the capacity to
read it but I'd appreciate if somebody could print
out a copy of it. That way I can take it in my
briefcase and take it to my office and read it.
But anyway, I just appreciate the way, but I think
quite frankly it's not as important for me to read
it as it is for the public to be able to access it,
to be able to understand this historical moment, to
understand that after doing what you have done my
sense is that people around this table are more
committed to progress than you were the first day
you walked in and you have had an opportunity to
play a role in the history of this region.
So history chose you too. I may have appointed you but history chose you because the appointments that I made to this Commission were not based on who I knew or who I liked the most or any of that sort of stuff, I mean my God a significant percentage of the people on this Commission I had never interacted with directly, personally, some had interacted with me in various ways, I mean groups and meetings and whatnot, this is not, but I say that because we really were trying to make sure that once this was started that when the report was issued and the hard work of change began that people would respect both the process and the substance and the people that stepped forward to lead at this difficult time.

So I'll finish my remarks where I started, to the Commissioners. Thank you for being willing to step forward at this difficult time, to America, issues like this have happened all across our country over the last 12 months. This has been an ongoing discussion, an ongoing challenge. I would submit that no other region has reached out and said in a concrete way we will chart a path forward but in many ways we have that responsibility and we've taken it. I also want to
say this hasn't been an easy path. If these were easy issues consent bills would have been passed by legislatures all across America 50 years ago. If these were easy issues people wouldn't have the level of emotion around them that they do. If these were easy issues it would have been very easy to make a set of recommendations and do them in about 30 days and call it. This change in many ways has to come not only structurally but individually and I could not be prouder of the commitment that you've each made and am incredibly excited by what you see as priorities and the path forward and commit to you that it will be a significant part of the history of this region for as long as I have a voice in assisting making it that important voice.

So God speed, good luck, your work is serious and hard, it's now August 7th, report is due September 15th and obviously we'll be communicating between then but I tremendously appreciate in a deep fashion everybody's commitment and hard work. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE Thank you Governor, we are grateful for the progress that has been made, we are deeply aware of how much progress and
how many more things need to be done so we thank
you for that challenge and for the engagement and
we commend the voices that will be speaking this
weekend and throughout this process and we commend
the law enforcement officers who will be there and
make sure these voices will be heard and all of our
citizens. And we've come to realize that we don't
have to walk arm in arm to see eye to eye, or see
eye to eye to walk arm in arm, sorry, I messed that
up, and we have realized that this Commission has
been a way to do that so thank you for putting us
to that task.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thanks. Just
appreciate you for your time and particularly I'll
just note briefly, we've, this is a historic
anniversary this week that we've closed out, two of
them. One that started the end of July, 1965 in
Independence, Missouri when President Johnson came
here and in homage to President Truman's 40 year
struggle to get Medicaid and Medicare passed and
signed into law and that happened in Missouri and
then of course yesterday we noted the 50th
anniversary of the signing of voting rights
legislation. Important in this sense as you talk
about history that it's bound all of us. That in
one of those bills we cared for a generation, we
made sure those who are our elders would be cared
for and had this conversation about caring for
those who come after us generationally and the
other was about equitable voice for all people in
the process of inclusive democracies and we've said
from the beginning we think this is kind of an
experiment in that so thanks for the opportunity to
engage in that experiment where history may have
found all of us.

GOVERNOR NIXON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: There are a couple
of things we want to do for today's business, first
we want to have the opportunity to use one of our
partners and leaders at the table, Ms. Serena
Muhammad, our facilitator for this afternoon's
discussion. As a community advocate and director
of strategic initiatives for the St. Louis Mental
Health Board in her role there she is responsible
for facilitating and leading regional initiatives
that focus on systems, systems building and
collective impact to improve the lives of the
city's most vulnerable children and adults. Prior
to joining the mental health board certain a was
the founding and executive director of the new
development organization that integrated evidence-based strategies to directly design and innovate initiatives and activities for early elementary school students promoting wellness and education. She earned a Bachelor's degree in English from Xavier University of Louisiana, go Xavier, and Master of Fine Arts from the University of Missouri St. Louis. She is married with one brilliant son.

We also note for all of you with thanks for the appreciation of the service of Dr. Grayling Tobias who has resigned from the Commission, we thank him for his service along side Becky James-Hatter in leadership of the child well-being and educational equity working group and we push forward even with that, with thanks for his service.

We dare not go much further without illustrating and expressing thanks and give an opportunity to share a bit of welcome to Ms. Ruby, Dr. Ruby Curry, the interim president of St. Louis Community College Florissant Valley who has been graciously open to all settings of this conversation over the course of the last year so we want to offer an opportunity to share with us as we
begin our work portion of the meeting.

DR. CURRY: Good afternoon. To our co-chairs, Commissioner McClure and Commissioner Starsky and all the other Ferguson Commissioners. You know, from the beginning we've been the open door and we appreciate the work that you are doing and I kept hearing change, the winds are changing and I pray that they're changing for better and I'm sure that the work that you have done, it's not easy work, we know that, those that know about this know that this is not easy but just want you to know that we appreciate you and we thank you for coming and allowing St. Louis Community College to be a part of this change so God speed with your work and we're looking forward to that report on September 15th.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Thank you Dr. Curry. Thank you for your hospitality on multiple occasions, you and your team have been very welcoming and very accommodating so thank you very much for that and thank you for the role and presence that you and this entire institution play in our region.

It's appropriate that we gather on
this day as we said, on the Friday before this
weekend that catalyzed our region and our nation
and so today it is our deep desire to push forward
through a positive, meaningful change agenda that
we're going to be talking about. Together with the
public and extensive input that we've had over
these past eight months we've had difficult
conversations that have resulted in 200 plus calls
to action. It's today's business that we have a
working session of the Commission, so it will be
just the Commission, working through the
prioritization of these 200 into signature
priorities, into bundles that together put a
cohesive set of priorities to the table, doesn't
diminish any of the 200 but it says we must
prioritize because if everything is important
nothing is important so we have to make sure we
speak clearly into this point and so this will
shape the legacy of our work, we commend all of the
work that has been done to this point and we need
to especially extent our gratitude to our working
group co-chairs through this process, some of who
have been mentioned already, for citizen-law
enforcement relations Dan Isom and Brittany
Packnett, for child well-being and educational
equity, Becky James-Hatter has been an extraordinary leader as have Brittany and Dan. We've been blessed to have the great and solid leadership of Traci Blackmon and T.R. Carr on the municipal court reform working group and we've had the opportunity to have very deep and positive engagement through long and carefully thought through issues in our economic inequality and opportunity working group with Felicia Pulliam and Pat Sly.

So to all of those and to those that came to the table on the racial inequity and healing working group and those that have come, or working process, and those that came to the table to help us understand more deeply health disparities and issues that we needed to have a crosscutting view throughout our working groups in both of these spaces, we're very grateful for that leadership and that leadership has been essential to get us to this point but really what has driven us to get to the substance of this point is the hard work of the community that came to the table in each of those working groups in long, very intense and thorough sessions and so this is the culmination of a bit of that work and as we begin
to shape the report as a Commission this work today
in shaping the priorities is really essential to
moving forward.

So with that we're going to ask our
managing director Bethany Johnson-Javois who as all
of you know has done an extraordinary job of
leading our team and leading us as a Commission to
organize us, to lead us, to challenge us, to push
us and to be very thoughtful about the way we
approach our work. She's going to review the
prioritization process and the way to proceed.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

I'd ask Commissioners to please go into your
packet, what I'm going to do is do a quick overview
of the prioritization methodology that was brought
forward at our last meeting and was approved on
July 13th. Really quickly we know to date
that what we decided to is to look at lens with
which we would look at our work to determine our
signature priorities, those lenses are as follows:
We understand that place matters, that generational
considerations need to be made, this is called an
action impacts more than one generation. That
children and youth need to be at the center of
these calls to action. Racial equity and health
equity are critically important as we move forward and the calls to action, are they researched and formed as appropriate, and the answer is with all calls to action yes, but in particular looking at the signature pieces those are the lenses that we looked at. And then we took a look at three specific criteria, are they transformative, is it innovative, does it create significant change and leverage multiple points that we can push forward. Is it urgent? How will this policy call to action address pressing issues in response to what we have heard with our time together and pulling from the executive order and Ms. Muhammad has said it to us many times is it unflinching, does this policy call to action present bold and root cause driven solutions that call out core issues in the region. So with those lenses and with those priority criteria the following outline of time was approved, I'm page 2 for your reading.

In the initial process we submitted that the community prioritize for us starting December 1 through citizen-law enforcement relations, municipal courts and governance, child well-being, education equity, economic inequity and opportunity and racial and health equity as well
and moving forward from those priority areas as we worked. We then approved the process that we are participating in now, on July 13th we approved the methodology and Karishma Furtado who is to my right is going to go further to talk through what happened in this window of time from July 15th to present to get us to the bundles if you will of our calls to action that now are up for discussion and approval today as our signature priorities.

MS. FURTADO: Thank you. So I'll be walking through the document in your packet entitled Prioritization Process Survey To Present. So to recap for all of us the prioritization work that has taken place most recently Commissioners spent the week from Wednesday, July 15th, to Tuesday, July 21st prioritizing the approved calls to action through an on-line survey. They were given two options for doing so, first of which was scoring all 200 calls to action, the second was scoring just their top 20 to 30 and to give you a sense of the breakdown four of you went with option one and scored all 200 and the remaining 11 chose to score just their top 20 to 30 or so. So according to the options selected Commissioners gave calls a score from zero to 4, from strongly
disagree to strongly agree for each of the three criteria that Bethany just mentioned, transformative, urgent and unflinching. This means that each call to action could have received a score from zero to 12 from each Commissioner scoring it, that's the sum of zero to 4 for each of those three criteria.

From that point on staff extracted the data and began analyzing it, they did multiple analytical approaches in order to identify the fairest and most straightforward and this meant both identifying calls that received high scores but also those calls that were voted on by many Commissioners so it was a balance of those two elements and ultimately we settled on a method that accounted for both the number of responses and the magnitude of scores by first calculating an average score for each call to action so that's from zero to 12 and then multiplying it by the number of Commissioners voting on it, a number from zero to 15, that would yield a total score which would be theoretically anywhere from zero to 180. So the top 30 calls to action would be those with the 30 highest total scores and you should note that when random numbers due to a tie for 30th place the list
is actually the top 31, or was. So all of that was
the work that was done before the working group
co-chairs met last Friday, the 31st of July. We
brought the results of that analysis to the working
group co-chairs and they engaged in a robust
discussion around the limitations posed by the data
set and they identified and applied fixes to those
limitations that ultimately yielded a stronger more
representative list of top priority calls to
action. So they then began the process of refining
that list of top 30 calls to action and after
rigorous review, collegial debate, and discussion
on what calls should be included in the signature
priorities the working group co-chairs last Friday
decided to retain the top calls to action collected
by the commissioner survey, that came out of the
analytical process, they bundled those calls to
action along with key other calls that rounded out
the bundle and they identified gaps in the existing
bundles and recommended calls to action that would
fill those gaps. All in order to strengthen the
slate of calls to be adopted as the top priority
calls. That process yielded 28 bundled top
priority calls to action which can be seen in the
blue and white striped document.
With that I'll hand it over to Serena to take us further.

**MS. MUHAMMAD:** At this point we're going to have a discussion about the 28 that are already bundled with the idea that if you have specific comments that this would be the time to express those comments. You've had an opportunity to review them so if there's no discussion then the next item would actually be to vote to approve them so that we can move to the other items for discussion.

**CHAIRMAN MCCLURE:** Okay. So these 28 have been circulated, they've been as Karishma said thoughtfully bundled by the co-chairs who worked very carefully to think about which ones related and which ones support each other that came out of the top 31 in a way that we begin to tell a cohesive story of the agenda and recommendations and the calls of the Commission. So I commend this staff team first of all for a very thoughtful and thorough approach, this is not easy to get the input of 15 people and to begin to make a cohesive pattern of recommendations from it and they represent all areas of our work so we would welcome comments, thoughts on these 28 areas of bundled
calls to action of any kind and then we will later

turn after we deal with these 28 to the question of

what should be added, if anything, to this based

upon the suggestions of various Commissioners.

So the floor is open for comments and

thoughts.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We note one point

of order just for the public, I think Commissioners

know this. Commissioners who do not have the

ability to be with us today, Kevin Ahlbrand, Pat

Sly and Gabe Gore, they have provided their votes

to staff ahead of time as we had all this

information so they would be registered as we go

through the priorities and deal with the bundling

by the staff.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Couple of comments

I will just offer perhaps just for a bit of

discussion. I think you should as you've gone

through these, perhaps you've gone through this and

it's a kind of exercise I tried to do and perhaps

many of you did is I looked at the things that had

energy and passion and commitment from the folks

that we heard from throughout the process, I looked

for those that had transformative potential and so

I hesitate to pick out any but there are examples,
there was a lot of energy around child development accounts and what potential that would have across multiple spaces. The staff has worked through racial lenses to say we'll just have to remedy disparities going forward so I think we should think about have we in fact been true to both what we heard and true to our charge to think about transformative and unflinching recommendations so let's have a little more discussion.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Mr. Chairman, I agree as a co-chair as we were, obviously we did all of our voting but I think it is fair to say that when we reviewed all of these we were thinking very much about what brought us to this moment and if we made these changes would it prevent this moment again. If we really did this. I think we thought about everyone that walked in every work group and did, could they find themselves in this work and then I think in the co-chair's working group the notion that we were able to identify gaps was very important so I think one of the things I heard as a co-chair was have we been true to the process, has this process been inclusive, transparent, thoughtful and I think this does represent very much the moment a year ago, I
think it represents what is possible and what is necessary and I thank the Staff and the Commission for bringing us to this point.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other comments from any of the co-chairs?

MS. PULLIAM: I'd like to offer that the opportunity to sit with the co-chairs over the course of a full day, to study the breadth of the work and really digest what had come out of working group sessions as well as Commission meetings. To confirm what Becky has said I think it's important for community to know how much time we actually spent detailing the recommendations, looking and thinking into the future around their impact, dialoguing with each other to better understand and make sure that the language reflects the intent of the recommendations. It was a very long day, everyone was committed to the process and we left there feeling really good about our ability to cull priorities from the 200 recommendations that were presented to us and I think after that process thinking about the transformative potential of our work I, it was quite encouraging for me and inspiring for me that Commissioners said, stepped away from the work in part of that day and then in
subsequent days to come back with suggestions to make sure that we plugged all of the holes that so community would know that we heard them, we did our research, we worked together and we've talked about the dialogue and how energetic it was sometimes and it certainly was but that was to understand where people were coming from, their diverse perspectives to make sure that we got it right, as right as we could get it. So I'm grateful to the co-chairs for that day and just want the community to know how committed and how intensely we took that charge.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: I too am appreciative of the process that we all have committed to and followed through on and I'm more appreciative of the process even than I am of the product and what I mean by that is recognizing that a lot of work has gone into this, great leadership has been involved, there are still holes and there will be holes because we were hitting a moving target, so what we started with when we began this process, the world didn't stop and things have begun to evolve in ways that we could not have even imagined even from meeting to meeting and so I think that it behooves us not to just lift the product as perfect or imperfect as it is, and it is
imperfect because we are imperfect, but also to
lift the process. I think that what this
Commission has had the opportunity to do to reach
across diverse people who live in diverse places
with diverse thoughts and decide that we have a
goal that is great enough that we can come together
even in our differences for the sake of our region
is a model for all of our communities, that this
conversation doesn't stop here, these suggestions
don't just stop here but as new issues arise that
we will have to have a process whereby we can
attack those even if the Governor doesn't call us
to and I think that the work of this Commission is
a great model on how those things can happen, how
we can sit in uncomfortable places for the sake of
our region and come out with thoughtful, thoughtful
recommendations that take into consideration the
well-being of everyone that is involved. For this
opportunity I thank you and I thank both co-chairs
for your leadership in this process and for the
amazing staff that was put together to make this
come to fruition.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: I think that both
Commission and the working groups have done their
best to try to capture the community's voice and
we've done that through many, many different means
and what I hope the community recognizes that that
was the driving force behind our recommendations
and I think within those recommendations not only
the priorities but the full recommendations we are
trying to capture the voice of the community
knowing that that's not perfect and that this is
going to be a living and breathing document that
will change over time as we get more information
from the community and as things change but from
the citizen-law enforcement standpoint I think that
we tried to capture structural problems in our
policing in this region, we heard time and time
about accountability and oversight and I believe
we've done a good job of capturing many of the
things that people have suggested in those areas.
We've heard from officers about training, mental
health issues, wellness. We've tried to capture
that within the report as well and so it is a
starting point, I think it's a very good starting
point that has captured many of the things that our
diverse community is asking for in the area of
citizen and law enforcement relations.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I would just
echo my co-chair and absolutely want to thank him for his consistent and progressive leadership on this but it is absolutely a starting point.

I was privileged to Skype in with a number of high school students in Washington who had been studying our report and the President's task force report and who had all supplied their own recommendations and they said, yeah, 27 hours is great but what about three hours every month, right? So our young people are continuing to give us the indicator that there is more to be done and so I hope that this serves as a beginning and as a jumping off point and not as the end, right, so that it is the floor but not the ceiling.

I also really want to extend a note of gratitude to the members of our working group and all of the members of the public that very consistently came and involved themselves in all of our working groups but especially ours, about midway through our report, actually maybe three-quarters of the way through our report, Bethany's looking at me, we had to hit pause in our working group and say there are some places that we still have not covered with the amount of thorough attention that this moment requires and so people
were willing to adapt, be flexible, roll up their sleeves and make sure that we spent the extra time necessary so at the very at least the floor that we're setting is still one with a high enough bar that would satisfy the call of today. So it is certainly imperfect, it is certainly just the beginning but I'm proud of the work that we've done.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I would note by Brittany and Dan had made their comments I was struck as Starsky and I stood at the press conference yesterday where the announcement was made in the call for the adoption of police training standards that in effect the areas and the direction if not the substance of that call was driven by the work that your task force did and we said in our statement this is the minimum, this is the heart and we hope it's certainly regarded that way because it's past time for these things to have been put into place for the safety of our citizens, for the safety of our officers, for the well-being of our citizenry, the well-being of our officers and so I think that's a great example of how the Commission was calling early through the work of the task force for addressing this very needed
space and work of the working group was really
critical in that space.

Okay. Before we proceed the process
if you don't mind Serena we'll take a moment here
and I've asked Bethany if she would take a moment
and talk about how we're going to, how we have been
processing dissent, folks who don't agree with the
particular recommendations and how we will document
and process the document then going forward.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Sure. Just want to note a couple things. Number
one, Commissioners at your table you will see that
you have a mechanism, the polling that we have
asked our community to use at every meeting and now
we're going to use the same technology so let's see
if we can do it as well. So we're going to do it
two ways. One, when you take this poll and when
you press the buttons the 1A will equal yes, 2B is
your no and 3C is an abstention on the vote that
you'll be taking. This will show up visually but
it won't actually record what individual
commissioner has voted in what way so not only will
we do the keypad polling but we will also do the
roll call so that I can confirm that for you, so
just the process so you understand that.
Second is in the issue of consent, the issue of dissent. We will be talking about this a little more deeply a little later on in the agenda but just so we can be clear and the public can understand that three things actually, the three Commissioners who are not with us today, Gabe Gore, Kevin Ahlbrand and Pat Sly have provided me with their vote and have provided me with comment with which as they have moved to accept the bundles there's also individual calls that they made note of that they dissent and so the process will be that we will take dissent, that you can submit any comment that you have both affirming a call to action that you feel strongly about or dissenting call to action that you want to make note of in the report, we make note of that there and also provide overall language as you may remember in our municipal courts and governance space that shows that not everything was done by consensus and there was a great rigor and debate as well to accurately reflect the viewpoint of each individual commissioner who oftentimes do speak with individual voices.

So that's the process.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So let me say it
back to you and Starsky can clarify or comment. So we thought through this a bit because we do want to reflect accurately the views of individual Commissioners on individual calls to action, both those that want to say here's why I really affirm this call and here's why I dissent from this call and every one of these calls to action have been voted on previously, actually in many ways including ones we may consider in a bit but, and so where there have been dissenting votes those have been recorded, within the record there were in some cases roll call votes that did that and so what Bethany will describe later is the way in which we envision the report documenting that in the appendix so it's really transparent what the views of the Commissioners are and how we approached that so the vote we're going to take today is on the 28, if an individual commissioner has dissented on one of the 28 we certainly can vote any way we choose to of course but our view and the way I'm going to approach my vote even though I might have abstained on one of the 28 is to approve the entire 28 and realize that I can document and my dissent is already documented in a meeting and could be documented further in the report if I so choose and
recognize that this is directionally bundled that
we're approaching.
So that I think is the approach.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yeah, this is a
good point of conversation because I don't think
that's the way we're supposed to do it. That's the
way I understand it to approach this vote, so we
are voting up or down on a bundle and we'll do so
by roll call mostly because I'm really jealous in
no meeting have we had a chance to use keypads, we
will this time.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I brought my
garage door opener.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: If you're not
evoting with me you can use your garage door opener.
So there's an agreement here, we're
going to vote up or down, we'll have a record of
that by doing so with keypads, if keypads don't
work we'll have a roll call so we can note also
those that are not here. The process of dissent in
the report is a discussion point that we will
decide on later, it's an action item later on in
your agenda and there are two options on your
agenda and we'll decide that together later but at
this point it is still the case that we are voting,
we have discussed these before, we're not for the record debating further, we're voting on what has been presented by bundle and then by individual if need be. And then later we will discuss the process of documenting dissent as an action item you see under Pathway To Final Report where there are two options that are presented there, one Rich has noted as well, so they're there, we'll discuss that and we'll decide together how we will handle dissent in the report.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: What my co-chair has appropriately noted we want the Commission the language of dissent should be noted so we should all together collect that point.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: I wanted to clarify for the people who hear differently. Am I to understand that even if I have disagreements in the report my vote is whether or not I acknowledge that this is the bundle that the working group and the Commission has faithfully decided to put forth and whether or not I can accept that, is that right?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yes. This is an affirmation of the bundle considering a couple of things. Considering the process which we've spoken
to, considering that we have had opportunity to add
to the bundle and that in the document you have we
have acknowledged those things that have been added
and the fact that we will next have an occasion to
speak to additions --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

One by one.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: One by one and when
we note that is the ones in orange --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Outside.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Outside of the ones
in orange, the ones that were submitted I think
before noon on Wednesday then we'll have an
opportunity for Commissioners to add them, to speak
to them in a two minute comment so what we're
voting on now is as presented, this 28 bundled
calls to action would the Commissioners by your
vote of affirmation, you would say this is the
appropriate bundle to move forward together based
upon the process that we have gone through to date.
After that, and I'm looking at Serena to correct me
here, after that then we'll have an opportunity to
speak to additions outside of this bundle that was
submitted by virtue of our process by Wednesday.
MS. MUHAMMAD: Right. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Questions about

the process?

COMMISSIONER CARR: For action item

1A I move that the Commission accepts the bundled

signature recommendations as our priorities. All

recommendations will be included in the product.

The Commission acknowledges that these

recommendations were not unanimously approved in

the work groups in order to be inclusive and

reflect opinions of individual Commissioners and

Commissioners may submit their endorsement,

opposition or reservations about individual

recommendations in written form for inclusion in

the final report. These should be submitted to the

Commission staff no later than Tuesday, August the

11th.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Is that a

motion?

COMMISSIONER CARR: That's a

motion.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Commissioner Carr

makes a motion. Is there is second?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Further
discussion? Does everybody understand the motion?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I have a question about the motion. The motion seems to also presume the second option for dissent so my concern is whether --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: This motion is to accept the 28 calls to action.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Respectfully Commissioner Carr made the motion.

MS. PULLIAM: Can't we just hear it again?

COMMISSIONER CARR: The motion says the Commission, I'll read it again. The Commission accepts the bundled signature recommendations as our priorities. All recommendations will be included in the final report. The Commission acknowledges that these recommendations were not unanimously approved in the work groups. In order to be inclusive and reflect the opinions of individual Commissioners in the final report Commissioners may submit their endorsement, opposition or reservations about individual recommendations in written form for inclusion in the final report. These should be submitted to the Commission staff no later than Tuesday, August the
11th. How it's included in the final report will
be decided by the staff.

To get to your point Starsky I think
option 1 or 2 is how it's included in the final
report. Option 1 deals with appendix, option 2
deals with something else. So this is a mechanism
to review these, my view is that this is a
mechanism to receive commissioner endorsement,
reservations or endorsements on individual items.
How it's included is another item. That's the
intent.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Except the second
option actually does not speak to individual
commissioner's opportunity to express dissent,
rather it speaks to the process about which it
suggests that this was not the consensus or
unanimous but rather, and does not necessarily say
that Commissioners would have space for such notes
in the final report.

MS. MUHAMMAD: So could you amend the
motion without having that second piece about how
you will note dissent and just focus on accepting
the calls?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: For the sake of
further discussion later action I would ask
Commissioner Carr whether he would consider it a friendly amendment to remove the language that begins in order to be inclusive and ends August 11th.

COMMISSIONER CARR: That will be amended.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So could you reread the motion with the amendment please?

COMMISSIONER CARR: The Commission accepts the bundled signature reservations as our priorities. All reservations will be included in the final report. The Commission acknowledges that these reservations will not be unanimously approved.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Question.

It's my understanding from our breakout group that there were additional reservations that we were going to consider today to be a part of our priority. The way that that is worded does that allow for that? Does it allow for us to add additional?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: This is the first. So as you go to this this is the first bundle and this is the first action. The second action that is coming up will allow for the
additional discussion of those brought forward by Commissioners that were presented to us prior to today.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So what we're voting on does not deal with the question how dissent is documented or accepted.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: No.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: We leave that decision for an action item later in our process. That's the spirit of the amendment.

Okay. So we have a motion as amended, does the second accept the amendment?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: I do.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So any further discussion?

Now, Starsky's been dying, do we get to use these?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: At this time.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So who's going to give us instructions to do this?

MS. FRANKS: So like Bethany mentioned A and slash 1 will be yes, B slash 2 will
be no and C slash 3 will be abstain and then note
the red corner at the top right, I will open
polling now.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: While everybody's
voting I've really been dying to tell what my
favorite color is and I've had no chance to do
that.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We know it's blue.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is now closed.

And 100 percent yes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we have
endorsement of the 28 calls for action and thank
you for all your hard work and support of those.
So we're going to roll call for the
three who are not here.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Point of order. We should probably roll call
everyone.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Reverend Starsky Wilson?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Rich McClure.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Yes.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

1. Kevin Ahlbrand's vote was yes.
2. Rasheen Aldridge?
3. COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Yes.
4. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
5. Pastor Traci Blackmon.
6. COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Yes.
7. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
9. COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
10. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
11. Dave Gore is yes.
13. COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.
14. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
15. Dan Isom.
16. COMMISSIONER ISOM: Yes.
17. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
19. COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Yes.
20. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
22. COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes.
23. MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
MS. PULLIAM: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pat Sly is yes.

Byron Watson?

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

And Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Motion carries. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you all very much.

The next portion of the agenda calls that we reference to have open discussion on additional calls to action. During this portion of the agenda Commissioners have one more opportunity to address signature priorities. Commissioners who brought forth additional calls to action prior to the deadline on Wednesday have two minutes to present their case explaining how the call addresses a gap in the existing set of recommendations or the set of prioritized calls communicating why it is transformative, urgent and unflinching. Commissioners will then take a majority vote to determine if the proposed addition
will make it to the slate of signature priorities. Those, I look to Staff to note which ones we had before to date so if Managing Director MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS will give us direction on those that were brought forward.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Sure. Please look in to your packet and the title of your document is Recommended Actions to the Slate of 28 Top Priority Calls and ask first if, the first ones proposed by COMMISSIONER Pulliam are recommending adding three calls to action to three existing bundles. Your existing calls your request is to put them into the existing 28 bundle.

MS. PULLIAM: Yes.

Good afternoon again Commissioners and I appreciate the opportunity to further define the calls to action from the economic inequity and opportunity working group.

After further reflection of the bundle I am recommending that we add I&O number 14 which concerns individual development accounts and family development accounts, roll that into the call that has been confirmed for child development accounts and I'm asking for that action to meet the charge of intergenerationality in the nature of
transforming conditions when it comes to economic
mobility. So we've got child development accounts
but we've left out individual adults and families
so I'd just like to include them there. That call
also works to create a funding mechanism so calling
for the state to increase its matching fund back to
the original $4 million because the couple hundred
thousand dollars that they have now is quickly
depleted so went to establish a matching fund for
that and also capture unclaimed dollars held at the
state, make those available for matching funds as
well. So that is my first call.

I do have two minutes for each one or
all three of them?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
What we'd like to do is take each individual call,
hear the two minutes, have discussion and vote
individually.

MS. PULLIAM: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I would ask if
staff has the actual language from I&O 14, to have
that read into the record?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
I&O 14 reads as follows: Provide progressive
Individual Development Accounts and Family
Development Accounts offered statewide by means of a dedicated funding stream from the state. Additional potential funding sources include, first bullet, using the Community Reinvestment Act to provide banks with credit for funding development accounts. Second bullet, offering corporate tax breaks for contributions to development accounts. Third, redirecting unclaimed savings account funds turned over to the state, or fourth bullet, restoring the state funding matching program to its original 4 million.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: What page do you find that? How is it numbered in our packet?

MS. FURTADO: Page 8.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Page 8 and your calls to action are numbered by the total score. So page 8 it's in orange at the top of your packet.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Is there discussion on the addition of I&O 14 which is found at the top of page 8 to be bundled with recommendation, with bundle number 10 on expanding the MOST 529 program?

So moved and properly seconded that I&O number 14 be added to a bundle with prioritized call to action number 10 with expansion of the most
529 program for child development accounts.

Is there further discussion?

Just make one not for discussion, I think it speaks to it but I think we'll get to this considering all of these. If it's the case that I understand the scoring correctly that the highest scored call to action is 151, this one was at 50 and it speaks to the conversation about while again there are gaps in the thought process, I think the argument is significant but I think it may be helpful for us to consider where these rank in our priorities before and this document is helpful for us and kind of reminding us around that.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: One quick question. Are we going to go line by line on approval of this or are we just going to wait until she finishes all three parts?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We'll take them individually.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So at this point we do have a motion and a second for I&O 14. Is there any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I would just like to make a comment that in the
conversation this was one of the regs along with others that were very important to the idea of asset building and as much as wage increase is a part of the conversation that we need to make a path so that families, children can begin to build assets and I think this was a part of that overall understanding of asset building. So it's just further support of this.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you.

Any further discussion?

Yes, Commissioner Windmiller?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Felicia I have a question about the actual. So is there a current statewide funding stream for IDAs or CE, or FDAs?

MS. PULLIAM: CDAs. There's a statewide stream at $300,000 for the entire state and it is rapidly depleted. It actually provides to access for most people to match those CDA accounts so we're calling to increase that statewide matching fund to $4 million and then provide two additional revenue streams to feed that state matching fund.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: I don't see anything in this recommendation that calls out the
CDA money, unless I'm not reading it correctly.

MS. PULLIAM: No. And that's why I'm calling for the bundle. The funding streams are included in this, the CDA, the recommendation for CDA came out early and got information out of our group. When we came back to the working group we started working on IDAs and FDAs and after a lot of work were able to come up with the funding mechanisms. They got encapsulated here in I&O 14 and here we have I&O 10 about CDAs that doesn't have that language, doesn't have the funding mechanism and that's why I'm calling for the call.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Okay. The only other question I would raise or suggestion I would make is that I think you're missing one accountable body and that would be the Governor.

MS. PULLIAM: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Do you require statutory change?

MS. PULLIAM: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I would just note that on I&O 4, the one that isn't bundled approved it says owner accountable so I think when we bundle these we probably need to look at the accountable body and make sure we rationalize those across
multiple calls that are considered.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: And if we are calling for CDA money for this joint, the combination of the two I just want to make sure that the CDA reflection is in the MOST piece, otherwise it's not going, there's, the recommendation isn't going to make potential sense if what you're saying if there's an existing stream but it's not mentioned in either this I&O 14 or in the MOST piece and you're reflecting back to the current financial support from the state to CDAs, I'm not seeing that anywhere.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: So what you're suggesting is to enhance the language restoring the state funded matching program to actually call out that matching program by name and insert it here.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Absolutely.

MS. PULLIAM: So noted.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any further discussion?

Do we get to have fun on these too?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: All right. We invite you to grab your keypad, action item number
2, we're asking do you accept, we do have a motion
and a proper second, do you accept adding the
proposed call to action to the state of signature
priorities, this is the recommendation of adding
economic inequity and opportunity number 14 to
bundle, prioritized bundle number 10 related to the
expansion of MOST child development 529 program
accounts.

All those in favor please press 1 or
A, if you want to vote no press B or 2, if you want
to abstain press 3 or C.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is open.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We note that 100
percent of Commissioners with I believe that was 14
that read, 14 responses have voted yes. Noting
that 14 I ask have you voted for, have we already
voted for those who are absent?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Yes. Well, we can when we take a roll call.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So the question I
raise --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Yes, they did.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So staff is voting
currently -- thank you.
we will reserve the right to call roll when there is not a unanimous vote.

All right. We are still in the hands of Commissioner Pulliam, on the recommendation of adding I&O 19 on inclusion rather zoning to bundle number 26 regarding unit sizes, work force housing and LIHTC.

Commissioner Pulliam.

MS. PULLIAM: Thank you. This is a simple amendment, I would just like for our prioritized call numbers 26 to begin with establish inclusionary zoning and support of the Missouri Housing Development Commission 2015/16 QAP. The, here it is referenced the unit sizing, strengthening and supervising the use of low income housing tax credits and providing set asides for work force housing, those are principles of inclusionary zoning but it occurred to me, woke me up in the middle of the night, what if they change the legislation, what if the intent of the QAP changes, so if we say establish inclusionary zoning and support what's happening at the Missouri Housing Development Commission, that we're covered no matter what happens. If may seem redundant but then it's locked in.
CHAIRMAN WILSON: I&O 19, Co-Chair McClure as you're helpful in noting it's on page 10 there in the middle.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: So to read it it's enact inclusionary zoning ordinances to promote access to affordable housing for low income individuals.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: That will be added again to I&O, I'm sorry, to the prioritized number 26. Which is item 20.

MS. PULLIAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Support Missouri Housing Development conditions, 2015/2016 Qualified Allocation Plan, it references unit sizes and investment in LIHTC and work force housing.

MS. PULLIAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Is there any discussion?

If there's no further discussion ask for a motion.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: I move.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Second.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Who moved?

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Traci.
CHAIRMAN WILSON: Moved and properly seconded that we add economic inequity and opportunity recommendation number 19 to bundle number 20 regarding unit sizes. Is there any further discussion? If not the question is before you on the screen, do you accept adding the proposed call to action to the slate of signature priorities, the recommendation has already been read, the addition of I&O 19 to bundle number 26.

If you would now vote on your keypad.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Brittany just stepped out and asked me to vote for her.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay. All those in favor notify by pressing 1 or A, proposed 2 or B, abstention is 3 or C.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is now open.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Seems the motion carries with 100 percent voting in the affirmative for yes.

We now move to the third recommendation from Commissioner Pulliam, recommended adding I&O 29, funding public transportation, to bundle 27, I&O 30. It's found on page 9 at the bottom.
MS. PULLIAM: Thank you.

And Commissioners here we have called for establishing a north/south link to provide access to areas of opportunity primarily for employment purposes via either a MetroLink line north/south or bus rapid transit, this is what's been approved. The humor about it, we can't get this done without a funding stream and so what I'm calling for is that we include I&O recommendation 29 which would establish a state funded, a state transit fund. That transit fund is critical to moving infrastructure projects forward because all of these large projects require Federal dollars and without that state match our applications just aren't competitive. We're one of the few states that doesn't have a state transit fund and so that is actually oversight on my part not to have those bundled together last Friday. So I'm asking to include the funding stream.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you Commissioner Pulliam.

Is there further discussion or questions about the recommendation?

If there is the floor is open for a motion.
COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Second.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Moved by Commissioner Windmiller, seconded by Commissioner James-Hatter. Is there further discussion?

Hearing none the question is before you on the screen, action item 4, do you accept adding the proposed call to action to the slate of signature priorities, recommendation of adding economic inequity and opportunity number 29 for funding transportation to bundle priority number 27 for public transportation priority projects. If you desire to vote in the affirmative please press 1 or A, to vote in the negative press 2 or B, to abstain press 3 or C.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is open.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Polling is closed and with 15 responses looks like the vote is unanimous again so Commissioner Pulliam has pulled off the hat trick.

MS. PULLIAM: Thank you Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Motion carries to add I&O 29 to bundle 27 in our recommendations. So we now have these three added to the bundling, we
thank Commissioner Pulliam for her thoughtful engagement throughout the process of leadership in I&O and specifically in the co-chairs meeting but also being diligent about continued pursuit of making sure these things make sense together so thank you for your continued leadership and guidance.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Now turn to additions proposed by Commissioner James-Hatter, recommending adding three calls to action to one, one existing bundle and making one small language change, those are also in your handouts. We offer the floor to Commissioner James-Hatter for explanation on these additions.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Refer to page 9.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Thank you Commissioner Starsky.

You have already approved 16, child well-being 16 earlier in the 28. When the Commission originally approved this call to action it was to reform policies and practices that disproportionately impact youth of color and students with disabilities and further compromise
their ability to thrive and succeed. We needed to bundle, within that call were roughly 10 additional comments in there, three of them have been left out in this document that we just approved. 13, child well-being referred to school-based law enforcement officers. You may remember that when we made the call to action at the committee, or at the Commission meeting, it was understood that we needed to get that in there, it was in there, it's just not in the bundle so this is more of a technical issue than it is anything else. We needed to make sure that 18 and 19, one that really goes to the issue of accountability which is the reporting on the disproportionality and 19 which is to make sure that juvenile courts, municipal courts related staff also understand the rights of students as it relates to the issues of disproportionality as it relates to suspension, expulsions, et cetera. So this is not a new call, it was just left out in the original and we're just trying to make the original call to action complete.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: For those who desire to have these before them in your packet you can find child well-being 13 --
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:


CHAIRMAN WILSON: Are there any questions for Commissioner James-Hatter regarding these issues?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So question. So Commissioner James-Hatter, these are all intended to bundle the training and the, kind of the enforcement and regulatory framework around training and make sure we capture all of that.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes. So if you look at the 28 we just approved under disproportionality of disciplinary actions all of these were bundled together originally, they just got unbundled, we just need to put them back together is all we're asking for. So if you go to page 2 of the original ones you just did we had to bundle them and these three just got inadvertently left off but it was part of the full bundle and it was part of the enforcement of that disproportionality as it related to disciplinary actions.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So not for discussion now but when we get to talking about
report narrative that we would try to figure out
how to satisfy these all in one way so they don't
look disjointed, so they fit all together. We
considered them separately but your point is
exactly what I was thinking, we're in the same
space so we can rewrite so we capture the meaning
but we don't have 15 calls to action, that's an
exaggeration.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes. And
I think all the co-chairs assumed the bundling, the
writing of this is one thing, this is just making
sure it gets in there so that the staff and others
so when they start to write understand it but the
language doesn't have to stay exactly like this.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Got it.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any further
questions, clarifications needed regarding the
bundling on this recommendation?

COMMISSIONER WATSON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Watson
moves that we adopt this recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commissioner Isom
seconds. Any further discussion?

Seeing none the action item number 5
is before you asking whether you accept adding the
proposed call to action to the slate of signature
priorities, it also is written before you on the
screen. All those in favor please notify by
pressing 1 or A, all those opposed please press 2
or B, all those abstaining please press 3 or C.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is open.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We see we again
have unanimous vote of 15 Commissioners voting in
the affirmative. Just want to note just for the
record who's voting for Reverend Blackmon?

COMMISSIONER CARR: I am.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Okay. So
Commissioner Carr, co-chair votes for Reverend
Blackmon so we note that for the record as well.

Motion carried, we now move to action
item number 6, also with Commissioner James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

Thank you. This is a simple but important change
and it really reflects the call of the Commission
several meetings ago when we made the
recommendation originally to eliminate the option
of out of school suspension for students in
kindergarten through 3rd grade, you may remember
that Commissioner Packnett asked why we did not
include pre-K and we all agreed that we should have
put pre-K in there and when it got in to the last
language it stated the original so I'm just asking
to make sure that our intent is full and at this
meeting to make sure it reads pre-K and not just K.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Any further
questions regarding this?

COMMISSIONER CARR: Move for
approval.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Move by
Commissioner Carr. Is there a second?

MS. PULLIAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Second by
Commissioner Pulliam Any further discussion?

Hearing none all those in favor of
action item number 6, do you accept that proposed
call to action to the slate of signature
priorities, the recommendation that we change
kindergarten to pre-K. All those in favor please
notify by pressing 1 or A, opposed 2 or B,
abstentions 3 or C.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is open.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Polling is closed.

We have 13 recorded responses all in the
affirmative so I ask we do a roll call just so we
have a record what either the abstentions are or
have the opportunity to correct the keypad polling.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Okay. Starsky Wilson?
CHAIRMAN WILSON: Yes.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Rich McClure.
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Aye.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Kevin Ahlbrand voting yes and we did vote yes.
Rasheen Aldridge.
COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Aye. Yes.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Pastor Blackmon.
COMMISSIONER CARR: She voted yes.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
T.R. Carr.
COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.
Becky James-Hatter?
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Dan Isom.
COMMISSIONER ISOM: Yes.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Scott Negwer.
COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Felicia Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pat Sly was a yes and I pushed yes. Okay.

Byron Watson?

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: So I think someone may have not pushed hard enough.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you Commissioners.

Action item number 7 now, thank you very much Commissioner James-Hatter for your guidance and leadership in pursuit of those corrections. For action item number 7 Commissioner Packnett has a recommendation, a new call to add to the body of 200.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: So thank you for the opportunity. I'm actually realizing that on closer reading of bundle 16 perhaps this can just be friendly language for CWB 12. So
essentially this recommendation is based on the idea that we have recommended cultural responsiveness and anti-racism or anti-bias training for court workers, for officers and for teachers but, and school personnel, but school personnel are actually the only ones that, for whom it was not reported an actual time frame on which that should happen or this language around certification which was included in the other ones. So essentially I'm trying to add language to mirror the idea that these people are responsible for molding young lives and minds as well and that the language should be reflected across all three of those groups. And so I guess I will amend my recommendation to say mandate annual or biannual cultural competency and anti-racism professional development training and certification for teachers and staff which is in CWB 12. So that we're not actually adding another recommendation.

MS. PULLIAM: It's annual.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: If annual is what is in the other one I think annual is fine. It should be annual.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: So on page 2 I'm taking it to your colored document,
bundle number 16 which is on page 2, Commissioner Packnett's talking about CWB number 12, specifically amending that one.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: And so I am saying to mandate it annually which is reflective of what's in bundle number 8 and so add the word certification after training which is reflected in the long form language in the other ones for teachers and staff.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Do we have the extended, I know we do, but I'm looking for child well-being number 12. Also we'd be amending the language of child well-being 12, correct?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes. To have it mirror the language of the recommendations around cultural competency training for officers and for court workers.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So question while we're looking for the full language --

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: It's on page number 1.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: It's on page 5.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So reading your explanation that was provided in writing your
thought that this would be part of the professional development process each year that school districts go through now in training and doing continuing education for their staff.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes. In the same way that we're requiring it off officers and court workers, on the same time frame.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So it would be helpful just for the record to hear Commissioner James-Hatter's perspective on this as it's a child well-being recommendation and you stewarded that work.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I think this is a friendly amendment. I mean the combination of I think what Commissioner Packnett if I'm understanding, which I would be supportive of, is the time frame of requiring annual and there may be, I'm looking at where it says mandate cultural competency and anti-racism professional development training for all school personnel including teacher, staff, community partners and law enforcement officers in schools including the school resource officers. So where we may need to add some more language there but the idea of annual is certainly supported from child well-being.
COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I think that what you're saying in terms of the addition of responsible parties in the school building, I would agree.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Could we just to be clear then ask the question of Commissioner Packnett just to read or rehearse into the record what the final language would be.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I most certainly can. Mandate annual cultural responsiveness and anti-racism professional development training for teachers, staff and school resource officers.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Last time you added and certification.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Scratch it because I'm realizing it's not the right mirror.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: The only thing I would just add that in child well-being the list is just a little bit long including community partners that are working in schools so everyone that is working in the schools has this understanding. So if you're working in a school whether you're a teacher, resource officer or
community partner everyone must understand cultural competency and anti-racism to be working so directly with our youth so we're not in disagreement, I think when you get into the writing there's some overlap and I'm totally comfortable with it.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I agree with that. So teachers, staff, school resource officers and community partners.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So I just wanted to ask about community partners a little bit, whether we're speaking of the institutions or the individuals would this apply to say volunteers, parents who are working in classrooms and those kind of things, would that application happen there as well?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So I think when we were writing this it was intended that the institutions that are working in there would be the ones that must be trained and then if there's a further call to say the institutions are responsible but at that point it was just the institutions that are working in those schools.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you.

Any further discussion?
MS. PULLIAM: I just, it's not actually a discussion, I just want to say that I really appreciate the attention that we have in this area right now given the DOJ's report and we know that the disparaging treatment that it's racially biased. This is such important work so I appreciate you taking time to collaborate on that and making sure we clarify that and expand the accountable parties in this space, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Thank you very much.

So what we have before us is an amendment to child well-being which is a part of bundle number 16, that the amended language would read that we would mandate annual cultural competency and anti-racism professional development training for teachers, staff, school resource officers and community partners. All personnel activated in schools and the institutions that work with them.

Is there any further discussion? If not the floor is open for a motion?

We have moved by Commissioner Aldridge, seconded by Commissioner James-Hatter.

Any further discussion?
Hearing none all those in favor
please notify by pressing 1 or A, opposed 2 or B,
and any abstentions 3 or C.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Push hard.

MS. FRANKS: Polling is open.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: We do note there
were 15 responses all affirmative, this motion
carries, action item 7 carries.

Just note for the record who voted
for Commissioner Blackmon, is that you Commissioner
Carr?

COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Good deal.

So action item number 7 carries. We
thank Commissioner Packnett for her diligence and
care to that and the expansion of that language and
the specificity that has been added with this
amendment and the care that Commissioner
James-Hatter continues to provide as we care for
these intersections for our young people.

At this point we're going to set
another precedent, we're breaking down all kinds of
barriers today, we get to use the keypads and today
we will take a break which we do not always do but
we do have a schedule to take a break, actually we are ahead of our schedule, we're scheduled to take a 10 minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken by the parties)

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: We're going to go back to work, Mark or Dave could I ask you to slip out into the hall and let any other Commissioners know we have restarted.

So we are going to begin the discussion of the pathway to the final report. I need to certainly let members of the Commission know, many if not all of you know this and certainly members of our audience that literally the staff team and Starsky and I began envisioning what the report might look like and what we might have literally at the day of the appointment realized that this communication is so critically important to our work and so Nicole Hudson who runs our communication efforts has been working diligently and literally full time on this in addition to her other full-time responsibilities with us and Bethany is going to walk us through the process on the report, the editorial process, the dissemination strategy and so we welcome that discussion now.
MS. HUDSON: Thank you Rich.

So as we mentioned a few times the report will be what we're calling digital first and that does not mean there won't be copies and there will not be a way to print off the information contained in the report, what that means is prioritizing with our resources and our focus the idea of using 2015 technology and methods of consumption to make sure that the information and the hard work that you've done is available and able to be engaged with and in ways that people are increasingly interacting with information. So we are working with a development team who's focused on that, on building that and in lighting speed and we've identified a few core principles for how we want the report to live.

So the idea that it be delivered in a story based human centered framework, we've done a lot of talking about bridge between policy and individuals and that our work is heavily in the policy space but one of our key challenges is to help people understand how that impacts their day-to-day lives and the force of the impact on the policy of day-to-day lives. So we will look to the design and structure of the report to help bridge
that gap.

The idea that the report has to have a visual narrative that is authentic and compelling that the visuals in the report should reflect the interconnectiveness, they should connect the diversity and the breadth of our community, that all audiences and constituencies should find our work relevant and engaging so it is just not full of policy language but it includes language and ways of engaging that will hit people at different points of entry and that it should provide clear opportunity for sharing and multiple communication channels and participating in a continuing dialogue. So our window is short, it will not be like the report is Facebook but we do want to have some engagement points within the information and we do want to make things easily shareable so people can take pieces of our information and keep pieces of our information and hold perhaps discussions on their own platforms, on multiple platforms. So now that the priority calls have been identified, big news, we can start with the editorial and the narrative building. So the way I've been thinking about it is looking at what's happening now is the presentation layer so the
content layer is all the work that we've been doing, the research, the expert testimony, all the priority calls to action as they've been written, that's sort of our bucket of content and so now that we have that bucket of content we can talk about the presentation layer, so that's how it's packaged in the report, the digital version report, that's how it's packaged and whenever it's available to be printed, that's pieces that we can sort of take away and produce ancillary products out of this bucket of content that we had so that idea of separating the bucket of content from the presentation layer.

So we're looking at building the narrative that there will are a macro sort of overarching theme, some one sentence take away, the idea under which everything else falls and underneath that there'll be our signature theme so that will be a few to a handful of ideas or phrases that are key for regional progress and those will roll up the 40 so calls to action and 30 so bundles that we just approved so the idea is that we might say something like Justice For All and underneath Justice For All might be 20 of our calls to action. So that's how we're thinking about organizing the
information hierarchy and with each of those there will be context so the lenses that we've been using, people, or children at the center, place matters, unflinching, transformative, those sort of lenses and things that are keys to addressing our calls to action, our key messages so we're thinking of if you look at an iceberg you've got the tip of the iceberg where you've got our overarching theme, you've got our general narratives, you've got why this work is important, why it has impact and how it has impact and then the next layer down maybe under water will be the detail of our 40 so calls and our 30 so bundles, the context, et cetera, and then underneath the water is the other 200 calls to action, all the policy work, all the macro and documentation and because when digital you can come in at the top and if something's relevant kind of dive down to the bottom and grab it and pull it up next to it. So we're really thinking about stacking things in that way.

So the process, the actual taxable writing has already started. Because we will be including all 200 calls to action in the report we've been able to kind of look at the key topic areas and start to gather the research and
background documentation that went in to making
those calls so we started developing what we're
calling cluster documents, I think right now there
are about 45 of them so for example transfer,
school transfers, all the calls that had to do with
school transfers they'll be a set of documentation
that is background, current context, status,
research around that topic, that can be tied to
each of those calls so that writing has already
started and now that we have our signature calls we
can start to build the narrative.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
For the record Nicole's saying --

MS. HUDSON: This is how excited I am.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Let's see how it shows up in the transcript.

MS. HUDSON: September 15th is right
around the corner.

So the report process we decided that because we're moving so quickly and because we have
so many people at the table, so many contributors
we're just going to have an open review process.
We will, we developed a process that can go into
more detail and you have in your packet where there
will be a draft that staff will review and we have
key reviewers on staff who we make sure reviews
each of those documents.

   The next step will be a Commission
review so a couple Commissioners have stepped
forward to say they're going to read every word and
everyone else would will get the notification and
be allowed to read whatever they have time, we're
going to be moving very quickly. Then we'll do
that draft and then there'll be another staff
review and then it will be finalized.

   We're going to be utilizing
technology to do this, we're going to be using
Google docs because it has the ability to comment
on a specific section and then have a discussion on
the comment and then resolve the comment or reopen
the comment and also that is recorded and versions
are recorded so that way we can sort of make sure
everybody's gotten to weigh in and that we're
recording all of that.

   And that pretty much covers how we're
going to plan to move forward. The idea is that I
believe we're looking at having a final draft by
late of this month so we'll keep you up to date on
that time line but we're going to be moving as
quickly as possible.

Do you have any questions or clarifications that I can offer?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Questions or thoughts from Commission members or from Bethany or anybody?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Just a quick comment Nicole, it sounds really wonderful, it sounds like a great process and I really like the idea that it's a living document, that the community can impact with and go to the pieces that speak to them the most.

Having said that and it sounds like it's something that's going to be quite a challenge technologically will there be a way for it to be easily downloaded and printed --

MS. HUDSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So anyone can actually get help, for as the Governor said luddites to use.

Thank you.

MS. HUDSON: Yes.

And the CBD is what, there'll be a pdf that somebody could download and that will be part of the navigation, you know, download the
report. It's to be determined, and we're in a situation where because it will be electronic we could even update as things, you know, evolve. I'm going to reach out to the library systems to talk about whether or not we can collaborate on making sure that people can in come in and see the digital but will print out the pdf so all that is happening and parallel to the work.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Is there any thought that there might be some kind of a mobile app also?

MS. HUDSON: So I believe, I'm speaking for the development team but I believe we're looking at mobile, so the way that the world works now there's html programming that pretty much acts like a mobile app so when you view the site on your phone it will feel, it won't feel like you're viewing it on a desktop and you have to pinch and move, it will be built, it will be responsive, responsive design. So if you're looking at that on your phone or your tablet it will adjust to that.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Thank you.

MS. PULLIAM: And so if, I'm just interested in what's happening around like the juvenile justice issue so I can, that's all I care
about. And so how will I just extract the stuff that I care about, just juvy?

MS. HUDSON: So we're going to be using a teething system so I think one of the things that will happen tomorrow now that we have our signature calls we'll look at a narrative taxonomy so that there are key words that will be attached to all content and so as you're looking at content it might show you this five or six key words that are relative to the content you're looking at and if you click on any one of those it will show you all other stuff that goes with that key word and there will also be a search capability.

MS. PULLIAM: So I can pull it all together on one place no matter where the activities or the actions are.

MS. HUDSON: Right. You could just say children and it will give you all the stuff that's called children.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Great questions.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Just going to note and suggest perhaps that the significant time that goes into design for both the web application, website and the like and a, and something that's
printable so I would just kind of note my preference for the record that it may be most helpful and even most accessible to, for the print version to not have a lot of design bells and whistles such that it may not be, it may not sell in the same way if you would or invite in the same way is better language as the website or the web-based applications but considering the time constraints that come with it and quite frankly things that are more simple are a little easier to print if we talk about public printing, that there be less time spent on what the print version looks like than the design for these other applications. I think it's there for the sake of accessibility but with some care to the time that it takes for the development of the staff team I just note the preference that we put, that we not put as much energy into it.

MS. HUDSON: I very much appreciate you putting that on the record.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I have a questions. I want to state very clearly is not an antithetical to what Starsky just said. I'm wondering how in particular a lot of the demographic information on the spot action research
that we did during the meetings, how that's going
to be, how that or other things are going to be
graphically represented in the report.

MS. HUDSON: There is a task being
held my a couple people on staff to kind of go
through all of the comments that we got at the
meetings, the polling that we've got which was
pretty because it's all digital, and that will
definitely be layered into the information. User
interface wise I'm not sure how but we want to do
as much of that as possible.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: And I'm
assuming that includes some of the type of research
that was present to us in some of the early
testimony.

MS. HUDSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.

But I do not believe we should be spending a bunch
of money on colored ink to put a bunch of graphs
in.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And as I
understand it in terms of the research driven,
research support for signature calls we intend to
extract or to highlight research we were shown that
supports a particular call around that call.
MS. HUDSON: Correct.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I want an Opportunity to thank Truman as well for helping us to build our desk and bench and research and he's done an outstanding job and those documents are sitting right now and ready to be accessed and they're in process.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: One thing I was going to ask about, how we will illustrate our commitment to, you said Truman and it made me think about it. How we will illustrate our commitment to the racial equity lens and our various recommendations, have we thought about how we'll show that?

MS. HUDSON: The preliminary conversations have sort of, so given the weight of racial equity in the conversation across all working groups versus the number of calls to action that go with that there's been a lot of talk about how racial equity lives in the narrative and sort of the overall framing of the report and so I believe that you'll see the drafts as they start to come out but that racial equity became sort of an underpinning theme throughout the report in addition to illustrating the specificity of the
calls as well as utilizing the lens actively.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So respectfully I

don't think that, I don't think that lives out the
commitment that we made.

MS. HUDSON: Okay. Keep talking.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: That the
application to racial equity lens to policy that
would suggest desegregation on data of how
different groups are impacted by particular policy
regulation or piece of legislation or ordinance and
we noted a commitment to model that, I think we
need to illustrate that at the very least with our
priority calls. I recognize the intense nature of
that task but that is a commitment that we made on
the record.

MS. HUDSON: I see what you mean,
they, that's something we can work into the
content.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Currently what we have to speak to your point, not
completely but what we have in progress, we have
had the in kind support of community and Dr. Kira
Banks. Together they have developed over 16 page
business case with a lot of the demographic
information and a lot of those things that need to
be pulled into the narrative to speak more than
just the calls to action, more than saying we do it
and so having that level of research will help to
make that point from a data perspective.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I appreciate those
things but I just want to be clear about this.
When we talk about the child well-being status and
when we suggest that there can be no, or when we
call for people not to have out-of-school
suspensions for pre-K to 3rd grade and we should be
illustrating the number of pre-K suspensions, from
pre-K to 3rd grade over a certain period of time by
race. That's the commitment of the racial equity
lens and we've got those three questions, we noted
that we would do it in an action and I think we
need to do that at least with our priority calls to
action.

MS. HUDSON: So you're saying to say
it back to you to apply and show the work of
applying the racial equity lens to each of our
calls to action that are in the signature
priorities.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I'm saying we voted
unanimously that we would do it and so we've got to
do it.
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And the support.

MS. HUDSON: Our working group did it, they applied the lens and now we're showing the work on how this lens plays out with data for each of these calls to action.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Right. Got the three questions that need to be asked and answered, I recognize we can't do it for 200 but perhaps we can illustrate a resource, we can do that for those 200 before the top priorities. We've got to illustrate, got to answer those three questions.

MS. HUDSON: Noted.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: And so the audiences and constituents in finding it relevant and engaging, does that mean that it speaks a lot of languages?

MS. HUDSON: We haven't discussed that, kind of translating.

MS. PULLIAM: And translating.

MS. HUDSON: Yes, that is on the list.

MS. PULLIAM: And I don't mean languages as in indigenous or cultural languages, I mean languages in terms also of people's ability to digest the material.
MS. HUDSON: Yes.

MS. PULLIAM: In a culturally positive way.

MS. HUDSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Any other questions or comments for Nicole?

COMMISSIONER CARR: What's your time frame? I notice we have a meeting on the 24th? Just looking at the iterations and drafts, 24th where will you be then?

MS. HUDSON: We are anticipating having a full draft by the end of this month but I wanted to get through today and understand the universe of stuff that we were working with officially and will be sharing a specific time line with you next week. But our initial stake in the ground before having as much information as we have was I believe the 28th of this month to have a draft of the full report.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Church language. I notice Commissioner review team so are the doors of the church still open?

MS. HUDSON: So since this document went out I've heard from two of you, so I'll say
for the record Starsky and Rich, I've heard from Rose and Gabe has also stepped forward as being the four sort of guaranteed Commissioner readers but I will share, if anybody else wants to be one of the readers let me know.

Becky's raised her hand. And when I send out these notes I will send, what will happen is when there's a new draft -- I see your hand up Brittany. When I send out the notification of there being new stuff to read I will include everyone, so you can get in where you fit in, if you happen to have some time. I will also note to the window for comments when I send it out because it will vary, sometimes it will be a week because we know we're working on something else or sometimes we know it will be 24 to 48 hours, so that communication will be iterative and specific to each communication.

MS. PULLIAM: So every, even the initial reading will go to everyone but these are folks that have guaranteed to be on the Commission review team.

MS. HUDSON: Yes. So the staff will read the first draft then the second draft I'll send a note to all Commissioners but the five, six
people have agreed to be for sure going to read and
then there will be a final staff read.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And I think the
invitation is relevant so if a Commissioner has
some particular time and wants to get in and see
where it is, all that's available to you, open and
available in the draft form, they're all in draft
obviously.

MS. HUDSON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: All right. Well I
want to echo Bethany's comments about the strength
of the teamwork on this kind of across of board.
It's literally everyone from our talented intern
team that's with us and some of them are going to
have to of course go back to school, I hate that
school's in the way of this work, and the
consulting team and the Truman team, the research
team, just were really impressive and this is, I
think probably if we think about the iteration of
our thinking here this is a more complex and
frankly more expensive process than we expected it
would be but it will be well worth the cost and the
effort that we put into it for the purpose of
communicating very clearly and broadly in a way
that is very engaging so thanks you for your strong
input.

MS. HUDSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we're going to talk through the issue that we began to talk through earlier, the representation of dissent and affirmation and then make a decision on how to approach that as it relates to the report.

You'll note in your agenda and on the screen two options available for capturing dissent and affirmation statements and there's option A and option B on the screen, 1 and 2 on your notes for the meeting but they're exactly the same. I think they're pretty much self-explanatory but we would welcome any questions or comments, ultimately we'll I think make a decision here by vote on whether we would do option A or option B or both options or another option that is developed and received support from the Commission. So we would open the floor for discussion and comment and Starsky I think rightfully directed us to let's make sure we have an open discussion about how we do this.

COMMISSIONER CARR: You said you could do both, just a general statement and then option A would be an appendix, is that what you were saying Rich, you said A or B or both?
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: It's just my opinion, my opinion we do both, we should certainly include a statement that is factual in the process is not always unanimous but that would not in my mind preclude A.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Just my opinion on doing option 2 alone creates too many questions. I think people are going to have a logical question next about who were the dissenters, how many people dissented. So I think either option 1 or both option 1 and 2 in my opinion would be the best choices.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other comments from Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Would this also include the names of the Commissioners that dissent?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Yes. It could. The dissents are on the record, when someone voted in dissent those are in the record.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: I mean by name?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I think it's helpful to know what we're talking about is the actual report so some of those dissents aren't on the record in the report so we're talking about one
platform of communication recognizing you'll have access to both so part of the discussion and framing here is what is the relative value and what's the process behind dissents and affirmations and I think it's helpful to talk about both.

Dissents and affirmations in the actual official vote. Recognizing that people have and will continue to have, particularly their opinion but we do not have as we have done today a documented record by roll call of all votes so there's not necessarily unless someone chooses to dissent and identify themselves will we require them to identify themselves, there's not, there's not necessarily a record of who dissented on what. So that's just in recreating that record maybe. May not be possible at this point based on how we took some of our votes. And again this is about what's in the report not what people have the capacity to do, but what's in the final report.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So I have a question actually about option A. It says an appendix of the dissenting votes per call as well as endorsement for particular calls to action. Is that endorsements that are made after the fact, in other words if I wanted to
dissent on something and I sent something in for the final report would I also if I had a particular endorsement for a particular call to action I would be sending that in as well? I don't understand exactly what an endorsement is. I thought this was strictly about dissent so I need a little clarification on that.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Well, it's written to provide for both. If someone says I like this call to action for the following reasons, now presumably that's captured in the report and it's fully represented but someone might want to put an explanation point or give their rationale so that would be at least one way to do it. I don't know that there's any clear way to do it. And I would add in my thought if option A is chosen is that we would have a limitation on the number of words given to it so that is, whether it's an affirmation or a dissent that it's limited.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So a follow up to that. So if I feel particularly strongly in support of a particular call to action and I want to make that known as part of my record for the report in two or three words or however many we decide that's appropriate in addition to if there
was something that I chose to dissent on.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Again this is just me talking, so this is something for the Commission to talk through but that would be in my mind an option.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: So I'm asking that as that's my, that's the way I'm internalizing and understanding option A and I guess I'm leaving that to the rest of the group to determine if that's the appropriate understanding.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I probably agree with you because what we're trying to do with either of the policy options we want to access what people think and intensity of opinion so sometimes there's a recommendation to do X and you might feel that X is really, really important and you might want to include a sentence or two or three whether it's about option X, somebody else might think option X is the worst thing ever but sometimes it helps us to establish intent so people can understand the intent because we have 200 some odd recommendations, we bundled a bunch of them together but it provides a complete record and I think our goal, I would hope that our goal was to provide a complete record of support, concern,
1 dissent, you know, I think we could do that and I
2 think that's appropriate for us. Almost like
3 Rich's comment of all three, comment at the
4 beginning, because some of us think some of these
5 are really good. Some of us think some of these
6 have questions but we want to stress that I think.
7
8 CHAIRMAN WILSON: I think part of the
9 question is whether we will, whose report is it?
10 You begin to use possessives and we're singular.
11
12 COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Right.
13
14 Because I want to make sure people understand, this
15 was my understanding of it, not necessarily the
16 group.
17
18 CHAIRMAN WILSON: But it just raised
19 for me whose product is it and if I'm making
20 individual advocacy for or against, first I've had
21 an opportunity to do that on the record in the
22 transcripts, second it isn't Starsky's report so
23 should it represent the will of the people who are
24 in the meetings, the people who are in the working
25 groups and the deliberate and democratic process or
26 does it have to represent my opinion at the end of
27 the day. So I again begin it's part of the thought
28 process about what it means to have individual
29 appendices versus having a collective record.
COMMISSIONER ISOM: So just a followup to that. If every item was brought up in an open board meeting and everyone had an opportunity to vote it up, down, have comment on it why is it necessary for us to put that in the report when it's already on the record? I'm not really understanding why these options are even being put forward at this point in time because it seems like people are going to have the ability after the fact to dissent to things that we all voted on and I don't know what road we go down when we start to do that.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Scott you had a question or comment.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Yeah. I'm struggling about this and I think Starsky framed it very well, is it our report, and as a group we made decisions and we spent a lot of time in discussion that was very deep and involved. Ordinarily I could see someone reading the report and wondering did they consider this, did they think about this and in dissenting we would say this was discussed, these topics were brought up and they go okay, it was considered but as a group they did not. But -- well, I'm struggling with that right now.
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I think they're good arguments on both sides of this and I ended up looking at option A and B together because of the reason you just identified, that it shows that the Commission considered all the arguments, if someone feels like articulating them but I would take issue with a statement you made T.R. It doesn't, it's not an expression of intent, the intent of the Commission is what's in the report and what is adopted by the majority the Commission and that's the Commission intent. If any one Commissioner says I agreed with this for a reason in addition to what the Commission said they agreed with it for then that's their Commissioner's opinion on why they agreed with it or if they dissent they say I dissented but the full Commission agreed, to me it has the potential to add credibility to the report because it says we considered these views. I understand Starsky and I appreciate Starsky's point that it is the Commission's report and the Commission needs to speak with a voice with which we've spoken and frankly I've been very pleasantly surprised to light a turn, I've been very encouraged and affirmed that the Commission worked hard to find common ground with and got tremendous,
and I think that will come through in the report, I think that will be communicated but at the end of the day if someone says wait a minute, I don't like that recommendation, I don't think you thought about this, if we did I'd like to have that documented in some way but I don't want it included in the full report because it may reflect the diminution of the actual recommendation in the report. So again I think there are good arguments, that's why I ended up where I did.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: If I could just add, I think I share my working group co-chair's confusion and I'm wondering in reference to the point that Scott just rightfully made about transparency kind of about the process for folks who might not have been participating all along but read the final document, is there not a way to leverage the narrative instead of dissenting narrative, right, to kind of give an overview, especially in some particularly more sticky areas, kind of all of the angles that were considered? Because I think that it's a relative point. I don't think that that has to be addressed through dissent in part because my worry is that one of the symbolic points of this is that diverse people can
come together in a moment of a tragedy and great
challenge and come to some consensus and
progressive understanding and I don't want to
undermine that in a way that understanding
especially in my generation that we are sound bite
folks, if it takes me 300 pages to figure out well
it looks like they did come together I'm never
going to get that message.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So your suggestion
is to include the facts considered where there was
debate, in the narrative of the report?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I'm saying if
for instance we are reading, I don't know, I'm
trying to pick one arbitrarily, the minimum wage
increase is right in front of me, I voted for it, I
stand behind it. If we were to go into this kind
of process I would endorse it. I think it could be
relevant to say in the narrative we looked at what
this would do to tax increases and business and all
these kind of things and this was still the
democratic decision of the Commission. That's what
I mean by leveraging an area as an example.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: I feel that
if we start having individual opinions in the
actual end report that we tend to cower in the
strength of the report and it becomes about the
individuals and it's going to become about that in
the community as well. We came together to come up
with recommendations as a body and I think we
should do that as a body and as most of you know if
all of you don't know in municipal courts at least
we had to wrestle with this issue over and over
again and the way we addressed it was by
acknowledging up front that we didn't all agree but
what is is so if what is is why are we creating
opportunities or avenues to retry it in the court
of public opinion? That's just how it sounds to
me. So if every decision that I don't agree works
and there are some that I don't agree with then I
can write a personal paper or personal statement, I
know it's not a paper, but personal statement as to
why I don't think this is a good idea then in the
end the report is not going to be about the work we
did, the report is going to be about the dissension
in the group. So we have 200 calls to action, we
spent at least 20 hours coming down to 20 something
probably ending up around 30 except for creative
bundling and we're saying that this is our
signature platform and now we're going to take
those 30 and say but they're not really our
signature platform because we don't all agree so
let me tell you why I don't agree and let me tell
you why I don't agree, let me tell you why I think
this is important but I don't write on A, B and C I
just write on E and F. It becomes something else.
You know, I'm a preacher, I always go there, I've
been to the vote a little while in texts and I
guess what it feels like to me is not all growing
together but drilling holes every once in a
while.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Rasheen.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Agreeing with
Traci and Starsky this isn't the Rasheen Commission
or the Brittany Commission or the Bethany's
Commission, this was the Ferguson Commission, a
group of people that came together so I feel like
also we approved so many calls to action already
how do we go back and be like but wait, actually we
don't approve it so are we really following our
process of when we are voting? I feel like there's
going to be time after once the report comes out
that individuals are going to be able to speak to
the media, speak to whoever and say okay, I didn't
actually agree with, you know, I don't think all
municipal courts should be consolidated but as a
group and what I think is best for Missouri this is what the Ferguson Commission did so if that is, if individual opinions are in the main report I think it does become a problem, it's not about the work but like Ms. Blackmon said it's about more individuals and how they feel because I'm all gung ho for 15 but it could be other individuals who are not but that's not the main focus, the main focus is what's best for the region and as a group we had had people who have been doing this for years and study this, we even brought in experts and we voted on it so to go back it doesn't make sense and I think we shouldn't have individuals saying what they feel should be in the report and what should not be in the report.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Okay. Thank you.

Rose?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: The last three comments are specifically why I asked for a clarification on A because I don't really understand the concept of, I understand the concept of a minority report, if someone felt like there wasn't agreement but I don't, I'm having difficulty wrapping my head around, you know, I'm going to choose these particular calls to action which I
feel very strongly in favor of or I'm going to make myself publicly known on these calls to action which I don't support and it seems to me it then does somewhat denigrate the work of the entire Commission if we all decide we're going to pick and choose the ones that we love and the ones that we are less comfortable with, that's why I specifically asked about it because I don't understand how that fits into a concept of the Ferguson Commission report.

MS. PULLIAM: And to the point that I think it's important the community knows that we've been struggling with this, there are a lot of people that have experienced it with us and we have a transcript so at any point that you expressed dissent during the process it's been captured and is and will continue to be a part of the public record so creating an appendix to the report to make sure that, I don't know what, it's easily and readily accessible for folks to understand individual's dissent or endorsement I don't know that we need that because we have a public record and if someone is, and I understand that, I like dissent, I mean I'm a person that would, if I wasn't in the process I would be in the transcript
trying to figure it out, that's me. You can get in
the transcript if you want to do that. If I want
to know everything that was coming out of Rose's
head I can go through that transcript and try and
profile that from the public record. We have a
public record.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I just
want to make sure that I'm clear on option B. So
when it says include a general note in the report
that talks about the process not always being
unanimous. I just want to be clear when you talk
about the process. The Ferguson Commission's
votes, we got the majority vote to get it into the
call of action, it wasn't unanimous, so just to be
clear you're talking about the Commission not the
work groups, are you talking work groups, are you
combining that process? The work groups were not
always not only unanimous but I mean were they,
they may not have been a complete majority, I mean
I don't know that to be true, I'm just trying to
figure out when you say the process, this is the
Ferguson Commission report, the work groups were
vital, the community's voice was vital so can
somebody just answer process, which, who are we
talking about? Are we talking about us or work
groups or combination? I think that changes how I think about it.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
What we propose in the language specifically in option 2 is only referring to the Commission body itself. Whether you want to have a broader discussion you can but this language is the Ferguson Commission and commissioners specifically and how commissioners voted.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So I think it would be correct to state, Bethany correct me here, that this would probably more specifically be stated that all calls to action were not affirmed unanimously.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Or even each call to action was not affirmed unanimously but rather by a majority of the commissioners is what the spirit of what that says.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I know at least one working group, Traci and T.R. would reference this where you all in your report went out of your way to say these were not unanimous so document some language why that wasn't the case in the
working group.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I just want to clarify the difference between the working group and the Commission. I mean that seems to be shared responsibility but ultimate is we're the commissioners that have to vote and did we vote in a majority as a body, not necessarily unanimously but as a majority so I just want to clarify the process of the voice.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So the intent behind the draft on this was Commission only.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes, so inclusion will note in the report, so you could, yes. Of the Commission. So I am, so forgive me if I've just forgotten a lot, I don't think I have, but I don't remember with the exception of the meeting I was away for, I don't remember a lot of votes where there were a lot of dissenting voices. I don't need to know the number, I know there's a couple places --

CHAIRMAN WILSON: There were not a lot but there are some significant priorities, there were some in the prioritized group that bundled and prioritized today where there was what I would suggest as significant.
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: At the Commission level?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Commission level.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: At the Commission level.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Still majority.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So I think one of the things we just ought to think about in the transparency of the document, this is a very healthy discussion, a good discussion, is how easy we want to make it to define dissent because you're right, it is, I think by and large documented and I frankly can't remember one we don't have documented but we may very well.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I just mean about roll call. So I can't tell you those four people's name and I don't know that it's on the record, those four people's names.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: My memory I think they are but it is what it is, it's either there or it's not. So someone could find that obviously by going through the transcripts and the records and get to that and I think we've just got a decision to make as to whether we're going to, you know, how, whether we're going to leave it that way or
whether were going to allow at least someone to say
more about their dissent if they choose to. And
you know I confess a bit of being torn on this
because I said from the beginning we will not be
unanimous but directionally our goal is to have us
all moving in one direction and I think by and
large we have achieved that. We are directionally
moving in some very constructive and positive
directions and so personally I would not want
anything to detract from that message that this
Commission reached an incredible amount of common
ground, took an incredible amount of common ground
so, you know, I fall back to the credibility point,
I want people to understand we didn't just blindly
do these things, we thought about them carefully
and considered arguments and even if the argument
was not accepted it was heard and carefully
deliberated and research was involved in many cases
around that and I think if we reflect that in some
way, shape or form. If option B reflects that then
Brittany's comment then I think it adds to our
credibility, if there's concern among the group
that individual dissent detracts from common ground
because I don't want to do that.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: To be clear I
feel the same way about option B, I was not advocating for that, in individual sections like where there is narrative around a particular working group in the narrative there can be some transparency around how the process went, the kinds of experts that we heard from, here's the kind of testimony that we heard and this was the conclusion of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So two words are coming to mind for me, fact and truth. Fact of the matter these are the calls to action, the majority calls to action. The truth is on some of them it was not unanimous. I'm not too sure how much more we have to say as a Commission.

MS. PULLIAM: Can I ask an organizational question because I'm thinking about what you're saying and addressing it in the language when we're presenting it the way that the report is written. So Nicole when the report is presented when we were talking about tagging is there a way, I don't know, I'm trying to figure out is there a way to substantiate the extensive work that happened, the research, the content, experts and the dialogues and debate, I think that's important, so is there a way to make sure we
capture that without creating a whole document that
says this is where we don't agree, this is what we
don't like, this is what we think doesn't work
because how do we expect a community to get behind
this and move things forward if we say here it is
and then we have a whole other appendix to just
kind of shred it? Is it in the presentation?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: I wonder if we're,
option A speaks to an appendix, option B doesn't
necessarily, it says general note. I wonder if we
should be elevating that for the sake of this point
of credibility which I think Rich makes that, and
Traci said something about this earlier before we
were in this discussion, that the process is as
valuable as the product if not more valuable and I
just wonder whether the report needs to take some
time to describe the process in as much as we've
been very intentions to say every report we've got
we put up on the website so it illustrates who we
heard from and those kinds of things so that
perhaps that's already in the plan but I think we
may be compliant like this note would be, you know,
a couple of lines somewhere in the back rather than
describing what we've gone through.

MS. HUDSON: So maybe three things.
One that idea of presentation layers, whatever you theoretically decide, whatever you conceptually decide to be your wish can be addressed in the presentation layer and the design in some way so don't let that drive what your conceptual agreement is. Second, in the initial outline especially for the signature calls there is, well in the initial outline there is a space for process and process is one of those things that's above the water, that will be something somebody will understand who just skims and does the executive report and process is also emerging as a key piece of the narrative. Third thing that my thought is that in the printed version there'll be an appendix that will have a lot of stuff in it so the appendix theoretically wouldn't be just for dissent, it would be perhaps if you decided that's where you wanted to put it one of the things in the appendix and there was a fourth item which I can't remember. Yes. That the way the technology works anything that you bring up can have other things attached to it so the idea for the signature call would be that there's a signature call and then maybe you see the research behind it, the cluster it belongs to, ways you could get involved in an individual if you want
to move this forward, best practices for how this
has helped other communities, yada yada yada, a
story about a real person's life who is impacted by
this thing and then maybe also a quote by a
Commissioner that could be in support or could
number questions. So there are ways to attach
information to other information in that
presentation layer that can serve whatever you guys
decide conceptually you want it to be.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So interested in
your thought process of what she said as it relates
to your comment about an expanded option B.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: It says to me that
option B is going to be happening anyway in the
process.

MS. HUDSON: Right. I mean when we
talk about process, we'll talk about that there
were working groups, that there was discussion,
there wasn't always agreement, that the minutes are
available on-line, like all of that sort of stuff,
the way we got here and the story of how we got
here will be part of what's above that water line.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Will it also
be in the individual Commissioners?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: That's what we're
talking about.

    CHAIRMAN WILSON: Option B is

happening because you can't tell the process point
without doing option B.

    MS. HUDSON: Correct.

    CHAIRMAN WILSON: What we're really
talking about is whether they want to do option A.

    MS. HUDSON: Correct. And I would
also what you're talking impacts print so when
you're looking at it on-line it will probably feel
a lot more together, when you're looking at it in
print, so you can read the process at the
beginning, you might not speak to the call until
page 60, next to you reading about the call on
paper you may or may not remember the process. So
again it comes back to your intent as a Commission
how much, how present do you want that sort of
thing to be as somebody is digging into a call.

    CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Talking about the
process.

    MS. HUDSON: No, I'm talking about
that there's dissent. So the process will be part,
if you're look at it literally in print the
processes up front it doesn't necessarily live up
next to an individual call. So if you feel
strongly enough that when someone's reading about
consolidation or reading about minimum wage that
right next to that copy they see that there was
deep discussion about it that's something we would
need to know in order to represent that, that would
be represented by a direct quote from somebody who
didn't like it, it could be represented as a roll
call vote or it could be representative as a
reminder of process that just says a reminder of
the process. So it's a matter of how you want it
to be felt in the presentation and what weight you
want to give to that process point.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: To me this builds
on the point that Starsky made earlier, I'm not as
concerned about how it looks in print. I think if
someone, help them get to the digital version or to
make it easy for them to define that but what I
heard you say is on our signature priorities we've
got bubbles around big priorities that go into
depth about what research was considered, what best
practices were considered, the points that were
considered and the discussion of that and if that
reflects, and this gets just into how it's drafted
and what someone has said, if that reflects the
robust nature of the discussion and this is where
we ended up and the Commission voted for this and
provides that point of credibility that Scott
raised then I think that may be a way to do this
without detracting from our common ground goal and
so. So option B may be the way in which we're
going to try to do the drafting.

Ms. Hudson: But I think I hear two
different things in that in that if we were going
to tag on to the signature call a covering, a sort
of robust discussion, if we do that for some and
not for others it's still going to indicate dissent
for a specific set.

Chairman McClure: To me it reflects
the true nature of the discussion if there was
municipal court group in there, and their report
says here's what we considered and here's how we
did it and so to me that's relevant because
ultimately we got to the result, we got to the
proposal and we got to something done here.

Chairman Wilson: I think it raises
the question of what's the point of the report. Is
the point the current website to illustrate the
nature of the discussion which I would suggest
that's the decision we made early on, every
transcript we record to illustrate the nature of
the discussion. The point of the final report is to illustrate the outcomes, the outcomes are what the recommendations ultimately were. The nature of the discussions reflected elsewhere. The process is illustrated but the final report is a final report. So I don't think that they're the same weight, there's the same requirement or burden upon us to illustrate the nature of a particular discussion in the final report as there is illustrated where the community landed.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Other comments or discussion?

So what's the pleasure of the group in terms of what we would like --

MS. PULLIAM: Can I ask a clarifying question? There will be an appendix and now we're just deciding whether or not this dissenting and endorsing will be a component of the appendix that is already planned. So we're going to have B, it's already happening, and A's already happening too, is that what you said, there will be an appendix?

MS. HUDSON: So just to be clear on the separation between the presentation layer and the intent that you wish to go forth, there will be housekeeping that may or may not be called appendix
but has like, you know, organization stuff and so to put roll call vote in that stuff could happen. But it will depend on kind of what your wish as a Commission is for how this is represented, so. That would be a solution to the problem. And as for B an overall description of the process will live as here's the work we did, here's how we did it, here's why it's important so it would be all a general thing, wouldn't necessarily live next to a particular call or set of information. So it's not, I will also take that really as B because I think what we're talking about here is specifically noting robust discussion or dissent and how you decide on that would indicate whether or not that would happen next to an actual call versus the larger layer that's already happening of describing the work.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: B I think you noted something else. This is a new layer that comes from this discussion to suggest that we would talk about robust discussion on an individual action.

MS. HUDSON: That's right.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: What option B reflects which is in the way of the example that we have on our agenda a kind of expression of the
process that suggests that it wasn't unanimous, not
that we would do that call by call but rather we
would do that respect to all of the calls.

MS. HUDSON: Then in that case if
that's the interpretation that's already planned.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Again I'm going to
go by what's printed here, we have the example that
speaks to the governance working group that speaks
to a chunk of their calls and notes rigorous
review, collegial debate, and discussion and does
not always reflects consensus among the
Commissioners, right, or this is adjusted for
others.

MS. HUDSON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: If it is still the
same question I would like to call for a vote.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: The motion is to
vote on these three options, A, B or C?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: If that's the will
of the group, if this is still the same question.
I mean we've got through it a number of places.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Are we ready to
vote?

MS. PULLIAM: Because now the vote is
option A, option B, a combination of A and B or an
abstention.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: There are no, at this point we have what's presented in front of us, you and I have offered a motion for a combined thing. So if we want, I mean if someone wants to offer that motion they can offer that motion but no one's offered that motion.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Can we perhaps, I'm not offering a motion, I'm really trying to understand here for a second. Can we perhaps have a motion that separates these out, it sounds like we need to vote up and down for A, I can't totally tell if we need to vote up or down to B or if B is already happening.

MS. HUDSON: What I will say about B, I apologize, so what option B would do is say that in response to capturing dissent the Commission as a body is okay with just assuring that this language living in the overall description of process. So there's going to be a description of process regardless of what you guys vote in option B but if you vote on option B that language or some edited version of it will serve as addressing the idea of dissent for the purposes of the report. Does that make sense?
COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Can you say the last phrase again?

MS. HUDSON: If you were to vote option B what it would do would is assure that language very close to what's here.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: When you say what is here?

MS. HUDSON: So on the paper, the calls to action approved, that's why I was not. The calls to action based on a simple majority vote, reflect rigorous review, collegial debate and discussion do not always reflect consensus or agreement among commissioners. Given the level of rigor and all considerations all commissioners have agreed to align the dissents made in the process and in the course of discussion noted their disagreement as applicable.

So voting option B would be that in our overall process which is already planned for the report we would include this language for sure absolutely and that the Commission as a body feels that this is enough to address the idea of dissent.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Does that answer your question?
COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So the language under option 2 or option B on the screen is the by this we mean. So here's a way to proceed. I would suggest if someone wants to make a motion for option A or option B or for both then the floor is open for a motion.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I'm not going to know the Roberts rules to know exactly what I need to do but I really do think we need to vote on these things separately. Let me say this, I don't see myself voting for A or B which also doesn't make an abstension, an abstention doesn't make sense but I want to affirmatively say no to A and no to B, so that's why I'm saying, don't know what the motion language is and I'm admitting that publicly but that is what I'm suggesting.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Why don't we then if you want to make a motion, make a motion to start down that road if that's what you want to do.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: So I make a motion that we up or down vote option A and option B.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So the motion is to vote on option A?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Up or down.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: What we actually need an affirmative motion for option A if we're going to vote on option A. So the question is there anyone who wants to move option A?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: You want a chance to vote against it.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: But if there is no affirmative move for it then we can move on.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So would someone make another motion then please?

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: What are we making a motion on?

CHAIRMAN WILSON: It would be a motion to preclude --

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Option B or something other than option B.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I make a motion to approve option B.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Does that include the direction of the clarifying language in the notes?
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

MS. PULLIAM: I second that.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: We have a motion for option B with clarifying language and the board has a directional statement, perhaps not exactly. Is that fair to the maker and the second?

Can we do this on the software?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

We'll have a roll call.

Starsky Wilson.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Commissioner McClure.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Kevin is absent and given discussion he would vote this way.

Rasheen Aldridge?

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Is there a pass?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Abstain?

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Abstain.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pastor Traci Blackmon?
COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

T.R. Carr?

COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll abstain.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Gabe is not here to vote.

Becky James-Hatter?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Dan Isom?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Scott Negwer.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Brittany Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Felicia Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pat Sly is not here.

Byron.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Abstain.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
And Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Six yes, two no, two abstentions.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: So we have a majority of those here voting?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Three abstention, sorry. Six yes, two no, three abstentions.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: And we have how many commissioners here? 12 Commissioners and we have six.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

We're missing one vote -- Rich. Seven yes, two no, three abstain. Total of 12 votes.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So we have seven majority of those voting. Motion carries.

Okay. We are to the point of the Commission reviewing next steps. Bethany this is your portion of the agenda.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Also in your packet I'd like to refer you to your document, Stlpositivechange, the minutes from our July 13th meeting, 33 pages long. I need someone to approve the minutes.
COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: So moved.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: So moved and seconded in the discussion on the minutes.

All those in favor please say Aye?

Opposed?

COMMISSIONER CARR: I'll abstain because I wasn't there so not appropriate for yes or no. So I'll abstain.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: One abstention.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVORIS:

Second just wanted to touch base to let you know that we have two commission meetings left, the first on August 24th and the final prior to our report release is September the 9th. The 8/24 meeting will be located at Creve Coeur Government Center on North New Ballas Road. During that time we will be taking a look at the implementation budget to approve, to review and approve, second is to outline what happens beyond report release and to have discussion about that, to talk through options for the role of commissions beyond 9/15 as well, we have work to do after that and also to approve the remaining calls to action that are in progress from the child well-being and the economic
inequity and opportunity and a specific call to action for the faith community from the racial equity, three buckets of work.

On the September 6th meeting we'll be back in Ferguson, location is to be determined, in which Cincinnati, the cohort that was unable to joint us earlier this summer because of the unrest there will be joining us on the 6th meeting to have discussion about lessons learned, to look specifically at what they have been able to accomplish and also to feature in a community setting in an interactive way the signature priorities that connects policy with people, more to be determined on that.

So those are our two meetings prior to the 15th.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: Questions for Bethany?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Bethany I thought I heard you say two different dates for September. Is it the 9th or the 6th?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: September the 9th which is a Wednesday is the next September meeting and the 15th I'm referring to is for final report release.
COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Is there anything planned on the 15th? Is that set aside --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: In development.

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: I think it's safe to ask the Commissioners to hold.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes, hold the 15th.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: What was the timing for the 9th?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: The 9th meeting beginning at 5:30, at our regular evening time.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: 24th is?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: 5:30.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: We don't have a location?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: September 9th is to be determined. We do have a goal of where we want to land which is where we started but we need to get confirmation from the venue.

That's my report.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Anything else for
the good of the cause?

We perhaps land where we began remembering the significance of this weekend, particularly Sunday, recognizing that many of you will be engaged in various activities of remembrance, perhaps resistance as well and we invite the entire community to be thoughtful about the calls that have been made, particularly, I am particularly mindful of the calls that have been made by Michael Brown, Sr. and Leslie McFadden to remember, speak specifically to Leslie here, remember to care for young people as a way of remembering her son, being thoughtful about them, particularly this weekend, their emotions, their considerations, their voices but then also it's very specific call for people to be peaceful as they assemble throughout this weekend as well and so we invite of you as you partake in various commemorations whether it is the unity weekend that the city is putting on or the United We Fight activities, there are various group, organizing groups with putting on that you remember these calls from these two individuals who are most deeply affected by the anniversary that is coming up and that we continue to persist, to work
together around what I believe God is calling us to out of this moment which is deeper engagement to a true reconciliation.

So with that it has been our process, my co-chair have anything further?

CHAIRMAN MCCLURE: No.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: It's been our process to close in moments of silence for the sake of solemnity so I invite you to stand. Grab someone's hand. Make a full circle, everybody can touch somebody and make sure you've been touched.

We give thanks today to our facilitator Ms. Selena Muhammad, we're just glad she doesn't have to pull out the big guns on us. Thank you very much for your leadership and your guidance in taking us through this process.

Invite you to a moment of silence.

Thank you very much. We stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 4:05 p.m.)
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