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MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Good evening everyone. I have the pleasure of calling us to order this evening. Thank you everyone for attending, my name is Bethany Johnson-Javois, I'm the managing director of the Ferguson Commission and tonight marks our 17th Ferguson Commission meeting. Today is September 9th, we're here at Ferguson Community Center, I think we should clap for that too. 1072 Smith Avenue here in Ferguson, 63135.

I am here to do the roll call tonight so Commissioners please if you're in attendance state your name by saying aye or present.

Reverend Starsky Wilson.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rich McClure.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Kevin Ahlbrand.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: Here.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rasheen Aldridge.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Present.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Traci Blackmon.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON:  Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

T.R. Carr.

COMMISSIONER CARR:  Here.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Becky James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER:  Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Daniel Isom.

COMMISSIONER ISOM:  Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Scott Negwer.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER:  Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Brittany Packnett is excused.

Felicia Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM:  Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pat Sly.

COMMISSIONER SLY:  Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Byron Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON:  Here.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

And Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

And just for fun is Koch Elementary School in the house as well? And fabulous three teachers are you here as well? Let's clap for them.

So at this time we have in order to set the stage for this evening an opening song that will be performed by the 4th grade class at Koch Elementary, this is the combined fourth grade class under the direction of Ms. Teresa Kindell and their purpose for tonight is to sing a song that they have prepared in honor of their classmate, Ms. Jamyla Bolden, from Koch Elementary, this is in her memory and in her honor. Please welcome them as they come.

MS. KINDELL: Good evening everyone.

Thank you so much for the invitation and allowing us the space. As we prepare I'm going to introduce to you our principal of Koch Elementary School, home of the Cougars.

They're really excited by today, they're really, really excited by honoring their friend Jamyla.
(Performance by Koch Elementary School)

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I think they deserve one more round of applause.

So tonight at this time I'll ask the Commissioners and our guests from Cincinnati to please take your places behind me in your seats, your assigned seating and as you do so I'll ask if our co-chairs, Reverend Starsky Wilson and Rich McClure, would provide our evening's charge, please welcome them as they come as well.

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: To our friends from Koch Elementary and your wonderful tribute to your classmate Jamyla we are so incredibly grateful, you have touched us deeply. Thank you.

My name is Rich McClure, I'm one of the co-chairs of the Commission and we are delighted you have joined us here this evening. We are particularly thoughtful tonight because we have had guests from Cincinnati join us and you'll learn more about them later but we are incredibly grateful that they have made this journey and sacrificed their time to be here with us.

Our Commission's work focuses on policy recommendations that seek to address the
root causes of systemic and structural inequities in the region and so through this work, through listening and engaging with the community and listening and engaging with experts it's become abundantly clear that we must also deal with and recognize the real regional trauma that has and continues to occur in our region and the presence of our friends from Koch Elementary is another vivid, vivid reminder of that.

So we've heard expert testimony from the Regional Health Commission, the Missouri Foundation For Health, we've heard research about trauma and toxic stress as the underlying causes of poor health and leading to undesirable education and occupational outcomes. So we seek to be informed by other communities that have been through their own experiences and have experienced similar events as we've experienced in our region and so as we prepare to release our report early next week and to take all of the calls to action, which many of you have helped us formulate through your engagement at these meetings and in working groups, tonight we think it's very appropriate that we hear from a community who has had experiences like we've had and so this will be a particularly
meaningful meeting and at this stage I'd like to
turn the podium over to my co-chair and friend and
brother Reverend Starsky Wilson.


Good evening everyone. So because
there are empty chairs you've got to make up for
the volume that people who would have sat next to
you would have brought today. So good evening
everyone.

Thank you very much. My name is
Starsky Wilson I'm pleased to share
responsibilities with my friend Rich McClure in
co-chairing the Commission and really pleased to
see all of you here on tonight come back to this
space just across the parking lot from where we
began this journey December 1st, 2014, we had our
first meeting here at the Ferguson Community Center
gathering members of this community to begin this
conversation that we extend today before this last
open meeting before the release of the Commission's
report. It is unfortunate but appropriate that we
have the construction of our agenda tonight,
unfortunate because it is a sign that connects us
to something we have learned over the course of the
last year if we did not know it before. It is
pointed out by Lindsay Lupo in a book entitled Flak-Catchers: One Hundred Years of Riot Commission Politics in America, and that fact is just about every nine to 10 years in American history it is a fact of life there is community uprising in some city that usually happens because of a police officer shooting an African-American person, usually an African-American man. Lindsay Lupo wrote that book chronicling riot commissions that happened between 1917 and 1929 closing with the Los Angeles riots. She closed that work before the next chapter could have been written and that chapter would have been written in Cincinnati. We come to learn today because our experiences are inextricably linked. If we probed the stories we would find them but I'll just share one. I was a youth pastor of a church, Greater Mt. Carmel Missionary Baptist Church in North St. Louis in 2002 and all of a sudden I came back to the city and we were all in a tizzy because my pastor had gotten a phone call that he was going to be the host pastor for the Progressive National Baptist Convention. That convention was going to happen in August, he got that phone call in April. He got the phone call because of an economic boycott in
Cincinnati where the meeting was supposed to be held. Over an extended period of time of the community's uprising turned into a kind of tension that was held long enough so that certain collaborations and conversations could happen, there was enough tension that was held long enough that people recognized that they needed to change behavior, there was tension that was held long enough that people put in place accountability measures such that those behaviors would be measured over time and evaluated such that there can actually be cultural change, not just an accommodation and quiet.

So we come tonight to learn about that experience and chapter in American history, prayerfully and hopefully so there is not a city that has to learn from us 10 years from now. So we are pleased to have these guests with us, we pray that we learn from them that will chronicle these lessons and that we integrate them into our process, our learning for our community and perhaps even for the nation as is formed by their tragic history. We thank you for being here tonight and look forward to a productive meeting.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Thank you so much, and as a point in process I wanted to note tonight that public comment will be captured in at least a couple of ways. There are blue sheets that you can see on the table that will allow you to be able to write and express, those comments will go on that board. We also have markers if you want to write directly on there and Ferguson Commission staff if you would stand tonight, if you have additional comment or feedback that we need tonight will you please see one of the staff that are making their way in or raising their hand? Emily here in the front as well. Just a point of order on that, so thank you for being here tonight.

At this time audience polling will begin and we're asking Ms. Monique Thomas from the Ferguson Commission to conduct this at this time. Does everyone have their polling apparatus? If there's someone that doesn't will you please get it to them?

Thank you Monique.

MS. THOMAS: Now does anyone still not have a keypad polling instrument, tool? All right, great.

Good evening, again my name is
Monique Thomas, I'm the assistant director of the Ferguson Commission so I'm part of the staff and as Reverend Wilson noted about the significance of history being part of history this too is making sure you're a part of history so this is our audience polling, it's significant to us. I know we have a couple of veterans in the audience who have been with us for a number of times but I know there may be people who this is their first meeting, this is their first meeting and this is the first time maybe you've used keypad polling and maybe just raise your hand and let me know if you've never used this keypad before to participate in a public poll.

Okay, a few of you. Many of you seem like you're familiar. So I'll review, we'll have a test question to get us kicked off, get us started so you'll be warmed up for the actual content. All right.

So you'll see your keypad, for those who are new to us there are a number of buttons and they have letter A through J or 1 through 9, also zero, and that is going to correspond with the answer choices that I'll give you. So I'll ask a question and you respond with the best answer based
on this. Sounds more complicated than it is so
we're going to do a test question, okay? Are you
guys ready?

So I'm asking you what is your
favorite color? We have A, black; B, brown; C,
blue; D, green; E, orange; F, purple; G, red; H
yellow; I, white and J, other. Please note that
polling is now closed. It's indicated by this red
rectangle that Jerrica Franks is so kindly circling
with her mouse. So as you enter your keypad answer
in it won't be locked right now, we don't be able
to capture it because it's closed right now. So
when it says polling open then you can do it but
then polling will be closed and if you do it after
it won't capture it. Okay, enough suspense, let's
do the test question. What is your favorite color?
If you're entering your answer you're wrong because
we haven't kicked it off yet.

And polling is now open. The bottom
indicates how many seconds you have left, you have
about 15 seconds.

We're going to close it. We have
results here. Blue always wins, it's always, about
50 percent of us our favorite color is blue, I'm
not mad at all, it's consistent.
So that was the test question, now we're going to be collecting two sets of data, demographic data gives us who's in the room and also content-related data and that is pertaining to trauma. Okay? So we're going to kick it off with this one: In what geographic area is your primary residence or home located? A, St. Louis City; B, St. Louis County; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair County; G, Madison County; H, Monroe County; I, other. Polling is closed.

Polling is now open. About five seconds left.

Great. Significant representation in St. Louis City, St. Louis County with 55 percent in the County and 32 percent in the City.

In what geographic area is your primary work and/or school? Now if you are retired you can indicate I, other. So the answer choices are A, St. Louis City; B, St. Louis County; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair County; G, Madison County; H Monroe County; I, other.

Polling is open.

Okay. Interesting. So we have 33,
we have a majority again in St. Louis City, St.
Louis County but we also have a significant amount
of people who have indicated other, 30 percent.
Shows the retirees in the room or other, welcome.
With which gender do you identify?
Please select one. A, female; B, male; C, other;
D, decline.
Polling is now open. About 10
seconds left.
Okay. Majority female, 60 percent.
Four percent other, 36 percent male.
Next question. In what age group do
you belong, please select one. I also do this
consistently, reminding people that it's anonymous
so you don't have to lie, it's a safe place so you
can just indicate your truth and you also have an
option to decline with G, but it's safe, okay? So
I'll read the answer choices. A, 21 and under; B,
22 to 34 years; C, 35 to 44 years; D, 45 to 54
years; E, 55 to 64 years; F, 65 and over; G, you
decline.
Polling is now open. About 10
seconds left.
Great, okay, we have some diversity.
20 percent is under 34 years old, we have, well
specifically between 22 and 34 years old, we have
significant majority over 55, some choosing to
decline and then folks in the middle. Welcome all.

Next question. How would you
describe your ethnicity or race? A, white; B,
black or African-American; C, Hispanic, Latino or
Spanish origin; D, Asian; E, American Indian or
Alaskan native; F, Native Hawaiian or Pacific
Islander; G, other; H, you choose to decline.

Polling is now open. About five
seconds left.

Okay. Majority white followed by
African-American with some representation in other,
others choosing to decline.

Okay. So this is our 17th meeting of
the Ferguson Commission. How many previous
meetings have you attended? Okay. So if you put A
that means this is your first meeting, okay? I, 15
or more, you've been to all of them nearly. So A
none, this is the first meeting; B, one to two; C,
three to four; D, five to six; E, seven to eight;
F, nine to 10; G, 11 to 12; H, 13 to 14; I, 15 or
more.

Polling is now open. About 10
seconds left, a little less.
Okay. A number of new folks, this is your first meeting, welcome. Then we have a spattering throughout. No one has been to nearly 15 or more which is disappointing, I'm looking at you Ruth directly but she's indicating that she's been injured which is why she's down, she has an excuse, that's fine. But anyway.

So how did you learn about today's meeting? Check all that apply. So you can select all that apply and how that works, excuse me for not explaining this, you have an opportunity to lock in multiple answers so if all of these apply to you you can indicate A, B, C, all throughout, okay? It will save the last answers you locked in if you change them.

So how did you learn about today's meeting? A, Facebook; B, Twitter; C, e-mail; D, newspaper; E, radio; F, word of mouth, friend, coworker, relative, et cetera told you; G, Ferguson Commission website stlpositivechange.org and then H, other, some other way not listed here.

Polling is now open. About 15 seconds left.

Okay. So let's find out how people found out. Mostly word of mouth, 38 percent
followed by the Ferguson Commission website, thank you for giving us those hits. 20 percent e-mail, nine percent other.

So now we're going to go into our content-related question, almost done, and here we're going into questions related to trauma, toxic stress so I wanted to know a description because each question will be related to this topic, okay? So this is described as a one time or ongoing deeply disturbing experience often brought on by physical, economic, cultural, emotional or environmental assault. Again so trauma and toxic stress described as one time or ongoing deeply disturbing experiences often brought on by physical, economic, cultural, emotional or environmental assault. The first question is, excuse me, have you experienced trauma or toxic stress? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to respond.

Polling is open. Less than 10 seconds left.

Nearly eight out of 10 of you have experienced trauma or toxic stress indicated by yes.

Next question. Do you think the
community you live in has experienced trauma? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to respond.

Do you think the community you live in has experienced trauma?

Polling is now open. About 15 seconds left.

Consistent with the last question, seven out of 10 of you indicated yes, 15 percent no, others saying they don't know and others again choosing to not respond.

Next question. Do you believe someone can be traumatized by racism? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to respond.

Polling is open. 10 seconds left.

96 percent say no, the rest being split between no you cannot be traumatized and two I don't know.

Next question. Have you experienced any trauma due to racism? A, yes; B, no; C, don't know; D, decline to respond.

Polling is open. 10 seconds, less than 10 seconds.

It's split, some indicating yes, excuse me, 46 percent indicating yes, 48 percent indicating no and six percent not knowing.
From your experience, how many people in your community are coping with past trauma or toxic stress? This is approximate. A, very few; B, some; C, a lot.

Polling is open. About 15 seconds left. How many people in your community are coping with past trauma or toxic stress?

56 percent indicate a lot followed by some and 15 percent saying very few.

That concludes our polling. I'm now going to put us back to the direction of Bethany Johnson-Javois, our managing director.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Thank you very much. If you would if you have your polling keys if you would turn those in to the center aisle if you haven't done so already, just pass them down to the center and someone will collect those from you at this time.

It's my pleasure to do introductions to community and to Commissioners tonight of the Cincinnati delegation, one which is joining us by audio visual behind me so if you would press the green light to have him join us at this time I will also do a review for him.

To my left Al Gerhardstein, if you
would waive your hand. Al is the lead plaintiff
counsel in the ACLU lawsuit against the CPD. He's
a partner in the Cincinnati lawn firm of
Gerhardstein & Branch. Mr. Gerhardstein has been
an attorney for over 37 years, his area of practice
is on civil rights including race, sex, sexual
orientation, disability discrimination and housing,
employment, prison rights, police misconduct,
voting rights and reproductive health issues. He
also is lead counsel with the plaintiffs in the
class action lawsuit which was an eight year effort
that resulted in more officer accountability, less
use of force, elimination of systematic factors
related to racially based policing and increasing
engagement of the African-American community
through problem solving. Welcome Mr. Gerhardstein.

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: Glad to be here.

MANAGING DIRECTOR BETHANY

JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Kathy Harrell is president of the
Fraternal Order of Police Queen Lodge No. 69 in
Cincinnati. Kathy was born and raised in
Cincinnati and received her degree from the
University of Cincinnati. Through her career Kathy
served for four years as a military police officer
in the U.S. Army Reserves and has been a member of
the Cincinnati police department since 1987 where she has served as a community beat cop on the west
side of Cincinnati and as an undercover drug and major crime investigator. Ms. HARRELL was the
first woman selected as union president of the FOP Queen Lodge No. 69 and currently holds that
position. She also serves as national FOP pension chairman, second vice-president of the National Conference on Public Employment Retirement Systems and a member of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. Please welcome Ms. Kathy HARRELL.

Captain Maris Herold is here as well. She is, works within the Cincinnati police department. She's the District 4 captain of Cincinnati PD and has worked extensively with the implementation of the Cincinnati Collaborative. Since 2001 Captain Herold has led many reforms serving as an officer during the 2001 Cincinnati riots and during the past decade with CPD she has served as a negotiator between the police governance and community organizations. Captain Herold is experienced in working with the old model as well as the new community problem solving policing framework and has seen strong improvements
within the CPD since the establishment of the Collaborative. Just a little bit of background, she has held numerous positions within the Cincinnati police department including the criminal investigation section, professional standards, community relations, crime analysis and problem solving units and police academy. Please welcome Captain Maris Herald.

Pastor Damon Lynch, III is to my right, a former president of the Cincinnati Black United Front. Pastor Damon Lynch, III is the senior pastor of the New Prospect Baptist Church, a position he has held since 1970. Also a lifetime resident of Cincinnati graduating from the Cincinnati Bible Seminary with a Bachelor of Science in '73 and in '91 received his MBA from the Graduate Theological Foundation at Notre Dame. Pastor Lynch is a former president of the Cincinnati Black United Front and led the group of organizations in the filing of a class action lawsuit against racial profiling in the city of Cincinnati. This lawsuit resulted in a historic landmark agreement between the Cincinnati police department, Fraternal Order of Police, City of Cincinnati, American Civil Liberties Union and the
Cincinnati Black United Front. He's also on faculty and in 2015 Pastor Lynch was appointed to the Ohio Governor's Task Force on Community Police Relationships. Pastor Damon Lynch, III is joining us as well.

Ms. Iris Roley, Cincinnati Black United Front. Iris Roley is a native of Cincinnati and currently serves as the project manager for the Cincinnati Black United Front. In 2001 Ms. Roley was instrumental in the design and monitoring of the Cincinnati police department reform stemming from the deaths of two unarmed black men by the CPD. She later was named as Cincinnati's city manager selection committee which involved the hiring of a new police chief and later leading to Cincinnati's first African-American police chief. Ms. Roley also sits on the fraternal advisory committee of the police chief and is the Cincinnati branch NAACP chairperson of the education committee. Welcome Ms. Iris Roley.

And last but not least who is joining me by audio visual. Hello. Delay is not denial.

Robert A. Killins, Greater Cincinnati Foundation is program director, he coordinates GCS grant making in the area of Vibrant Places.
Vibrant Places grant making includes community and economic development, environmental stewardship, cultural vibrancy and job creation. Robert also coordinates the GCS $10 million impact investment program, he has been with GCS since January 2010 and January '09 he retired from P&G after 24 years. Important to know about him is he has significant nonprofit experience as a volunteer founder, board member and board chair currently serving on the Sisters of Charity Ministry Foundation. He is currently the president of the Cheers Toastmaster's Club of Cincinnati. Robert is a graduate of Leadership Cincinnati, key notes class of 23. Mr. Robert Killens joins us as well.

I'm going to ask the co-chairs to set us up for the panel Q and A at this time.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: We're going to have the panel speak to us in a particular order that they determined and there are some presentation materials and so we're going to have Bethany call on them in the order that they have agreed to speak and we're going to hold all questions from the Commission until they complete their presentation so we've got the full base of information.
So again welcome to our guests from Cincinnati and Mr. Killens thank you for joining us electronically, we are very grateful for your presence.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: At this time Reverend Damon Lynch, III is set to go first but you can either keep your seat or you can come to the podium. We would ask in your presentation if you would turn the podium this direction, toward us and speak with the cordless mic which I'm happy to give you.

REV. DAMON LYNCH, III: Good evening. I'm honored to be here, honored to be here with our team, honored to be here to share with the Ferguson Commission and the residents from the many different counties from which we first saw earlier. This is the first time I've ever had my bio read, which is a compilation of my bio and my dad's bio, so sometimes you guys mixed my father who was also Damon Lynch who was actually a pastor in Cincinnati, the bios are mixed. So when I heard I've been pastor since 1970, I was 10 years old in 1970. My father started in 1970 and so I'm honored to share his name and anything about him so it is great to be here.
I started pastoring in 1990, I've been pastoring 25 years, the Church of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Let me share with you, and I need to talk kind of quickly because there are a lot of people coming behind me, so I'll share with you what I shared last night with the group and I'll start with a Sufi story, a Sufi story is a title, you will only learn what you already know. So the story says that there was a woman, there was a village that had an intractable problem, they had a problem that they could not solve. So eventually they asked a woman of another village who was of great wisdom to come and help them with their problem. In time the woman came and when she came she asked the people in Ferguson, she said do you know what I'm going to tell you, and they all said no, she said well if you don't know I'm leaving. And she left. And the people in Ferguson were like we brought these people all the way from Cincinnati for that? And so the problem continued and so in time they got up the nerve to ask her to come again and she came. She came again and she said do you know what I'm going to tell you? And this time they all said yes. She said well, if you know I'm
leaving. And she left. But the problem persisted so the community one more time asked the lady to come to share her wisdom. Well, this time the community thought they were ready and so when they came she asked the same question, do you know what I'm going to tell you, and this side of the community said yes and this side of the community said no. She said well, those of you who know tell those who don't know and you all will know and she left again and never came back. That night one of the elders in the community had a dream and she said I understand what the elderly woman was trying to tell us is that any real wisdom, any real knowledge that we need we already have it in our own community. It doesn't have to come from outsiders, it doesn't have to come from outside experts, we just have to have the courage to believe in ourselves.

And so we come from Cincinnati not because we're experts, but we come from Cincinnati because we share the same problem. We come from Cincinnati because we have sat where you sit, we have been through what you're going through and so I think it's important for us to understand tonight is why we go through this in communities around
this country. I think it's important for each of us, especially for law enforcement, to understand it. One of the problems we've had in America at least since 1619 is that the face of oppression, the face of racism for African-Americans and other minorities, the face of it has been law enforcement and law enforcement itself doesn't even realize that. The first 20 Africans came to these shores in 1619, they came here on a Dutch slave ship called the Man of War. They landed in a place called Jamestown, Virginia, 1619. From 1619 to 1863, 244 years, the first 244 years of Africans' existence on this land was slavery and if you left the plantation, if you tried to get away you know who came and got you? Law enforcement. The first 244 years spent just trying to get out of slavery. So when you talk about American exceptionalism, greatest country ever was, ever lived, there might be a slight reason why there's some people who don't really feel that way. So from 1619 to 1863 bondage, from 1963 to 1964 apartheid, apartheid means segregation, we called it in this country Jim Crow. So for the next 101 years, from 1963 to 1964 Jim Crow segregation. The first three and a half centuries for black people in America, the first
350 years, slavery and Jim Crow segregation. And I understand Jim Crow segregation was not something in Alabama or Mississippi, it was something in Cincinnati. It was something in St. Louis. The first 350 years, and so if you decide you want to cross the Edmund Pettus bridge, who's on the other end to stop you? It's not the governor, it's not the legislature, who do they put out to stop you? Law enforcement. Who is the face of the structural racism in America? So when they turned the dogs on you and water hoses it's not Governor Wallace or Governor Faubus or the legislature, and these might be nice cops but you got people making laws saying stop them and who's the face of that? The guy with the badge, the guy with the gun, the guy with the night stick, the guy with the German shepherd. The first 350 years.

So after that then you have redlining, profiling, mass incarceration, so from 1946 to now is another 51 years. You have to understand the history. So what we wanted to do in Cincinnati was figure out how can we move beyond that, this is after 15 black men were killed by police from 1997 to 2001, all black, different varying circumstances, I'm not saying everybody
didn't deserve, some people didn't deserve to be killed but the only people being killed in Cincinnati were black men and killed by white cops in that time frame and we thought the number 15 was huge. Nowadays in some cities, and that was over a period of time, now in some cities that happens within, you know, a year. But we wanted police transformation, we wanted police reform but we also wanted to bring our community together and how do we bring our community together? What Ferguson has and St. Louis has and Baltimore has and others, what Cincinnati has, we have the same problem. We will probably all end up with the same product. Everybody's got the same product, got to get some kind of consent decree from the DOJ, we're all going to get the same product because none of us are that smart that we're going to do that much different than what anybody else has done. Same problem, same product, but what we wanted to do different was process, a process that brought Ferguson together so since we're in a church, or I think used to be a church, now a community center, let me give you a word, it's called synoptic, if you want to write it down, write it down. S-Y-N-O-P-T-I-C, synoptic. If you know language
you can break it down in to two words, syn, S-Y-N, being with and optic meaning lenses. We had to figure out how can we get people in Cincinnati to see this problem through the same lenses, not just to see the same thing but to see it through the same lenses. For you Christians in the room you know that the first three books of your New Testament, Matthew, Mark and Luke, all called synoptic gospels which means that these three guys not only see the same thing but see it through the same lenses. Because I wander if you saw what I saw earlier today, those beautiful kids get up here and sing, this fourth grade class, and me, the way my lenses work I'm looking for the white kids, I'm looking, I'm like these beautiful black kids, where's the white kids? I'm like oh, that's right, because every city I travel to now vies for being the most segregated. Every city I go to, we're the most segregated city. I went to Cleveland, we're the most segregated city, Cincinnati, we're the eighth most segregated city. America has so fastly segregated itself it's funny. So I watched all these beautiful little kids and I'm like well, where's the integration. Because we're resegragated.
So how do we get synoptic vision?

Synoptic vision works like this, I'll only take two more minutes. I am African-American, born and raised in a black American family, attended a predominantly black church all my life. I've lived the black experience my entire life but I'm also born and raised in America and so I have an africentric stream of consciousness and I have a eurocentric stream of consciousness. I went to a public school system, I had to learn European history, I had to learn about the French Revolution, I had to learn everything my white friends learned. I had to be sometimes just as white as my white friends. I know what it means to be the only black person in the board room, the only black person in the classroom, that's my life experience. So I have a dual stream of consciousness. Most of my white friends are purely eurocentric because you're in a European country and being eurocentric is really all you need. So what happens is, and we're old enough in here to remember this, you can put up on the screen the OJ trial verdict and Judge Lance Ito reads the verdict, not guilty, and we're all in the same room at the same time watching the same thing and you
know what America did? It defined it. The
majority of white people said this is crazy, the
majority of black people said we finally won one.
You could put up the Rodney King beating in Los
Angeles and we're all in the same room watching the
same thing at the same time and majority of white
people in America said why did he just lay down and
the majority of black people said why do they keep
beating him. And we're looking at the same thing
at the same time but not looking through each
other's lenses and so because I have a dual stream
of consciousness I can see what my white friend
sees. Sure OJ did it, who else did it? I can see
that. I can see what they see but so often others
can't see what we see. And so Iris Roley is going
to come behind me and show you how we were able to
take the city of Cincinnati divided by race,
dealing with police brutality, dealing with the
deaths of 15 black men and bring the city together,
what was called a collaborative agreement, how we
did that, she's going to share that with you. And
so hopefully it's instructive for the work that
you're going to do here in Ferguson to bring this
community together.

Thank you for your time.
MS. ROLEY: You're all clapping, I'm not, it's hard following Reverend Damon, III.

So I do want to thank Ferguson for, and the Commission for having the Cincinnati team come into your region to talk about the work that we did in Cincinnati and the work that we continue to do. I, like Reverend Lynch, we always are talking to the community folks and it's hard to talk to important people.

So it's my job to attempt to tell you how we did it but I want to say one very important thing. How we did it was being very determined as a people to attempt to see transformation of a system and in hopes to see, seeing transformation of a community. A very important person said to me one time if you attempt to change the system and not change the community you will be walking a very long road. That person was Iris Roley.

And so I've been walking this road with Al and Damon and Kathy and Maris for the last 14 and a half years and it never seems to get easier. So we have to be very determined, be very deliberate and in some instances very arrogant in our attempts to transform the system because reform without transformation is nothing. You'll be
having more commissions, more panels, more meetings, more conversations, writing on more cards but you'll be at the same place on that very long path.

So I wanted to read a couple of things because we often and always, I know that Reverend Lynch and Al and myself, we always find ourselves going back to the Collaborative Agreement because this process is not a document, the Collaborative is a process and it is a continuous process because systems change, police get new weapons to use to fight crime, communities figure out how to commit more crimes and so we have to come together to figure this process out together so I wanted to read some things to you because they're very important and I often read them all the time because I find myself looking back to 2001 thinking wow, that was just yesterday, but it was 14 years ago and I'm still 25.

So the first thing that I want to read to you is the very important value statement. The overall Collaborative Agreement described in this document contains a description of problem-oriented policing which frames the overall philosophy and practices at its core. Central to
problem solving and orientation is the problems are
the limits to be engaged and learned from and that
blame is an obstacle to progress. We bought into
that community, the Black United Front bought into
that because we wanted to blame somebody, it was
somebody's fault. The overall Collaborative effort
suggests an alternative to blame that different
groups within the community with different
experiences and perspectives share much more in
common than not and can work together on common
goals and solve problems together. So that was the
first phase of our process.

What did we do, under the Court's
order, before we got to the Court the Cincinnati
Black United Front collected over 400 stories from
the black community because that was the community
that was negatively, highly impacted by biased
policing. Right? So I could ask you what you
think about policing not even knowing your story
but 98 percent of you are going to say your
connection and interaction with police is probably
positive, am I correct?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not always.

MS. ROLEY: I feel like I lived
overseas and dictatorships, right? And I can ask
this beautiful lady sitting next to you about her experience and maybe 98 percent of those she loves and who she is probably would be a negative experience, am I correct?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Correct.

MS. ROLEY: So we come from those different lenses that Reverend Lynch talked about. So not only did we collect the 400 stories from African-Americans because no one had ever asked us how we were being policed. It was the most humbling experience in my life because I watched fathers bring their sons in, grandmothers bring their grandchildren, boyfriends bring their girlfriends and parents take their children out of school to bring them to us and we did this in the month of January, coldest month of the year in Ohio, and over 400 people came out and gave us their story so we knew we were on to something. The next process was how do we get everyone else's thoughts and feelings around policing? Right? So we created eight stakeholder groups, police and their family, youth, religious, business, nonprofits, LGBTQ, we covered everybody, everybody was covered in the community because the Collaborative starts off with that very critical C.
What is that you all? Because you all know what I came here to tell you, right? You all know what the lady came to tell you? What's the very critical C? You were there last night, what is it? Communities. So that's the biggest problem in all of this work is how is the community engaged in the law. So those eight stakeholder groups including the African-American group had the opportunity to describe what policing looked like for them and then how did they want policing to look. Can you guess what we came up with? Very similar statements. We had more in common than not. So when Pastor talked about bringing those and connecting those lenses together and then understand what they mean and what they look like we have more in common than not. Those eight stakeholder groups define the goals, the five goals in the Collaborative Agreement and I want to read those to you.

The first goal, police officers and community members will become proactive partners in community problem solving. It's not easy. We're talking changing systems and community.

Second goal, build relationships of respect, cooperation and trust within and between
police and communities. Not easy. Reverend gave
you history and if you missed it shame on you.
Because that was a great history lesson.
The third goal, improve education,
oversight monitoring, hiring practices and
accountability of CPD. Very, very lofty goal.
Fourth goal, ensure fair, equitable
and courteous treatment for all. Because see not
everybody was being treated fairly by the
Cincinnati police department but when you looked at
all the comments from the eight stakeholder groups
each group said that they wanted everyone to be
treated fairly and equitably by the police
department.
Our last goal, create methods to
establish the public's understanding of police
practices and procedures and recognition of
exceptional service in an effort to foster support
for the police. Wow, that's really big. In
particular for the black community because as
Pastor described who's the front line in a very
negative, negative way all the time? It's the
police. Could be nice women and men, I like Maris,
I like Kathy, some days anyway, but we have more in
common than not. Right?
The last thing that I wanted to share with you is that throughout this process, and that was just the first phase of what we had to do because we had to continuously survey the community, engage, teach to know your rights, but we also had to be at the table. There's nothing about this agreement that the Black United Front didn't have a hand in. Nothing happened without our consent and it was our duty, it was our commitment to the black community to make sure that they understood and that they knew that we were there fighting for them because without buying, without ownership, the process can wane. So what we have in Cincinnati, Ohio is a continuous process to make sure we get it right, get it better, continue to build but we never leave out the critical C which is who?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Community.

MS. ROLEY: If you leave out the community you will just have a document. So I urge not only you but the Commission, it's my challenge to figure out how to get community in the process and particularly those who are mostly impacted in a very negative way. I will tell you that you can move forward in a positive way if you do that
simply. At times I wanted to tell the police you were just wrong, just dead dang wrong, just say you're sorry. But reforming systems is much more than that. So we have to be the adults, we have to be the honest ones, we have to be the ones that are going to roll up our sleeves and do the work. It's not easy, it's 14 years later. And I believe, are you after me Al? Kathy's after me so Kathy will tell you how long this process has been going and we're still working, working very hard so we've got to figure out now, we got to problem solve now how to get out of this situation that we're in in Cincinnati.

I want to end with this: Cincinnati is not the utopia for black people and police but it's much better than what it was in 2001 and I need to say something to you Pastor. We filed our lawsuit in March 2001, that was before the unrest, we didn't have a riot, we had unrest so it was before, it was our goal to stop the police from killing another unarmed black man but unfortunately it happened again so I just wanted to correct the history.

So I want to tell you all that it can be done but be self determined, be arrogant, fight,
push, kick, scream, everyone curses sometimes but
be able to use those lenses that Pastor talked
about so that you can see some transformation.
Don't be in the same place next year at this time.
It is up to you all to figure out how to use the
problem solving method to problem solve your issue.
We did it in Cincinnati and you all can do it here.
Thank you.

OFFICER KATHY HARRELL: Welcome. I
would like to thank everyone for being here and
taking out the time to be here tonight, this is a
very important process, it is a process that is
very necessary, very important to making sure that
you are heard.

I'm going to say some things to you
that are probably going to be very surprising
coming from a police officer, a union president and
having been in the unrest in Cincinnati in 2001.

A little bit of background about
myself. I got myself hired by the Cincinnati
police department in 1987. I turned 21 in
September, got hired in November. It's the only
job I've had, it's the only job that I know.
Worked in the neighborhoods, became a neighborhood
officer, majority of my work done in the police
department was drug work, undercover drug work.
Major offender unit, and I got involved in the
union in 1999, got elected to the board in 2001,
right as the unrest was unfolding. I was used to
sitting on that board and getting 10 to 12 officers
sued every month by Al Gerhardstein for civil
rights violations. That's the relationship that Al
and I had prior to becoming president in 2005.
Sitting there month after month spending large
amounts of our member's money in civil lawsuits, I
will tell you that like Captain Maris Herold I also
worked the lines during the unrest and I, it will
probably be surprising to some but I have said this
around the country, on the lines I had my
African-American partner Bill Andrews to my right
and another African-American officer to my left,
Russ Mendez. And when racial slurs were being
thrown at me on that line and they came to my
defense they were called Uncle Toms. So when you
talk about looking at the unrest and the policies
that we were in through different lenses I can say
very confidently that the Cincinnati police
officers during the unrest and after being involved
in this process did not see the unrest as race, did
not see the colors black and white, we saw the
color blue being attacked and that was us as law
enforcement officers and that was very important
for us. Our attorney Don Harden worked very close
with Al Gerhardstein and as Iris and Damon Lynch
stated there had been a suit filed before the
unrest in 2001 and two additional African American
men being killed in Cincinnati. After that unrest
our FOP attorney came to the union and said we need
to take part in this, we need to be at the table,
it's very important and came to the union to try to
sell that. I was a no vote, I did not want to take
part in the Collaborative, I felt like a lot of
officers that was a personal attack on me, how I
policed, that I engaged in racial profiling, that I
was a racist and I knew that I was not, therefore I
was going to be a no vote because in my mind if I
voted yes to take part in it then I was agreeing
with what they were saying about me as a police
officer and I knew it wasn't true and a lot of
officers felt that way. But then we needed to
listen to our attorney that said you need to be at
the table because if you're not at the table
there's going to be reform that you have no input
in, you're not going to be a part of the process,
you're not going to like what happens. And I'll
tell you Damon, Iris and Al will agree that this society, FOP, signing on and agreeing to be a part of that process was instrumental in the final outcome of the Federal Collaborative. We went into court to make sure that the word collaborative was used because it was a very collaborative approach. So when we sold it to our members and said we need to be at the table we gave them a five year commitment, we will use your dues, your money to pay an attorney to sit at that table for five years. It went to a vote and it passed. At that time I never thought I'd be FOP president, that wasn't even in my radar of going and running for president. I became the president in December 2005 and I'm still the current president and right after I got elected I called Don Harden and said what about the meetings that I'm supposed to go to, he said what do you mean, the FOP attorney hasn't been to any of them. At that point we'd been in for a good two years. So I thought it was important that I went and that's when I started building relationships with Al Gerhardstein, Iris Roley, Damon and I never spoke too much until about two years ago when he gave a presentation in New York and I think was a little surprised about what he
heard there as far as the FOP involvement and our commitment to it. But the thing that's very important, a statement that Iris just made previous to me coming up here is the fact that we all have a lot in common. We all have the same goals for the communities and the one thing I will say that was very surprising I think in those that took part in the process, that attended meetings like this, that sat at the table, was the fact that the officers also wanted change, they had been asking for change and they weren't being listened to because what most people do not realize and understand is that officers police according to their training, their policy and procedures and if you expect change and want that change you need to do it at your state level, like ours for instance, Cincinnati police department had its own academy so it was a lot easier for us during the total collaborative to add additional training and that's actually what happened. And during the process of the Federal Collaborative we actually had meetings set up where officers were separated to just police officers and specialists and asked very important questions about what they believed needed to change and this is our police department to be and we had
supervisors that were also interviewed about the
change that they thought was necessary and they
even brought in our families and spoke to our
families. The concerns that our families had, what
were some of the issues that officers were bringing
home, what the spouses and children were hearing
from those officers and making sure that all of
that was taken into account and it was being
listened to. I thought it was my job as a union
president, this may be a bad word but to sell the
Cincinnati police department to the community, to
get trust back in the police department. For the
citizens to understand that the officers also
wanted change but they were policing according to
policy procedure, training and state law. And that
was very hard at first until we gave example after
example when Al I think was surprised on numerous
occasions when they wanted policy change and the
FOP was like we want that too, we want the same
thing, let's get it done, how can we get it done.
Or we would bring things to Al and say can you get
this done for us because the administration isn't
listening and Al was able to get it done with the
work of our attorney. I will say that because of
that process, because of the officers being
involved in that process and the community understanding that as Iris said we all want something in common, basically the same thing at the end of the day but how do we get there? The Cincinnati police department, the officers in the Cincinnati police defendant every day are still working toward that Federal Collaborative. We had an all new round of additional training, tasers, in-car cameras, the establishment of a citizens complaint authority and everyone seems to think, and one of the biggest questions I get, well how hard is it to keep involved in that process, how hard is it for that Federal Collaborative to continue to keep being, moving in that same direction of the community-oriented policing, the problem with policing and what we have learned in Cincinnati due to budget cuts, due to who's hired, due to what direction is given from the upper command dictates what our officers do, what that importance is and what direction they are given and we're still working towards those goals every single day. I get very few questions anymore from my membership and haven't in probably the last six years, and I've talked with Captain Maris Herold about it, it's just something we do every day.
When new training comes through, when as Al stated earlier today a meeting, when they brought up the fact about our tasers having chest shots with the tasers and changing it, it was a policy and procedure change. They didn't get a lot from the FOP, a lot of arguments or anything else. The FOP had used a very outdated evaluation system for our officers but our attorney liked it because he was able to win arbitrations with it so when the union president, myself, says to the attorney our officers are policing differently now and we're not getting credit for it. They're asked to do problem solving, they're asked to write down and document the work that they're doing with the community but they're not getting any credit for it, they're getting lawsuits and people yelling because they're on the radio too long. Because radio runs are being held. So we were able to get that evaluation changed so that because we were policing different in Cincinnati their officers were able to get credit for the work that they were doing. This is a very long process but for us, and I can say it now and a lot of people are shocked by that, getting involved in the Federal Collaborative was of one of the best things that the FOP did because
our officers did have a voice, the citizens in Cincinnati realized that they were working towards the same goals, the same things and in many instances disagreed with the command staff and wanted those changes, had requested those changes and been ignored so we had the union. What most citizens do not realize is even the FOP and the union, we have no say in policy and procedure, we have no say in the training that occurs, we have no say in the direction that a police chief, command staff officer gives or directive that they give to their subordinates. Those officers are expected to follow those and if not as we all know there's potential discipline because of that.

Luckily in Cincinnati we believe we're on the right path, we continue and the officers are very dedicated, there's still problems, there's still issues and we have to work those out every single day but the one thing I can say is there is trust, there is transparency, it is something that has to be worked towards every day with new promotions, officers going from PO specialists to supervisor positions where of course there is different type of goals and problem solving that's expected of them in a supervisory
role and hopefully because they have been POs or specialists for so long while we've been involved in this Federal Collaborative they would then go ahead and make sure that that is what the direction is that they give to those that they command.

It's been a long process, it's been a lot of work, it's not been easy but it has been very well worth it and it's something that we will continue to strive for. I will tell you that I believe very, very much from the bottom of my heart that with what we did today in speaking to people today and coming into Ferguson today and speaking to everyone that there are goals that can be reached and there's going to be surprises along the way, things that you would not have expected that you would agree with and not expect an outcome that you would hopefully believe would benefit everyone in the community and I do wish that for you.

Thank you very much.

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: Thank you Kathy.

I'm Al Gerhardstein, the civil rights attorney, I've represented the Black United Front, the ACLU, African American residents of Cincinnati and throughout Ohio on police misconduct cases and when Iris came with her 400 stories and all of the
problems and the 15 African-Americans who had been shot I knew that we had to do something very dramatic, we had to do something different because what had we done before that time in order to affect police reform in Cincinnati? We'd gone to meetings, we had blue ribbon panels, we had lots of important people sitting at tables that had skirts on them and we issued reports and those reports were really profound and thoughtful and thorough and they sat on shelves and the reports didn't change anything and the clients still got killed. So I'm sorry, but I have to start there tonight because I'm worried for you.

I got a sneak preview here of your citizen law enforcement calls to action, 50. Got a lot of work on police reform, and the last column has multiple bodies and people responsible for implementing that, a lot of work to do but I don't see a boss and I don't really see how you're going to get this done and I'm afraid that you're going to be like I was back in 1990 carrying around my three ring binders showing everybody all the reports that had been done and that hadn't been implemented and I hope I'm wrong, and I hope that with the warning and with the attention the nation
has paid to your region that you'll find a better way to make sure that people get the work done that you've now identified and that you're naming and committing to but we're here to tell you about Cincinnati and I'll say that when we finally did assemble those 400 stories and started our work the one thing we knew was that we had failed so miserably at implementing blue ribbon panel reports that we wanted a court order and we needed a court order to keep us all on track and that court order wasn't just about spanking people who did bad things, it was about helping people because the court order came with a group of monitors. We negotiated a very comprehensive agreement much like your 50 calls to action and within that agreement we knew that in the short period of time we had to implement it we needed to change the culture of the Cincinnati police, we needed to change the way business operated and that meant we had to take the court order and translate that into the policy and procedures of the Cincinnati police department and those policies and procedures had to become the training for the Cincinnati police officers and that training had to be become the standards, the metric for performance evaluations as Kathy just
mentioned so that people got credit for all this new philosophy of policing that we were talking about, and that metric for performance on your daily activity reports had to become also the metric for supervisors to be promoted so that we had bosses who were on the same page as the people we were training. That's a lot of work, that's a lot of detail and I will tell you every time we start to tell this story to police officers and we use a word like community policing people say oh, we do that, or we use a word like training people say well, of course we do that. Or we use a word like force reform, they say of course we do that. So there's a lot of detail here that's got to be figured out and we worked through that in Cincinnati and our monitor team who implemented the police reforms under the court order had two jobs and the first job was to do technical assistance, we have the best people in each field who were very creative go in and say to the Cincinnati police, look, this is how we're doing in such a such a town or this is the best practice for this and to really help them because for some of the stuff it was like asking people to wiggle their ears, they didn't know how to do it, so they just got hunkered down
and say we do that already. Well, no you don't but that's okay let's try it another way. And rather than order you again to do it let's talk about how we can inspire you to do it or give you some skill sets you don't have yet and we were all about it because we understood what we were dealing with but it wasn't easy, we had to hold the city in contempt, we had to go into court and get an extra year of court supervision because people even though they served, even though they said we'd do this they didn't do that, we had to stay vigilant. The FOP was actually a partner in all of this and when we had to go for the extra year the FOP was not a party for that extra year because they weren't a problem, it was the administration that was a problem and we had known that all along which is why the FOP was at the table because again we all worked on this stuff together and not only did we create the Collaborative Agreement together with all our disparate groups but we then went through all our crises together and have continued to do that for 14 years. I mean we have gone through lots of officer-involved shootings and Kathy and I have talked and the manager and I have talked and Iris and Damon and Captain Maris Herold, we've all
talked through all of this stuff and more officers getting shot, in fact we were supposed to come last month but on the eve of our trip an officer was shot, a citizen was shot and killed, so, but we worked through all that together. Today our chief got fired but we're still talking. Now we don't all have the same reaction to our chief getting fired but we're still talking. So we have relationships that can endure all of the stuff and the stuff that will happen as we proceed and I hope that through your work you can find that, and so let me just say one other thing about the Collaborative. Not only was it unique because it brought the FOP to the table and that was very, very important but it was also unique because it didn't, it didn't, it wasn't copycat to the traditional DOJ agreements, the traditional DOJ agreements say to the police department reform yourself, do a better job of using force, do a better job of being culturally competent, don't do racial profiling, do biased-free policing, hold yourself accountable appropriately, have an early warning system, have a citizens complaint authority where there's subpoena power and an independent group that can actually look at what's going on.
All of that stuff is just about policing fairly and I'm not minimizing it, it's big stuff, but at the end of the day my clients say okay, you did all that work just to make sure the Constitution was followed, you did all that work just to make sure that they don't beat us up and kill us anymore? I mean can't we aspire to something a little bit better than that, and that's where we really tried to take an extra step in Cincinnati and as Captain Maris Herold will tell you we committed to problem solving and why is that? The reason we committed to problem solving is that my clients, the African-American community, said they were occupied. They didn't feel that the police were their police, they felt that the police were always coming in and doing tactics that passive, innocent people over policed the people who were engaged in just minor transgressions and were acting totally unfair, and all of this in the name of law enforcement. So how do you turn that around, because the typical response is well, there's lots of crime in the black community, well that doesn't mean you have to use tactics that treat everyone as if they're a suspect, rather problem solving allows you to say okay, and this is basic criminal
justice, very few people commit most of the crimes, very few victims trigger or are victimized most of the time and very few locations create the conditions where we see a lot of the crime. So if you can capture and understand your repeat location, your repeat victim and your repeat perpetrators you can focus your work on those areas and people that most are responsible for crime and disorder and we actually did in the Collaborative say problem solving as I'm labeling it now is the primary strategy for fighting crime and disorder in Cincinnati. That way when Captain Maris Herold goes to an African-American apartment building and says I'm here, they don't expect that we're having stop and frisk or a sweep, rather she'll be able to say I'm here because we've had so many calls to this building or we've studied our data and we understand that this building is triggering this much crime and blah, blah, blah and we're here to help work with you to try and solve that problem and as you'll see that kind of approach says to the African-American community all right, I'm a partner with you now police in making my area safe. That makes sense. That's fair. That's logical. That's problem solving. That's not midnight
basketball, that's not, you know, feel good, let's all have a picnic and a party, there's a place for that kind of stuff too, and Officer Friendly, you know, playing with the kids, I mean that's all good but that's not what I'm talking about, I'm talking data driven policing that really treats the black community with respect. And that gets respect back by engaging in multi-stakeholder problem solving and that's what you'll hear more about from Maris Herold.

CAPTAIN MARIS HEROLD: Good evening everyone. Thank for coming, you got about 15 minutes for me? Because I'm going to go through a PowerPoint quickly but I would just like to tell you and the Ferguson Commission this will be the hardest thing that a police department will undertake, it will be the most challenging, but this is the most important work that a police department will ever engage in and so I hope you guys as we go through it understand it and have some questions at the end because I really do think it's the most valuable tool in policing right now to avoid police legitimacy issues and it will build community's trust I guaranty you. But problem solving is a science, it's a data driven strategy,
it's usually referred to as problem oriented policing in all the literature. In Cincinnati I think Iris did a heck of a job and everybody that worked on the Collaborative because it is the critical C that really brings it home and that's the community problem-oriented policing so I'll refer to it tonight for brevity purposes I'll just use problem solving so why don't we go ahead and I'll start.

All right. So the crime triangle. Has anybody seen this, anybody? You've seen it. All right. Let's briefly go through this because it's important, the whole basis of problem solving is based on this crime triangle and basically what this says is it's based on routine activities theory and basically what this says is that for a crime to occur you have to have an offender, a place, a target or a victim come together in time and space for the crime to reoccur. We can all agree on that, right? So problem solving says well, if we intellectualize this and we look at the data and we understand the problem and we understand the crime well enough and we can target one side of that crime triangle then the crime can't occur. Okay? It's as basic as that. Now
I've always said we should try to take out two sides of the crime triangle to be more efficient and more effective but smart people have come along since the early '80s and said listen, let's add another crime triangle and say the offenders should have handlers, the more handlers we can add the better and the targets or victims should have guardians and the places that we're responding to repeatedly should have better management tools to manage this location. Okay? So if somebody in the audience, somebody give me an example of a handler for an offender?


But in Cincinnati we're getting really good at making handlers somebody that's very close or attached to the offender emotionally and we've had a lot of success with that so families, sisters, brothers, grandmothers, people in the community. So we can all go through this and agree that that's very important. Okay?

So this is probably the most important thing about problem solving is that we know that there are very few offenders, like Al said very few offenders, very few locations and
very few victims that are contributing to 80 percent of the crime problem. It's called the 80/20 principle, it's actually an economic strategy but it works very well with just about everything. So let me ask you something, if we know this and when you look at violence it really goes through. When you're talking about violence in Cincinnati we're talking point zero five percent of the Cincinnati population that is committing these violent crimes. So why are we randomly policing these communities? You got to ask yourself that. In Cincinnati we also know that less than three percent of locations are contributing to all of our chronic nuisance problems. So I have to ask myself if you're a logical person why are we allowing police departments to randomly patrol? We should not. It should be very focused, we should be very focused in our policing. When you look at victim data it's the same thing. We have a high percentage of repeat victims contributing to the overall crime problem. Why aren't we getting services for the repeat victims? Isn't that a smart way to police? I think it is.

So this is just one of the tools that we use and I'm not going to go into it but I urge
everybody in the audience, I urge the Ferguson Commission please, there's an excellent website and they talk about 25 techniques of situational crime prevention and it's www.popcenter.org, this is an interactive crime prevention tool, it's excellent because what it tries to say is if we can convince offenders through crime prevention strategies that they're going to have to increase the effort, increase their risk, we're going to reduce the rewards for committing crimes, we're going to reduce provocations and we're going to reduce excuses then offenders, because offenders are rational just like us, right, they go about their day just like we do, they make decisions based on logic just like we do, they're no different so if we can make the offenders think, wow, that's too risky to do, and we can, why aren't we doing it as a police department? You have to ask your police departments this, why aren't we engaged in this type of policing? And it works.

So what is problem-oriented policing?

It focuses on results, it groups events into patterns, it looks for ways to address proximate causes, it emphasizes on information and analysis, it selects actions to fit the problem and it forces
the police to partner with not only the public but private and public organizations that have just as much responsibility to impact the problems and my favorite thing is it's evidence based. So the difference between problem solving and traditional policing is it's not at all considered, I mean it's not at all concerned with a single event. So it would not be considered if you two got into a fight and it was an isolated incident and it never happened again, we could not problem solve that because it has to be repeated. Nor is it concerned with these large scale economic, cultural, political or social change, it's too overwhelming for the police department to deal with. It's somewhere right in the middle is usually where we're working.

This is a basic problem solving model. You can use any kind of model, Canada uses CABRA [sic], the European countries have another one, I like the SARA process because it's very easy but this is what you should force your police department to do every time you have a repeat problem that you're concerned with. Are you properly identifying the problem, are you analyzing the problem so you can come up with a tailored
response that will work and that will not
negatively impact the community and are you
assessing that problem, and today we were with a
group of police chiefs from across Missouri, I
believe, and they indicated they do this. I don't
think they are. Because I know we're not assessing
their successes and I know they're not really
giving big analysis on the problems and if you
don't do those two your responses are either going
to be overbearing for the community or they're not
going to work.

So this is from the National Academy
of Sciences, it's probably the best well-known
research organization in the country that studies
police strategies and so what they have studied is
basically when you're unfocused by the standard
policing model, which a lot of police agencies are
still engaged in, they're still reacting, they're
still doing an investigative model and they're
still thinking that rapid response is the best way
to go in policing. So there's also community
policing, right, and that relies on neighborhood
canvassing, foot patrols, but it's not very
focused, so the more focused you get, and that's
problem solving and that's like hot spot policing,
the more focused you get the more effective you become and problem solving encompasses the community policing so you get the double bang there. You have to partner with the community, you have to be highly visible, you have to be, you have to understand the community's problems so you are much more effective than the traditional model or just community policing by itself.

So these are five cautions that I can guarantee you that every police department that will try to engage in policing will run into. Please do not allow a police department to say they're problem solving a large area or a neighborhood. That should never be allowed to happen, don't ever let a police department tell you we're going to go police the whole community or we're going to police the neighborhood, that's not problem solving. In fact, I think that we've gotten so good with the data we really should be talking single addresses. And I'll show you a project that not only are we talking single addresses, I can break it down and I can talk about single units of a large apartment complex and that's important. So you're not impacting the community negatively.
Public support is necessary but not a sufficient condition for effectiveness. I'm a big believer in science and I get a ton of community input on everything but sometimes the community can be, they can perceive things wrong or what I have experienced lately as crime goes up community can drag you back into traditional policing models so you have to be aware of that, so does your police department.

Most criminologists do not know much about crime prevention so be very careful who you partner with and that is the truth. There's a handful of experts in criminology who understand crime prevention so make sure you partner with somebody who really understands it.

Superficial problem solving probably exists in a lot of places and problems solving does not have a natural process with police departments so I'm going to tell you that problem solving is very complicated for police departments to engage in. It is not natural because what police departments usually do is react to that 911 system.

So let me briefly just talk and I think we're only going to go over one because of time so if we can go over a couple of these. One
thing Cincinnati has and I'll encourage you to consider this is one thing that the Collaborative mandated is that we had a problem solving tracking system and this is really important because it forces the police department to go through that SARA model and document who they're partnering with in the community so that's very important. We have a tracking system that goes all the way back to the very beginning and documents all the problem solving projects, and not all of them are great, but there's some really great ones in there that have been very creative and innovative, we've won awards for them, but what that does is that administrator who is putting the problem solving project in is forced through a series of questions to be very analytical, to be very data driven and to ensure that we put our partners in that problem solving tracking system and it's an accountability tool as well.

Okay. So this is a recent problem solving project, I just wanted to put a face on it so everybody, we're all on the same page. This is a project that a group of us worked on in District 4, I'm the commander of probably right now the most violent district in the city of Cincinnati, and
historically this apartment building was responsible for the most violent shootings and the most burglaries in the entire city and so I decided to take this project on and I'm glad I did because I learned a lot of valuable lessons but I just want to say this is the kind of policing you should expect today, it's 2015, this is the kind of policing that we should all expect and it's doable. So let's go through it.

So this is the apartment, it runs right up the Reading Road corridor which is a major corridor going north and south of Cincinnati and this building has historically been very violent. It has 44 apartments in it but right off the bat let me ask you, what is missing from this apartment complex in your mind? What's it really look like?

It looks like an institution with not a lot of grass, not a quality of life building, right? So right off the bat this isn't Avondale, right off the bat doesn't that give you a bad feeling like I don't want to live there, right? So as we take a deeper look at this, now this is important, you got to disentangle these issues and it has to be done systemically so you know, old policing would do what? We're going to go in
there, we're going to take everybody out of that
apartment building, we're going to arrest them,
we're going to cite them for whatever they're doing
and it's probably all of the people living in there
that are bad people, right? That's the traditional
model, right? We're going to invade that property,
we're going to take it over, we're going to piss
everybody off and then we're going to go home and
say we did a good job. So I'm asking you, let's
think about this a little bit in a more
compassionate, ethical way so let's look at it.

So the first thing when I go there
which is aggravating to me is look at this, there
are no lights, there is no numbers on these
buildings, no identification for the residents, no
system of cleanliness, no garbage cans, no flowers,
no grass, no nothing to say this is a livable
building. So right away, you know, my radar's up,
this is going to be a hard project.

What triggered this was a little 14
year old girl that got killed by one of our group
member involved gang members living in Cincinnati
so we knew that we had a problem, probably a couple
of people inside the building and we knew that we
had a problem with the land ownership of this
building.

So this is how bad it is, people dump tires there, it always looks like that and residents that care put up these trash cans on their own so they have some sense of livability there.

So as we looked at this closer we, again we had five people that were shot inside of this building in a very short amount of time. We had 300 calls for service within a year. Now as a community I'm asking you do you want your police officer responding 300 times a year to this one small geographic location or could they do better things in other parts of the community? So I have to dedicate all of these resources from the police department to respond here. The highest call was family troubles and it goes down. You have to do this analysis to understand. Okay? 300 calls for service a year I can tell you that scientifically that's off the charts. 80 percent of my multi-family locations within the city have zero calls for service, zero. 10 percent have one. This is one of the buildings I was talking about before.

Again, aggravated assaults and
burglary, major problem no matter how you look at it, slice the data, major problem.

Okay. But this is really cool and this is complicated work because it requires feet on the ground from the community, social service agencies and the police. This is really interesting. So when you look at the building this is how all the floors are laid out, these are individual apartment units, right? So let me ask you something, the red signifies a problem, the orange signifies a little problem. Let me ask you something, of all those apartment buildings what do I have to be concerned with? A couple, right? Everybody else is what? They're great. Getting by, they're doing their thing, they're going to work, they're going to school, they're doing their life, right? A couple of them I'm concerned with now, right? Force the police departments to do this type of analysis. Why would I think this whole building is bad, it's not. I've got possibilities of two apartments having some issues and we, as we go through the problem solving process we figure out what's going in these buildings. This one sits on the outside, right, so they're, they were drug traffickers out of here so
they're burglarized constantly because it's an outside unit. This one right here is where the little girl was killed, 14 years old, the lady that lived in that apartment was a relative of the gang member that killed her. So now I've got two apartments I have to contend with.

So you should ask this before you begin a project, who's available to help you, what is the goal and what are you going to do, you got to ask those in the beginning.

These are the partners that I used weekly to solve this problem. Patrol officers you have to include, right Kathy?

Violent crimes squad, I used Safe Streets which is just a smaller group that understands gang violence, I used our neighborhood liaison unit, I used our quality of life enhancement team which is instrumental because the chief allowed that team to stay there for six months. That was huge. They weren't -- the quality of life officers are dedicated to a problem solving project, they work out of the police chief's office so the chief gave me two officers that he would dedicate that wouldn't have to go back and answer radio runs so they stayed there and
really got the confidence of the residents of this building. I used a chronic nuisance attorney out of the city, obviously I used a top notch crime analyst, I partnered with the owner of the building, Community Builder's, I partnered with the community counsel in Avondale and the redevelopment counsel, all the business owners within that block and here's something I'm very proud of, I partnered with legal aid and they have not left my side since this project and I work with them all the time and they normally, Al am I right, they normally do not work with the police, we usually are opposing sides but I tell you when you partner and you establish a goal that you don't want another 14 year old little girl getting shot everybody can agree with that. People that are naturally not good partners can agree if that's what we're trying to stop and we can do it ethically, let's do it.

The long and the short of this is at the end of the day the city, I'm just really proud because we were able to cut aggravated assaults by 50 percent and burglaries by 50 percent.

Now, here's the story: We were able to stabilize this building for eight months and now we are back in negotiations with the Community
Builder's because as soon as the police left and moved on to the next building the Community Builder's, what they, you know, dedicated to do to help us stabilize this, they backed out. So all of the sustainability, all of the things that they should take ownership of, right, they own the building, who owns crime? They do, not the community but they do at this point. We all stabilized it, they have to sustain it so we stabilized it for eight months and now unfortunately we have to do it all over again which will probably involve legal legislation or legal action against the owners but the work can be done, it can be done ethically and I wanted you guys to know that, take that to heart that there's a better policing model and remember a police agency is a paramilitary organization, police will do what they are told to do, it's the natural way police departments work. Don't let anybody ever tell you any different.

If you tell police to police like this they will police like this. If you don't tell them and you don't make it a point to have a strategy in place they will go back to reactive policing that usually is zero tolerance, take over a neighborhood because
1 that's what they know.
2 Thanks a lot for your time tonight.
3 Appreciate it.
4 
5 CO-CHAIR WILSON: We'll now set up to
6 go to a representative of the Community Foundation
7 who is joining us via technology.
8 
9 MR. ROBERT KILLINS: Well, it's a
10 pleasure to be here with you tonight, or at least
11 be with you via video to talk about the Cincinnati
12 effort.
13 
14 As you know during the Cincinnati CAN
15 process funders came together led by the community
16 foundation to talk about how we would fund
17 initiatives that we knew would come out of the
18 Cincinnati CAN effort. So we started almost two
19 years prior to the launch we started trying to
20 align funding to support many of the initiatives.
21 We had a very ambitious goal of trying to raise $20
22 million to fund initiatives that were yet to be
23 defined but initiatives that we knew had to be
24 substantial if they were going to make any kind of
25 lasting and sustainable difference. However, from
26 the start we were only able to raise about six and
27 a half million dollars and that was, you know, a
28 little disappointing to say the least but it was a
start. About 75 percent of that money went into something called the Community Police Partnering Center which was, you know, designed to be kind of a broker or an intermediary between the police and community for the purpose of trying to improve police community relations, help citizens to be engaged in the process and then the balance of the money, a little over $2 million went into a variety of other programs though what I would say, and I won't be long, but one of the things looking at this in the, from the lens of a citizen and the lens of a grant maker what I was, what I felt was that the approach to what I call the city administration level and in some cases the broader community was really a crisis focus and a lot of the work was short term and crisis in nature and really was not a long term sustainable focus and so while this funding collaborative stayed together for more than eight years many of the partners, especially some of the business and corporate partners, you know, they fell off after about two to three years and it was only for the most part the nonprofit partners, the foundations and the like working with their partners that stayed in the process to the end. So that was the, one thing
that I wanted to offer, there had certainly been some lasting change but probably not enough to have a long term sustainable partnership and a program that has to be long term commitment. I think in many ways so much of the effort, and if you just look at the funding with 75 percent of it going to deal with police-community relations that was a precious little that was left to deal with the underlying, the long term, the structural problems of lack of education, poor education, the economic issues, all of which contribute to and foment the problems that then the police and others have to deal with and that the community has to suffer from so one of my lasting impressions was that there was not enough done to deal with the long term structural issues that were there prior to what happened in April of 2001 and that continues sort of to plague us now and as I close I would simply say as I look at the data, because one of the things that we did do as a part of the funding of the collaborative we engaged the University of Cincinnati's community research initiative to track the disparities data around employment, education, criminal justice, a few other metrics and in some cases the numbers or the data is no better and in
some cases it's a little worse. Now, I will say like all the country the economic downturn had a devastating impact and that devastating impact certainly hit Cincinnati and the data shows that just about every group, economic group except for African-Americans and especially African-American men have recovered. So in many cases our unemployment rate is worse so what you see is you have even more economically distressed, undereducated individuals with many of us some criminal justice background, et cetera, that don't have viable economic means to go forward and so we all know when that kind of circumstance is prevalent what the long term outcome is.

So that's what I would say, I'm certainly prepared to answer questions about any of the specifics because I was at the table prior to the funding collaborative starting, I've been at the table for the eight plus years that it operated and am still there dealing with some of the legacy issues both positive and negative.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: We again extend our thanks to all of our guests from Cincinnati for sharing with us.

This time is now set aside for
questions from Commissioners for our respective
guests so there are microphones at your different
places, it's hard to see everyone in our
configuration so just jump in.

Commissioner Becky James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I've got
a couple of questions. Al, I think this one is
particularly to you.

If I'm understanding correctly you
feel strongly that the hammer to get some of this
done was the court order. Can you imagine a
possibility where you could operate without the
court order and still have successes in the issues
you've been discussing?

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: Sure. I mean if
you have shared commitments and you have shared
goals and a time line and somebody organizing you
it can be done. I tried for 20 years to get that
done in Cincinnati before the Collaborative
Agreement and I failed, so good luck. But we
needed a court order. And I hope you don't.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Could I
ask a second question?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Sure Becky.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I have
three, I'll limit it to two. Iris in particular. So I've listened and heard and read, and congratulations to everyone on all the data and the reduction, I'd be curious if we walked into the neighborhoods that have suffered and have been the most concerned with these issues what would the community, the residents say about the last eight years, how would they see it?

MS. ROLEY: Depends on who you ask. And so while things have gotten much better in some respects things still need change and I think I wanted to point you back to where Reverend Lynch started because for most of us and as Robert so eloquently ended on the presentation with historical reference of all the new causal issues that black folks in particular have to deal with, and even today, and Robert talked about the industries, the economic downturn, the lack of access to great, good education, being able to go on a college campus in your community is a very, very far, far dream away so being able to dream as a young African-American child is very difficult in 2015. But I will say this: If you drill down and ask, because you can simply walk in and say our
policing methods, some say hell no, so why do you say that? And really have a conversation around it. I mean you probably will get a different answer but because Cincinnati mirrors the rest of the country in things that we see you can easily wake up and listen to black talk radio and you can hear a story about a police and citizen encounter whether it's just a beating or a death and say dang. We're always one issue away from going backwards, so how do we institutionalize these things? The problem is how we see the problem so to simply ask that question is not enough, you've got to drill down and then you have to ask are you engaged and are you involved in your community because policing is not just for police, it is for all of us, tax paying citizens, you have the right, the role and that is your responsibility to talk about how you want to be policed.

So there's more to it than just asking that very simple question. That would be my answer.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Other questions from Commissioners?

Commission Ahlbrand?

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: Captain, I
think this question is probably for you, and
for me if you talked about this while I had to
run to the bathroom a little earlier in the talk.
But I think we talked earlier today about the
difference in philosophies between the bottom up
rather than the top down. Could you, if you didn't
talk about that already could you expand on that a
little bit and how important that is in this model?

CAPTAIN MARIS HEROLD: Sure. So I
think the founding fathers, Herman Goldstein and
there's a lot of them, John Eck now from the
University of Cincinnati really wanted this
evolution in policing to come from the bottom up
and they always said that the innovation and the
creativity would come from police officers and work
its way up. Unfortunately my experience in
Cincinnati and other cities that I've visited that
are engaged in some type of problem solving it
comes from the chief down and so it's very
important that the chief supports problem solving
because police officer's natural tendency is to go
back to reactive policing because it's so much
easier than engaging in data driven strategies
because you know what works and what doesn't and if
police departments are strictly being monitored and
held accountable for answering that radio and
writing tickets and making arrests that's what the
police will do because that's, I hate to say it,
that's a lot easier than doing problem solving
because that takes different skill sets so the
chief has to push that down. Now John Eck if he
was sitting here, Dr. Eck, he might disagree with
that but from a police perspective it's absolutely
chief down.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: And I think
it's also important for especially rank and file
officers when I hear buzz words hey, we all went
through the COPS thing in the '80s and what's the
flavor of the month but we talked about this and we
said hey, older coppers say yeah, that's what we
do, I mean, but it goes a little bit farther than
that and I think some of the pushback from rank and
file is going to be hey, I get yelled at because
I'm out of service too long and the radio's backed
up, we got 20 calls backing up and the sergeant's
saying hey, you got to answer these calls. So I
guess two fold, there's going to have to be number
one the officers realize that their portion of
problem solving can be simply, and we call it
project 87, filling out a little project 87 form,
hey, respond to this address, and then that goes to somebody else so it really doesn't take that much of an officer's time, however, I think it's important that line officers are allowed, if they choose, to really be able to, to dig in if they can.

CAPTAIN MARIS HEROLD: I think you're absolutely right and I know, I have officers that do creative problem solving, there's no doubt you can have officers engaged in this greater problem solving but at the end of the day a police officer only has so much latitude to do these deep problem solving projects but they're most certainly a part of it because they are responding to those calls for service daily and if you're not asking your police officers what are you seeing, because they know, they know what's going on, I guarantee you they know what's going on, you have to interview not only the community residents that are affected by this but you have to sit down with your cops because they have great insight into this and so, you know, I really push on the police officers all the time to deploy with purpose and then the critical small areas of the district that require their discretionary work and that's the key. I
also tell police officers all the time do not let
that radio dictate your policing style and I'm
always on them, I'm always on supervisors, do not
let a dispatcher tell the police how to run the
police department, and you probably know what I
mean by that, because you'll get these dispatchers,
what's their number one goal? Clear the screen.
Right? And I have supervisors that will go oh my
God, we got to clear this screen. No you don't.
You know what you have to do, deploy with a purpose
and you need to problem solve when you're out there
and so that's something I just really feel, I'm
glad you brought it up.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: Which is why
it's really important to let the community know
hey, this is what we're doing so I hate to say it
but yeah, it might take an hour or two hours for an
officer to respond to your burglary call or your
stolen car call or something like that.

CAPTAIN MARIS HEROLD: Or the
community, you know, we need to have more
conversation on what we do not expect the police to
respond to because there's a whole group of calls
for service, you know, I ask myself do the police
really need to be there and so these, this will be
the next evolution of policing, I mean problem solving, to go continue to evolve and it's an old strategy, I mean we're talking about it like it's new but heck, it's been around since 1979 but it's harder but you really bring up good points so thank you for that.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: And I'm sorry Commissioner, I'm sorry to monopolize this but I've got a bunch of questions.

OFFICER KATHY HARRELL: I was just going to say you that brought up a very good important point that I didn't even bring out, is the fact when you say officers are engaged as they're doing it at some point on their own depending on the beat that they run and the work that they do and it was brought up earlier today that everyone who's involved in law enforcement understands that officers get involved in law enforcement for different reasons, some get involved and they start to get involved in drug work, that's what they enjoy. We have others that enjoy neighborhood policing, others that enjoy traffic, so what you end up finding is as a good leader or command staff officer is going to know which officers that they can go to within their
command that have an interest and enjoy doing that
type of work so when they do specific problem
solving projects that's where they're going to go
to for those expertise to add to that project, do
that problem solving.

Keep in mind what we've experienced
in Cincinnati and why we've gotten away from all
this and haven't been able to get back to it as
much as we have in the past is budget. Cincinnati
police have not hired since 2008, we have been
threatened with layoffs in 9, '10, '11, '12. They
hired their first lateral class of 21 officers in
2014 and at one point we're 188 officers down from
where we had been in 2000, January 2009. And we're
still seeing that attrition, we're still losing
officers and even though since 2014 we've hired 93
officers we're still down 117 and that greatly
affects what we're trying to do and accomplish in
moving forward the Federal Collaborative and it
does affect the police department and is totally
out of control of the police department.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Is there anyone
else who has a question?

COMMISSIONER ISOM: There was to some
degree and then the Collaborative Agreement and
there were a set of goals or issues that the community is working towards, how, this is for Iris and Al, how did you, and Reverend, how did you evaluate your progress along the way? What are the sort of metrics that you are looking at that says that the community is progressing towards your goal and you started out with 400 people that were interviewed, did you continue that process to engage people, interview them and see if their perceptions about community and police relations had changed over time?

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: All right. So during the course of the court supervision we actually had a contract with the Rand Corporation to evaluate the progress on several levels and the big take away from that is that it's too short a period to do it in four years. We did not detect much of an increase in trust by the community of the police and I think anecdotally that it is improving but in the short period of time we had funding for I can't say that we saw a tremendous amount of increase there. But other things that the Rand Corporation did that were very helpful is that first of all they did an integrated group of experts who evaluated the traffic stops. One of
our, we had a paragraph 59 was that you have to respect citizens and so we had the Rand Corporation deconstruct on a random basis the traffic stops done by officers and break them and this was very helpful because we had black and white officers, black and white experts all working together to try to figure out what does make a respectful traffic stop and where is your cultural competence shining and where are you really out to lunch and we worked through that and that was reported out to the community in several forums and that was very helpful to try to get a shared idea of what a respectful encounter looks like and hopefully the supervisors continue to draw on that as they look at traffic stop tapes going forward.

The other thing that Rand did was they did a regular count of policing in Cincinnati, you know, where is the heavy hand of the police being demonstrated, what are officer injuries looking like, what are citizen injuries on arrests, those all went down, officer injuries on arrest went down, citizen injuries on arrest went down, crime went down generally and part one crime in particular went down so on a large number of metrics we made progress. I wish we still had
funding to do that type of analysis, we don't, but Iris has tried to carry on and can tell you what she's done in the community.

MS. ROLEY: So great question Chief, thank you all for that. Great question.

So in 2011 we did a survey model, very unscientific, because we're very thoughtful and I think one of the things that we need to underscore here is that police do not have unrealistic expectations. This was a very new model, a new way of doing things and for all intents and purposes we're still in a pilot phase because when we went to Federal court we had a 30 year study of how policing had been negative in the black community and it's going to take us 30 years to figure this out so in 2011 we employed I think maybe 20 youth through the Andrews Family Fund out of New York and we received a grant from them that Al and Megan and our partners the Urban League wrote for us and we put the youth to work. We wanted to simply know what the people know about the Collaborative and we wanted to focus on the class and I forgot to read the class for you all because for me that's what makes the CA so special and it goes something like this: The class is
defined as all African-Americans or black people who are perceived as such who live and ride and roam through the streets and thoroughfares of the city of Cincinnati, come into contact with police and/or agents and the last line is all others, something like that. I'm close. And so we wanted to deal specifically with the class because the class was the group of people that have been impacted in the very negative and very biased way and so what we saw in a very unscientific way is people knew a lot about the Collaborative Agreement mainly because the Black United Front we used to read it every Sunday on the radio and we had quite a bit of interested people who were blind, who couldn't read, who wanted to know about it so we would read it paragraph by paragraph to people so they knew about the Collaborative, they knew it was something to do with police, they knew that it was for African-Americans. Now, what they did not know were all other things, citizens complaint authority, service, cease fire, all these outbursts that came of the Collaborative had been signed and delivered to the community but what we did do is we did, our youth did interview 150 people who were willing again to share and to go to work so
hopefully as we go forward we can start
interviewing people -- let me take that back. The
partnering center will initiate another survey to
really focus in on how people see and perceive
problem solving in the SARA process.

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: So as one final
followup to that that's a great question for your
commission, because before you lose your staff,
before you disband and while you've just got all
these, like I mentioned you have 50 recommendations
in the policing area alone, come up with your
metric for how you want when the anniversary story
comes out, the press will come out in six months
and then in a year again, so what happened, did the
Ferguson Commission make a difference, if you can
start laying the table for what the metric ought to
be other than just did we accomplish 13 of our 50
or 20 of our 50, but actually get it back to the
problem you're trying to address, that will be
great work for the final weeks of your paid staff's
employment because that's what we didn't do. When
we lost our court order we just said all right,
let's keep it going and we are actually literally
doing this right now, we are coming back together
to come up with our dashboard of data that we want
to collect to show our progress, to capture our standards so that we know whether we're staying on the right track. So I just thought of that. So I think it might be helpful for you.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: I'm extremely interested in the comment you made about commission reports that are nicely bound and that you carried around for a long time. That I believe everybody on this commission shares my interest in that comment and one of the things that I've noticed throughout our process is that while there has been tremendous access for community to be involved in this process, every meeting has been open, community was involved in every work group, what has been noticeably absent is law enforcement outside of those who are hired to monitor us on the outside for protection, and maybe they were here and they just didn't identify so I won't just make that statement boldly without any qualifiers but I haven't known of a large amount or even a small amount of community officers participating in this process even though I've known a lot of community people so I'm interested in what would you recommend as being those policies, those strongholds, those program, programmatic pieces
that have to be put in place to hold accountable
those who need to be held accountable for these
changes to happen in law enforcement? I don't
believe that they're going to happen just because
we roll out our plan, I'm not that naive, but I am
asking you because you said that you found on the
opposite end that that is what you needed. What is
it that you found that had to be mandated to create
change in law enforcement?

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: Well, I mean my
law enforcement partners here might agree I think
that law enforcement generally is stuck in the
status quo, it's really hard to get people to
change their ways and just because a bunch of, and
the other thing that I often experience when I sue
law enforcement all the time, I mean that's what I
basically do on my day job, and what I find is that
the officers that I am litigating against think
that they're doing something super secret, I
couldn't possibly understand it, this is like the
CIA, this is really dark stuff and, you know, I
wouldn't want to reveal any of my special ops and,
you know, that's true for about one-fifth of one
percent of police work and what Maris is talking
abut is real police work and so just changing
attitudes, and then I get back to the metric that you want to leave the community with, you know, don't leave us with 50 recommendations that have 16 bodies each responsible for it, because that's like nothing is responsible. If you can come up with something really tight that the press could seize on, that those who want to work on this stuff could seize on, you've got a great opportunity.

There's two things going on here that weren't around when I was carrying my notebooks around, number one the whole nation is watching your work and your community and as part of that we're at a time when people just need leadership. Yesterday a friend of mine, another civil rights attorney, got a $5.5 million verdict on a police shooting in Cleveland. The day before that Baltimore settled the Freddy Gray case for 6.5 million. Last year New York settled Eric Garner's case for 5.9 million and cities hoped they could just buy their way out of this problem and they can't, they need the work you're doing, this reform work. You just can't throw a bunch of money at people and think the problem will go away but those dollar numbers do tell us that they're really serious and that people are taking it seriously so
I think your work will be taken seriously.

The other thing that we haven't really talked about is that the DOJ did an excellent report on Ferguson and I was totally impressed by the findings that they made and the detailed recommendations that they made and that will be a court order and it could be a good model for some of the reforms that need to be done throughout the region but even without that, when I was very involved in taser cases I just did a public records request to the 47 law enforcement agencies in my one county, Hamilton County, Ohio, got all of their taser policies and training and did a white paper rating all of them and came out with a report saying which law enforcement agencies had bad policies, which ones had good policies and why and the press covered that and that was helpful because that put a shining light on certain agencies that were doing a terrible job of keeping our citizens safe and then the local law enforcement community, their chiefs association wrote a rebuttal report which was great because it opened the dialogue. So the more focused your work can be, the more tight your recommendations are and the more tools you give the press and others who
1 are interested like all the people in this room for
2 how to carry this work forward the better off I
3 think people will be.

4 COMMISSIONER WATSON: Getting back to
5 the evaluation process, I think that was very, I'm
6 speaking to Captain Herold. Could you expound a
7 little bit more on that evaluation process because
8 I think you're hitting on something that I think I
9 heard in some of the work groups especially with
10 officers that I've had the pleasure of working with
11 in terms of recognition for some of the things that
12 you were talking about and included in the
13 evaluation process that you guys have actually
14 modeled in terms of having evaluation based on the
15 things that you're asking law enforcement to now
16 start doing. Obviously taking supervisors,
17 recognizing that as being a change so that officers
18 are not penalized for doing the things that their
19 public is wanting them to do. I think that
20 sometimes just like you said police officers are
21 kind of like pro military, we follow orders and if
22 we're not getting recognition or reward for going
23 out doing the things that citizens are asking us to
24 do then it kind of falls into a hole as to what do
25 you get rewarded for and what you don't get
rewarded for and so my question is how did you
incorporate that into your evaluation process and
how did you get the supervisors to buy in on it?

CAPTAIN MARIS HEROLD: Okay. That's
a great question. First I think the Collaborative
Agreement through the years first of all changed a
lot of the policies and procedures that gave
recognition and award system including promotions
and preferred assignments, everything that we grade
a police officer's performance is measured by do
they have a really good understanding of problem
solving and are they engaged in that, so that's
number one. From my perspective to make that
tighter for the police officers that are under my
command I've thrown out all of the old metrics that
so many police departments still use so outputs, I
tell them right out front I'm not interested nor
will I give you credit for bringing me 10 moving
violations a month unless you can tie that to a
high auto accident location, I'm not interested in
that. What I am interested in is results, what I
am interested in is do you understand the data that
I put up every day enough to deploy with a purpose
and are you solving problems and are you
interacting professionally with members of the
community and that includes businesses and public
organizations as well. So everything that is going
on I give great credit to problem solving but
there's a whole institutionalized backdrop to that
and they know that, like I know that I'm not going
to be able to be an assistant chief unless I
understand problem solving and a sergeant knows
that they're not going to be a lieutenant unless
they have, they can talk intelligently about
problem solving projects so when you go into, you
go into a promotional process you're sitting with a
panel just like this and they are asking you tell
me about a problem that you solved and a project
and that's from the lieutenant's rank up and you
better be very eloquent about it and you better be
results oriented or you're not going to get the
promotion.

So I hope that answered your
questions.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Yeah. Just one
other anything is that actually on an evaluation
sheet where they actually get a check mark for
doing whatever the deed might be?

CAPTAIN MARIS HEROLD: Absolutely.
Not only is there monthly evaluation they get
credit for problem solving but it's on their yearly performance evaluation, there's a big section dedicated for problem solving activities so yes, I think we covered just about everything we can cover as far as performance. If I was a police chief I could think of a lot more metrics but I'm not right now.

MS. ROLEY: Maybe you will be.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: Do we still have Robert?

Commissioner McClure has a question for Robert then we'll go to Commissioner Pulliam.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Robert can you hear me? I know we've got a delay. Can you hear me?

MR. KILLINS: Yes, I'm back, I'm sorry. I'm plugged in again.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: So you mentioned that some of your funders dropped out a couple of years and some stayed as long as six or eight in this community policing problem, policing funding project that had 75 percent of your funds. What would have kept your funders at the table, what was important to them and what would have engendered more commitment?

MR. ROBERT KILLINS: Well, I think,
you know, I started as a corporate funder and
priorities changed a lot with business and
corporations so it's hard to keep that group of
funders at the table because I've been in many
collaborative and it's kind of par for the course
so to speak. So I don't know if there's anything
but I think the mind set that many brought to the
issue was in fact that it was a police-community
issue and that once things seemed to be settling
down a bit, once this, you know, the Collaborative
Agreement and some of the other things seemed to
have taken hold and at least were in process, you
know, for many it felt like a business as usual and
so they stepped away. But for those of us
especially looking at the underlying conditions,
the situations that caused the, you know, the issue
of police, where the rubber meets the road so to
speak, that those issues need a lot of long term
care and that just didn't appear to be the
commitment there so work on those issues. So I
can't say that I could give you any advice around
that because I saw this funder fatigue or this
inability of funders to maintain focus more than a
couple years on any particular project.

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: But hold on.
Robert, if you, if we didn't have a court order and
the only thing in place was better together money
running, you know, setting up what we had set up
much like this commission which has some private
money wouldn't the funders want, wouldn't they have
wanted to at least fund somebody to do assessment,
somebody to do review and reporting out to the
community as to whether all this work went down the
drain or whether it moved the ball? I would think
that funders would want to fund something like
that.

MR. ROBERT KILLINS: Absolutely. You
know, and I think we did because, you know, we, and
I say we at the time, I was at P&G, P&G and some of
the other funders did fund a number of things
outside of BTC, we tried to help with that and I
think that that was an interest in that but the,
you know, the issue of the community and trying to
improve the underlying conditions that were long
ignored, there didn't appear to be a lot of
interest around that and, so, you know, I agree
that they are interested to where we are and were
interested but it was really a short term deal and
so if there's any hope there in Ferguson around
anything sustainable you are going to have to have
partners and players that are committed for the long term and, you know, I'm not here to take shots at the city, you know, the city administration, whatever, but throughout this process and I know it had its hands full with the Collaborative and boycotts and a whole range of other things but it didn't put a penny against any of the community police partnering center effort because, perhaps because it didn't believe in it or felt that it was duplicative or redundant but that was very difficult for many of us who were at the table to realize that there was no, not one penny put in from the city to support the process that was designed to try to reduce some of the problems and avoid the kind of situation that led up to 2001.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you very much.

I'm at a point I wanted, and I know I want to call on Commissioner Pulliam here but there are a couple of things I wanted to ask, perhaps Iris and perhaps Reverend Lynch to clarify a little bit of context here for us and perhaps even some language.

There are a number of factors that cause some accountability and sustained engagement
and time line. I just wanted to see if you could talk a little bit about, and Iris you did some of this before, the time line of when the lawsuit was filed, whether there was what some have called unrest, some would call an uprising in the community and how those things played to one, the economic boycott came into play and how those things played together along with the time line for this kind of accountability because for us as we're thoughtful about, we're mindful that there were three months before there was even a commission called and that began its work four months in and the community had already been engaged in what has been called here rebellion or uprising, not riot nor unrest. So I recognize people are careful about that language and different things, but if you could just talk about those different community inputs and how they played out on a time line to assure some sustained attention to the issue.

MS. ROLEY: Okay. Reverend get over here so you can help me out with this.

So the story the Reverend told you in the beginning the 2 and 24 was in November of 2000. By January of 2001 we're collecting stories from African-Americans throughout the city, we did a
month of Saturdays with five sites throughout the city to make sure that we covered the city to collect the stories. So that was November December, two months' time and by the end of January we had the 400 stories, we served those over to our dream team attorneys Al Gerhardstein, Scott Greenwood and Ken Lawson and by March of 2000 there was a Federal lawsuit filed.

The other part of your question was?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Just a time line, the boycott. You said March of 2000 or March 2001?

MS. ROLEY: March 2001. If I am correct I believe it was March 13th?

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: Yeah. He wants to know about the boycott too.

MS. ROLEY: Let me pass the mic for Reverend Lynch on the economic sanctions and the boycott.

REV. DAMON LYNCH, III: All right. I Thought I was done.

I was president of the Cincinnati Black United Front which was an organization that was started in July of 2000 and the city of Cincinnati, because in the city of Cincinnati we have this jazz festival every year that brings
about 50 to 60,000 African-Americans to the city of Cincinnati from Chicago, Louisville, all over.

July of 2013 downtown restaurants closed their doors and wouldn't serve African-Americans. This was not 1965, this was 2000 and I happen to be, my wife and I were down there and pulling on restaurant doors and they were locked and you would look on there to see what time is this restaurant supposed to close. So we found out that 13 downtown restaurants in Cincinnati colluded not to serve us. We later found out that they had begun a survey the year before and they concluded that African-Americans don't tip, that they steal silverware and they steal salt and pepper shakers so in the city of Cincinnati which a lot of people call up south, it's like the southern most northern city so just that tremendous crazy, and that's what we do, this is up south, we all claim we're the most segregated, we've got the highest childhood poverty rate, I'm sure you probably say you got it too, Cincinnati says they got it. The stuff we claim now is so ridiculous that cities fight over who's the most segregated, who has the highest childhood poverty rate, every city I go to says that we're at the top. So that's when we got
formed, July. Since the Black United Front didn't exist until the restaurants closed their doors so we started protesting and challenging restaurants. We found out the restaurant association when they made that decision, we met with the restaurant association, they were an all white group so clearly when that decision was made there was no other stream of consciousness in the room to say that might not be a good idea, all right? Just a whole bunch of white guys saying we're going to close the restaurants, nobody in there to say maybe not a good idea. Then November two black guys get killed by cops and we're out there, we're the radical group protest, that's the time line. As they said in March, lawsuit filed, right after that an economic boycott on the city of Cincinnati. We said until there's justice we're asking people not to come to Cincinnati, the first person to say I'm not coming was Bill Cosby so whatever his psychosocial sexual issues are now all we know is that in 2001 Bill Cosby because we asked him not to come to Cincinnati he didn't come to Cincinnati. Now imagine how that did to the psyche of Cincinnati, Cincinnati is no different than St. Louis, we're so proud of our major league teams
because that's really all we got, we don't have any ocean front, we got major league teams that's our pride and joy, we got to build them brand new stadiums, all that stuff, Bill Cosby says he's not coming, then Whoopie Goldberg says she's not coming, the Baptist convention says we're not coming, I think it ended up like $70 million of economic pain to the city of Cincinnati. At the same time we're at the table negotiating with the DOJ, negotiating the Collaborative Agreement. Now remember what I said, the same time we're at the table I personally was at the table, Al was at the table, we're at the table, not like here where the DOJ and the city are secretly somewhere doing something, we're at the table, matter of fact the FOP was at the table because we invited them to the table. So the rank and file was at the table, the community was at the table, all right? The city administration was at the table, they hired a high powered attorney out of Washington D.C. Our attorneys kicked their behind, FOP's attorney Don Harden was excellent but the community was at the table. All right? So we continued, the city every other week as this was going on, well we're at the table can you stop the boycott, no, that's the
pressure. The pressure continued, the protests continued and yes we're at the table. Finally John Ashcroft came to Cincinnati who was the attorney general at that time under George Bush, sat right next to me and we signed this thing, we signed this agreement.

As you talk about funders and the funder fatigue St. Louis has the same issues that every other city has, United way every year in our city, they get excited, $61 million, well you did 60 million last year, 61 million this year and next year you get another CEO to head it up, 61 million and five and yet we're the second highest childhood poverty rate in the nation, everything is going backwards so we keep putting money in certain places because it's like the thing to do. So in St. Louis I'm not, I don't even have to live here to know you're doing the same thing we're doing, you're going to raise $60 million for United Way, give it to a whole bunch of different people and the statistics are going to be worse and the next year you're going to raise 61.2 and think we're doing something. At some point we have to be smart. At some point even if we continue to do that some people have to pull away and say we're
going to be the group that does it a little bit differently. Take some of this 61 million we keep raising every year to give to the same social service people to do the same thing and our numbers keep getting worse. So we're going to take some of this and put it in the commission because we're going to be focused on building better communities, strengthening communities. So that's the time line. The time line goes all the way up to September, what, 9th, 2015 and here we are in Ferguson.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you very much.

Felicia you will have the last question and we will put the documents that we have received on-line, that have been presented today.

Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Thank you so much. I just have a couple questions.

Al for you you said that the monitor was there to do two things, provide technical assistance, and I was wondering what that second thing is, and then Pastor I'd like to know from you what is the, what was and is the participation of the rest of the faith community around the work for
the Cincinnati Black United Front and then --

CO-CHAIR WILSON: You said two.

Brittany already asked for one.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Okay. Those two.

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: So the other thing the monitor did was grade them, were they doing what they were supposed to do under the terms of the Collaborative. After you were nice and said this is how you could do it if having been led to the well you don't drink then you get a demerit and you get rated badly and if that doesn't work then I hold you, you know, I filed a motion to hold you in contempt so yeah, we had a stick as well and we tried not to use it but we only had five years so we had to really hustle. And so, and it was important to monitor that role as well. This is your 17th meeting, we he had 17 monitor reports during the course of the Collaborative.

REV. DAMON LYNCH, III: We outpaced the clergy. We had some clergy participation, not much. We outpaced it. As president of the Black United Front that scared some clergy, why do you have to call it Black United Front, why can't we be called anything but Black United Front? So
anything but Black United Front.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: All United

Front.

REV. DAMON LYNCH, III: So that

scared them and there's clergy now 15 years later

who tell me why they weren't with me, why they

weren't with us, they said people told them not to

and doesn't matter, we got the job done and so

that's all I can say.

MS. ROLEY: Let me jump in on that,

our former chief does have a clergy group called

the God Squad and they do a lot of street walk and

talking around initiatives that the police

department has going on which are really a lot, a

lot of things happening and then there's part of

our service initiative as well whether there are

shootings happen, crimes in our community they

respond, a lot of clergy will respond as well so

you see a evolution of people and, there was a

whole lot of scared black folks in the city of

Cincinnati told us not to do it, said we couldn't

get it done and what we wanted to focus on what the

community said focus on and that was policing so

what I want to say to community everybody that has

a focus on policing the issues that Robert talked
about and the reason that we had the economic
boycott is because we had a whole other set of
demands, policing was just one, education, juvenile
court system, housing, section 3. My second
meeting coming to Ferguson I asked about Section 3,
I asked but your MSD, what projects was going on
and how were black folks getting jobs throughout
the county.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ROLEY: So everybody doesn't have
to focus on this particular issue. We got to be
smarter, wiser and stronger and you can't do it all
under one umbrella so we're going to focus on
policing reform and transformation focus on that,
if you want to focus on better education focus on
that then come back and report it but we had a
whole host of demands from police reform to
education reform so when people talk about things,
yeah, that was part of our demand back in 2001. We
had a whole host of demands, I think we had four
others and many people came. We had to bring all
of the radical groups together because everybody
had different demands and that was the beauty of
what was going on in the city of Cincinnati.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Commissioner
Packnett will have the last last question.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.

I'm sorry I didn't think about it earlier.

So the President's Task Force had a hearing in Cincinnati and I appreciate this conversation because it's given me a lot of contacts that I didn't have when we just kind of flew in and flew out so there's some insight that I want, a particular perception that I think does inform the future here, and maybe you guys can help clarify through the lengths of anything you might do differently if you had it to do all over again, but here's what my question is based on: So we're staying at the hotel, asked where to go to dinner and they told us the neighborhood Over The Rhine so we went to a neighborhood that now feels very analogous to what in St. Louis is the Central West End, very hip, very trendy, lots of popular restaurants, et cetera. It wasn't until the next day after the hearing that I met up with a friend that I found out that's where the riots were and his comment was yeah, so they, and I'm just telling you what was told to me, the comment was yeah, the riots became the excuse to gentrify the neighborhood and get the bad element out. And so
there is that continual concern of does safer neighborhoods just mean fewer black people and fewer low income people and as an outsider that is the story that I was told by someone who lives there, right, and so I'm wondering if you can offer some insight, whomever can offer some insight to that.

REV. DAMON LYNCH, III: That would be me.

For 25 years I've pastored the first 25 years of my life in Over The Rhine, I spent the last 25 years of my life in that community. I led almost every protest, every march in that community. When Kathy and her officers were facing us, against us, they were trying to stop us from going into downtown Cincinnati so where you were downtown there's a street called Central Parkway that separates downtown from Over The Rhine, Over The Rhine historically is historically one of the poorest communities in Ohio and yet right across the double yellow line there was Proctor & Gamble, Chiquita Banana, Federated Department Stores, Kroger, major Fortune 500 companies who could look out their window at the immense poverty in Over The Rhine. Where Timothy Thomas was shot, where three
nights of civil unrest took place, where Iris and
myself and others spent every night in our church
and allowed people a safe place to be. What can
happen, and you have to, I mean I'll talk to the
community now, is you can win the war on policing
and transformation and reform and lose the larger
war on community and so Over The Rhine, I was there
for 25 years, when I got there there were 15,792
people living there, I know that number because the
community had done its own study, now there's but
7,000 people living there so I watched 8,000 people
or 9,000 people be moved out. They went to the
west side of town all up in these places where
there's a whole lot of other issues so I watched
8,000 people be moved out. Now where there used to
be local bars there's sushi bars, micro breweries,
all this stuff and so the community, the people
that I knew and loved, they lost. The Gentry has
moved in and it has been touted by the New York
Times and others as the best example of
neighborhood revitalization in the country but for
the people that I knew and loved they lost and so
you've got community, the police piece is one of it
but you can lose your very souls, lose your hole
community while you fight just one part of it.
COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Right. So thank you for that. My question then is if you had it to do all over again what would you have done that you think, feel like could have prevented that?

REV. DAMON LYNCH, III: It was a long, hard struggle and we're part of that. Our model to the community was don't move, improve but people lived in those conditions for so long and what happened you had went from project based to vouchers and the moment people got a voucher and a chance to get out of the rat infested run down community, because there was no investment coming in while they lived there. Maris talked about the 80/20 rule and they used that for almost everything, the 80/20 rule was said that for there to be a viable community it had to be 80 percent market rate and 20 percent subsidized. Now this is a community that is like 90 percent subsidized and they're saying the only way it's going to thrive is to be 80 percent market and 20 percent subsidized. That's a huge flip but that's really not what they wanted and so every, and this goes back to the United Way thing, Over The Rhine used to be the most service community in this nation, every social
service known to human kind was in this one community, the Drop In Center, Tender Mercy, City Gospel Missions, soup kitchens, every social service agency was in this community. Do gooders would come from other cities to Over The Rhine, there go church vans and get off the church van and pick up paper and paint and eat pizza and get back on the church van and go back to the suburbs. You know what happened now, every social service agency that was there has been kicked out, Drop In Center, you got to go, City Gospel Mission, you have to go. So I'll say this and I'll sit down, to the African-American community and poor communities we'll always talk about we need to take back our community, I heard that for 20 years, we need to take back our community, and all that they mean by saying that is we need to get the dope dealers off the corners, that's what they mean take back our community. When the Gentry wanted it and said we need to take the community they showed you how to do it. We kept saying take back the community, they said, and the reason they wanted Over The Rhine because Cincinnati you can't go south because there's Ohio River so if you're going to expand downtown Cincinnati you can only go north, you
can't go south and so when they stayed we're going
to take Over The Rhine they showed you how to do
it. So there are lessons that could be learned.

MR. GERHARDSTEIN: Hold on, one of
9 those lessons, I mean Reverend Lynch said earlier
the face of enforcement was the police, that was
true in Over The Rhine as well. Our chief at the
time Striker was totally supportive of this
economic development and felt he was the arm of the
developer and he was running the vortex unit in
there which is a stop and frisk unit and we're
fighting him over those strategies in that
neighborhood so if I was to do something
differently it would have been to jump on this
earlier and to fight harder because that dragged
out way too long. At the same time Robert's
talking that he had funded the partners center with
a lot of private money and the partnering center
was supposed to lead us into doing problem solving
around these very type of economic issues that
would translate and bridge the gulf between people
who have different ideas of even what crime is and
instead the partners center which wasn't getting
any cooperation from this chief ended up changing
its mission, it wasn't doing problem solving
anymore, they did seize fire so they'd go to sites
where people got shot and they'd put on T-shirts
and they'd take back the streets and they'd protest
and they'd inspire and sing and stuff that I'm sure
at some level is really important but it wasn't
problem solving so we've wasted his money by never
really implementing the community arm of problem
solving while our chief was off muscling the poor
people out of Over The Rhine.

So yeah, I would love to do, redo
some of those years.

MS. ROLEY: So if I can jump in, I
was the black girl who sat for two days while you
were in Cincinnati and I wanted to hear exactly
what was going but it's sort of back to, and I
don't remember who made the statement but who owns
crime, who owns the economic development and that's
why I'm really cautioning the community, everyone
doesn't have to focus on this because if you do you
miss what the Reverend said. So we have part of
our demands was economic development but we were a
group trying to take on a system that was humongous
so it's almost, it's a fair mission but it's almost
unfair, especially to communities who don't know
what to do so that's why we go and we talk so we
can say look at what we didn't do sometimes so maybe, maybe, I wanted to answer the question because it's something that Reverend and I are working on now is focusing on the economics.

OFFICER KATHY HARRELL: I just want to say the one thing I would do differently where we're at in Cincinnati right now I think is very important is putting, and Iris kind of alluded to this but making, institutionalizing, et cetera, is somewhere, somehow, I don't know if you do it through policy or procedure, we never moved forward enough to think that there would be outside chiefs coming in or command staff that were not engaging in this problem solving and so do so much work for so many years and have different changes and the elected officials out of our control, et cetera, but I think what we would have done differently or tried to implement is making sure that whoever is at the top that there is some type of control, guidance, policy, whatever it may be to make sure that problem solving, community policing is the number one priority.

MS. ROLEY: Brittany there's several things I would have done differently, certainly as I look back I probably would have asked our
attorneys not to give so much power to the mayor to
appoint the board of the citizens complaint
authority because it can become political and I
would have tried to figure out how we can pay
communities to sustain and do the work. It's
difficult to ask people to have to go to work and
take care of their children when everybody else at
the table is getting paid and a pension so it was
difficult to ask people of communities to come to
meeting after meeting and I say it often, all the
time, I can't get a bus card so it's difficult and
so some kind of way if the commission and the
community have figured this out how to make sure
the community people get paid for the work that
they do is just as valuable, their time is just as
valuable as your time.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you very
much. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Starsky. Can
I quickly, I won't say.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: I think that
this to Ms. Iris. Going back to that community
part, like I said it's going to be real quick, go
back to that community part, the youth group that
you mentioned, what was the name of that?

MS. ROLEY: The Youth, it was just Youth, it was 1,000 and I believe five of them that participated in the process of what they wanted policing to be.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: How did you get it, what different I guess tactics and tools did you use to get young people that was mainly most affected that hung out on the street?

MS. ROLEY: I don't know why you say that young people mostly --

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Well the young people that are more oppressed more than others, the ones that live in the, in St. Louis it would be north side St. Louis so those young people, the ones who are being oppressed on a daily basis, how did you really get them to participate and for me to you in the black community that's usually not something that, we usually do the step but for our stuff, recently across the nation --

MS. ROLEY: So what strategies did we use to bring the youth to the table. The first, so maybe you're thinking about the survey, the surveying, elements group and, I'm having a senior moment but in the beginning what we did was we
employed an agency to work with youth to go out and get the youth to bring them in so that they could be part of the process, it was just as simple as that. But because of how loud and visible this was in Cincinnati in 2001 that everyone wanted to participate and they showed up and they stood out. And I don't know Al if Jessica had a hand in bringing youth into the room too but we did go out and get an organization that works with youth and said can you make sure that their voices are heard because they had a special day just like everybody else.

The second part how did I get them, I paid them. I wanted to pay them for their work because their time is valuable. So we went to the Andrews Foundation and got a grant, said this is what we want to do. We want to make sure that the people are aware we're still here, the reforms, the policies, some of them are now penal codes how are they supposed to behave, so we paid them for their services and their time. That's how we got them.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you very much.

We want to thank again our guests from Cincinnati who shared with us and all of you
for the context that has been given so thank you very much Al, Kathy, Maris, Damon and Iris and Robert.

We do have an administrative agenda to move as well, Commissioners you previously as our managing director comes and positions herself to turn your attention to the minutes from our 8/24 meeting and ask for any action on those and I actually want to as we pull those if we have stuff just to take a note of one edit or addition in language on page 3, about halfway down it notes asking that the Department of Justice report be sent to the staff, be sent to the commission. I wanted to add an amendment if it be possible to note that that is in response to testimony during the open microphone session from Mae Quinn of Washington University's juvenile law clinic and Reverend Beatrice Wise-Baker, chaplain at the St. Louis County juvenile detention center that request was made. So it we could just note that since we didn't know the actual content of the open mic I just want to note that we're asking for that in response to that open mic period.

Are there any other amendments or edits to our minutes?
If not the floor is open for a motion on the minutes.  

Been moved and properly seconded that we approve as amended the Monday, August 24th, 2015 minutes of the Commission. All those in favor police notify by saying aye.

All these opposed same sign. 

Any abstentions?

Motion carries. We're now in the hands of our managing director.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: 

Thank you Reverend Wilson. Action item 2 that will be before the Commission, asking Serena Muhammad, for those of you that this is your first meeting Ms. Muhammad has come to us before presenting, in our last meeting she talked about the function that comes after the Commission so that this work can indeed have success and have traction once the Commission sunsets December 31st so at this time Ms. Serena Muhammad is with us so she can come to speak more in-depth so we can see what in fact does happen as we move forward.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Thank you. And I think there are six tie-ins from what we heard from Cleveland, one being that we have to focus on the
process that brings community together, the second
being that people have to do the work actually
needed to be involved in crafting the solutions,
the third being that there needs to be a formal
collaborative agreement, the fourth being that
there needs to be a focus on transforming systems,
the fifth being that there needs to be a process
for monitoring evaluation and the sixth being that
enduring relationships throughout the process are
important. So I think when we go through these
slides we'll see how those six elements beam into
this process and we should be able to achieve these
things using this process.

So one of the things that we did was
looked at what the key characteristics to successes
have been for the Ferguson Commission to date so
that we can make sure that those characteristics
carry through into this selection process. The
first being that there's a transparent public
process so we thought that as we talk about the
process selecting the court intermediary that there
be a focus on maintaining a transparent public
process because our authority to do the work
actually comes from the public having buy-in to our
abilities.
CO-CHAIR WILSON: Ms. Muhammad, I'm going to ask Bethany to confirm something, is this the same deck that we saw on the 24th?

MS. MUHAMMAD: No.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: It's a different desk?

MS. MUHAMMAD: Yes. This is just about the process.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MUHAMMAD: The second characteristic being work has to be data driven, unflinching and urgent and the third being you have expertise to be able to focus in on issues but also enough breath to be comprehensive so we talked a little bit about not focusing in on one issue by itself but make coverage intimate enough that you can address multiple issues throughout the process.

So we looked at key responsibilities for a core intermediary and there are actually six and they separate out pretty nicely into leadership functions and support functions so the first three key responsibilities around building public will, guiding visual and strategy and advancing policy usually happens at the leadership level and that's when you're bringing people together to actually
own implementation of the action plan. The third
set of steps, its supporting aligned activities,
the establishing shared measurement and the
mobilizing funding are more support functions and
we thought it was important to call out the
distinction between the types of responsibility
that the court intermediary would be facilitating.

So this slide gives the specific
elements of what the core intermediary will be
asked to do. One thing to keep in mind is the
Ferguson Commission is the commissioners but it's
also the staff involved that has been involved in
this process so we looked at what are the core
functions and activities that are currently taking
place and how we would translate that into the
function of a core intermediary so this list is all
the things that a court intermediary would be
responsible for in order to carry out the functions
that were on the other slide.

And in the next piece I think is
significant to call out the core intermediary is
the organization or the entity that's responsible
for providing those support functions but there
also needs to be a method for engaging the
community and engaging stakeholders to actually
take leadership in moving the calls to action forward so we looked at those, that leadership circle where we're looking at the community engagement, the institutional capacity and the willingness to actually advance a shared agenda so it's not up to the intermediary by themselves to advance the call to action but it's up to the core intermediary to organize the space, organize the stakeholders and then to support those stakeholders in actually moving the calls to action forward.

So this is how all of this looks or comes together. The integration of the support function and the leadership function all in the racial equity lens, the core intermediary provides those support functions, they're responsible for accountability, they'll work with the evaluation partners to make sure that performance is managed and then within all of those signature calls you'll have leadership that focuses in on those three key areas to make sure that nothing gets lost and that the effort remains comprehensive.

So this is the selection process. Essentially you're looking for the core intermediary to perform those support functions and you're going to ask interested entities to describe
their capacity, to be able to provide those core functions. There will be a request for qualifications where it will have a series of questions that will help to measure an organization's capacity and readiness to deliver on those core functions. They'll have to talk about their internal mission alignment as well as others of opportunity for growth and capacity building but they'll be able to provide information that you can use to access their fit in moving this work forward as the core intermediary.

You'll have staff, volunteers, members of the public who have served on work groups who will actually review those proposals and then they will make a recommendation on the top three depending on how many applications you receive, or they'll at least rank those applications based on a scoring criteria and then the final list will be invited to actually make a presentation to the Ferguson Commission with how they would move the work forward and as a result opportunity to vote on the finalists based on the recommendations of the reviewing body.

The second piece is the accountability piece so after you've identified the
core intermediary there will be a process to
identify an evaluation partner and they will be
responsible for setting up the monitoring and the
performance management and the request for
qualifications process is the same, they'll submit
an application, it will be reviewed by
commissioners and members of the public and then
they will do a presentation for the Commission.

This third piece, the leadership
piece is important to note that through this
selection process you're focusing on the core
intermediary and the evaluation partners and in
their application they will tell you or they will
describe what systems and processes they will put
in place to help elevate and support this
leadership function so we're not asking that you
have a third process to identify all of the
leadership for all of these areas, in fact in these
applications the applicants will address how that
will be done.

So this is the basic time line. The
request for qualifications, proposal review, for
intermediary selection and then that same process
repeated for the evaluation partners.

We believe that if all of these steps
are followed in this order you should have your 
core intermediary selected by the November 9th 
Ferguson Commission meeting and your evaluation 
partners selected by the December 14th commission 
meeting.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Are there any 
questions from Commissioners regarding the 
selection process for the core intermediary?

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: I have no 
questions, I just want to say to the staff, even 
who put this together, I just think it's very 
solid, responsible in alignment with everything we 
heard tonight so just fabulous, fabulous work.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Absolutely.

Agreeing with that accommodation and noting that 
this requires our approval to move forward the 
floor is open for an action.

Commissioner Windmiller moves the 
approval process to select the core intermediary 
and monitoring evaluation partners. Is there a 
second?

Properly seconded. All those in 
favor please notify by saying aye.

Opposed same sign.

Any abstentions?
Motion carries.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Thank you very much Commissioners for the green light to move those processes forward in particular of what we heard tonight from our Cincinnati support group.

I'm asking you now to go into your packet for the final action item of the night, this was another carry over from our last commission meeting, this is the Ferguson Commission proposed budget, this is the for the time frame of October 1st through December 31st, focusing on how we spend the remaining funds from the 1.217 million that we have left within this work. Just wanting to note that Ferguson Commission has been given the green light by the Governor to be able to extend our time together through 12/31 and that this week I had several conference calls with the government funders to make sure that they are comfortable verbally with what I'm presenting to you tonight, both of them are and letters are going out as of tomorrow for, to support for the private funds to be able to shift in this way and we do have this flexibility to do so. That in mind I'll take you to the revenue at the top where the total revenue
streams are $508,217 and you can see those sources of remaining funds up top. From the expenses we have projected independent contractors will still be needed to continue our work, professional fees line item, operations at 4,000, we continue to need to sustain the commission final report development and dissemination and I wanted to focus really quickly on core intermediary planning as you've just approved there will be funding that we would like to set aside from our remaining funds to be able to plant financial seed for the function that we just approved tonight and so we have put a place holder then for $176,675 to support the infrastructure that will be needed, that comes beyond us. With that also as you just saw we'll have at least two commission meetings with which to have the public selection process so we do have money that is funded for community engagement and commission meetings, commission report and dissemination of the platform of which we launched the digital first strategy will have to be maintained through our time together and that is estimated a 59,000 for that and website posting at 1,000 over three months time frame. So I present this budget to the Commission to get us through the
31st and what we just approved as our time line and
our goals for our work together.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: So you've seen the
budget proposal that is refined from the document
shared with you at our last meeting. Are there
questions or comments from any Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: I just have
one comment regarding the posting of the web site
for three months and so are we anticipating in our
translation project with the intermediary that they
would assume that responsibility of having the
information at least available for some time and
hosting?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Yes, we are assuming that it will be able and we
plan, that's why we put the intermediary first in
the October November selection time frame to then
walk with them from November to December.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I don't have a
question about the number, did I hear you say the
office of the Governor has in fact endorsed this
process in moving forward?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
The office of the Governor has provided to the
Commission a letter that acknowledges that will be
in commission if you will through December 31, yes.

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: Other questions or comments? Any Commissioner?

Okay. Seeing none then we'll entertain a motion for approval.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: So moved.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: So moved by Commissioner Blackmon, is there a second?

Several seconds. Any further discussion?

All those in favor please say aye.

All those opposed.

Motion carries, the budget is done.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Thank you.

With that we do not have other business for tonight to be addressed, we do have a media communications update from Nicole who is here with us to provide that update.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: Okay. Our director of media communications Nicole Hudson.

MS. HUDSON: Good evening everybody. You've all received a lot of e-mails from me today. As of tonight you will have a full copy of the draft of
the executive summary and all but one section of
the signature priority section and about 90 percent
of the area of focus documents, the rest of that
will be posted tonight. If you have any trouble
accessing those documents we are doing the comments
on-line so that we can keep everything in one
place, I've been printing them out and then putting
my comments in so let me know if you have any
access issues. We're trying to get all the
comments back by 9 o'clock on Friday morning, we're
parallel processing with both the state for the
layout of the printed piece the pdf and also the
web development company that is working on the
platform so they'll be placing draft content, in
we'll be spending the weekend making sure that all
the edits that come from everybody make it on to
the platform.

Other update is that there will be a
press conference on Monday at 2:30 in the same
location where we will release the report
officially so you'll receive further information
about that as it gets completed.

Any questions?

I wanted to thank everybody for
participating in the sprint that is this week, I
thank you in advance for your comments and your
continued patience as we move toward Monday.

CO-CHAIR MCCLURE: Thank you Nicole

and the staff for all your hard work. Any other
questions?

So I reiterate to the Commission,

this is a very important time for everyone to
engage that chooses to do so in their comments, the
deadlines are real deadlines, we'll be unable to
accept comments after our deadline in order to
reach our production deadline, much of this content
of course is work we're familiar with but read it
closely and carefully please and we do appreciate
all of that help and also to second the commentary
from Commissioner Aldridge appreciate the hard work
of many of the staff team working through this.

Any other business to come before the
Commission?

Our Cincinnati friends are still,
some of them here and I want to thank you very much
and to your colleagues that can still hear us,
Reverend Lynch I see, Al Gerhardstein, Captain
Herold and Officer Harrell, thank you all very
much, you have made an credible sacrifice.

They do this freely and willingly
because they care about their country and they care
about their region and they care about ours and for
that we are very grateful.

It has become our custom for all of
us to stand and to recenter ourselves and think and
contemplate the reasons that we come to this
journey together and the reasons we come for this
work so let me just ask you to grab a hand of
somebody close to you if you can and I would ask
you just as you touch someone and we pause for a
moment of quiet silence and centering to recall
what brings you here, recall what brings your level
of concern, recall the care and the motivation and
the passion and the urgency that you bring to this
and how you can share that with others that will
move our community and our region forward. So
let's think about that for just a moment.

Thank you. Amen. Travel safely.

Stop symptom

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:59 p.m.)
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