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(Whereupon, the meeting began at 5:40 p.m.)

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Good evening. How's everybody doing this evening? My name's Bethany Johnson-Javois, I have the pleasure of doing the call to order for the Ferguson Commission meeting, in which we anticipate commissioners are on their way out the door and already being seated.

We can see Traci, we can see you.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: I can see you, too.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Great. Okay. This is the 19th Ferguson Commission meeting being called to order on December 7 here at the Nathaniel J. "Nat" Rivers State Office Building here at 4811 Delmar Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri.

Commissioners, if you're in attendance, please state residence as I call your name.

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, Jr.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Pastor Traci Blackmon.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

T.R. Carr

COMMISSIONER CARR: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Gabe Gore.

COMMISSIONER GORE: 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.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Present.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Felicia Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pat Sly.

COMMISSIONER SLY: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Byron Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Present.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you very much.

At this time, I don't have my agenda in front of me, but I believe we're going to have a welcome by Chris from Launch Code. Could you please stand, Chris, so I can see you? All right. Thank you for coming.

CHRIS: Good evening, everybody.

Welcome to the Launch Code Mentor Center. Launch Code is really honored to be a part of this event and to host the Ferguson Commission, this final meeting. I just briefly tell you what we are and what we're doing, what the space is. Launch Code is
a nonprofit that is devoted to creating economic opportunity by helping people find jobs and technology. So this space is brand new, we opened it last month, and it is our educational hub, it's where we hold all of our educational programs, which are free, and are developed with the goal of making equity, access and diversity a priority, and exposing people to technology.

So that's what we do here, if you want to know more, talk to me or talk to anybody here that works at Launch Code, and they'll be happy to tell you more, and other than that, we'll really excited and honored to host this meeting. Thank you very much.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you so much for having us tonight, Chris.

We also have one more welcome to do in the form of invocation, we're going to ask Cynthia Williams, MSW, to come at this time for invocation.

MS. WILLIAMS: Father, You have greatly favored, us; our city, our region, our nation, with lavish and abundant resources and gifts, and we give You thanks for Your favor. We ask that You reward these 16 commissioners and all community members according to their works, according to their
contributions, and according to their investments in addressing the inequities of our daily life experiences. For some, Lord, the work is done, but You, God, are diligent to accomplish the works of Your design and Your hand. Father, complete the work. Be the equalizer, be the rewarder of those who diligently seek Your face. Father, send help. Send peace, send deliverance to our region and to our world. In the incomparable Name of Jesus.

Amen.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Good evening. My name is Starsky Wilson, I am blessed to serve as co-chair of the Commission with my friend and brother, Rich McClure, and am pleased to see all of you here on tonight. Tonight is not only I believe they say the 19th of meeting of the Ferguson Commission, but here just a little over a year since our first meeting on December 1st, 2014, it is also the final meeting of the Ferguson Commission, as the Commission expires on December 31st, 2015.

It is perhaps more -- less intentional or more providential that we gather in this place on tonight, even though the activity that has happened on this corner is an activity that has sprouted in this place only in the last month. We also gather
here with a Delmar address. We gather here at a place that has been so significant in the history of this region as a dividing line and a defining space for health outcomes on one side of the street, health outcomes on the other side of the street. Economic outcomes are different on one side of the street than they are on the other side of the street. Housing stock is different on one side of the street than it is on the other side of the street, and one's very length of life is different on one side of the street than it is on the other side of the street. So we end our work tonight, the final meeting of the Ferguson Commission, at the Delmar divide.

I didn't know that. I came to St. Louis in 2000, so just take briefly a point of reflection here, I lived about three blocks up from here at the corner of Delmar and Union, I didn't realize all the things that were going on around me at the time, I was just here working, trying to raise some Monday for United Way, help some people. But I lived at this particular dividing point, and it is critically important for all of the discussions we have had over the course of this last year and perhaps will even play into our discussions here on tonight about
I am mindful tonight of two people. One turned 99 years old in the last month, Ms. Frankie Freeman, who's a champion for our region, helped us when we came to one of these dividing points, when we would respond in and after the 1983 settlement of the desegregation case in the St. Louis Public Schools, making sure that we would equitably care for the next generation through our public policy and through our investments thereof. She worked, and continues to work quite frankly, and would build the effort to make sure that monitoring of that settlement happens, that there is accountability for that work in this community, that someone's paying attention. And they were very -- they were very thoughtful to make sure there was resources for that kind of monitoring when the settlement was made.

I'm also mindful tonight of one who has been a mentor to me since I came to St. Louis in 2000, Mr. James Buford, who is a great champion for this region in this community, who deserves all of our honor for his fights in this community, and today his family would welcome also our prayers and thoughts as he recovers as he has been ill. And so I invite your thoughts and your prayers for their
service. The sacrifice that our dear sister and
mother Freeman gave to this community as it sought
to care for its children across these lines, and for
Mr. Buford as he gathered, joined hip with Bill
Danford to help the community to overcome the
challenges of fragmentation in health care, even
with our great health assets that led to the
establishment of the Regional Health Commission,
just in the courts over the last 15 years.

This is policy work that has been
difficult that we have done together. It will take
the kind of commitment that we saw in those days,
that we continue to see and persist even a
generation later as it relates to the deseg case, to
make sure that the work that we have done over the
course of the last year is not only fruitful, but
rather has the kind of benefit that it can, should
and shall have for our children. So I invite you to
keep them in mind tonight as we seek to do this
work, in as much as is honor --

(Applause.)

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you. It is my
charge to speak to a bit of the traction that we've
had to date, I'll be brief in that as we've already
taken privilege. We note and we thank the community
for its response to the fourth Ferguson Report since
the launch of the digital first report platform on
September 14th, the website has been visited over
26,000 times for a total of over 68,000 page views.
Facebook has been the largest driver of traffic to
the platform through the sharing of community
stories and experiences of St. Louisans in
connection with the policy recommendations of the
report. Text, photo and video posts on Facebook
sharing stories from community were engaged with six
times more than other nonstory posts. It means
we're paying attention to one another's lives.

As it relates to pdf downloads metrics,
in the last 60 days there have been over 2100
downloads of the pdf form of the report, in the last
30 days there were 872. The community is reading,
the community is engaging, the community is paying
attention, and for this I thank God.

As we look at our work forward today, I
turn to my co-chair, Rich McClure, to bring us
reflections and to get us started.

CO-CHAIR McClURE: Thank you very much,
Starsky, and thank all of you for being at this
meeting tonight.

It's appropriate that we gather at this
site, not only as a state office building, since we are state commissioned, but because it is the home of Launch Code, which has as its stated purpose to create jobs and bring economic opportunity to diverse and under resourced populations, and they are creating these, even as we speak, in these rooms and in the back to learn and to be mentored by companies and entities in the region. And just as our efforts are intended to bring innovation and creativity and to focus on those who have been marginalized and have not had seats at the table, it's appropriate that we be here in the spirit of that innovation, and the fact that this work and this journey has been one, in fact, one not undertaken by other regions and undertaken uniquely in our region at a time when it's so desperately needed.

I want to offer a few points of gratitude, and then a couple of, of observations about tonight. First of all, we have in the audience a number of folks who have been about creating art and creating expressive ways to talk about the challenges of hopes and dreams of our opportunities, and if some of those artists are still here, and I think they are in the back, they
have been part of publications, and books, and
paintings, and so we would, we want to that
recognize their creative work. Would you all stand
so we can recognize your creative work tonight?
(Applause.)

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: This evening we will
be working on what is to come next. And I think it
is important when you think about what's to come
next to consider where we have been. In just a
little over a year ago when we met for our first
meeting on December 1st, we began with the process
of confronting our reality, and we heard from our
community, we heard from folks who have been living
the reality of our region, and after a hundred days
we published a report about confronting that
reality.

And then on September the 14th, after
thousands of folks had participated in meetings, in
60 meetings of working groups and 22,000 volunteer
hours, we delivered to our region a report Forward
Through Ferguson, A Path Towards Racial Equity. And
that report really is not the culmination of our
work, but in fact, the first step of what for our
region will be a very long and hard journey. But
make no mistake, that journey must start with energy
and momentum and passion and dedication, and it's
what we have seen from this commission, but more
importantly, it's what we have seen from the
thousands of people who came to the table to be with
us and to join with us as partners in this work.
And so in unflinching and transformative ways it has
been our hope and prayer that what we have said
during these many months will provide a pathway for
the region which now must come together and take
ownership of this work, across racial lines, across
cultural lines, business, civic, community activist,
front line, grass roots organizations all must come
together as they did around the work of the Ferguson
Commission in order for us to take true progress and
positive change that was our aspiration from the
very beginning.

So I want to thank my co-chair, Starsky
Wilson, my brother, that we started this work not
certain where it would lead us, not certain whether
we should do it, in fact. But it has been an
incredible journey, and one in which I have grown
immensely, spiritually, in ways of revelation and
knowledge, and it is because of your partnership and
our brotherhood, and I thank you.

(Applause.)
CO-CHAIR McClure: And then to our staff team, I want to get these thank yous here, the other commissioners will have a chance to do some reflections perhaps a little bit later, but while the cameras are here and while all of you are here, and sometimes that's not the case at the end of the meetings, I want to make sure that I thank Bethany Johnson-Javois, our Managing Director, and the incredible staff team that she assembled that worked tirelessly night and day, frequently through the night, in order to make sure that what you saw was unflinching, transformative, and truly ground breaking, and so to Bethany and to the team, thank you.

(Applause.)

CO-CHAIR Wilson: And to our fellow Commissioners, we'll have a chance to thank them later, we've already thanked them privately, but these folks have given sacrificially of time, many of them far more than they ever expected, but they stayed with us and stayed at the table, and more importantly were there with passion and dedication, and an incredible energy to find the common ground that would move us forward. To the Commissioners, thank you.
(Applause.)

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: We're now going to move forward with this evening's work, which is to think about our partnership with FOCUS St. Louis and other community partners in designing an ecosystem, but we're going to start, as we always have, with audience polling, our ever popular process that we're learning a lot about each other, and Monique is going to come to speak.

MS. THOMAS: Good evening. Good evening! That's much better, you've got to start off right. This is the last meeting of the Ferguson Commission, it's the 19th meeting, and it is our tradition to collect data points, that's you, so we'll be asking you to respond to a series of questions. We've been doing this since the beginning, it is a way of capturing your presence and who you represent in the room, so first I just want to ask a logistics detail. Does everyone have a key pad? Raise your hand if you don't have -- hold up your key pad. Who's feeling alone? Who doesn't have a key pad? Okay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I just want to say, as well, if there are some who typically waive taking the key pad, but it's really
important that you take it and that you participate, please, even if you typically waive it, we'd like to be sure to capture the number of people in the room. Thank you.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you. Okay. So who has not used a key pad holder before or used key pad holder before? Okay, thank you. Fine, I'll walk you through, we'll have a test question, and then we'll have 12 questions, most of them are demographic, and then we have some schematic questions related to trauma, and that's been what we've been capturing over the, I guess the past six or more meetings, for most of the meetings we've been capturing that related to trauma and form, that experience. So you'll see that if you look at your key pad, you'll have a series of numbers slash letters, and so I'll ask you a question, and then there'll be a series of answer choices, you select the answer with the corresponding letter or number that best fits your best answer, okay? So we'll do a test question as we always do. Is everyone set? Anyone not have a key pad? All right.

This is the test question, and we'll start with the hardest one, right? What is your favorite color?
CO-CHAIR WILSON: I think I know.

MS. THOMAS: St. Louis has been very consistent in answering the test question, so I'll read the answer, the choice A, black; B, brown; C, blue; D, green; E, orange; F, purple; G, red; H, yellow; I, white; J, other. So you'll see on the top screen that polling is now closed, you'll see apology is closed, it's red. I'm going to say polling is open, and then your answer choices will be captured, okay? Any questions?

All right, let's try it. Polling is now open. You have 30 seconds. 15 seconds. What will it be? Well, well, well, one third blue. That's been the consistent answer every time we poll and ask the question, blue has been the -- I don't know what it is.

Okay, so now we're getting into the real deal, this is, these are the real questions. Okay, so the first one, and please just select one. And if there's a case where you need to select two, I'll let you know.

In what geographic area is your primary home or residence located? A, St. Louis City; B, St. Louis County; C, St. Charles County; D, Jefferson County; E, Franklin County; F, St. Clair
County, Illinois; G, Madison County; H, Monroe County; I, other. It is not represented here. Polling is now open. And if for whatever reason you need to change your answer, it is the last thing you enter.

Okay. Okay, we have nearly an even split between St. Louis City, St. Louis County.

Okay. In what geographic area is your primary work and/or school. Please note if you are retired you can select other, so 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 now open. About 15 seconds left. Okay, so nearly 7 out of 10 of you work or attend school in St. Louis City.

With which gender do you identify?

Please select one. A, female; B, male; C, other; D, decline. Polling is open. About 10 seconds left. See we have one more person that hasn't responded. That may be you. Okay. So nearly 60 percent female, 43 percent male.

In what age group do you belong? Now I always invite people, remind people that we can't see who is answering, okay? So, you know, you can
choose to decline if you'd like, but please be honest. A, 21 and under; B, between 22 and 34; C, 35 to 44; D, 45 to 54; E, 55 to 64; F, 65 and over; G, you politely decline. Polling is now open.

About 10 seconds left. Remember, you can decline.

All right. So you have about one third between 22 and 34, 23 percent between 55 to 64, and those are our greatest proportions. Okay.

Now how would you describe your ethnicity or race? A, white; B, black African American; C, Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin; D, Asian, E; American Indian or Alaskan native; F, native Hawaii or Pacific Islander; G, other; D, decline. Excuse me, H, decline. Polling is open.

About 10 seconds left. Okay.

65 percent who are represented in the room have identified as white followed by about 30 percent African American.

This is the 19th meeting of the Ferguson Commission. How many previous meetings have you attended? Please note that I make a good distinction between these full meetings and the working group meetings, so we're not counting the working group meetings for these, okay? So A, none, this is your first meeting; B, between one and four;
C, between five and six; D, nine to twelve; E, thirteen to sixteen; F, seventeen or more, you've been to nearly all of them. Polling is now open. About ten seconds left, but I think we blocked answers.

Okay. So we've had people, a lot of people who 32 percent is their first meeting, but we also have 32 percent who have been to a few, so thanks for coming back. Usually a high proportion are new folks, that's a good thing, so thank you. And thank you for that one percent who've done the 17 or more with us.

Okay. How did you learn about today's meeting? Check all that apply. So this is one where you'll be able to select all that apply. So all of these are accurate, you found out about the meeting through all of these things, just put A, B, C, D and so on. So A is Facebook; B is Twitter; C, email; D, newspaper; E, radio; F, word of mouth, friend, co-worker, relative, et cetera. G, the Ferguson Commission website also STL positive change dot org; and H is other. You found out through another means. Polling is open. About 15 seconds left. I think we're good.

Okay, most of you had good friends, 40
percent, nearly 40 percent found out through word of
mouth, followed by an email, and then the Commission
website.

So those are the content-related
questions, so these have to do with trauma, and give
your opinion about how you define these things. So
first let me note how we're describing trauma. So a
trauma or toxic stress, we're noting it as:

Described as a one-time or ongoing deeply
disturbing, one-time or ongoing deeply disturbing
experiences, often brought on by physical, economic,
cultural, emotional or environmental assault. Any
questions or people -- is that clear to folks?
Okay. So the first one is: Have you experienced
trauma or toxic stress as defined, as I just defined
it. A, yes; B, no; C, I don't know; D, decline to
respond. Polling is open. About ten seconds left.
Okay.

80 percent, little over 80 percent have
indicated yes.

Do you think the community you live in
has experienced trauma? A, yes; B, no; C, I don't
know; D, decline to respond. Polling is open. Less
than ten seconds.

Over 90 percent say yes.
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. Less than five seconds left.

Nearly all of you say yes.

Have you experienced any trauma due to racism? A; yes, B; no, C, I don't know; D, decline to respond. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Less than five seconds.

Nearly split yes and no, 49 percent yes, 44 no, six percent not knowing.

From your experience, about how many people in your community are coping with past trauma or toxic stress? A, very few; B, some; C, a lot. Polling is open. About ten seconds left. Less than five, that's an approximate. Thank you.

Over 50 percent say a lot. 41 percent say some.

So that concludes our audience polling, thank you again, and now I'm going to turn it over to Jerrica, and now we'll be going to audience, it will be audience participation, we're going to get to open mic.

So we're actually collecting those polling, the polling key pads, so if you see your
MS. FRANK: And just like she says, these key pads cannot open your garage door, and they do not change the channels on your television. Good evening, everyone. And so, as Monique has mentioned, we are going to conduct our public open mic. If you've been here prior to meetings we allow the audience to give their feedback suggestions, ask any questions, whatever you may have on your mind. You have two minutes, and I will be timing. We try to give everyone a clear chance to speak, and I will pick from our jar as far as who can go first. Again, two minutes, please, as you would allow for everyone to have a fair amount of time to speak.

First we are going to start with Dr. Jason Pernell. After Dr. Pernell, we are going to have Gerald Higginbotham, and then we will also have Tom, please forgive me, Charboneau?

MR. CHARBONEAU: Charboneau.

MS. FRANK: Charboneau thank you, sir. We'll have Dr. Pernell first, please. Two minutes.

DR. PERNELL: I have some handouts for the Commissioners, if you'll take one and pass them
along. I want to state publicly what I said in an
email to Rich and Starsky and the core staff of the
Ferguson Commission, my congratulations on an
outstanding report to the community, I know work
goes into putting into a, putting together a product
like that firsthand, so my congratulations to all of
you, I extend that to you.

I'm really here tonight to put on the
record something that Starsky and I heard at a
meeting recently, that there was a perception in the
community that For the Sake of All, which was the
report on the health and well-being of African
Americans, and the Ferguson Commission were somehow
separate and/or competing initiatives or projects,
and I want to put that to bed. These are not
separate, we've been aligned from the beginning, and
what you have before you is just some examples of
that, so every commissioner had a copy of For the
Sake of All's report, as soon as they started their
work, I came to give expert testimony in February of
this year, I consulted with several of the co-chairs
of the working groups throughout this process, and
more importantly, if you look at the probably second
to last or third to last page, there is direct
alignment between the recommendations of For the
Sake of All and the calls to action of the Ferguson Commission. We talk about -- we talked about investing in high quality early childhood, you talk about investing in early childhood education. We talked about investing in coordinated school health programs for all students, the report calls for schools as centers of health, we discussed helping low to moderate income families create economic opportunities, which included child development accounts and financial advice and services. The Ferguson Forward report talked about creating universal child development accounts and financial empowerment centers. We talked about investing in the quality of neighborhoods for all in St. Louis, which includes things like, inclusionary zoning ordinances and low income housing tax credit forms, and finally, Faith and For the Sake of All is engaging the faith community in the racial equity commission. So we have been in alignment, we will continue to be in alignment, and I pledge my, the support of the For the Sake of All project as we move forward with implementation. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. FRANK: Thank you, Dr. Pernell. And then now we will have Gerald Higginbotham.
MR. HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes. Close enough.

Good evening, my name is Dr. Gerald Higginbotham, I'm the Senior Vice-president for American Slave Nation, I'm the spokesperson for the Descendents of American Slaves Spiritual Advisors. I want to say congratulations Starsky and Rich and Commission for doing an outstanding job. I had the opportunity here recently to speak before the House of Lords in London, as well as in Liverpool, to go back and really go to the beginning of this thing, the problems that we've been having in our nation, and we're still dealing with -- I want to go on record and say this, we're still dealing with the after effect of slavery, it's never been addressed. And going to Liverpool, they sent 1.5 million slaves here to the Americas, 400,000 of them came here to the United States, and they have apologized, and they want to work with Ferguson to begin to heal in their community in London -- I mean correction, in Liverpool, as well as in Ferguson. One of the issues that we still have to deal with, we have an identity issue. We've been dealing -- we've been called slaves, colored, negroes, black, African Americans. We've got to, we've got to address that on our side. We are, we are Americans, we are the
descendents of the American slaves. In order to
help a group of people, you first have to identify
the group of people it is that you're really trying
to help, and African Americans are different from
the American slave culture. Two total different
groups with two total different needs. I spoke here
recently at the United States Citizenship
Immigration, UMSMAN, Fifth Annual Conference in
Washington, DC, on the 5th, and I spoke with Maria
Ogman and shared with her that blacks are not
burning down the community in Ferguson, and it's
certainly not African Americans, because African
Americans can go back to Africa, because that's the
United States immigration term. And she totally
agreed with me, and so I said it's the descendents
of American slaves that were born in this nation
here, America's first born descendents, that have
not been recognized, that culture, and so we have to
dig a little bit deeper, and I'd like to work the
Commission, American Slavery, as we begin to roll
out a model here in this community and across this
nation to bring about the change that's desperately
needed.

(Applause.)

MS. FRANK: And Mr... you'll need to
introduce yourself.

MR. CHARBONEAU: As the work of this body comes to a close, it's appropriate that it be here at Launch Code, in this monument of clear thinking and the power to save our own future. Perhaps your work will spark an epiphany of collective consciousness for our community, our nation and perhaps our world. At best, every success will be -- will lead to some call to make a greater struggle necessary. Inevitable will be angry enemies, desertions from the ranks with mocking contempt of those who remain behind him. Be not deterred, profits from exploitation and fearful isolation may be replaced by rewards greater than the preachers of separation and the drawers of lines on maps can imagine. Old walls built on foundations of selfishness have only served as a prison for those surrounded by them. Great ideas become manifest at the confluence of urgent need and undeniable opportunity. Our city where rivers meet stands as testament. Perhaps now begins the end of disenfranchisement and artificial separation that endured here since the Civil War. The reward may be enjoyed by generations unborn, as we are long forgotten. It may be the only chance for mortality
this lifetime will ever provide.

(Applause.)

MS. FRANK: And then we will finish up with Scott Addison and Dan Hyatt. And Dan Hyatt, you will follow Mr. Addison.

MR. ADDISON: I just got back from a little trip back east. Rather than seeing my family on Thanksgiving I went to a vigil in front of the White House and took part in a ceremony requesting clemency for Leonard Peltier, who this February will be a political prisoner in America for 40 years. His case as an activist for AIM, and then targeted by the FBI and the infamous COINTELPRO projects of the late 60's and early 70's under J. Edgar Hoover. This was a signatory moment in the misuse, the germinal moment really of the misuse of police and the prosecutorial powers to suppress right to petition and the First Amendment, which was what was about to begin with.

My career has touched some difficult stuff, because I've seen these kinds of abuses continue, and the subplot of the Ferguson crisis, saw the ramifications of that and the continuing effects of those kinds of policies as we failed to address the real bounds of police powers and the use
of prosecutorial powers in this country, and I think we really kind of only danced across the surface of those issues if we have failed to address the proper limits of and the exercise of police powers, and the immunities that officers enjoy that shield them from accountability. Early in this crisis, there was a TV interviewer with Allen Howard, Professor Allen Howard of the St. Louis University Law School, and he glibly speculated that there would be a lot of hoopla and brouhaha about all this, but not much would happen in terms of real effects because of qualified immunities of police. I wrote him a note, I kind of conferred with him before -- I'll finish in a second -- and asked him if he at once taught constitutional law and not to use it, but I think that remains the issue, and I don't think we, this Commission has really touched these really core issues in the use of police power in this country, and I've argued about the pretext of emergency law and the suppression of speech, I don't think that got very far. So that will have to carry on.

MS. FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Addison.

(Applause.)

MR. HYATT: My name is Dan Hyatt, I live in Maryland Heights, Missouri, I've been an advocate
against the tyranny in North County through petty enforcement for the last five years. I want to thank the Commission for the hard work, you've done much hard work, you've led a great effort, and much has been accomplished. Last December I stood before you and I said: We don't need new laws, we need to enforce the laws we have. Yes, we need some new laws with teeth, but we continue to have the problem where we haven't, I have to use the word tyranny. We have tyrants in the police and the aldermen and the mayors of North County and other municipalities, and the reason why this continues is lack of oversight, lack of accountability, and I continue to see it and I can relate story after story after story of, some of it people go: Well, it's not a big deal. Well, it is a big deal, especially when you multiply it by a thousand and 10,000, when you have a municipality that's citing people for mismatched curtains, and impounding cars for revenue, and I was cited because somebody parked a car in my driveway that wasn't properly licensed. It wasn't my car. Only in St. Louis can you be cited for somebody else illegally parking a car that's not yours. And so what I hope to see come from the Commission and the other efforts is
municipalities are proving over and over again by their lawsuits and other resistance that they have no intent of allowing change. They have no intent of stopping the tyranny. And they have no intent of giving up the power which they only own because of complete lack of oversight and accountability. So again, I hope that we get to enforce the laws, I hope that this Commission is successful in its endeavor. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. FRANK: I want to thank everyone who came up and spoke, we truly do appreciate all of your comments. I will now turn it over to Rich.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: Thank you very much Jericca, and thank you to those members of the public who not only commented this evening, but who commented throughout the process of our 19 meetings, we've learned a great deal from you, thank you for your engagement and participation.

We're going to now turn to the main presentation of the evening, a discussion of next steps and the core intermediary functions. Bethany Johnson-Javois is going to manage that presentation with a number of presenters, but before we begin that, we do have to -- we want to make sure that we
get on the record to recusals from Commissioners who will so state for the record their conflict and their recusal. We have had other Commissioners that recused themselves at prior meetings from this discussion, or at the last meeting, that was due to the application participation of the Applied Research Collaborative, that participation or that application for participation has been withdrawn, and so those recusals are no longer necessary, at least from the Chair's perspective, and that, that group has, has made that choice certainly voluntarily.

So I'll ask for the two commissioners, Reverend Wilson and Felicia Pulliam, to state their intent.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: As consistent with prior process I will participate in discussion, but will not vote on the implementation action, as I currently serve as the Board Secretary for Further St. Louis.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: To reaffirm that I, too, will participate in the participation -- participate in the discussion, but recuse myself from a vote because I am the Development Director for Further St. Louis.
CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you, that is consistent with our practice for participation or to gain any benefit of the use to refrain from voting for those two commissioners, and so we will now proceed with the presentation, and we will start with our Managing Director, Bethany Johnson-Javois.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you. As the setting context for those of you that were at the last meeting that we had and those of you that weren't, after the presentation was provided we had the direct charge of staff to go back to work with FOCUS and additional partners specifically working with community organizing leadership and others to ensure that we had appropriate feedback and to present to Commission and community our, our best thoughts about what needs to happen when we move forward as we think about the infrastructure needed after the sunset of the Commission, which is set to take place 12-31-2015. I just want to offer to you, please, if you have it, community and Commissioners, you have a presentation that should be in your materials, so please pull that presentation out, we're going to walk that through now. And there's a second piece of reference material for you that you should have
received called FSG Policy Link Summary that provides some background information so that you can have clarity as we're discussing about some of the content of tonight's presentation.

As stated, we have multiple partners who have worked together over the course of the past, almost month, if not little over a month, to bring tonight's presentation to fruition. I will start and take the lead on speaking. In the presentation David Dwight, who's a Ferguson Commission fellow and who's been an expert, who's been an organizing community expression on campus at Washington University will come after me. Serena Muhammad, who we have at the Ferguson Commission secured in the August timeframe moving forward, provides collective impact, support and understanding of the regional frameworks, as well as the national frameworks brought to us by the St. Louis Mental Health Board as alum resource. Yemi Akande-Bartsch, she's with us, as well, from FOCUS St. Louis, who will also present tonight, and in close, Nicole Hudson, Ferguson Commission Communications consultant. So that's the order of the line-up, and with no further adieu, I'm going to direct your attention to tonight's presentation that we as staff have
entitled A Road Map For Forward Through Ferguson:

How the implementations of the call to action should happen.

So my goal for tonight is to cover the process that we are recommending, and the process actually so far in this work. So initially, if you remember, Commissioners and community, we talked about the work needing to be done differently, and to be organized around collective impact, which is a national concept, it has been a proven model, and proving is still happening within the nation and the within the region. So on the left, typically what would happen in the process is you have relationship -- based committees that would have a universal issue, they would form around that issue, you then in this middle circle have time to do a detailed action plan that is member led and direct that implementation, and then from there, you would go through the process of supporting the existing backbone leadership.

And so on the right-hand side, the Ferguson Commission, we started our work in essence as a planning body. Many of the funds that we received were planning grant funds to talk through the four working group areas of our report per our
executive order, and to think about how to produce 
those calls to action, which was the planning phase, 
and that work took place, it took us ten months to 
do that work, from the November timeframe all the 
way through the report release in September. Then, 
as atypical in collective impact, we needed to think 
very clearly and closely about how we would think 
about implementation. Now this is a different way 
that the design works, and so we raised the question 
that Serena helped us to think about as community 
together, if leadership will invest using the 
collective impact model in a single form or using 
multiple entities, and here is what I mean by that, 
if you go to the next line.

In the single entity function, I'm going 
to direct you to one through four, we would be 
looking in the RFQ process for this type of 
organization. Organization and partnerships that 
had broad mission and sophisticated infrastructure, 
had the ability to convene and coordinate and 
implement, and that 3 is really important where in 
this structure of one single entity requires 
significant capacity building, and would have high 
visibility. The other option that is on the table 
in terms of collective impact is a multiple entity
approach, which you would see here some of the high
points, it would require the Bridge for Ferguson
Commission, significant relationship building, and a
power balance must be shared. At that time we began
to discuss and think about what would be the best
option in the region, again a very aggressive
three-month timeframe. And what we decided in that
public meeting was as we looked at the essential
functions of what collective impact provides, which
are one through six, we needed to put in that RFQ
process, and that document captured this
information, these abilities: Respected neutral
convener, we looked and asked for an RFQ manage --
the ability to manage internal and external
communication, that data collection and analysis is
critical, the engagement of community and
relationship building, as the Ferguson Commission
had learned to do over the course of our time
together, advocacy fund raising, and the commitment
of organizational resources.

And so here with these thoughts in mind
and these concepts that we weighed heavily over
time, we then created an RFQ process in which we
acknowledge the following in terms of process: We
had to work with a compressed timeline that we had
very specific qualifications as outlined in the RFQ that we needed, and we knew that the infrastructure in the region did not allow for hundreds of applicants to come forward, so we did understand that there would be a limited pool of eligible entities. Our conference calls where we would have open meanings also model that where we had handfuls of individuals who would actually participate in those public conference calls looking for information on the RFQ process. So in terms of the process, we had a sole applicant respondent, FOCUS St. Louis, in which we did an iteration, it is an iterative process, that we gathered feedback from multiple people in multiple ways. For example, when the proposal was submitted, we convened an external review committee and had a public meeting with which eight additional pieces of feedback which we're calling priorities were provided. And then we conducted a public presentation and received feedback from both the public and commissioners in our last meeting, in which five additional areas of feedback were provided. And then subsequently, we participated in several planning meetings and partnership with our staff, community organizing groups to refine the approach in response to the
feedback. This is a document or a piece of the document just to show you the time line with which we worked, and to be accountable and transparent as to the process from the report. The report release was 9-14, and immediately the RFQ release was 9-21, and you can see the work that we've done all the way to date through the RFQ information calls, our commitment to thinking through the evaluation and monitoring function with which we began to engage FSG and Policy Link in conversation, all the way through our last commitment on 11-20 meeting with grass roots organizations, FOCUS St. Louis staff, and staff of the Ferguson Commission, to today's date which you even see a 12-7 working session, because yes, we do work to do whatever it takes, because honestly, the urgency with which this is needed and the kind of closure with which some need in order to transition well, we understand that, and so we took this process very seriously.

So that is the process part to kind of bring us up-to-date on where we've been, why we've made the decisions that we have in this region, and now we want to talk through some of what we have learned as we've embarked on a totally new process.

So at this time I want to ask David to come forward
to talk about this.

MR. DWIGHT: Thank you, Bethany. So

I'll be talking about the organizing community
feedback that we received. Like Bethany mentioned,
I'm coming from Wash U, just graduated, and was
involved with organizing there, doing a series of
protests there, awareness campaigns, eventually
demand, demands with the administration, which was a
great transition to this work, because although the
action of the Commission were not demands at the
behest of student protests, in a way they were at
the accountability of the community and the sheer
urgency of these issues. And so as Bethany just
walked through the history of this process, it
really continued to come up in the feedback that we
received that it was really key and important that
community organizers representing marginalized
communities in St. Louis were brought to the table
really from an early stage, and the Commission
recognized that in the last meeting, asked staff and
FOCUS to go back and talk to community organizers,
and to, instead of looking so much at what the form
of this structure would be, to look at the key
functions that are necessary for the work.

So here's a summary of some of the
salient points from that meeting, and I won't read
them all since you all have handouts, but I'd like
to touch on a few of them.

So transparent process of the Commission
was a huge one, raising the bar rather than checking
the box on these issues. Really ensuring that youth
and youth development and youth involvement, really
feeling like they had a stake in the decisions that
were being made was a key point. Looking at
advancing accountability in the region, really using
racial equity as the North Star, and ensuring that
those conversations came out of the margins and came
into the mainstream conversations in the region.
Ensuring that the convening of community members,
accountable bodies and technical expertise
continued, and that that dynamic tension continued,
because out of those tension meetings can come the
greatest change. And last, an analysis of systems
and acknowledgment of how conventional structures
have failed to solve entrenched problems for
marginalized groups in St. Louis. It really makes
me think of the signature priorities of the report,
that we live in a region where not all have access
to the opportunity thrive, really centering on youth
and having justice for all residents, and that there
needs to be a new articulation of the new philosophy of the social change in the region.

And just to review who was at that, who was able to attend that meeting, which was facilitated by Rebecca Bennett, Metropolitan Congregations United, David Girth, Tia Byrd and Jeff Vordour from Missourians Organizing For Reform and Empowerment, Laura Gretich from Jaws With Justice, Mortague Simmons from the Organization For Black Struggle, and lastly Rasheen was kind enough to join from Young Activists United.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Okay, so I think we've kind of established that this was unprecedented, that this was a very different approach, collective impact, in and of itself, is a new model, new design, a new way of looking at how you build momentum and build movements to address social issues, and even though the collective impact's framework was new, there is some flexibility in how it can be designed to address specific issues that are occurring in a particular community or region. So when we looked at some of the conditions that we had in St. Louis, when we looked at the fact that we had a planning group that was actually designed to produce a report, and now moving into
implementation, we had to make some adjustments and
to address some of those considerations. So I'm not
going to read what's on the slide, because this kind
of highlights what some of the other speakers have
already talked about. I think the thing to
highlight, though, is that the collective impact
approach is adaptable, and we did kind of push it to
the limits to figure out how we can be more flexible
to address the needs that emerged as we went through
this process.

So here are the things that we learned
from the process. We knew that capacity building
would be a critical role for a sole intermediary.
We initially decided that the sole intermediary
approach would make sense because of the time line
that we had, but we understood that asking one
organization to be able to do all of these things
was a heavy lift, and we recognize that in order to
make sure that that one organization was successful,
we'd have to build some capacity around that
organization. What came from the external review
process, as well as the commissioners and the
public, was that there needed to be a greater focus
on fund raising, grass roots mobilization and really
embedding the racial equity lens through everything
that was done through this process. We also knew that there would be a need to bridge the Ferguson Commission with the implementation. So as we discussed traditionally with collective impacts, the people who actually produce the plan have some period of time where they work together towards implementation, and we didn't have the luxury of time to be able to do that, but it doesn't negate the fact that it's important to have that continuity, so we understood that we had to create a process that would allow some of that social capital that had already been created to continue into the new implementation phase.

So the way we made these adjustments was we looked at creating a bridge of former commissioners who are able to secure institutional commitments to bring into the new work in partnership of FOCUS St. Louis. So understanding that there is social capital that has already been built, that they have a unique understanding of the calls to action, that they have a level of momentum that can't really be replicated by any other group, that there needs to be that continuity so that people see that the folks who have been involved from the beginning who have probably the most stake
in success of moving this forward are still involved in some way, and are still providing a bridge between all of the planning that took place into the implementation. And we also understood that it is very important to honor the fact that FOCUS St. Louis has already accepted a leadership role, and that when we went through this process, we understood that there would be a very limited pool of candidates who could actually meet eligibility requirements, and that there is a high level of visibility and a high level of risk, and that an organization that is in a position to step up and accept the responsibility of the civil leadership is a good partner because of their early commitment or their early adoption.

So when we talk about Forward Through Ferguson, when we talk about the bridge, we're talking about looking at the specific role of former commissioners and staff to support implementation going forward. The weight that we envision is that we would have two different key staff who are former Commission Staff, who would support implementation of the calls to action through a partnership with FOCUS St. Louis in what we're calling the Forward Through Ferguson design. We would invite other
commissioners or former commissioners for the ideal
so this speaks to the idea of how much involvement
we need going forward from those who have already
served on the Commission, and we would ask those
former commissioners to look at how they can make
organizational commitments that would actually drive
the signature calls to action forward. The
importance of this is that traditionally in
collective impact you have people who are working
together around a particular issue, because it's
something that they do in their regular everyday
work, so it's not an add-on, it's helping them to
actually elevate what they're already doing, and
it's raising the stakes on the importance of this
particular issue for them and their organization.
So what we're recognizing is that as we go out into
the community and we ask people to step forward and
get commitments to advance the calls to action, it
makes since to start off with the folks who are most
invested, who have been a part of the commission
process all along. So the second bullet point
speaks to asking the commissioners to look within
their organizations to determine what commitments
they can make to drive the signature calls to action
in partnership with FOCUS St. Louis in this Forward
Through Ferguson design.

The other thing that this does is leverages the networks and relationships that already exist through FOCUS St. Louis. They have the ability to convene through stakeholders, they have the ability to drive the racial equity lens through the signature areas, and we think that it's important that we don't necessarily create new structures where structures already exist, but that we look at ways to lift up and support and build those structures. So we would build upon these existing partnerships, we will work with the Ferguson, the former Ferguson Commission staff and commissioners who already have established relationships with these grass roots organizations, to make sure that the community leadership is available and integrated into all stages and all levels of the implementation process, and through this partnership or this bridge between former Commission Staff and Commissioners and FOCUS St. Louis, we would create this design that allows us to bring forward the momentum that's already been created with some of the opportunities that exist in working through FOCUS St. Louis.

So this is kind of what this looks like.
You've seen this graphic before, and it illustrates that racial equity is the context under which all of this work is conducted, and then there's a signature leadership ring that addresses all of the signature calls. So Justice For All, Youth at the Center, and Opportunity To Thrive. The important thing to note about the signature leadership ring is that it represents the key stakeholders who are already working in these bases. So again, we're not asking for FOCUS St. Louis or for Forward Through Ferguson to create three different groups, what we're asking is that we work the existing infrastructure in these spaces to help them self-organize. So if you have an entity that's already working in Youth in the Center, to connect with that group and to help them to build a line so that they can advance the calls to action. This is a more sustainable approach, it avoids duplication of effort, and it ensures that everyone is working towards the same goals. And in that very center circle is what we've been calling the core intermediary all along, but it just shows that the work of the core intermediary, which was traditionally described as those six backbone functions, is shared amongst these partners.
So the principles of this partnership is that at all levels we embody the racial equity lense, that the report, itself, drives the work, so the signature priorities determine who is at the table, who's in the room, and who's making decisions, and all of the actions moving forward are anchored in that signature report. It's the North Star to make sure that we're moving in the right direction. And then we maintain a commitment to being unflinching, recognizing that the work will be difficult, and the reason that we're calling on all of these community resources is because we don't expect one organization or one entity to be able to do this alone, and that there is a commitment to continuous learning, again, recognizing that collective impact is relatively new as a model, nationally, and especially locally, and even more recent is the integration of the Racial Equity Lens to do collective impact work, so we'll need to learn as we go and lean on some local and national resources to make sure that we're doing this to the best of our ability.

So this outlines the benefits of the proposed structure. I'm not going to read some of those that I've kind of talked about in other
slides, but I point out things that are new for this particular piece of the presentation. FOCUS St. Louis can serve as a fiscal agent which will provide lean infrastructure. We think it is important that we not contribute to the proliferation of organizations and initiatives that are happening in our region. We understand that there are a lot of coalitions who are working in different spaces, and we don't want to create a situation where we're competing for resources, so it makes sense to look at an existing entity who has the capacity to serve as fiscal agent so that as we're raising money and we're finding resources that are in kind as well as for cash, that they're actually going into the implementation of the calls to action, and not on a bunch of administrative or overhead costs.

The other thing to look at is we have to build the capacity for civic infrastructure over time for the entire region, so it's not just about building up FOCUS St. Louis, or making sure that Forward Through Ferguson becomes this next big organization, but it's looking at as we look at our landscape of what's missing, how do we make sure we're creating opportunities to increase resources across the board so that we have the infrastructure
as a region and not just within certain institutions of certain organizations. And then as I've mentioned, we really want to avoid duplication of effort as much as possible.

MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: Good evening, Commissioners. Before I dive into my part of the preparation tonight, I think it's important that I set context. I look around the room tonight, and I see a lot of familiar faces, but at the same time, I see some unfamiliar faces, and so the context that I would like to set is in terms of FOCUS history. Now FOCUS, as an organization, has been around for about 46 years, and we have certainly distinguished ourselves as the region's premier civic leadership organization. We have seven programs, about to become eight, and we have close to 8000 alums, and we're proud to say that about 70 percent of those alums still reside in the region. And through many of our initiatives, we touch close to 10,000 individuals annually. Now I think in my humble opinion, I would venture to say that FOCUS has certainly made considerable progress to advance civic leadership in our region. When we talk about the civic leadership that we advance, it's an educating, connecting, and engaging a broad spectrum
of leaders to be able to transform themselves not just individually, but also their community, and I think FOCUS St. Louis, I believe FOCUS St. Louis has done that really well than any other organization in the metropolitan area. I think some of you may be familiar with our history in terms of the work that we've done around policy initiatives, some of you may remember Confluence St. Louis, which was a program that was started by the very first Leadership St. Louis class, and Confluence St. Louis went on to birth and be involved in a lot of community engagement projects.

The collective history of FOCUS, we've also worked on a significant number of policy reports, we have upwards of 45 plus policy reports, and we also started the Dismantling Racism Institute, worked on a number of public education initiatives, worked towards development, and started the Bridges group. And some you have may or may not know this, but FOCUS St. Louis was actually one of the founders, the co-founders of the St. Louis Business Diversity Initiative.

So this is all to say that when you look at the broad spectrum of the FOCUS St. Louis network, we not only have staff members, we have
program graduates that have led what we consider to be social transformation initiatives, and they've also participated in regional agenda setting efforts and have certainly worked across boundaries and sectors to advance our region.

Not put anyone on the spot here, but just out of curiosity, those of you that are in the audience that feel led to do so, if you are a FOCUS alum, could you just stand up?

I think that speaks for itself. Thank you.

So certainly with what I've shared, we're not an organization, given our collective 46-year history, as one that rests on its laurels. And a little bit over a year ago, there were a number of significant what I would say are internal as well as external alignments that allowed us, as an organization, to look inwards and reexamine what our strategic direction commitments were. And at that point, the FOCUS St. Louis board, who I report to, decided that in so doing, in the exploration of at that time our 2011 and 2014 strategic plan, to look inwards, and to look at where it is that FOCUS St. Louis, as an organization, and really as a pillar of this community, was going. And to that
end over the course four months, now certainly I
have to say there were times it felt a lot longer
than that, and, you know, the Ferguson Commission
feels that they had a compressed time line, I'd say
that the Board really challenged us that so did we.
There was an urgency with respect to the work that
we needed to do. And so through April and August of
this year, FOCUS alum, FOCUS board members all came
together to help examine what the strategic
direction of the organization was to be. And in so
doing we took a good look at ourselves, we also took
a good look at what was happening in our community,
and we realized that many that were coming to us
were certainly seeking the knowledge, the skills
that were needed to address some of the structural
inequalities in our community. And at that time,
following a series of planning meetings, the Board
and the staff reviewed the existing mission of the
organization just to determine how clearly and
succinctly a community, communicated FOCUS's purpose
and impact. And what we realized is that our
original mission in the form that it was lacked that
clarity, lacked sufficient detail in terms of the
work that FOCUS was doing and for work that FOCUS
was committed to doing in the community. And to
that end, we came up with the first paragraph that you see up there, because we recognized that at the end of the day when it's all said and done, what FOCUS St. Louis does and does well is it prepares diverse leaders to work cooperatively for the thriving St. Louis region through its experienced based leadership program, but more importantly, through our civic issue education and public engagement initiatives. We did this work from April through August, certainly ahead of the RFQ being released.

So you might ask how does this tie in to the Ferguson Commission or for the Ferguson Commission report. To us, it was evident as we started to think through whether we were going to raise our hand in accomplishing the heavy lifting of work that needs to be done in our community. And I have to say that I had the, the unanimous, the collective support of my Board in looking at this, because we intuitively knew that our focus and our programs was on civic issue education. And given the history of our program, we have explored and exposed our program participants to many of these issues, perhaps not all, but to many of these issues. And we recognize that for FOCUS St. Louis,
we needed to continue to be unflinching, as we had
learned during our strategic process, and we needed
to be continually transformative in the type of
civic education initiatives that we embrace. And we
recognize that perhaps one of the greatest civic
issues that was facing the St. Louis region today
was around racial equity, and in order for our
leaders that we were training, we needed to engage
them in understanding that racial equity work.

Second to that again is how does this
relate to the Forward Through Ferguson report? And
it's around the public engagement initiatives. And
this includes our policy work, our civic engagement
forums that, once again, in looking at the work that
we have done to date, certainly highlighted a lot of
the calls to action. But we knew there was room for
growth. And we know that we have the platform with
which to bring these issues to not just our alumni,
but to the community at large. I'm glad that
Dr. Jason Pernell was here, because we have been
working with Dr. Jason Pernell, they are a community
engagement partner, on For the Sake of All. So in
terms of relevance and alignment, we felt that there
was relevant -- relevancy and alignment for this
work.
So next I want to talk briefly, we can advance -- here we go. So as part of your strategic planning process, another thing that we, we looked at is our values, our guiding principles, what really guides the majority of the work that FOCUS St. Louis does on a day-to-day basis. And I'm sure for our alumni, you all have memorized our values, but again, this was an opportunity for us to look inwards again. And in so doing, what we attempted to do is to really take a look at them, do a deep dive into them and begin to have conversations around what do we need to refine that is in line with where our community is going. And collectively we decided that yes, our values needed to be refined, and they needed to be reprioritized, and to that end, these are the new values of FOCUS St. Louis that we are moving forward with. So I'll take a couple of these without dive too much into them. As we took a look at our programming around quality leadership, and one of the things that we recognized that in order to provide education training for leaders in a way that was impactful, we also needed to take a look at who was at that table, who was in our programming. And one of the realizations that we came to is that we needed to take a look at
nontraditional leaders, because they needed to be at
the table in us moving the needle in any number of
the issues that we traditionally focused on, or for
that matter in this case, the 189 calls to action.

Another realization that we came to is
traditionally diversity and inclusion is one of our
values. But following the discussions we came to
the realization that equity is what we were striving
for. Equity more accurately describes what our
community needs in order to move forward, and to
that end, equity became one of our core guiding
values, essentially supporting fair truth and access
in opportunities for all, eliminates the
disparities, and strengthens the region's quality of
life.

And last but not least, the one that
I'll focus on in terms of our guiding principles has
to do with the importance of partnerships. We've
heard this evening that we cannot do it alone.
There's an old African American adage that it takes
a village, and in this instance as FOCUS attempts to
take on many of the issues that were identified in
the calls to action, it's going to take the whole
village for this to be able to be successful. And
so we're continuing to work on partnerships, we
talked a little bit about recognizing in our last meeting that not everyone that needs to be at the table was there, and to that end, we started to reset the table. Some instructions were made on our behalf, and we had those what I would call candid courageous conversations in ways that I would say for both parties it was enlightening. It was a great great opportunity for us to do that. Because if we're going to tackle our complex community issues, we need to talk to everyone.

So another thing that we've done that we've outlined has to do with this category that we're calling: What are the principles of the partnership? And what we did was we looked at FOCUS values, some of which I've already outlined and explained. And we positioned that against the principles that have been set forth by the Ferguson Commission, and we noticed that there's some cross ones. We talked a little bit about the racial equity lense and how important a factor that has become in our values, and if we look at the breadth of work that FOCUS does, the racial equity lense certainly is something that, moving forward, can be applied to every single one of FOCUS's values. The is second principle set forth by the Commission
using a report as an anchor in issue-based efforts. We look at that in terms of our programming, we look at that in terms of our community collaboration, and we look at that in terms of regional perspective that inclusivity is what is going to lead to transformation. And I, you know, I was joking with one of the Ferguson staff members that, you know, there are a lot of language or words that have come out of the Ferguson Commission, and I think we could put all of those words together, because they are very powerful, unflinching, transformative. Racial equity. Those are key things that can and should and will drive change in any community.

So when it's all said and done, we believe that FOCUS has what the Forward Through Ferguson needs in order to be able to move the needle on the calls to action. We've built the trust in community, and as you see by those who stood up today, that we are also in community, and so as we move forward with this, we believe that transformation is possible, and is doable. Thank you.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Me again, and I just have two slides. So one of the things that has happened in the process of figuring out how these two could
form a core intermediary, is looking at the principles of implementation, so these are the things that have come up as being important to all of the groups that gave feedback about the process, so whether it was through public comment, or through the commissioners directly, these are the things that we thought needed to be raised up as key considerations as we're looking at how to move forward. So they may not have been highlighted in the request for qualification process, but as we received feedback, we recognized that these would be critically important. And what we did was we outlined which entity would take primary responsibility for making sure that these principles were actualized. It doesn't mean that one would necessarily not work in this space, but it means that if you see one X, that entity is saying that they're taking primary ownership to making sure that this moves forward, that this principle is lived out in the implementation process. And I'm not going to read the list, because you have it in front of you, but I will just call out a couple just in case the language is not clear just because of the just the constraints of the space.

So where it says with aggravated data,
what that's specifically talking about, I think we talked about at a meeting last month, looking at disproportionality, so not just looking at regional numbers, but really getting down to the neighborhood level to figure out where resources are needed, and that's how the Racial Equity Lens is applied to data analysis, and we're saying that that should be a core principle of how we move forward as we're looking at data in this, in the space for implementation.

And then another one that I think might need some further explanation, the youth leadership pipeline. It came out in most of the feedback that we received that we needed to make sure that youth were at the center, and that's not just having a youth organization present, but that's actually being in the community working with youth to make sure there's an opportunity and a pipeline for them to have their voice as young people, but also to go throughout processes and structures that would allow them to influence what happens at organizational level, at government level, assistance, and at policy level. So it's a complete pipeline to make sure the youth are engaged at every stage.

Okay, and then this next slide is just
proposed roles and responsibilities. So when you talk about having a group that's kind of emerging, the Forward Through Ferguson with former commissioners and former staff and FOCUS St. Louis, it's very important that you have clear understanding of who's responsible for what, and this is kind of a first pass of looking at out of those very core, core intermediary key tasks, how they would be assigned going forward. So I'm, again, I'm not going to read the entire list, but we talked about FOCUS St. Louis serving as the fiscal agent, we also looked at public convening as happening in more than one way, so FOCUS St. Louis has their customary approach to convening that they would be well positioned to do, but we also think that the public process that the Ferguson Commission has used to date, make sure that there is accountability, that there's always a public eye on the process, and that it would be valuable to continue to have public convening at that level, that Forward Through Ferguson can always make sure there's transparency throughout the process. And then I didn't speak before too much before about the relationship with FSG and Policy Link, but we did briefly discuss the fact that there...
will be a need for continuous learning,
devotional evaluations, and other processes to
make sure that as we go along we're able to course
correct based on what's happening in realtime, and
that's what those coaching relationships with FSG
and Policy Link are designed to do.

MS. HUDSON: Thank you, I get the fun
slide. So one of the key questions that's often
asked about this work is how do you pay for it, how
do you fundraise, how do you not bifurcate the
investments that are already in our region. This is
an extremely generous region with a lot of capacity,
and one of the things that's become clear over and
over in our work is that alignment is something that
we can gain a good deal of ground on, and that is
not different here when we talk about funding
philosophy. We need to be able to start to see how
investment and implementation is an investment in
the work. So as Jason spoke tonight about the CDA
efforts and early childhood education, a lot of
those align with things in the report. And if we're
truly to design the implementation work around the
report, we should be able to start to see how
investments here, even if they're not going directly
to the organizations who might be running the
report, are directly supporting the implementation
of the reports, it's a new way of looking at our
investments in the region. Being able to take a
partnership approach to fundraising. So as we, as
core intermediary would identify opportunities and
gaps for leveraging existing work in the community,
being able to clearly identify those, and maybe look
at going after fundraising in a partnership manner,
so again, we're tying it back to the report. And
then existing interest in this unprecedented
approach from national resources. Throughout this
process we've had a number of advisory conversations
on various aspects of implementation and process,
and we believe there's a lot of opportunity there
for that. You know, while there will, of course,
need to be some operational funding, really looking
at how we can apply whatever thinking and creativity
we have to optimize existing work and optimize
existing resources will be key. I'd like to say
that if we're doing it right, that the Forward
Through Ferguson entity might go out of business in
terms of implementation, because we're truly
aligning existing resources that already exist,
raising the Racial Equity Lense, and helping people
understand how they can embrace the calls to action,
and move them forward as existing entities.

So after our discussion tonight, it is our vision that we would hit the ground running throughout end of the year and the sunset of the Commission. Things that we would know that we needed to immediately address are putting together a true memo of understanding that would detail a strategic partnership between the Forward Through Ferguson entity and FOCUS St. Louis, partially probably very much informed by the discussion tonight. We would need to confirm how this entity would be designed. There are lots of questions about how to maintain independence, also being able to enter into partnerships and contracts, so that would need to be something that would be figured out through the details as we started to discuss them.

We would continue to have discussions of policy with FSG, you should all have had an opportunity to grab a handout when you came in that gives you of little bit of background with the work of Policy Link and FSG, and if you did not get that it is available up front, as well. They have been an advisor as we go forth, and one of my favorite stories is the people who wrote the book on collective impact have told us that we're doing it differently than anybody has
ever done it before. So that is both encouraging and terrifying.

We would continue our conversations that we've begun with grass roots organizations to help identify what partnership in this work looks like to them. We often talk about bringing them to the table, having core partnerships, but in reality, organizations look different, and the way that organizations are designed, it's important to take that into account when you talk about true partnership and what that really looks like. So we want to continue those conversations that we started, and then of course build and finalize initial budget numbers and start to identify funding. So that's not much to do before the end of the year.

So I wanted to, so that we wanted to sort of take a specific look at some of the opportunities that we might have to learn from FSG and Policy Link, who have been doing this work nationally. Training, ongoing coaching perhaps, and external assessment of our partnership process, this process that we're developing, based on their work and based on our work, and then have that national third-party perspective and help us learn how to
design it so that we can be using local resources for implementation, but get the best thinking from their experience nationally. And then also support of the design process, process and value -- and outcome evaluation, as well as helping design monitoring and accountability infrastructure. We haven't spoken a lot specifically about evaluation and monitoring, initially it was in our design to do two RFQs, one for the core intermediary, and then follow that up with one for evaluation and monitoring, but as our process is iterative and constantly morphing, we are focusing here on this process now, and also maybe seeing that there's a different way that we might approach that than we initially thought, so looking again to their expertise, because as you can see from these handouts, that is something that specifically FSG has a, has a long history in evaluation, and Policy Link has a really strong history of working directly in and with communities, the people closest to the issues, to help design accountability.

And so these are some of the ideas about what the strategic partnership between Forward Through Ferguson and, and FOCUS St. Louis might start doing on January 1st, right around the corner.
I won't read all of these to you, but a lot of these are based on things that are already happening every day in the office. We're getting calls to help explain the Racial Equity Lens, we're getting calls to help further articulate the policy versus programs, there's actually a handout that you also can get tonight that outlines that. Really mapping what our capacity assets, challenges, opportunities are as they pertain to the specific signature calls to action, and the signature priorities, being able to really take a look at how all of those things work together, and provide a centralized place for that. Another piece of feedback we've heard consistently is that the story telling and the presenting of these issues in real people's lives is something that people are both using in their own work, and finding a way into the issues that they haven't before. So that's a very important piece that we want to continue. Sharing our learning as we go is really important, and then articulating a theory of social change. Everybody enters into this work from a different place, and everybody enters in with their own experiences, and in order to have a North Star, we have racial equity as our North Star based on the title of the report, but as a region to
1 really have a North Star, we need to go through a
2 process of really articulating what our own theory
3 of social change is for us, so that even though we
4 work at it through possibly different paths, that
5 we're all moving in the same direction. That's it.
6
7 I think we are now open for questions.
8
9 MR. KING: I want to clarify one thing
10 about FOCUS St. Louis hasn't already flinched in
11 Ferguson once. And it's my understanding that in
12 September of 2014 FOCUS St. Louis was supposed to
13 have a group of fellows go to the city of Ferguson,
14 and after the unrest popped off, that didn't happen.
15 So my question for FOCUS St. Louis is why didn't
16 your fellows go to Ferguson in the midst of unrest?
17 Was the unrest why you cancelled that trip? And if
18 so, did you flinch?
19
20 MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: Chris, I know deep
21 down inside of you, you probably want to be a FOCUS
22 program participant, and at some point in time maybe
23 we'll convince you to be so. So having said that,
24 it's not a matter of flinching. As it was, the
25 fellows were coming from all over the country. And
26 to then, I don't know if you're familiar with the
27 logic study that our fellows do in community, and to
28 that end, just because of the at that time
instability of what was going on in Ferguson,
because the staff generally helps a ton with
securing the interviews, it was something they could
not necessarily be guaranteed at that time. And so
when we're trying to, when we run a program that's
around talent to traction and retention, you know,
putting them in an environment where we can't
necessarily know or guarantee what's going to
happen, I don't think it will be a good way to
necessarily walk on the individuals to the, to the
city. And so at that point the decision was made
then to go elsewhere.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you. This
period of questioning is both commissioners and
community, so if you're a community member who has a
question, just raise your hand; if you're a
Commissioner, you've got mics, so please jump in and
we will facilitate the answers to the questions.

MR. ADDISON: Sure. Hi, I -- I'm Scotty
Addison. I just took note of one point of this
which was really interesting, that FOCUS St. Louis
proposes to act as a fiscal agent, and from long
hard experience, that role can be very useful in
terms of not having to recreate all sorts of
management infrastructure for funds, it's very
useful in the formation of new organization, and getting it off the ground where a fiscal agent can stand in those shoes and let the people do the work. In this instance, is that function going to extend to -- I mean obviously it can serve existing organizations which are well established and not have to recreate that infrastructure. In the spirit of what I'm talking about, does that also serve for independent operators, and unconventional leadership? And that segues to a second question. How are you going to include unconventional leadership? Because that's kind of a dear topic to my heart, having been unconventional for a long time, and getting things done that big organizations didn't do and didn't know how to do throughout my career. And so I'm really interested in how you involve that kind of unconventional leadership. I've had a tough experience with the Commission, because there are times I found the participatory process not very open, and I had the feeling I, my best bet was to tie a note a rock and heave it over the wall and wonder what was going to happen if it landed there, because they'd never find out. So this, whether you're able to really engage the people in the trenches, or just, you know, the same
old friends, is a real issue here.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thanks, Scotty, and Nicole, for responding, and thanks for letting us know where that rock came from, too.

MR. ADDISON: Yeah, I got more.

MS. HUDSON: Also, I'm so glad that you're here, Scotty, because it would not be the last meeting without you.

MR. ADDISON: I'm sorry, I'm...

MS. HUDSON: Oh, no.

MR. ADDISON: I've been thrusted into a tough position of muck raker, and, you know, it's not my fault.

MS. HUDSON: Thanks for coming. We appreciate it. So I think the first question was about fiscal agency, and just to clarify, the thing we're putting forward is that for the independent entity that would be the Forward Through Ferguson, that FOCUS would serve as their fiscal agent, so it wouldn't be necessarily for other folks who were doing the work. So that being said, the thought is that moving from planning to, to implementation, that the participatory nature, the leadership would be designed around people who are working toward implementation. So the people who would be at the
table, the people who would seek to be at the table
would be people who are doing the direct work of
implementing around the calls to action.

In addition to that I think -- you might
disagree -- I think that even through the life of
the Commission, you know, we've had to learn along
the way, partially given our structure of the public
meetings, et cetera, how to more effectively engage
the people in the trenches. And I think because,
again, I was speaking earlier about the nature of
partnership with grass roots organizations, that
partnership always doesn't look like we think it
does. And so one of the immediate things that we
need to learn that we've started to learn is around
how to have those conversations in a way we can
understand what partnership means to them. And as
it pertains to the calls to action, being able to
design partnerships that both drive that change and
also keep those voices at the table, because if
those voices are not at the table, we're not, we're
not getting the work done.

MR. ADDISON: And if I can add one minor
point.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Scotty, if we could,
we want to get in as many questions as we can, so
we'll move on to someone else. We'll ask the others if your would prioritize, as well.

MS. MINELL: Hi, Kiera Manell. Quick question. There was a sense of urgency when putting a plan together and having it executed by the 31st of December, and the only thing that I didn't hear in the strategy moving forward is at least some date so it could also drive some urgency to like expedite the process and get to the point of executing on the plan. Can you talk to that?

MS. HUDSON: Sure. So I will say that that is something that we should add to our list of first steps, and that to me is a key part of that first asset mapping, really understanding. So also I will say that we have a lot of stuff that we've heard moving, and so part of the design of how this new partnership will work will have to do with some parallel processing, of both making plans for long-term, but also understanding what short-term are moving. And so I would think that one of the initial first steps we would add to that list would be to set some benchmarks, understanding how to articulate movement without putting ourselves in a place where we don't have enough time to do the work. But some sort of external communication of
deadlines and a work plan would be something that we
would want to put forward before the 31st.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I also have a question
on behalf of the commissioners. On the slide that,
there are a couple slides labeled partnering for
change and following the one that is noted heading
Forward Through Ferguson in which there are
questions about commissioners or former
commissioners at this point both securing
institutional commitments from commissioners, and
then on the next page on Forward Through Ferguson it
says: Especially, quote unquote, organizational
commitments. I wanted to ask you if you can give us
some examples of what those kinds of commitments
are, and clarify as to whether that also is some
personal involvement of commissioners beyond
December 31st.

MS. MUHAMMAD: So I think it can be
personal, as well as institutional, but for the
institutional examples, I think Deaconess Foundation
might be an example. So if you decide that there
are particular calls to action that you would want
to advance with Deaconess Foundation, actually
coming out and making a public commitment saying we
want to take this particular piece to work on, or we
want to change our internal policies to reflect what we've learned through the process, but it's asking commissioners to look at how they could advance the work through their own organizations, because that enhances the sustainability, and it also shows that there's commitment from those who actually put the plan forward, and we think that it might, it might attract others who are in a wait/see mode to see that there are actually folks who are starting to step up and take pieces of the work on and take responsibility for the work.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: How might -- so I'm an easy target. How might that work for nonsocial 501(c)3 kind of commissioner worker?

MS. MUHAMMAD: So I said that it could be institutional or personal, because if you're not in a position where you can make an institutional commitment, then it may just be a personal commitment that you would want to continue to work on a particular issue, but I think that if you work for a university, if you work for a hospital system, if you work for law enforcement, there are several places where there can be intersections between what we do in our day to day lives with what we're asking to be done in the calls to action. And I think that
the main point is to be reflective or to be self-reflective as commissioners as you're putting the calls to action out to the community, what have you done within your own organization to demonstrate walking forward on the calls to action, itself.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Yeah, I'm Jackson, I want to applaud you all's efforts, it's been amazing what you've done in a very short period of time, and you gave in the community, you've given the community a real opportunity. And, you know, as an OG...

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Triple OG. Kobe, you're using Kobe language here, triple OG.

MR. JACKSON: Well, you know, I've seen a lot of efforts to change in St. Louis, I mean we've all seen millions of dollars spent to solve essentially the same problem that you all have been talking about. So, you know, to me one of the things that we haven't done very well in my opinion in St. Louis, and that is build trust. You know, we've got all these organizations that are going to be working together, right? And, you know, because we sit at the table and talk about the issue, that doesn't say what it means when I look in his eyes, right? And what I'm thinking about him. So one of
the things I would really encourage FOCUS to do is develop a strategic way of building trust and relationships among the agencies, the many agencies that you're going to be working with. And I'm talking about sometimes it's worth spending money to go on a retreat, spend a weekend talking, learning, playing with people to learn something about who they are, than it does sitting around the big conference table talking about the issues. So I think that there are some things that you all have done and will continue to do that will really make a difference over the long-term, and finally, I would say that defining the racial equity framework is important, because just saying we've got a racial equity framework, most people don't know what you're talking about. So that needs to be defined so that people will have some clarity about what the end game is. You say in the document what the end game is, but, you know, you need to say we need to do this in order to get to the end game.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you.

Commissioner Becky James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Yeah, I would just like to follow-up on the last question from the co-chair. So when you're talking about the
former commissioners, I just heard one part of the answer. What -- so are you not saying you're asking for people to continue the level of work they're doing right now? It's not continue kind of, be a commissioner but not be called one? Or is it to work in your own organization to bring, to bring to life the call to action? So just want to clarify and make sure I've got the not in this.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Right, the latter. It's all about implementation, so it's institutional or personal commitment to, to move into implementation. It's not the same role of meeting regularly to plan or to discuss the calls to action.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: So before you let all these people off the hook, I want to make sure, because she's asking an exclusionary question. Is there in the deck or anywhere in your mind a request -- because we talked about this in our last meeting -- a request for volunteerism in this framework from current commissioners?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes, there, there is absolutely for that. One example of how volunteerism could also look, for me it was an
ace in a mile and it worked quite well, it's also in
loaned executives. So for institutions or
organizations that you know that there's already --
you don't want duplication, you know someone that
could do this work, you have someone in the shop
that perhaps can play a specific role for a discrete
amount of time. Or you have already reached --
you've already paid a consultant to research an
issue, or to do a road map that you know would be
helpful. Bringing those types of assets forward
that you've already funded, already invested in, or
an individual that you know that would be great in
that skill set, loaning that resource to this work
are also some specific examples of a way that both
commissioner organizations, individuals, as well as
regionally could help.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I don't want to hog,
but if not as volunteers, where in the structure is
governance for the partnership?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Where what?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Where in the
partnership structure is governance?

MS. HUDSON: So the way that we have
envisioned it here, there are two separate entities,
so FOCUS has its governance, and this entity in this
nascent conversation of its design are theories that it might have a leadership body that's made up of people who have organized around the implementation. So for example, there might be someone from FOCUS because they have a stake in being, in being a strategic partner. Any one of the commissioners that might decide to move forward based on a specific ask at a later date might be on that leadership council -- would be on that leadership council, because they are moving toward implementation. If we were to do -- I'm making this up right now, so I guess it's going on the record. If we were to do a strategic partnership with For the Sake of All around funding and implementation, somebody from that would probably be on this leadership council. So the thought that we have in our mind is that, instead of creating sort of a body that sort of nods and affirms and supports, that it's a body of people who are deeply involved in the work in some way, shape or form, that also nods and supports and...

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Do I have a question from the community or commissioner?

COMMISSIONER CARR: I have a question.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER CARR: Question about the Forward Through Ferguson. What is it? Is it a 501(c)3? Is it a private corporation? 501(c)4? What is it? Because we've talked about it with a lot of responsibilities, you're creating this entity, I just -- it's kind of fuzzy to me.

MS. HUDSON: It is fuzzy, it is very fuzzy. We -- so one of the challenges of putting function before form is not answering those questions first. So we have talked through sort of the laundry list of things that it might be and kind of gone pros and cons about what it is, but one of the steps between now and the 31st would be to put forward what we think our best thinking is about what that should be. And part of that will have to do with the details of the MOU with FOCUS, that they should be the fiscal agent, so there are a number of details that kind of weigh on what the best decision is for that form. But it will have some sort of form that enables it to partner and to enter into contract, and et cetera.

COMMISSIONER CARR: And what is the budget that you have -- you said that you don't want to cast this to develop a budget?

MS. HUDSON: Right.
COMMISSIONER CARR: What are you looking at, and have you had conversations with funding agencies to fund this Forward Through Ferguson entity, whatever it's going to be?

MS. HUDSON: Right. So we have put 159 percent of our energy since the last meeting into clarifying this structure as clearly as we could for the purposes of this meeting. So we have not done a thorough assessment of what ledge it might look like. There are also some major considerations for that, loaned executives, design, so we have, we have put -- sorry, we have put in front of that sort of articulating the structure, and we do not have sort of a formal budget as of yet, but that will be one of the first things that we do. In terms of speaking to funders about it, we have not spoken to funders specifically about this design, because it's literally fresh off the press, but a lot of the principles and the, the things that are highlighted in this design are things that have come from funders as being very important for them to see. So that will be a quick follow-up conversation once we reach that.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: We'll have an intention of design conversation among commissioners.
even after today, so there may be some thoughts around that that we'll have a chance to get some input. Commissioner Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I have a couple of questions. Because I want to do -- one of them actually is a follow-up to that, though, because I appreciate -- and excuse my voice -- I appreciate the approach that you are letting the community voice right dictate the design instead of the other way around, but this subpoint in the steps between now and December 31st, the second one says: Confirm how Forward Through Ferguson should be designed; I'm wondering if there are thoughts already as to who's involved in that confirmation -- in that process.

MS. HUDSON: Who's involved in Forward Through Ferguson or who's involved in the process --

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Who's involve in the design process.

MS. HUDSON: So continuing conversation with commissioners, conversations with our strategic partner, continuing conversations that we have started with grass roots organizations, and we have by no means spoken to all of them, and key stakeholders, but as this process has been driven a lot by staff and staff experience, I think we would
probably move forward some straw models for
reaction.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Mm-hmm.

Helpful. And then my other two questions are
related to FOCUS and other additional partners that
I know have yet to be named or figured out. One of
them relates to what Serena was saying earlier about
our organizational responsibilities, right, so for
example, Teach For America, which I run full-time,
has already, I mean throughout the year has taken on
a number of organizational changes, given what our
community has been going through, but we've been
leveraging the Ferguson Commission report as an
additional vision setting process for us in order to
be able to do that, and so I'm glad to hear that you
all are strongly urging those of us on the
Commission and outside of the Commission with, with
opportunity to do that, to be able to make those
shifts and take that responsibility. My question is
that for, for FOCUS and any addition partners that
are more formal parts of this, will those kinds of
shifts be suggestions, will they be required in
order to participate? Like how are, how are we
thinking of that? Like that is open to anybody.

MS. HUDSON: So the slide that was -- do
you still have this possibly? No. So if you look
at the slide that is Principles and Partnership.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Mm-hmm.

MS. HUDSON: I believe there are four
bullet points on it.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes.

MS. HUDSON: That is a slide that was
really meant to articulate the posture with which we
would expect a core partner to enter in, and
understanding, as many people have said about their
organizations, you know, based on what's happened in
the last year since we started this process, I think
understanding steps that might be taken is
acceptable as opposed to you must do this right now
before we start talking.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Sure.

MS. HUDSON: But that is the posture
with which we would expect a partner to come
forward, and I think that, that as we talked to FSG
and Policy Link about accountability, about
training, about, about looking at the racial equity
lens of the poor, that those will be things that
would be required of partners, as well. But that's,
that's something that as we look at the MOU and as
we look at the design, that will solidify. But, you
know, ultimately, if we're doing it right and we are really centering on the call to action, the signature priorities and racial equity, anybody who partners with us in a core way would almost have to embody that in order to be legit. You know, I think anybody who would partner with the core and didn't move to or actually embody the principles that are outlined in the report would open themselves up to a lot of push back. So it's almost, it's almost a no brainer, but I believe that it is something that we, we aim to articulate specifically, at least as an intent.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: That's helpful, thank you. And I'm glad to hear you talk about accountability in the design of this moving forward to those specific things.

My last question is specifically for FOCUS, and it is an extension of this question that I just asked. So in this Principles and Partnership slide, the first one is to embody the application of the Racial Equity Lens. If you were to apply the Racial Equity Lens to FOCUS's work right now, what would be your assessment of what you would have to shift, or evolve, or change in order to meet the standard that Nicole just discussed? And I, you
know, I'm assuming that you've done some of this thinking, given that your, your organizational principle shifted, and so I'm wondering as a result of that what can we expect will change?

MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: Well, that's a good question. As we outlined before in our presentation, what we did is we made a decision to put our best foot forward in terms of applying for this is we looked for alignment. And the alignments that we looked for were along those policies or these principles of partnership, and we felt that there were things that we knew that we met, and there was areas of opportunity for us to grow.

As I mentioned before, as we embarked on our strategic plan, we looked inward. And one of the decisions that we made related to our values, for example, is just in using the term diversity and inclusion. We felt that equity was much more of a term that was forward looking. And in light of the challenges of our community and the work that needs to be done, that's an area that we could focus on. And so an initial step is in looking at even our curriculum in terms of how are we applying that lens across the board. And additionally, that's something that trickles down to even the training
that we do. So we have seven leadership programs across the board, about to become eight, those are things that we're being intentional about in our training of applying that lens across the breadth of our programming.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Any other questions from commissioners or community?

MR. JACKSON: Yeah. Champions of change. You know, we got a lot of public officials, we got a lot of corporate leaders, and we need champions of change, we need people who sign on the dotted line that they're going to support the work of the Ferguson Commission and FOCUS to make this happen. And at Reverend Wilson's church a couple of weeks ago, Tom Irwin and the guy from the regional business.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Joe Reagan.

MR. JACKSON: Joe Reagan from the Regional Chamber were there, and they said that they would support financing the 25-year financing Racial Equity Fund, so I think, you know, as part of this process, you need some high level people to step out and say (indicating): I signed up. I'm sincere about this. I believe in the racial equity
framework. And, and that includes political
leaders, too. So I think that, you know, public
means something. So I think, you know, if we have
people who believe that will do that, ask them to
sign on the dotted line, and that will make a
difference in terms of the PR of the whole effort in
the future.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: We'll take two more,
and then we'll go into the design conversation.

MR. KING: Just a practical question, we
learned tonight that the Research Partnership
dropped out of FOCUS presentation. When you say
that FOCUS would be the fiscal agent, does that also
mean St. Louis Community Foundation dropped out?

MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: As it is right now,
because the, we've been asked to consider being the
fiscal agency -- agent rather, it's similar to the
work that we've done when we worked on the HUD
project. So it's not necessarily a new area for us,
it's something that, you know, we're under
consideration, under serious consideration in moving
forward.

MR. KING: And the St. Louis Community
Foundation is out of the mix then.

MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: You know, I don't
want to say that in the affirmative, because this is something that is still, we're still exploring, how this is going to play out.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Co-Chair McClure.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: So just continue just a little bit more clarity on the fiscal agent role, so the United Way has been a fiscal agent for the Commission, the Commission has been an independent body that made the decisions with regard to the expenditure of the funds allotted to us, would you see that -- and this would be posed to Bethany. Would you see that Forward Through Ferguson independent entity would have a similar kind of relationship with fiscal agent is FOCUS or whatever it is, that, much like the commissioners have with the United Way?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: So little bit of background, we were able when we met with FOCUS leadership to actually ask specifically that representative from United Way Rosie Stafford to joint us to share the background work of tactically what it is that they, what role that they play, it was a three-page document that shared that, what kind of fiscal agent we need for government funds, private funds and other. In the conversation
we could tell that FOCUS leadership was used to being fiscal agent and took down both these notes to say didn't seem to be problematic to explore what that would mean.

Second thing we also did is that there's another opportunity to leverage the structure or infrastructure that is provided through the Ready By 21 efforts, which they shared those documents, as well, for consideration. So Yemi, if you can speak to anything that you're thinking internally that might help to answer the question about fiscal agency. From my perspective, it felt very strongly that that was a viable possibility.

MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: So as I mentioned before, FOCUS St. Louis a couple of years ago worked on a HUD grant, and we had a lot of community collaborators that we worked on this grant with, and so part of our responsibility was just in the oversight in grants administration, so it's not completely unfamiliar territory with FOCUS in terms of what that entails. And so at the meeting that we had recently with getting a better understanding of what their Ready By 21 structure was and how United Way has served as a fiscal agent for the Commission, it doesn't seem like something that's completely out
of the realm of possibility, and so as we continue
the conversation, it's an outlining what
specifically is that going to look like moving
forward.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: How
would that impact your resources? You may want to
speak to that.

MS. AKANDE-BARTSCH: So right now, using
the model that we had used before for the HUD
project, we actually have an accountant that we
subcontract with, and so similar to the HUD project,
that consultant has helped us manage all of what
went along with the grants administration for that
particular one. And so that would be something that
we would explore in detail as we flush this out in
the future.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you. Any other
questions from commissioners?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Any from the
community? Maybe one more? Burning question?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Seeing none, then
we'll launch into a period of design conversation
among commissioners. We'll have some guidance, I
would imagine, from Staff, but I think more than anything else, we are seeking to respond to what's been presented to us to suggest now going from kind of interrogatory or questioning what's happened, having some clarification, getting a more, little more declarative about changes that we would like to see in the design of this particular structure or partnership.

So is there any input on changes that you would like to see for the sake of design to share with staff, a post in the condition change to go back as we kind of structure this?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: This isn't necessarily a change, but just a suggestion, and I understand that the design is still being undertaken, so for consideration as you guys do it, I think, I think that these principles and partnership are really strong. I would suggest that, I don't know if it would be the leadership council of Forward Through Ferguson, or some other diverse body that would be a part of assessing the, the amount to which partners are achieving these things, right? Offering suggestions to partners, and offering support as they move toward those suggestions I think could be -- could add to this
formal accountability that you were talking about, but also engage in, leverage rather the diverse voices that will be at the table in that process that I trust and believe, given where this has evolved, will greatly include youth and grass roots leadership.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: This is a similar comment. I actually, I want to pick up on two points. First, from a design standpoint, I think from a governance perspective, either this, if there is no governance for the partnership, then the governance of FOCUS St. Louis becomes a default governing body of Forward Through Ferguson. My suggestion here is that whatever design include an articulated leadership council very specifically for the partnership that is not the governance of FOCUS, but rather is in conversation with both parties, it has responsibility for oversight of the MOU to make sure that parties on both sides are actually caring for their commitment to the MOU.

Finally there, I would also suggest while we speak to the potential relationship with FSG and Policy Link here, rather, and I think on the post January 1 includes, we say potentially, we reference several times that we could get out of the
partnership, I would suggest strengthening the
language to say that post January 1, we actually
speak to executing an agreement with FSG and Policy
Link for staff and volunteer training, ongoing
coaching, and external assessment, those three
critical functions being a part of an executed
agreement that is a part of the overall partnership
understanding, as well.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: If I might build on
that comment just a bit, I think one of the things
that the Commission knows, and perhaps many in the
audience know, is that we have benefited during this
journey, during this work, from lots of national
advice that folks that have had learning, you all
remember Barbara Johnson came and spoke to us about
the New Orleans experience, and it was from that
notion that the longitudinal long-term nature of
what we're doing came to have some flesh and some
meaning. Others perhaps a bit more behind the
scenes and not on public testimony, but nonetheless,
giving us their learning. One encouraging dynamic
to me is that FSG and Policy Link have been very
willing to step to this table and help us, and so to
put some more formal structure around that,
particularly in an early formation time of the
Forward Through Ferguson work, and movement of more partners to the table, helping FOCUS understand how they might improve what they do as a partner I think will give us, will give the leadership council and the team in Forward Through Ferguson a really robust national model, because as they have said, this is, this is new, we're doing it differently than others have done it, but our community requires this to be done differently, the Commission has been a different, a different approach, and so I think it's really a continuation of what we've done to leverage national knowledge into our particular circumstance.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: We note that we do have Commissioner Blackmon with us via technology, so I'd just ask staff maybe, maybe if not now, but it may be an opportunity at some point to engage her, so if we have a capacity to shoot her a note for when, she may want to have comment or input. Don't put her immediately on the screen.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Excuse me, Co-chair Wilson, can I ask a question? For the leadership council, did I understand you to say that you would appreciate in the advanced design specifically delineated eligibility, or requirement for participation in that body, as well as
governance that lays out what the roles and
responsibilities of that council would be?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I think, I think both
of those are appropriate. At this point I just want
clarification that there would be one. Because in
our questioning it seemed that there wasn't
commitment that there would be one.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Oh.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: That there could be,
but there wasn't necessarily, so I just want clarity
that there will be a body.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: There will be
one.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: There will be a body,
a leadership body. And that -- so that's what I was
saying.

MS. HUDSON: And you were
differentiating between a governing body of the
entity and a governing body of the partnership,
correct?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Yes. Because that --

MR. HYATT: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: -- quite frankly, I
don't see that there is another -- there is no other
entity legally.
MS. HUDSON: Right.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: But there is a partnership here.

MR. HYATT: Right.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Starsky?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: I have a question. I was wondering if there would be a consideration of a name change of Forward Through Ferguson. Ferguson is a community of 21,000, a very diverse community that is, quite frankly, going through its own healing process, and it's gone through a great deal in this past year, and they are trying to move forward, so I think the Forward Through Ferguson can have positive connotations, it's just, it's just a constant reminder that we won't forget, but there is economic issues, and there are a variety of other issues that the City of Ferguson is dealing with.

MS. HUDSON: Thank you for that.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: And I'll just offer a comment, Scott, so thank you for the candor and concern behind your comment. And we thought long and hard, as you know, even before titling the report Forward Through Ferguson, about that, and as you know from the very beginning, we have clearly
said this is about our region, and this is about
what's happening in our entire region, some of that
was frustrating to some of the leadership in
Ferguson who wanted us to focus more on things
specific to that community, so we kind of heard that
in different dynamics. And as, and thoughtfully,
and this was not a decision taken lightly and we've
talked a lot with our staff team and others that
were thinking through the process of communication
and messaging, the Ferguson name has become to be
more than Ferguson, of course, and more than the
community, and I understand your statement it's a
reminder that, of what occurred there, but it has
become a national, if not an international, symbol
of much broader issues.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: And that's my
point.

CO-CHAIR McClure: Yeah, and I
understand. And as much as, you know, from a
Ferguson perspective individually, we may not want
that to be, it is. And it is kind of a reality, and
so my own thought personally, and I think the reason
which we proceeded down this line and the reason I
would support continuing to keep that branding is it
does have a we're moving through these issues, and
we're moving through the issues raised by what happened in events surrounding Ferguson, and that is something I think we just, we need to embrace in order to move forward. So I understand you may disagree with that, and I certainly understand the rationale behind that, but I think nonetheless, it is kind of where we are and something we need to own.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: I'll just ask you to reconsider.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Understand.

COMMISSIONER CARR: I would agree with Commissioner Negwer about the name of Ferguson. We can use the name Ferguson to market activities that we're doing, but Ferguson is a community of 21,000 people, of businesses that are trying to move forward. I deal internationally with lots of individuals, and the name Ferguson has a negative connotation. We have the opportunity by changing the name to signify that we're dealing with the St. Louis region as a whole, not that we're dealing with a small municipality. Ferguson needs healing, Ferguson needs growth, Ferguson needs support. I believe it's ill-advised, I believe it's inappropriate for us to use the name Forward Through
Ferguson. We can find an alternative name which is more appropriate, which is a positive, and which has not utilized the events in Ferguson as a marketing mechanism for what we do. I feel very strongly, and I would so move.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: When you say -- I want to clarify how you closed. Did you say: I so move?

COMMISSIONER CARR: Yes. I so move that we find a different name other than Forward Through Ferguson.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: And when you say that, you mean a different name for what?

COMMISSIONER CARR: A different name, a different name for the entity, whatever it is. I don't know what this entity is.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Whether it's a 501(c)3, or a 501(c)4, or a private corporation, or whatever it is, but we have a, we've been distributed with a listing of a column of Forward Through Ferguson. I don't know what that is, I believe it's inappropriate to use the name Ferguson, and I, I really agree with what Commissioner Negwer has said. We should find a different name other than Ferguson. We can use St. Louis, we can use,
you know, region, focus on the region, but I believe with the creativity that we have, we can find a positive name that we can use.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: So we do have a motion on the floor. My question is do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: I will second.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Okay, we have a motion and a second that we, as far as the discussion regarding the name for the successor partnership and/or entity, that we find a different name other than Ferguson or some construction of the name that does not include Ferguson. I want to check in just for the sake of accountability, this seems to be, it is not -- it seems not to be a designed conversation element, does not seem to be critical to the core of the succession, so I just want to check in about accountability for, for the recusals, because this does not seem to be a germane issue for myself and for Commissioner Pulliam.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: So using the power of the co-chair, I'll make a, I'll make a judgment that the recusal would not apply to this particular vote, but would welcome the Commission to vote on that, if anyone wishes to challenge that ruling of the chair you are welcome to do so, but because this does not
relate to the question of FOCUS partnership, but
does relate to the question of ongoing design and
structure, then Felicia and Starsky will vote on
this, so if there's any challenge, someone make a
motion to rule otherwise.

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR McClure: Okay, hearing none
then.

CO-CHAIR Wilson: That being the case,
and recognizing that we do have, I want to make sure
that we just kind of communicate back and forth to
Reverend Blackmon, I want to make sure she has
capacity to follow the conversations, I'm noting
that she has some broken elements here, so we may
misvote here, so maybe it's best to go roll call
vote here just to note who we have the opportunity
to capture and we don't, so I'll ask for the
assistance of our Managing Director here.

So the motion on the floor has been
moved by Commissioner Carr, seconded by Commissioner
Negwer is that the Commission, in consideration of a
successor entity in partnership to implement the
Commission's work find a different name other than
Forward Through Ferguson for the branding of such
initiative.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Okay.

Taking a roll call.

MS. HUDSON: Discussion?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I'm sorry, is there further discussion? Commissioner Sly.

COMMISSIONER SLY: I don't have it, Becky.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Actually, Rasheen really grabbed the mic, but I'm going to, I have -- my thing was I want to hear the conversation, and I'm empathetic to both sides of this story, so I do want to hear the discussion. I've heard part of it from the co-chair about why it's important, and I certainly hear from the, our other two commissioners, I'm curious about is it bigger than this, and are there other opportunities? So I'm just, I'm going to turn it over, I just wanted a discussion.

COMMISSIONER GORE: Could I just follow-up on that?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Commissioner Aldridge, and then Commissioner Gore.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Thank you. I don't agree too many times throughout this process with T.R., but I kind of want to on one point. I
also don't really understand what this Forward
Through Ferguson is, is it the Ferguson Commission
Staff, is it going to be some of us, is it going to
be a more unflinching arm of two bodies and focus is
going to be more of a program type of way of using
maybe some unflinching ways through the program?
I'm not really sure what the unflinching -- or if
it's going to be two things or one thing, but I
disagree with, with my fellow commissioners, I don't
think that Forward Through Ferguson, changing the
name or keeping -- or keeping the name is, is a bad
thing that we need to get rid of, I think as we look
back at this last year, of course when you, when you
hear Ferguson, one thing comes to mind, Mike Brown.
Of course when you think of Ferguson you think
police brutality, but in reality, as we've been
saying for a long time, it is deeper than Ferguson,
it is deeper than, than just St. Louis, and it's
deeper than just police brutality, and that's why
we, as a Commission, kind of understood that even
though it happened in Ferguson, it is deeper than
that, that we were going to continue to push forward
and going to continue to work on issues outside of
just police brutality, but like my friend said next
to me, it's kind of hard to say let's, let's take
away, or let's get rid of the Ferguson part, it's,
I -- mean that's, what happened happened, we can't
not say what happened in Ferguson happened, and I
don't think any of us on this Commission, or even
the Commission, itself, has painted what happened in
Ferguson as a negative light, and like you said,
it's like taking, it's like taking away Selma, you
know, Selma is Selma, and you just -- I mean it is
what it is. And it is nothing negative to it, it is
history, and we have to own it, and we got to move
forward and we got to figure out ways that we are
going to make it positive. And if you look at what
it says, Forward Through Ferguson, is, is not
painted in a negative light. The people in Ferguson
have been going through a lot this last year, but
that's why we are here to try to help them, not just
try to help Ferguson, but to help the whole region,
help communities like Ferguson that have been left
out, so Forward Through Ferguson, also Forward
Through Dellwood, Forward Through Bellfontaine,
Forward Through Jennings, but unfortunately, we
can't say Forward Through, you know, the whole St.
Louis County because we all know all the
municipalities are really jacked up and we need to
change them, but, you know, we, we got one right
here that people are trying to paint something positive about, and we see that a negative situation did happen in Ferguson, but folks are not going to continue to let that darkness be dark, we're trying to make some positive, we're trying to shine a light, we're trying to move forward through Ferguson, so I would hope that my other fellow commissioners vote no on this and we continue to use what we've been using since we released the report. I mean our report appropriately is Forward Through Ferguson, so I mean if we change the name now, it's not like, you know, our report is not still called Forward Through Ferguson.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: I was going to make a comment, but I agree with everything Rasheen just said.

COMMISSIONER GORE: So I was going to just make the, just to me it's a, it's a process point, I think valid issues have been raised on both sides. This wasn't something that was on the agenda for this evening, I haven't given it much thought, because it's an issue that just came up for me. We talked previously about the fact that we called it a the Ferguson Commission but had a broader mandatory than that, but that's something we talked about
previously.

To me, this issue should be the first
order of business for this organization whenever
it's established and a structure is set up, they
should take this issue up and decide what they want
to name themselves, and it, that we, as a
Commission, should really -- we don't need to get
involved in that, and it doesn't need to be decided
tonight, that's why I remind you of it, I think it's
something that's worthy of a further discussion
being put on the agenda at the last second and
discussed right now.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Do you offer that as
an amendment?

COMMISSIONER GORE: I offer that as a
explanation as to why I'm going to vote no on the
motion.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GORE: But that I do think
that it is something that is worthy of further
discussion and consideration than it's going to
probably get tonight.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Is there further
discussion? Commissioner Blackmon?

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Hi. I'm
following as best I can, some of the conversation is broken. I understand that there is a recommendation on the table to change the name from Forward Through Ferguson to what?

MS. HUDSON: Something.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Something else.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: There's not a recommendation as to what the core of the recommendation is to remove Ferguson as a reference. In care for the citizens of the city.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Okay. I feel that it's important that we stay, we keep in front of us what brought us to this place. We are beginning to face Ferguson, I think that the implementation of the work that the Commission has done will be the forward movement, but it is important that we remember what brought us to this place, and anything that takes away from that remembrance I believe would be harmful to this process. So I'm in favor of keeping Forward Through Ferguson, because I want to see us move forward. That's about it.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you very much, Commissioner Blackmon. Is there any further
discussion on our amendment? Commissioner Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I just want to second what Commissioner Aldridge and Commissioner Blackmon said. In addition, I think this is a critical opportunity to apply our Racial Equity Lens, because as someone who has been trained thoroughly and trains others in racial equity, culturally responsive leadership, et cetera, one of the important attributes of that is, to say it a plain way, is to name a thing a thing. And, you know, when we think about this word healing, it can mean all different kinds of processes for all different kinds of people, but to comment that was made by someone in the public earlier, it's important to recognize that typically for people living in marginalized communities, it is the fact that we don't name the places of our discontent that lead to our lack of healing, right, that, that lead to the erasure of the things that have happened to us. And so I think it's important not to continue the practice that we so often do in St. Louis of sweeping the things we don't want to talk about under the rug, because quite frankly, that's how we got here. Instead, let's make a choice to continue to be unflinching and call a thing a thing.
CO-CHAIR WILSON: Commissioner Negwer.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: I just want to make it clear, that was not the intent to sweep this under the rug. This is strictly a, as I mentioned, a process for Ferguson. That is my position.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Sure.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: It was for the City of Ferguson, the citizens of Ferguson.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Sure, and I, and I am saying that this conversation about healing, again, can mean multiple things for multiple people, and so you're offering a perspective that taking the name out could mean healing out for some, and I'm offering the perspective that keeping the name in means healing for some.

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Correct. And as you said, all politics (inaudible).

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Commissioner Pulliam.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Thank you. I live in Ferguson, I understand the pain, the agitation, the uncomfortable space, the fatigue of the connotation, the definition that saying Ferguson, the context of what Ferguson is, but that is what the work is for. If we don't have Ferguson there, in 365 days people will forget what we're
moving forward with, and that's a problem. We're moving forward through a very specific situation that has caused grief and pain and angst, and economic depravity and health disparities, and that pain is what we need to keep our eyes on, because that's what this work is about. So I live there, I know it's difficult for me, it's difficult for my neighbors, but this is not easy work, these are difficult times, and we have to go forward through the difficulty.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I'd like to just quickly offer in this context the capacity for redefining. We began the discussion on tonight by talking about the number of page views, 68,000 page views at Forward Through Ferguson, so perhaps that means something to people as a product of this work that is different, it means something as relates to resolutions, it means something as it relates to innovative process that they're engaging 26,000 times people have visited this work, and 2100 folks have downloaded even the pdf version of the 189-page report or 196-page report, so I think there's additional value there. So I add that as my comment as part of the discussion, as well.

Perhaps it's appropriate now if there's
no further unreadiness, to call the roll on the
question.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Okay,
please signify by aye or nay. Reverend Starsky.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Nay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Rich
McClure.

CO-CHAIR McClure: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Kevin
Ahlbrand.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Rasheen Aldridge.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pastor
Traci Blackmon.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Nay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: T.R.
Carr.

COMMISSIONER CARR: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Gabe
Gore.

COMMISSIONER GORE: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Becky
James-Hatter.
COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Nay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Dan Isom.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Scott Negwer?

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Yes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Brittany Packnett.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Nay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Felicia Pulliam?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pat Sly?

COMMISSIONER SLY: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Byron Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Nay.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Rose Windmiller.

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: No.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: 13 nos.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: So add that the
Commission has decided not to take action on the name of the initiative to the point of Commissioner Gore, that does not preclude the Commission has also not taken affirmative action for the future of the partnership.

Is there further discussion regarding the design of the partnership that has been placed before us in response to the elements here? I would suggest when we are trying to find ourselves as landed at language to, to provide some affirmative direction around to go forward on the road map or go Forward Through Ferguson, so if there are particular elements -- well, let me ask first, Staff, is there language that is to be presented to us as relates to a motion to move forward, or are we responding to language on a motion that aligns here, or do we need to construct that?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes.

I need get my -- actually get my phone. Okay. Okay, let's look at the following proposed language for consideration. The request from Staff tonight and the presenters would be to approve the partnership and direct Staff and Co-chairs to negotiate and sign agreement with FOCUS St. Louis and other partners consistent with principles and
responsibilities as outlined in the presentation, and as outlined in the feedback in the design process.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Could you reread, please? So what Staff is proposing for us to respond to is a motion to approve the partnership and direct Staff and Co-chairs to negotiate and sign an agreement for FOCUS St. Louis consistent with principles and responsibilities that aligned in the presentation.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And the subsequent feedback in the design process.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Including subsequent feedback which we have noted in a couple of ways on design format, the inclusion of a leadership council, the structuring for an agreement with FSG and Policy Link for staff coaching, training and excellent assessment.

Were there other elements of design for this conversation that we want to make sure we get in?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I had suggested that the, the leadership council act in a formal way of evaluation and accountability toward the principles of partnership.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Actually noting you the grass roots leadership.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Yes.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Any further discussion, or is there anyone who is willing to make said motion?

CO-CHAIR McClure: I'll, for purposes of getting the motion on the floor, I'll certainly make the motion as the staff as presented it, with the addition of the design elements as identified in the definition.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Second.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Co-Chair McClure has moved and Commissioner Packnett has seconded, we note as we go into discussion in this phase and particular action of the recusals that were noted before are, of course, in effect for Commissioner Pulliam and myself.

Is there further discussion regarding design? Commissioner Ahlbrand.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: Just one question, and when we're talking about signing contracts, are we talking about this MOU, or is that MOU something that this entity that is going to sign with FOCUS? Is the Commission going to sign the
MOU, or is this other entity going to sign the MOU?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: The Commission is not, as the Commission sunsets December 31, but the Commission would have, as you've had put into that, so the expectation is that an MOU would be developed and signed between the partners Forward Through Ferguson, quote end quote, plus FOCUS St. Louis.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: So I guess my, the only thing -- well, I'm confused on a lot, a lot of times, but in the motion it talked about directing co-chairs to sign contracts. What would that entail?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Well, it says, it directs the co-chairs to -- wait a minute. To the -- yeah, to negotiate and sign. So that may be inappropriate.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: That may be an inappropriate.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: And I just caught that, so let me -- here's the way I see that playing out. In effect, I think between now and the 31st we're operating as a proxy for the leadership council, but have no authority to act, which is
unusual from the last two or four months we've had no authority, so, but at the end of the day the leadership council is the one, or the governing entity, whatever that turns out to be, would be the one that would have to make that agreement and sign it, so all we're doing is providing guidance and advice to get them started with our best call at what this might look like. And they can take that or not take that. And my own hope would be that the, the folks that transition to this are so closely aligned, if not part of what we have done, that that becomes pretty much a reflection of what we have done.

But it is confusing and fuzzy, and I get that, so the amendment to amend the motion which I made on behalf of staff would be to, to say that we would develop a draft memorandum of understanding with the perspective partners and leave the question of contracts out, because we have no legal authority to sign the contracts.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: That would be the amendment I offer.

CO-CHAIR McClure: I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

CO-CHAIR Wilson: Any further
discussion?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Seeing and hearing none, accepting that as a friendly amendment, we'll invite again a roll call vote on this action to approve the partnership and direct staff and co-chairs to negotiate a draft and agreement of Memorandum of Understanding with FOCUS St. Louis consistent with the principles and responsibilities outlined in the presentation, and the design elements noted by commissioners in discussion.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Reverend Starsky Wilson.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Rich McClure.

CO-CHAIR McClURE: Aye.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Oh, I'm sorry.

Abstain. Thank you.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Rich McClure.

CO-CHAIR McClURE: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Kevin Ahlbrand.

COMMISSIONER AHLBRAND: Aye.
MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:

Rasheen Aldridge.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pastor Traci Blackmon.

COMMISSIONER BLACKMON: Aye.


COMMISSIONER CARR: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Gabe Gore?

COMMISSIONER GORE: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Becky James-Hatter.

COMMISSIONER JAMES-HATTER: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Dan Isom.

COMMISSIONER ISOM: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Scott Negwer?

COMMISSIONER NEGWER: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Brittany Packnett?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Felicia Pulliam?

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Abstain.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pat Sly?

COMMISSIONER SLY: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Byron Watson.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: Aye.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Rose Windmiller?

COMMISSIONER WINDMILLER: Aye.


yeas, two abstentions.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Thank you. I want to thank the staff team and team of FOCUS and many advisors, and Serena and others who have worked tirelessly since our last meeting to work through these issues and develop an approach with guidance from United Way and what we've learned from them, so this truly I think is a picture of how we learned as we move forward, and what we initially thought might make sense turned out to be different and better.

So thank you so much, all of you.

We're going to move to the
administrative part of our agenda, and we have four
topics here which Bethany will walk us through,
update on the Community Playbook, no review of
policy strategy, the Racial Fund Update, and then
approval of the minutes.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS:
Absolutely. So on your agenda, the first item is an
update only, there's no need for action.

The Community Playbook is something that
in conversation with Robert Wood Johnson Foundation,
thinking about national best practices, the staff
and leadership there thought that it would be an
appropriate idea and opportunity to document the
information as to how specifically the design and
the tactics and the launching and the closeout of
the Ferguson Commission happened so that we would
have a leave behind, if you will, a legacy document
the others will be able to leverage and capture
beyond our sunset. The intended audience is thought
to be comparable organizations, local and national,
seeking to address the system level policy
initiatives, and the lessons learned we feel would
be instructive for citizens and just in thinking
about how to design and think about policy level
work. The time line that we have laid out, we are
taking actually the evaluation that we have engaged
in from Trueman to put the lessons learned in this
playbook, in addition to a series of interviews that
have happened across staff and co-chairs for a
dissemination of post January 1. It would live on
the website, right now if you go to Forward Through
Ferguson it would have its own distinct place within
that work that it could be downloaded, and we have
had additional conversation with Robert Wood Johnson
Foundation staff, who are excited to think with
Commission Staff about the relief strategy and the
dissemination strategy on a national level.

So I wanted to provide that update both
to commissioners and to community as that part of
the funding that we received, the $100,000, is going
to these efforts to fulfill that commitment for
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Second -- if there's no questions on
that. I'm going to ask Tony Wyche, one of the
specific roles that the Ferguson Commission has
played thinking about these final three-quarters in
addition to the importance to review our design
work, thinking about the external evaluation and
monitoring, and also thinking of our strategy as
related to policy, and thinking about the 2016
legislative session. So I'm going to ask Tony, who
has been a consultant procured through the State and
Public Affairs Services to come to provide an update
to all of us, and for those of you that are still
hanging on in the audience, the thick document that
we've given you that's entitled A Guidebook, the
policy, please pull that out, that's what we're
going to be reviewing at this time.

MR. WYCHE: Thank you, Bethany. I was
contracted to serve as a resource to the Commission
for Public Affairs, which means that my role has
been to develop strategy for policy centered on the
calls to action in the report and to engage elected
officials and key stakeholders on matters related to
the report. I should note up front that the
contract prohibits me from lobbying, so I'm not able
to ask staff or legislators or anybody else to
introduce, or sponsor, or author legislation, or
take any specific action.

So the first action I took upon coming
on board was to develop four elected officials and
stakeholders very specific detailed lists of all the
calls to action where they were listed as an
accountable body, and then met with a whole host of
elected officials, and mainly with their staffs,
that includes everybody from the mayor of St. Louis, to the St. Louis County executive, state legislators, statewide officials such as the Attorney General and Governor, members of our congressional delegation for the region, and other civic groups and other -- and organizations, and those meetings are ongoing. In those meetings I worked with those officials' offices to educate them on the content of the calls to action that are in the report, and to see where we can be of assistance to them. But beyond the calls to action, we felt it was important that they understand the intent and vision of the Commission, as well. We didn't want this just to be an exercise in people checking boxes on calls to action, and I think you've heard a lot about this tonight, that we wanted to demonstrate the Commission's vision for implementation of policy, and as it's outlined in this guidebook in three key ways. One, the difference between policy and programmatic change; two, applying a Racial Equity Lens to the policy changes they're looking at; and three, aligning their policy that they may want to introduce with additional calls to action as they're listed in the report. So as you, you have with you I developed this guidebook for policy
makers, and as drafted, it's targeted to elected
officials, but it certainly is practical for other
policy makers and everyone else in general. It
outlines the Commission's vision on the policy
program, Racial Equity Lens issues, it provides some
user friendly side by sides I think to help clarify
the difference between say a policy and program,
what it's like to apply a Racial Equity Lens to
something and not to do so, and it provides a
concrete example of just what we're talking about.
It takes a case study from the report and works it
throughout all of these principles to demonstrate
the Commission's vision and how it would be applied
to a particular call to action. And I hope to
include any feedback that you all may have in a
final version of this that we can distribute in the
next few days.

Lastly, I just wanted to provide a very
brief update on some stakeholders actions that align
with the calls to action in the report over the past
couple of months. As has been mentioned, the St.
Louis Regional Chamber and Civic Progress have
publicly committed to a 25-year managed Fund For
Racial Equity. Recently the St. Louis County
Council passed legislation on uniformed policing
standards that align very close with several of the calls to action from the report. At the federal level Senator Blunt has, is working on legislation dealing with child hunger and child informed schools. At the statewide level Governor Nixon has recently signed an executive order promoting diversity and greater awareness of opportunities for minority and women-owned businesses, and Attorney General Koster just recently took steps to deal with predatory debt collection.

In addition, the state legislature, as many of you know, the prefiling period for legislation started last week, and some legislators have already filed bills, and there are others in process, that include several things that align with the calls to action from the report, including increasing the minimum wage statewide, reforming municipal codes to address nuisance violations, raising the cap on low income housing tax credit projects, and then several from the Justice For All priority area, including the requirement of body cameras, use of force legislation, both Tennessee versus Garner, and establishing a use of force database statewide. Also racial profiling and establishing a community relations training program.
for peace officers. Those have all been prefilled, and we expect there to be a few more coming up in the next few weeks. So I know we don't have a lot of time, but I just wanted to provide that brief snapshot, and I don't know if there's any questions or anything I can answer now or after the, the meeting.

CO-CHAIR McClure: We will take just a moment and see if the commissioner questions to build on your comments on responses to calls of action, I would note that a number of bodies that were called are not necessarily legislative, but they're executive --

MR. Wyche: Yes.

CO-CHAIR McClure: -- and have authority to act, and so the post commission, at the direction of the Governor, has recently adopted at least a movement toward the training standards --

MR. Wyche: Right.

CO-CHAIR McClure: -- and officer wellness, and culturally sensitive training, those kinds of things, that were worked out very laboriously and over a long period of time between the working group co-chaired by Commissioner Packnett and Commissioner Isom, and so that's in
addition to that.

Are there questions for Tony from any members of the Commission?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I have a question. I just want to thank you for your attention to the Racial Equity Lens in this work, I know it's often not applied to policy it's good to have it here.

MR. WYCHE: Thanks. It was in addition, like I said, to just getting folks to check boxes, we wanted to kind of shift their thinking, whether it's on something from the report, or something else, that they're thinking these issues through.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I was just going to ask what else you needed from us to formalize the document in order to be able to post it, we do think particularly community groups who are having this conversation would benefit from the document, as well.

MR. WYCHE: The quicker the better, so I don't have anything to --

CO-CHAIR McClURE: Why don't we just give it a day, commissioners, that absolutely has it, and staff will collect comments, or we'll send
them independently to the staff and we'll get those
to you and then --

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: We're ready.

CO-CHAIR McClure: You're ready.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes.

CO-CHAIR Wilson: Move approval of the implementing policy recommendations from Ferguson Commission report document as previously distributed.

CO-CHAIR McClure: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER Windmiller: Second.


We're moving forward tonight saying this is a great idea, and it is.

MR. Wyche: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR McClure: Okay. All those in favor please say aye.

Any opposed?

I, too, would say this is an excellent document, I'm speaking to a group on Thursday interested in education policy, and I'm going to use this as a great way to apply the Racial Equity Lens, and I will also say, in addition to that, Felicia
and I spoke to the Civic Engagement Leadership Group of a major St. Louis company a couple days ago, and we used some of the staff work applying the Racial Equity Lens to the opportunity that's arrived, our recommendations which they were most interested in, and light bulbs started to go off when they looked at public transit and other things, and so it's very helpful when you do it at this level of detail. So thank you, and thanks to the staff that worked on that.

MR. WYCHE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PULLIAM: Question. Will this be on the website, as well? So this will go on.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: We can now post this document as officially approved tonight.

Thank you, Tony, for that, and the next piece of the planning and administration is to ask Co-Chair Wilson to talk to the update of the Racial Equity Fund.

CO-CHAIR WILSON: I'll remain seated, it's just a brief update, so I think most of this we covered in the last meeting, as I mentioned before.

One of the recommendations under the three core
recommendations under racial equity in the report is
the establishment of a 25-year managed Fund For
Racial Equity infrastructure throughout the region.
We had occasion just before the last meeting to sit
with the group that was convened by a local
collaborative of funders who were interested in
diversity, equity and inclusion. Those I believe 33
funders represented the funding agencies in the room
helped us to construct and to consider thought about
how we build this fund together. They gave input to
a presentation that was provided later that week, on
that Friday of that week just before our last
meeting to charitable officers and legislative
affairs representatives from regional business
council and civic progress firms, and we received
positive feedback there. It has since continued in
discussion with others who were outside of those
circles who had an interest in it. I also should
note with appreciation not only the public
commitment center were noted from the executive
directors of civic process and CEO of the regional
business -- the regional chamber, I'm sorry, but
also the work that is happening behind the scenes,
so the regional chamber, and part of their
commitment was to both commit first to the areas
where they were identified accountable bodies, where they found appropriate, but then also to learn more with other accountable bodies, and so as they were named as an accountable body here, they convened all the other accountable bodies on the Racial Equity Fund to begin to talk about the construction and what the fund could look like. We've also been in conversation with the community foundation about what the structures could be, what oversight looks to be, and what the capacities are. Finally, I'll say -- and so the core areas as we presented last time are for support for implementation, for infrastructure, under this area of infrastructure we've spoken to infrastructure for diversity equity inclusion training and work and support in the region. I added to that also what was a third category last time of this kind of network capacity building for community organizing and advocacy in the region. Just last week Commissioner James-Hatter and I were part of the discussion around this work with some of the immediate past leadership of another large national foundation, and they suggested adding to this framework on innovation, supports for innovations, things that
could advance the work and may actually be a
programmatic considering the catalytic --
considering some of the principles of catalytic
philanthropy and offering this opportunity to
support social mentors that may draw our programming
out and lead to policy implementation, this is part
of our thinking now, and so over the course of the
coming couple of weeks, we'll have a couple of more
intentional discussions about this with the hope to
begin to kind of lay out and have a structure in
place beginning of January. So that's kind of where
we are, it's still moving, it's in conversation, but
there's still energy and increased commitment, so we
thank God for that. Any questions?

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: I
have one actually, Commissioner Wilson, a couple of
commissioners in one-on-one calls asked to clarify
the distinction or the connection between Racial
Equity Fund and the potential for intermediary
partnership that was presented tonight. Are there
any thoughts on that?

CO-CHAIR WILSON: Yeah, I think first,
the Racial Equity Fund would have a larger scope for
its funding purposes and intent. So these various
categories of support that would be spoken to would
be supported by the fund, in and of itself, so it
could, should, would, in our proposal at this stage
support, provide some support for the core
intermediary work and implementation, that's
critically important to all of us, but that wouldn't
be its exclusive purpose or function, quite frankly.
It may also, one of the structural elements when we
talked to the community foundation we note is that
the fund works as the advisors of the fund
structured it. So part of the ongoing negotiation
of the conversation is those who fund the fund have
some input into what this design looks like. And
what we have proposed is also an oversight set of
advisors that are weighted for people who are
historically impacted by the racial segregation and
implications of policy in our region, right, so
those folks would also have voice in how funding
gets allocated. Again, these are elements that
continue to need to be negotiated, but I think the
critical point that you make is it's bigger than
just implementation, it's implementation, it's
infrastructure, and perhaps also innovations that
would advance racial equity in the region.

CO-CHAIR McClure: I want to thank

Co-Chair Wilson for his leadership and his helping
to conceptualize and structure this with help and
input from lots of folks, and I think it responds to
the notion that these are long-term challenges, and
this is a long-term fund in our region in order to
respond to these issues needs to make long-term
commitments to that, so thank you for your
leadership.

We have one final administrative item,
to approve the minutes of the last meeting, which
the Commission has in front of them, and I will make
a motion to approve or amend those minutes.

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: So moved.
CO-CHAIR McCLURE: So moved from
Commissioner Aldridge, is there a second?

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: Second.
CO-CHAIR McCLURE: Second by
Commissioner Packnett. Any discussion? All those
in favor please say aye?

Any opposed?

(Motion carries.)

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: It's a hallmark of
our meetings that we take the time that it takes to
both do the agenda and to hear as fully and
completely as we can, and so in continuing that,
even though we are over time, we want to pause here,
since this is our last meeting formally as a
Commission, to offer any commissioners an
opportunity to provide any reflections or comments
that they would like to. We've already told them we
don't expect to hear from every commissioner unless
they all want to speak, but we would certainly offer
the opportunity for any of those that would like to.

COMMISSIONER PACKNETT: I just want to
offer the reflection that actually we're on time,
it's 8:39.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: Thank you, Brittany.

COMMISSIONER WATSON: I would like to
make a quick reflection, I just happened to be
looking at this date that sits up at the top of our
agenda tonight, and being a former military
individual who served in the United States Army, I
have a dad who's 97 years old who served in the
Battle of the Bulge, and the today is a day that
will live in infamy, which is World War II when
Pearl Harbor was bombed by the Japanese, and I just
wanted to just reflect on the fact that that day
will live in infamy. My prayer and hope is that
these brothers and sisters that I've served with for
the past year will also live in infamy.

CO-CHAIR McCLURE: Any other comments?
Rasheen?

COMMISSIONER ALDRIDGE: Since no one wants to. I guess it's a reflection or a comment, or just something that I'm always saying. Let me begin by saying thank you to our two co-chairs. If it wasn't for you two, I don't think the Commission would have been the way that it is now, unflinching and transformative, and I done said this several times, and I done also been talking about resigning from the Commission, because I done thought it was starting to become very typical and status quo, but you two as co-chairs continued to push and make sure we wasn't just a typical commission, so I thank you for. That I want to thank Ms. Becky -- I always get Becky and Bethany -- Ms. Bethany, Ms. Bethany a huge, a huge thank you for all that you have done, all that you had to take throughout this process, even when you had to switch from a commissioner to director, I appreciate all the hard work that you have done.

To the staff, a lot of you guys in the audience do not know, sometimes I say we're figureheads, and they always say don't say that, but it was the staff that really made sure that the work is done, that the report booklet got released. It
was the staff that made sure that we were prepped
before we come to the meeting and not just say: Oh,
what's going on? But making sure that they had, you
know, prepped us every time, and it was the staff
that also, just with the co-chairs, if it wasn't for
Staff, I'm not sure that this Commission would be
the Commission that it is today, and to all my
commissioners, I love y'all. I love y'all. It has
been a process for all of us, and I'm going back to
that moment when me and Brittany was actually in the
elevator when we was getting sworn in, and we was
both thinking like: What are we getting ourself
into? People are going to think we're crazy, we're
going to be called sellouts, and then walk in the
room and just be like it's a whole lot of old
people, you know, a whole lot of old white folks,
and ain't nothing -- you know. But I honestly can
say everyone on this Commission I consider a friend
or a good ally. Everyone on this Commission came
into this Commission not knowing what was going to
happen, but made an oath and said that, you know,
what did take place in Ferguson, we wanted to find
something positive out of it, no matter what our
background was, if it was white, if it was black, if
it was poor, if it was rich, if it was Wash U, or if
it was just St. Louis Community College, we all wanted to take an oath and say we wanted to make things better. So I know that was a challenge for a lot of us, we come from different fields, law enforcement and protester, you know, but we stuck it out to try to find something positive for our region, and I really appreciate everyone, and like I said, I love y'all.

CO-CHAIR McClure: Well said. Any others?

COMMISSIONER Packnett: I did have actual reflections --

CO-CHAIR McClure: So I want to make a note we are now over time. Commissioner Packnett, we don't, we don't care.

COMMISSIONER Packnett: I want to echo Commissioner Aldridge and I know everyone's thanks to the co-chairs, to the incredibly tenacious and relentless staff. I often tell folks that the thing that has kept me the most hopeful throughout this process continues to be the people. All of you who keep showing up every single time, whether you can be here virtually, comment on Twitter, be here for half the meeting, the whole meeting, the start, the end, this is your report. It is what it is, because
you have made it so. And we are deeply indebted to
you, and our region will continue to be deeply
indebted to you because you came here with your
sleeves rolled up ready to get into the work. And
so I am thankful that our co-chairs set forth not a
perfect, but a highly democratic process such that
those voices could come through not just in input,
but in decision making, and so that we could start
to build the kind of more equitable systems and
structures that we aspire to in this region. But I
would be remiss if I didn't remind us what has been
said by many commissioners and staff members
throughout this process, and that as much pride as
we absolutely should take in the steps that we've
taken to get to this point, that this is not the
win. If there were the win, then we would not have
seen over a thousand lives lost to police violence
in the last year since this Commission was
assembled. I would not be able to name Natasha
McKenna and Laquanda Gotall, and Ronald Johnson, and
Freddie Gray, VonDerrit Myers or Mansel Malbay, and
so I know that we are all committed, as you are all
committed, to making sure that this is not the
ceiling, but that it is the floor, that this is not
the end, but that it is the beginning, and as I
think about what Baltimore, and Chicago, and Ferguson, and all of these regions continue to go through, I am hopeful and optimistic that we will help continue to set a pathway forward.

CO-CHAIR McClure: Thank you,

Commissioner Packnett, very thoughtful. Any other commissioners? I know Bethany has some comments she would like to offer, and so we will give her that opportunity.

MANAGING DIRECTOR Johnson-Javois: Thank you. I'd like to take the time name the staff that are typically unnamed. If I call your name, please stand Monique Gillium, Nicole Hudson, Karishna Friteyo, Emily Johnson, Tony Wyche, David Dwight, Mark Zimmerman, Rudy Nickens, Kiera Banks, Serena Muhammad. And we also in this group because of the very hard work if Rosie Stafford, if you're still in the room, would you stand so that we can acknowledge you and the role that you played, and Erin Buddy from the United Way, if you are in the room, and a very, very special thanks if they are standing, Jerrica Franks, if you would please stand. Jessica Perkins is not here, but she's an integral part and Lorna Godwin, would you please stand? We'd like to acknowledge and thank all of you, and someone else
I'm missing? Angela. And Heidi. Thank you. And I need help, see, this is why you have good staff.

MR. HYATT: Elaine.

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And Elaine and Rebecca Biddle. And --

(Applause, end of comment inaudible.)

MANAGING DIRECTOR JOHNSON-JAVOIS: We just needed to honor you and acknowledge you in your work, and you may be seated. Also to FOCUS leadership who are in the room, I want to acknowledge your work with us, I see you all over the place, and thank you for that, you know, there's a commissioner that needs to speak and I'm acknowledging that. The next thing I wanted to do before I close with my five seconds left is my husband is in the room, Laurent Javois. Would you stand? He endured to the end, and I just want to acknowledge my family for the commitment that it's taken for them to loan me to this work. It's been awesome, I am honored, and the work continues and they're ready to do it. So thank you.

CO-CHAIR McClure: So I guess, Traci wishes to speak, so thank you, and Commissioner Blackmon, you are on the screen if you can hear us.

COMMISSIONER Blackmon: Hi, everyone, I
am so sad that I could not be there in person tonight, but I don't want the day to go by without me giving my appreciation, as well, first to Richard Starsky for your incredible leadership in this process, I'm so grateful that I've had the privilege to work and to serve with you both. And also, to the rest of the commissioners whom I have the utmost respect for. If I had to go to battle, I'm glad that it was with the group that was chosen for this. And to this incredible staff led by Bethany, thank you for all the hours that we don't even know about, thank you for all the things that you did to make this a success. I am so grateful, and I know that this is a wonderful start to the battle, it is not over, it's just beginning, so I look forward to seeing all of you guys on the battlefield. Bye bye.

CO-CHAIR McClure: Thank you very much, Commissioner Blackmon. Thank you for joining us and being a part of the meeting tonight. So before we close, and I, and as only he can do it, I'm going to ask Reverend Wilson if he would adjourn our meeting as he sees fit. We did find this phone on one of the seats at the very back, and so it's right here at Bethany's seat, if it happens to be yours, please come claim it. Reverend Wilson.
CO-CHAIR WILSON: So take first personal privilege and continue, I had an opportunity earlier to thank commissioners and to share my great appreciation for my co-chair. I've only shared at one other place, and I'll do it now. The most subversive thing, and I've been engaged over the course of the year, I have dealt with the family strife that comes with this kind of stuff, I have a new three-month old baby at home that I didn't have when we began this work, dealt with the time away, and I have been remarkably supported by the congregation of people at St. John's who gathered together and organized a protest and have never allowed me, even though I never invited them, never allowed me to come into a commission setting or commission room without at least one of them being here, including tonight. So I thank God for their prayers, I thank God for the support of my family, particularly my wife Dr. Latoya Smith-Wilson, and for my boys who have sacrificed over the course of this year. But for all that we've been through, engaged out in protesting in the streets with Brittany Packnett, Traci Blackmon, and Rasheen Aldridge has been arrested, and folks over the course of this year and have people ask: Why would
you do that? Don't you know you're co-chairing the Commission? The most subversive action that I have experienced throughout the course of this year was when Rich McClure asked me in one of our weekly meetings at 7:30 in the morning, he recognized the strain that I was dealing with with the church, with the foundation, and with home, and still trying to carry this, he asked me the question: How might I serve you? And I'm going to say that -- I say that because what he engaged is the kind of behavior that built the early church that I serve in now, the First Century church was made up by people who were willing to walk away from a bit of their own privilege in order to walk side by side, walk arm in arm, walk step in step with people who were remarkably marginalized by society. And while my marginalization is more historic than present, because I live with my own privilege, the fact that in this society, in this community, and in this region he would say that to me is a subversive act, and it's the kind of acts that we will all need to engage in in order to truly move forward together. It is a reconciling act that has less to do with me and more to do with him. It has to do with his capacity to see himself as a part of the solution in
a real way. To be guided, to be moved, to be
transformed by nothing, nothing less than his faith,
and to make a sacrifice. And that's the kind of
stuff that it takes. It takes that on a personal
level, it takes that on an communal level, it takes
that on a political level, it's going to take that
kind of courage from folks. I wouldn't be Starsky
Wilson if I didn't remind something that four out of
the five top offices in the state are going to be up
in less than a year. There are people zig zagging
across this state right now campaigning for votes.
What they are saying to you is I'm better than the
next guy. I'm better than the next woman. Until
they ask: How can I serve you; they've not engaged
in the kind of subversion that's required to heal
our community and get us to true reconciliation and
take us down a path toward equity. And I suggest
when they ask: How might I serve you? You tell
them that: I spent December 7th till 9:00 -- I'm
not going that long -- in a conference room with
some folks, because I believe that the 2200 people
who committed part of their life to the Forward
Through Ferguson report deserve to be listened to,
and how might you serve me? Serve them. Tell me
which of these policy recommendations you're going
to move forward if I trust you with my vote. Tell me where you stand and where you stood as our community dealt with our burning hearts, our burning desires and our burning buildings. And you ask them at the end of the day when the elections are done, I'm talking statewide, I'm talking local, as well, when the elections are done, on that day are they going to eat burgers or are they going to eat steak?

Last October Traci and I gathered all day when the established, the esteemed of the legal community was gathered together for the investiture of a federal judge, we were trying to get him on the phone, because we were there at the St. Ann police department trying to get 13 young people out of jail. And at the end of the day when those young people got out of jail, because we finally found at least one judge who wasn't there glad handling shaking everybody else's hand, one judge who would make a call to work to get them out. Thankfully this judge went to a church somewhere where he would listen to his pastor. But they finally came out, one of the members of the Millennial Activists United, we took them down and tried to get them a decent meal, we took them to a steakhouse there in North County, and one of them guys: Look man, we
got it, order whatever you want to, you know, he
order a burger, he said: Nah, you been in jail all
night all day, you just want a burger? He said:
Steak is for victory. He said: We'll eat steak
later, but tonight we eat burgers.

If the win for you is getting elected,
we don't need you. If you eat steak because you got
what you wanted and the community is still fighting
for a generation, you're not the one. We eat
burgers now. It's a long time before we get to eat
steaks. So tonight we're pleased to be a part of
this process, but this is just ground beef. We get
to the real work, we get to the real victories when
we can say we continue to count down that these
policy recommendations have been implemented, that
people who have been elected, that people who are
the true leaders in this community who have their
hands on the levers of power are champions for this
kind of positive change.

It's not done. It's not done. It's not
done. Franky Freeman is still waiting on us to get
it done. James Buford is still waiting on us to get
it done. Bill Danford is still waiting on us to get
it done. Tonight we eat burgers.

I invite you to stand with me. It's
been our, it's been our practice, and I guess after
19 times, after 19 times we can call it a tradition,
to close our meeting with a time of silent
reflection centering about our place in this work,
and where God will have us to be.

Thank you, God bless you, and God keep
us all.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.)
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