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MS. BETHANY JOHNSON-JAVOIS: At this time, we'd like to call the session of the Ferguson Commission to order.

Today is April 27th, and this is our tenth Commission meeting. We're happy that you are all here today to be with us, and our first order of business is to conduct a role call to confirm on record who is in attendance of the Commission's meeting.

So at this time, Commissioners, when I call your name, if you would please signify by saying present, that you are with us.

Reverend Starsky Wilson is on his way.

Rich McClure.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Kevin Ahlbrand.

MR. KEVIN AHLBRAND: Here.


Pastor Traci Blackmon, we know that she has an excused absence.
MR. TRUMAN ROBERT CARR: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Gabe Gore.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you. Becky James Hatter has an excused absence.

Dan Isom.

MR. DANIEL ISOM: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Scott Negwer has an excused absence.

Brittany Packnett.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: Here.


MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Pat Sly.

MR. PATRICK SLY: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Grayling Tobias has an excused absence on medical leave.

Byron Watson.

MR. BYRON WATSON: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And
Rose Windmiller.

MS. ROSE WINDMILLER: Here.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And I did not forget anyone, is that correct?

(No response.)

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: All right. So with that, Reverend David Denoon is with us to do our invocation. Would you please come at this time.

David represents First Congregational Church in Webster Groves, UCC. Thank you very much.

REVEREND DENOON: Thank you. I also represent the interfaith partnership of Greater St. Louis.

Let us pray:

God of Peace, Spirit of Living justice, Redeemer of those who seek new ways because their familiar ways just won't do any more. We gather in this moment to consider present pain and new directions. For we cannot stay as we are. We cannot afford to stay as we are.

Make Yourself known to us in the voices of all who speak here this evening. Remind us of Your grace. Prevent us from castigating or despising or judging. Catch our tongues if we
presume towards self-righteousness. Open our hearts
to new and genuine possibilities or even some old
ones that we didn't try because they seemed to be
asking too much of us before. Change our minds
about what we can be. About what can be. And then
hold us all accountable to the change of which we
speak so that none of us imagine ourselves victims
and each of us is transformed into a blessed servant
of Your's. Then may all our communities become the
beloved community of which you have spoken and
taught. In faith that we just wish our faiths could
emulate.

Amen.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank
you, Reverend, for those words of encouragement.

At this time we are graced to be here
at the YMCA of which I would like to check to see if
Tim helm is in fact in the room.

If not, we would like to ask Miss Cenia
Bosman, who is the Senior VP of Administrative
Services for the Gateway Region, to render us a
welcome at this time.

Cenia is a good friend and sister and
colleague, we're very grateful to have you.

MS. BOSMAN: Thank you.
Good evening.

On behalf of our President and CEO Tim Helm, I'd like to welcome the Commissioners, as well as invited guests here to our facility.

We are honored that you have chosen our facility to have your meeting and we think you will find it accommodating, and I'd like to also extend an opportunity if you're interested in receiving a tour to see the facility post your meeting, please, we have staff that will be available to do that.

We operate this facility to serve this community in partnership with the City of St. Louis. It's one of our newer facilities and we have a number of accommodations, and so again, we appreciate you selecting this site for your meeting, and we wish you a productive meeting and a pleasant visit at our facility here.

(Applause.)

MR. RICH McCLURE: Thank you, Cenia.

Thank you for your warm welcome and, Reverend Denoon, thank you for your willingness to be here and open up our meeting appropriately.

My name is Rich McClure, I'm one of the co-chairs of the Commission and on behalf of my co-chair, Reverend Starsky Wilson, whose plane was
delayed or he would be here now, but he'll be here very shortly, we want to thank you for coming here to the Carondelet neighborhood and being a part of this discussion tonight. We hope you find it informative and we hope that you will certainly take the time to participate fully in our session this evening.

This evening's session follows two sessions that we have had. This is our tenth meetings, and meetings eight and nine were on the topic of racial equity and reconciliation. We had two very thoughtful and productive meetings with extensive community and engagement and we learned a lot and we will continue to learn a lot about this cross cutting purpose that truly does pervade all of our work and you'll hear more about that this evening.

We have had very productive working group meetings since we last met and prior to the last meeting. I think I've counted five working group meetings that have had very extensive community participation. They've been in places like the Parents as Teachers Center in North County, as well as the University of Missouri St. Louis, and the participation has been full and extensive and
much of what you see tonight comes from those
sessions where the community and our working group
members partnered together to learn and to fashion
calls to action.

So tonight we gather not to discuss any
one particular problem, but we gather to discuss
prospective solutions that have been identified in
concert with the community.

This represents the midpoint in our
work roughly, and so we thought it was important --
important time to step back and reflect on what
we've learned and the calls to action that have been
made. So tonight that will be the deep dive that we
will do.

From the beginning of our work, we
committed that we would do this work with a bent
toward action, and so tonight we believe you will
see that.

So as you look through the topical
priorities that have been identified by the
community, many of you participated in those
sessions, then you'll see that we have taken that
learning and we've asked the question how can the
Commission interpret these calls for actions into
movement in the next 170 days of our work.
So in doing that tonight, we're going to review our process to date, as well as the approach on how we will operationalize these calls to action going forward.

We do not want to wait until September 15th to have a report in calls to action. We have from the very beginning began issuing calls when they were appropriate and when they were needed and begun to move action, and some of those things you will see tonight having, in fact, yielded some movement and we believe we'll yield movement going forward.

We all have a commitment in this region to not let each other down, to together come around the changes that need to be made in order for our region to address the very serious and deeply seeded issues that have led to the formation of this Commission and led to the kind of concern that you've reflected by being here tonight.

So tonight is about these pathways. We're going to follow a bit of our pattern with public comment and with our polling process, and then we'll be moving to our working group report-outs.

We will take a break after the initial
reports from the working groups are on the table to see if there are questions from the audience at that stage, in addition to the time for public comment.

So we're going to move now to our audience polling and, Monique, I believe you're going to do that, so welcome our assistant director.

Monique Thomas.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: Thank you, Rich.

Good evening everyone.

(Audience: Good evening.)

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: So we are going to, as is our practice, our tradition, do a little bit of audience polling. Does everyone have a keypad.

Raise your hand if you do not have a keypad. Somebody will get that to you.

Angela.

Perfect.

So to night we have eight questions and one practice question. Who hasn't actually used one of these keypads before?

(Showing of hands.)

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: Okay. That's fine. It's fairly easy. So we'll ask you a question, and you'll notice -- actually, look at
your keypad now. You'll see ten letters, ten
letters and ten numbers. So we'll ask a question,
and one of the answer choices will correspond with
either the letter or the number and you pick the
best one.

So if you change your mind during the
process, we'll save the last one. So if you enter
one and change your mind, the last one will be
saved. And there will be a timeframe that I'll call
out. Okay? So pretty basic.

So we'll start with demographic
questions and then we'll go into our topical
considerations. We'll do a little bit of a repeat
from last time for validity. So we'll start with a
practice question if we're ready -- and there are a
couple of new arrivals, so if we can get them
keypads if they haven't had one.

Okay. So we'll start with this.

You'll notice at the top, I guess -- my right,
you'll see polling closed and it's red, it's hard to
see. So the polling is closed, you can enter
answers and it won't be locked. When polling is
open it will be green, indicating it's safe to save,
and then when it closes it will close, so they will
no longer be saved.
Okay. So we'll start with this: What is your favorite color. Please note this is a practice question. No pressure.


Okay. If you tried to enter it just now, you weren't paying attention because the polling is closed. But polling is open now so you can enter your choice.

The bottom right-hand corner you see how many seconds you have left. About ten seconds left.

Oh, thank you. Is that better?

Okay. Polling is now closed. About 34 percent chose blue as their favorite color. Okay. So pretty simple. It's been consistently blue, so I think that's generally -- not the best sample perhaps, but looks like generally Ferguson Commission attendees like blue.

All right. So are we ready to start?

Okay. The polling is closed, but in what geographic city -- in what geographic area is your primary home or residence located?

Polling is now open.

Ten seconds left.

All right. So half of you are from St. Louis City, you reside, and then about four out of ten St. Louis County. A little bit of representation from St. Clair County. We see you.

Okay. Great.

Next question: In what geographic area is your primary work and/or school?

Now if you're retired, you can note other.


Polling is now open.

Less than ten seconds.

Okay. Again, about four out of ten the city. 37 percent the county. And then we have a
significant amount of other, 20 percent.


Polling is open.

About ten seconds left.

Okay. Closed now:

About 52 representing male. That a flip from the last meeting.

Okay.


Polling is now open.

About ten seconds left.

Okay. 65 percent white in the room.

25 have identified as African American. Four American Indian or Alaskan native. And then four percent of you declined.

Okay. So this is the age question. We like to tell you that it's self-reported and we can't see. Safe spot. Okay. All right.
In what age group do you belong?
Select one.  A, 21 and under.  B, between 22 and 34.
C, 35 to 44.  D, would be 45 to 54.  E, 55 to 64.
F, 65 and over.  And then G is decline.
Polling is open.
About ten seconds left.
About six seconds left.  You can press decline if you'd like -- okay.
All right.  So we have 35 percent are between 55 and 65.  27, 65 and over.
Okay.  This is the tenth meeting of the Ferguson Commission.  How many previous meetings have you attended?
I will note we're talking about the full Ferguson Commission meeting and not including the working group meetings.  Okay.  So this is the tenth one.  So if you have -- if this is your first meeting, you would say A, none.  Okay.  Okay.
B, between one to two.  C, three to four.  D, five to six.  E, seven to eight.  And F is nine, so you've been to all of them.  Okay.
Polling is open.
About ten seconds left.
Okay.  So most of you, welcome, it's your first time.  55 percent is your first time.
Then we have about small two percent, but you've been to all of them. Welcome back.

All right. Let's go to the next one.

So now we're going into topical considerations. If you've been to the last meeting, you know that this is a question that we're repeating but we're just making sure that we have the right data. Okay.

So what three issues have the greatest impact on our community's health and well-being?

This sets us up for the topic at the next meeting, May 11th. Okay.


So you're picking three here. Okay.

Polling is open.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: We choose three?


Can everyone see.
No? We may have to repoll. Maybe just to check to see if that's an option. Okay.

It looks like we -- all right. So I'm going to read it aloud again, that way everyone can see because people may be struggling in the back.

Okay.

So again, you're picking three. Polling is closed right now. But we have what three issues have the greatest impact on our community's health and well-being?


MS. JERRICA FRANKS: It goes automatically.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: Okay.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Did everyone have a chance -- go ahead and we'll try it again because it does it automatically.


H, was stress. And I, health care that is sensitive
to cultural differences. Does everyone have the
three locked in in their mind so you'll be ready to
go?

Okay. Let's try this again. Thank you
for your patience.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Polling is now
open.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: It's open now.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Read it again as
you're doing it.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: Okay. What three
issues have the greatest impact on our community's
health and well-being. A, insurance coverage. B,
ability to pay for health services. C,
environmental hazards. D, neighborhood safety. E,
distance to health care provider. F, ability to
understand and use health information. G, access to
fresh fruits and vegetables. H, stress. I, health
care that is sensitive to cultural differences.

All right. So it looks like ability to
pay for health services is top, followed by
neighborhood safety, followed by stress, which is
consistent with our last polling.

Next question also on health but a
different way. Same, enter three so we'll wait to
make sure you have your three locked down before we
go live for the polling.

What three issues have the greatest
impact on our community's ability to be access
health care services?

Okay.  A, having health insurance.  B,
cost of health care.  C, transportation.  D, finding
a provider or doctor that will see you.  E,
understanding how to find your way through the
health care system.  F, limited hours of clinics or
doctors.  G, ability -- excuse me.  Being able to
get off from work -- get time off from work.  H,
long wait before seeing a doctor.  Now --

MS. JERRICA FRANKS:  Polling is open.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS:  Does anyone not
have their three in their head already?

MS. JERRICA FRANKS:  Polling is open.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS:  Okay.  Polling is
open.  What three issues have the greatest impact on
our community's ability to access health care
services?

About ten seconds left.

Looks like people have -- people have
entered.

All right.  Okay.  Great.  So top seems
to be the cost of health care, followed by understanding how to find your way through the health care system, and then -- excuse me, no. Having health insurance is two, closely followed is understanding how to find your way through the health care system.

All right. That concludes our polling portion. At this time, Bethany Johnson-Javois, managing director.

Also, I'll note that we are going to immediately collect these. Raise your hand if you have one. Hold them up. That does nothing but operate this, so we kindly ask you to return them. We'll be immediately collecting them.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: You can't talk into it?

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: You can't talk, you can't open your -- what do you say? Garage door. So please, and you can tell on your neighbor.

All right, thank you.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you so much for taking the time to take that poll. People are coming around. Please hold your's up high if no one has collected your --

I just want to make mention as well
that we do have a time for open mike so if you have a burning comment or question, there is a fish bowl that is available for you to make comment so you can do that as well at this time.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Do you have the cumulative demographic data from all your meetings?

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Is that published or available --

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Yes, it is. Yes, it is, on the meeting -- or actually on the reports tab.

Okay. Okay. Without further adieu, what I'm going to do is to review the break-out sessions and the reporting from the demographics last time at our Commission meeting on April 13th.

For Commissioners, it's on your scream that's behind me and for the public audience, the same presentation as here.

So in our electronic polling the last name, nine out of ten attendees resided in either the St. Louis County or the City of St. Louis. 51 percent resided in St. Louis County.

And eight of ten attendees worked or attended school in either St. Louis County or City
as well, with 44 percent actually attending school in St. Louis County.

Nearly seven of ten attendees last time were women and we have a different demographic at this meeting.

And of the age groups that attended, they were pretty equally split amongst a small number with the majority, the 65 to -- 55 to 64 years of age.

Six out of ten attendees at our last session were white attendees as you can see here. And three of ten attendees have participated in at least one other Commission meeting. So we typically do draw new members to each meeting each time that we meet.

What we'd like to do now is to talk about the polling results from our last meeting. We wanted to include more voice into the considerations for health disparities and so we polled you today. At the next meeting you'll see your results as well.

From the last time, here is how people responded. Out of all of the categories, the top three were ability to pay for health services, neighborhood safety, and insurance coverage. So more than five of ten feel health care access and
neighborhood safety are the most critical issues
impacting regional health and well-being.

On the next question, the answers
seemed to be in that group acquiring and paying for
health care insurance are the greatest deterrents to
health care costs. 74 percent of those that voted
said costs of health care, 60 percent having health
insurance, 46 percent maneuvering the health care
system. Very similar to today's responses.

We had lively public discussion and
open mike and the small group discussions were
focused around racial caucus groups. Say that three
times fast.

Okay. So public open mike comments
really responding to racial equity and
reconciliation, these were kind of the realms of
comments. Dismantling racism and systemic --
dismantling racism at a systemic level is the first
step. The second piece is, position to offer
resources to help.

Fourth set of comments is a continuum
and need of efforts to train, to build awareness,
and definitely consistent theme of words is creating
healing spaces throughout our region.

And the fourth public comment is to
build community that is free of racial fear,
beginning with talking with others and not through
or over others.

And then we summarized the public
comment in the following way here above. There was
an individual that came to talk basically about a
reverse role play. Society seeking the worst
eamples as representatives of the African American
race, and should you not be in that race there's not
the same standard that is applied to you.

The second is moving beyond a black and
white discussion, although the data showed us and
the votes that having a discussion about African
Americans and whites is important, we also need to
move beyond that as well to have inclusive language
to include additional communities in our region, and
there was an expression from our public comment that
there is solidarity increasing between Asian
Americans and African Americans due to organizations
in our regions.

The third is a call for civic
engagement, that in fact as you look at the
Commissions topics and how we represent our working
groups, that same type of breakdown needs to happen
as well within our national discussion and dialogue.
The fourth was a critique of the Ferguson -- the Ferguson Commission's procurement process of which we strongly agree.

The RFB process for hiring, in fact, takes a lot of time and the individual comments about the scrutiny that's needed and the timeframe that is needed with the governmental entity to be able to effectively select the staff and support that is needed, and for that reason that individual said that it in fact does compromise the effectiveness of the Commission's work, especially as you hear Rich's call to say we have a bent toward urgency and action.

And the last one was a comment that we heard, actually Keith is in the room, so hopefully we made your comment well here, that erosion of trust does exist, but there needs to be mended fences between community and police officers.

Keith's comment specifically was around the fact that there's you a unique nature in police officers, that many volunteer for this job, initially officers run toward bullets on behalf of the community, and yet, there is a broken -- a brokenness in the relationship that we need to definitely begin to mend and rebuild and cause
increased accountability.

Keith, did we get that pretty much right?

All right. See, working hard.

So here the racial caucus groups broke out, we had a lot of discussion about the rationale, but we did something different with the Commission. Typically, we break up depending on smaller groups, depending on how you self select.

But this time we thought it was important that we focus in caucus groups of like color, data to show that there's a safety, and there's an ability to express things you wouldn't necessarily express if not amongst your own.

So we did this as an experiment and here is what we learned. Since you're in the back I'm going to read this a little bit to you.

Racial caucus groups from people of color this is the discussion that was had. The question on the table was, what do you need in order to continue the reflection of the conversation after our presentation.

And these are the needs.

I need white people to listen without explaining away the things I share with them.
I need black men to talk with each other and not just at each other.
I need youth to stop ignoring the problems in our community.
I need people of color beyond African Americans to get more involved in making things better.
I need darker skinned people to stop thinking that lighter skinned people think they are better than them.
I need black people to focus on the systems that are oppressing them and stop marching on other black folks.
I need white people to stop thinking they have arrived because they have one black friend.
I need for all of us to put ourselves in more uncomfortable spaces so that we can have real conversation about these issues, and I need for us to do less self-censoring.
So that was the feedback from the people of color break-out. And then this is the feedback from white people who were in the group with the same question, what do you need in order to continue the reflection of our conversation, and
here were the needs that we identified.

I need to know about opportunities for open dialogue and I need it to be consistent and regular.

I need structures to support connections across social diversity.

I need to be reminded of specific, personal, and concrete examples of white privilege.

I need cross racial conversations across all ages.

I need to know what language to use and ways to recognize cultural competency.

I need accessibility for those who don't self-select to come to Ferguson Commission meeting.

I need to identify nodes of hatred and challenge them.

I need the courage to take risk to initiate conversations where I am right now.

Two more.

I need to put myself in places to meet others.

And finally, I need these conversations to be a part of fun community building.

So with that, I want to thank all of
you that provided feedback on last week and that concludes the summary for our 4/13 break-out session.

At this time Miss Jerrica Franks is coming to open us up for our public open mike portion of tonight's meeting.

Thank you, Jerrica.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for attending.

As Bethany has mentioned, this is the general public open mike session, so this is an opportunity for you to share with us your opinions, suggestions, comments, questions that you may have for the Commission.

I will do a drawing. I do ask that as you approach the stand that you give us your name and also slowly spell it out as we do document everything that is said. So again, if we ever have to reference back to who said it, we can correctly acknowledge who is speaking with us today.

Okay. And you will also have three minutes. Okay. I will be keeping time, three minutes.

First, we will start with Van Smith.

Van Smith.
MR. VAN SMITH: I really don't have anything to say. This is my first meeting, I just put my name in the bowl.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Well, welcome. Thank you.

Reverend Mark Harvey. After Reverend Harvey, we will have Ronald Stamps, and after Ronald Stamps, we will have Alex Cuenza. Please forgive me if I'm pronouncing it incorrectly.

REVEREND MARK HARVEY: Hi, I want to welcome you to Carondelet. I'm a United Methodist pastor here in this neighborhood. This is a neighborhood which has had -- long had a commitment to support particularly of the police department.

And we -- we've had a lot of confusion in this neighborhood through the course of the Ferguson events as the South Side Safety Group has met right here in this room with a hundred to 150 people on a monthly basis with representatives from the police department seeking to communicate, build strong cooperation between neighbors, as we've participated in the next door communications, social networking and so forth, as the neighborhood to the near north of us has increasingly become the highest crime neighborhood in the whole metropolitan area.
I don't know if you're aware of that shift. Part of that has been demographic by nature, but not entirely we know, of course. And so I think this is a neighborhood that has responded greatly to the issues which you are addressing.

I want to thank you all on the Commission for choosing to come here. Thank you. I think that we have 50 percent of the people here tonight new. I see some familiar faces of people who have come from Carondelet here and I think that's very encouraging.

As somebody who personally has worked in racial diversity issues all of my life, I've served as a pastor, predominantly African American congregations, previously here in a neighborhood which is historically predominantly Caucasian, but that has shifted. We're now about 40 percent African American.

A lot of people have stereotypical perceptions of South Side St. Louis, which simply are not true. We've gone through all of that kind of change, which so many communities have gone through in terms of ethnic diversity. Also, the highest -- the highest Moslem, you know, area in the metropolitan area here in the South Side.
So we've worked on those issues, we're working to support the police, and we are just only now, a little bit to the table, beginning to move in to issues of discussing ethnic diversity and racial polarization. But I think our police department, all things considered in District 1, have done a very good job on working on those issues because they've been highly responsive to the neighbors for a long time.

Just wanted to say all that. Thank you.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Spell your name.

REVEREND MARK HARVEY: Mark Harvey, M-A-R-K, H-A-R-V-E-Y. Reverend. When I put my name in the thing, they said you may want to say something, I said I'm a pastor, I'll probably say too much.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Thank you, Reverend Harvey.

Ronald Stamps, and then after Ronald Stamps, Alex Cuenza. Please forgive me again.

MR. RONALD STAMPS: My name is Ronald Stamps, and it's spelled R-O-N-A-L-D, S-T-A-M-P-S. And I would like to say I think it's unfair that for so many years that the police have
been able to get away with so many things, so much
immunity. Everybody in this room probably is
accountable for their actions, but the police have
done so many things, devious things, and they've not
been held accountable. Until they are held
accountable, then that will be the biggest solving
of the problem.

(People in the audience say amen.)

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: After Alex, we
will have Linda, and forgive me, Laferriere.
Laferriere, Linda. After Alex, and then after Miss
Linda, we'll have Ricky Jackson.

MR. ALEX CUENZA: My name is Alex
Cuenza, I'm a professor of education at St. Louis
University, and what I'm here for is I wanted to
urge the Commission to think about in terms of
education, critical urban education reform.

We've had a long history of urban
reform in the United States. We've had a long
history -- oh, I'm sorry. We have a long history of
education reform in the United States, and, you
know, talks about this one that we're always --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry --

MR. ALEX: -- constantly searching for.

We're always looking for this one particular system.
What we've failed --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

MR. ALEX: Yep. What we've failed to often talk about are place-based strategies that we need to empower communities, and I hope the Commission takes that to heart.

I hope they find ways to leverage education and ways that they concentrate disadvantage. That we stop with emerging of school districts and we keep concentrated poverty in the same kinds of areas, that you're doing something more than the same clay book that we've be using in education over and over again, that you help us rethink the strategies of testing and punishing and try to accentuate the capacities of students, because that's what we need. We need to look at freedom schools. We need to look at that example that they set for those communities to really empower our communities.

And so that's all I was here for, just to urge the Commission to be more critically minded about the urban reform, to not -- to not use the same strategies over and over again that we've done, something more place-based, something more
empowering, something more specifically tailored to
the communities, and we redefine success in ways
that are more political, and not just mathematics
and science, but more specific. So that's all.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Spell your name.

MR. ALEX CUENZA: Sure. Alex, and the
last name is C-U-E-N as in Nancy Z-A.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Would you explain
freedom schools are.

MR. ALEX CUENZA: Freedom schools are
operated in the South and they were concentrated in
African American communities who taught African
American schools, African American communities that
were teaching African American children. So those
communities examples of what we need. We need more
teachers from the communities. We need to create
pipelines, we need to push education, higher
education, myself included, St. Louis University, to
create pipe lines between communities and schools so
they would return teachers back to communities and
empower the communities from the people who are from
those communities.

That's what I hope -- these are the
kinds of reforms that we're looking at, that they're
outside of the box, that's really thinking or just
doing the same thing that we've always been doing,
but more -- something more strategic, something more
critical, something that's just different.

(Applause.)

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: And Linda Laferriere. Laferriere. And after Linda, it's Ricky Jackson. Please also spell your name out for our transcriptionist. We definitely want to make sure we acknowledge all of your comments and suggestions.

MS. LINDA LAFERRIERE: Hi. My name is Linda Laferriere, and that's spelled L-A-F as in frank, E-R-R-I-E-R-E.

What I'd like to speak about is I'd like to bring together two of the focus groups and address child well-being, as well as law enforcement community relationships.

What I would like to propose -- and this is way out of my comfort zone to stand here and talk in a mike, so forgive me if I lose my train of thought -- but I would like to suggest a -- a police education and -- gosh, what is it called -- training kind of strategy that where the police would first be working in community service roles, like the DARE officer in the schools, before they're ever out
working a beat and facing more dangerous situations. By doing this, they would be building relationships with the community that they will be later serving, and I think that with stronger relationships we have a better chance of fairer policing, and that's my comment.

Thank you.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Thank you, Linda.

(Applause.)

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: After Ricky Jackson, we will have Dan Hyatt. And after Dan Hyatt, we will have Jim Roos -- Roos.

MR. JIM ROOS: Ricky and I would like to speak together. Is that okay?


THE COURT REPORTER: Please have them identify themselves please.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Please spell out your name and identify yourself.

MR. RICKY JACKSON: My name is Ricky Jackson. R-I-C-K-Y and J-A-C-K-S-O-N. It's always scary that you get up here and misspell your own name.

But Jim has a whole lot to say, I have a very little to say. But I do want to say this, as
I drove in, I made this up on the way in. I said, the police should protect and serve. Ever hear that before? Yeah.

I think the police should live up to their mantra of protecting and serving. Really, they need to get back to that very simple, very simple mantra, protecting and serving. That's what I have to say about that.

MR. JIM ROOS: My name is Jim Roos, R-O-O-S. Ricky and I work for a housing organization called Neighborhood Enterprises and Sanctuary in the Ordinary.

In the -- I think it was in March, the Riverfront Times did an article about our city defenders. They were aware of what was going on with the municipal courts long before Ferguson became a common name.

Neighborhood Enterprises and Sanctuary in the Ordinary are a not-for-profit corporation, have worked in providing decent affordable housing since 1971. The recommendations that we have to the Ferguson Commission are in literature that Ricky brought and that I brought, and we'd like you to get a copy of that before you leave.

The basic thought that we're
recommending structure is in the banner that we put on the wall out in the hallway. I've been invited, not to speak -- I mean not to present, but to come to the economic and equality and opportunity committee meeting on the 6th of May. We've been invited to come to that, so we'll say more about our housing strategy at that time.

Thank you again for considering our ideas.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Thank you so much.

Dan Hyatt.

MR. DAN HYATT: Hi, I'm Dan Hyatt, H-Y-A-T-T. I've been -- since I moved to Missouri five years ago, I quickly became an activist against North County justice, and against the -- the ticket revenue machine of North County, and the complete lack of due process in the courts.

In Jeff City for Senate Bill 5, I listened to the mayors explain how they've not heard anything, it's still business as usual. Former Chief Fitch gets up there and says, don't let the mayors tell you that this is about safety, it's not about safety, it's about revenue, and then he goes into his extensive information about how it's about revenue. The mayors get up there and said we're
doing good things.

So at my work, I ask many, many black women from North County, does your municipality do good things. And they look at me and they say no. These are professional black women.

Then I ask them would any of your neighbors say your municipality does good things, and they laughed and they say hell no, or just no way, or something like that.

Also, I've noticed in the courts, the Municipal Court League, which is not a government organization and has no sanction under the state law, is basically trying to reform themselves. They wouldn't do this before, even though they have a legal obligation under Rule 2 to report corruption and misconduct by other judges, but now that they're under pressure and they might lose all their courts, now they're saying well, let us reform our own house, and I say if they couldn't be trusted before, can we trust them now. I say no, we need drastic change in the municipal court.

With the police and these city councils, it's been a collision, it's been a conspiracy, violates state law, violating tax law because, as Chief Fitch pointed out, many of the
municipalities have in their budget, hey, we're going to increase ticket revenue 15 percent next year. That's actually an illegal tax increase under the Hancock Amendment because, as Chief Fitch said, either the mayors are clairvoyant or they're writing revenue tickets.

And lastly, I live on the cusp of North County and we've noticed that the police in North County have gotten crazy and scary, and such as myself on December 28th I was pulled over by a St. Ann police officer. I had two officers behind my car waiting for the signal to shoot. They're standing there, they were driving up the wrong way on the off-ramp.

My crime was that my front license plate had fallen off on I-70 -- well, prior, but I was on I-70, and instead of endangering the motorists public by pulling over on the freeway in St. Ann, I signalled the officer, let him know that I was pulling over, and I pulled over on the off-ramp as I had always been trained by California Highway Patrol and other agencies, and this officer became enraged, he was a bully. And he was out of control. And I hope that made sense.

Thank you very much.
(Applause.)

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: We have time for two more. We're going to have Forrest Miller. Forrest Miller, and after Forrest Millar, Cierra Frazier.

Again, please state your name and spell out for me. Two minutes.

MR. FORREST MILLAR: My name is Forrest, F-O-R-R-E-S-T, Millar, M-I double L-A-R.

My concern is the declining economy in our region. I have been visiting many cities in the Midwest my whole career, and I have seen cities like Indianapolis and Nashville and Louisville, Atlanta for sure, just absolutely pass us by.

When I was a youngster, I lived down the street here on South Grand and went to Cleveland High School, public school system, was probably one of the best in the country at the time. All the north, south, east, west schools were good. Soldan was good. Beaumont was good. The schools in Riverview was good. Normandy was good. Everything was good. That's all changed.

I'm also concerned that we don't think we're in competition with anybody else. We think we can do what we've always done and get away with it.
1 That's not what the people in Indianapolis are
doing. That's not what the people in Dallas are
doing. That's not what the people in any other city
that we compete with are doing. We are lazy. We
have to look at what they're doing and do some of
those things.

7 I also think that we need to all sit
down and make a new city, and change these
inequities and change the school system, where we
have schools that pay $20,000.00 for a student and
they have the next school district pays six. That
isn't fair. We will not attract businesses to this
community when we have school districts that people
can't afford to live in, and we have other school
districts where they can't get a good education in.

16 So I think the economy of this city
needs to be reinvented. I think we need one police
department like these other cities do. They don't
have to have, you know, however many we have. I
know one instance down near Lakeshore, the Lakeshore
Police, they have one lane of Highway 21, which is
Tesson Ferry road, the rest is patrolled by St.
Louis County. So they were giving tickets on one
lane of the street.

25 Am I done?
Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. TOM UTTERBACK: I got here first to sign up for speaking, and carried the water in, could I just have a few minutes? One more, if you would -- don't mind.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Let Cierra speak first. I'm sorry, if you don't mind Cierra speaking first, then I'll have you speak right after.

Pronounce your name and spell it.


I put my alias down, Cierra Frazier, because I'm paranoid and people always trying to shut me up. So, okay.

But I just want to say I've been a teacher for 15 years, and I've been knowing there was a problem ever since 20 something years ago. I went to a zero hour to try to graduate on time because I had a bad year my senior year. I was kicked out of school a lot for fighting.

When I went into Vashon, it was like oh my God, this is school? Like, what the. And I just don't understand why people want to attack the test
as if these kids when they fill out an application, it's not a test. They have to read the question, they have to answer, just like on a standardized test. They have to read choice. They have to synthesize information.

Okay. That's just to get an application in. If they want to go to school to be a lawyer or something, you know, what are they going to do then. What are we going to say about the -- what's the name of the law test you got to take? I forgot.

UNIDENTIFIED BOARD MEMBER: The Bar.

MS. CRYSTAL WASHINGTON: The bar, or, you know, you know, the teacher's test, just the fireman test. You know, this is ridiculous to sit up here and argue the reason why these schools are failing is because to put this information out here about this -- they get so much money here, they get so much money there, but not include the federal money that they get. You know what I'm saying?

Just try to make the information because people who have jobs want to keep their jobs.

Okay. So, you know, this whole Ferguson situation is because of education. These kids out here, they need to be on the Ferguson
Commission. They need to be able to read that information you all have in front of your name -- in front of your -- you know, your hands or whatever, they need to be able to read it and comprehend it and create solutions.

I could care less about a community school, I care about these kids. Okay. Any time you have a school and the whole school is poverty stricken, nothing is going to come out of that. We need integration. I don't understand why everybody is so afraid to be with the opposite race. I mean, me being in a room full of white people not going to make me less black. I'm still going to be black. It don't matter. You know, people are afraid to be around white people. We got to stay separate and all this. That's just craziness to me.

You know, why. Why would you want to be separate. We sit up here and say people are people, but everybody saying we want to be separate. We need black schools. You know, we need black this and black that.

I believe we need integration and we need to like have apple/oranges all in the same basket. I mean, yeah, you know, we need black teachers, but we need -- all of us need to be with
the people who have been getting educated for
thousands of years, not since slavery 150 years ago.

Okay. So that's just the bottom line
right there. And as far as solutions, I don't
understand in an age of technology why are we still
pulling people over to give them tickets for a
taillight. Can't you put something in the internet
and Google, and it goes to there and send them a
bill. If they don't pay the bill, tax 'em. You
know, that's less government. Okay. Less
government and let our kids be able to be a part of
that government via education.

(Applause.)

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: If you could
please announce yourself and also spell your name.

MR. TOM UTTERBACK: Yes, ma'am. Tom
Utterback, U-T-T-E-R-B-A-C-K, Ava's Grace
Foundation. That's A-V-A apostrophe S, Grace
Foundation. Okay?

Thank you. I'm here on behalf of the
Ava's Grace Foundation. We actually provide
scholarships to children of the incarcerated. Okay.
This year we will give at least two scholarships to
black males, targeted black males on the North Side.
I just moved back to St. Louis after
being gone for 15 years, and the last two months
I've spent up at McClure High, U City High and other
places interviewing the young black men, who very
easily might have been Michael Brown.

Now, it is easier to describe a
problem -- by the way, I'm here because my board has
wanted me to go to a number of these meetings
because we got invited by the -- by the Atlanta
people that contributed the money for these
scholarships we're giving this year on the North
Side, and said design us a program, we want to
impact what's going on in St. Louis on the North
Side.

And we looked around, they found Ava's
Grace, just we like what you do, now you tell us
what we can do because this fellow says I think I
can raise a million bucks if you tell us how you
impact the North Side.

So I've been studying what you folks
are doing, and the reason I do that is because my
background is cultural anthropology, and for 40
some, 48 years I've been designing change projects.
I became an attorney and practiced in St. Louis for
many years.

We all know this, it is always easier
to describe a problem than to figure out how to change it. Well, for 15 years I've lived down in near Eglin Air Force Base in a neighborhood filled with military folks. Colonels. More colonels that you can shake a stick at. Generals everywhere.

General Petraeus took a number of people from the Ranger camp down there and used them over in Iraq and Afghanistan. The interesting thing is that Petraeus required his people -- am I over?

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: A few more minutes.

MR. TOM UTTERBACK: A few more minutes. -- to read five books before they would join his command. Okay. Three of those books had to do with Muslims and a lot of the other things, but two of the books were very interesting.

One was T.E. Lawrence, The 7 Pillars of Wisdom. We've all seen the movie, Lawrence of Arabia, right? How many of you have ever read the book?

Today, right now, The 7 Pillars of Wisdom is the handbook for insurgency. Count on the fact that ISIS has read it. Count on the fact that the US troops over there are using it to understand
what's going on in that part of the world.

The other book that Petraeus required his troops to read was Kim. The book by Rudyard Kipling about the young boy who became a spy because it described the tribal relationship so well.

So what I wanted to do is give you folks -- because I looked at all your website, I looked at all the documents on there, what you were dealing with, here is the five books.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Can you do it in the next 30 seconds?

MR. TOM UTTERBACK: Genocide. Have you read that? If you haven't heard of it, you need to read it.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Right.

MR. TOM UTTERBACK: The book that just came out, Diversity Explosion, How the New Racial Demographics are Reshaping America. That speaks directly to Ferguson because there's -- there's 60 black males for every 100 females in Ferguson, as the book cited in the New York times article on it just this last weekend.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Can you wrap up for us please, sir.

MR. TOM UTTERBACK: Well I can't, so
I'll just quit right now. But the one book you folks have to look at, because of the process of change, Ward Hunt Goodenough wrote the book back in 1962, Cooperation in Change.

If you're serious about designing something that will just change something, that is still the textbook on how you actually implement the process of change. If you haven't read it, your staff needs to read it and they need to have read it yesterday.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: If you want to know what white privilege looks like, that was it right there.

MS. CRYSTAL WASHINGTON: I was up there longer too, and I'm black as they come.

MS. JERRICA FRANKS: Thank you all for your comments and suggestions. Again, we do have a note of this on our website as well, so if you ever need to follow up on anything, or if you missed any information, definitely do that.

I will now have Bethany speak with us.
Thank you.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you very much. Thank you, Jerrica.

This portion of the meeting agenda is focused on our working group updates and proposed next steps. So what you will see -- for the audience, you will see here, I keyed up the presentation, and for the Commission, the identical presentation is here for your viewing -- is updates from Citizen-Law Enforcement Relations, who will have five minutes; Municipal Courts and Government working group, who will have five minutes; Economic Inequity and Opportunity will report out tonight as well; and finally, Child Well-Being and Education Equity will report out.

So in that order, if Commissioners Isom and Packnett will please join me here at the podium, we will begin with our update from Citizen Law Enforcement Relations.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: Good evening. Thank you all for being here.

So we will, to my understanding, be providing a more detailed information in a bit, but the very quick update for us is that we are trying to achieve a change that includes accountability in
policy and that enabled law enforcement agencies to
serve and protect, to a comment that was made
earlier, all citizens, and that that system of
accountability is based on trust, mutual respect,
transparency, cultural competence, and
responsiveness and justice.

MR. ISOM: So the priorities that the
Ferguson Commission voted on and that the working
group is working on are use of force, and we will
talk a little bit about that today in terms of
training, civilian oversight, and anti-bias and
cultural competency, accreditation, accountability,
and community policing, responses to mass
demonstrations, and special prosecution of
specifically officer-involved shootings, and then
officer wellness, which we will also talk about
later today.

So those are the priority areas that we
will be working on in the future and we have more
information on three of those areas in terms of
training when we come back up.

MR. TRUMAN ROBERT CARR: The working
group on municipal courts has been active. We have
another meeting tomorrow at the University of
Missouri St. Louis.
One thing I would state is that if you look at the values that are governing our operations, we're focusing on just governance as manifested by court operations, focusing on restorative justice, judicial independence, fiscal responsibility and transparency.

I call your attention to the tactical approaches. One thing that we think is important is to have a uniform list of rights so that individuals who appear before municipal courts understand number one, court procedures, and number two, what their rights are as they appear before a judge.

We believe in addressing failure to appear charges, looking at ability to pay, and alternative to jail time, which involves establishing alternative community service.

Now one thing we might -- you gave me all this stuff about Senate Bill 5 so I wanted --

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Have at it.

MR. TRUMAN ROBERT CARR: I've been given a little more than five minutes. One thing to think about is that things continue to move in Jefferson City. Just -- when Senate Bill 5 was passed a few weeks ago, the House passed a
substitute for Senate Bill 5, which is somewhat consistent with Senate Bill 5, and I just want to mention a couple of the elements that are included in the House substitute. Many of these are also included in Senate Bill 5.

One thing that we had called in our working group, we had called for enforcing caps on traffic fines. Both Senate Bill 5 and the House Substitute do provide for enforcing traffic caps, caps on revenues generated from traffic stops. The Senate Bill capped it at ten percent. The House Substitute caps it at 20 percent for out state Missouri, and 15 -- excuse me, 15 percent for in state -- for in St. Louis County. There's a difference in that, we're not exactly sure what's going to happen as those two Bills move forward through the various committees.

Another thing is that the -- we have called for alternatives to failure to appear. We want to prohibit warrants for arrests for individual who have simple lie failed to appear, prohibit confinement for individuals simply because they don't have the money to pay for a fine. Those provisions are also included in the House Substitute and in Senate Bill Number 5.
We also called for allowing defendants to present evidence about their financial condition before fines are assessed, and this allows a system to be developed for alternative community service. We believe that's really important and that provision is also included.

We have also called for creating a list of procedural rights in all municipal courts and those procedural elements are included in the House Substitute for Senate Bill 5.

One thing we might also add is that House Bill 5 has been amended somewhat to include some new provisions that were not initially included in Senate Bill 5, and some of these amendments deal with municipal accountability.

It requires municipalities to have a balanced budget. It requires municipalities to have an annual audit and to report those audits. It requires municipalities to retain insurance. It requires municipalities to provide written policies on the safe operation of emergency vehicles.

What we're saying is that the House Substitute Bill has imposed -- would impose a whole series of requirements on municipalities to be what we might call, and this is not an appropriate word,
but analogous to a certified municipality, that they can in fact provide municipal services and to have a revenue base in which to provide those services.

One of the issues that's happened, and I think it's been alluded to earlier this evening, is a number of municipalities have relied on traffic fines as a source of revenue, and as they're allowing sources of revenue, and they do that because they can't provide regular services.

We're saying under the provisions of this bill that would require the municipalities to begin to the address that and report that out to the State.

One thing also the House Bill 5, the Substitute does, is that if a municipality does not comply, if a municipality is in violation, then there could be an election to disincorporate the municipality.

So there's a lot of provisions here. I would caution us to stop and understand that we don't know exactly what's going to happen as the House Substitute and the Senate Bill 5 are worked out in the various committees that are involved in Jefferson City, but we can see there are significant changes, and many of these changes that are
incorporated, in fact a significant number, that those have been recommended by the working group on municipal courts and governance.

So I would encourage you to stay involved, to stay informed, and to watch what happens in Jefferson City, because we really don't know what the ultimate outcome is going to be, but progress is being made, change is in the forefront.

MR. RICH McCLURE: We'll have time for questions at the end of all of it, so hold onto it and we'll come right back.

MR. PATRICK SLY: Thanks. What we have is not fruit. This is a very broad and challenging category to find changes to change this region's economic inequity and give opportunities for the underserved. What we really want to do is achieve economic opportunity and economic mobility, which is defined as one generation after another moving up in the economic cycle. So we're addressing family and community stability, institutions and organizations, and systemic policies and practices.

We've taken this challenge and carved it up into seven different pieces and that's what we're addressing in our work groups. We've only had two work groups so far, but we have another one I
believe next week. So we've carved it up into job
skills and training, employment and income,
transportation, housing, entrepreneurship and small
business growth, health and wellness, and youth
investment. So we have some pretty broad challenges
that we have to take on here.

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: Thank you, Pat.
And although we've only met twice, we've actually
gotten a lot of good work done, and so in order to
do justice to this work, we are putting forth our
best effort in doing our due diligence, which
requires quite a bit of research and gathering
information, looking at next practices, best
practices nationally, so that when we come back to
the Commission with recommendations, and they should
anticipate that we'll have calls of action at our
next Commission meeting around a lot of the research
that we've already done.

And so at our second working group
meeting, we had a presentation from Dr. Keon
Gilbert. And in his present, we focused on social
welfare policies and practices, and what those
disparate impacts have been in our community, and
how it's impacted family community stability, which
is the first area, the first layer of the work that
we're looking at.

So the research shows -- one of the
striking things that we learned is that the research
shows that the benefit of education as it relates to
life expectancy for African American males stops at
12 years of school, as it relates to life
expectancy.

And so we thought well, what does that
mean, 12 years. You have to look at the research.
And when you get in there, what we find is directly
related to the report that came out today, talking
about the gender, the gender unbalance in the City
of Ferguson and how pronounced it is.

So the research says that institutions
for education are perceived by boys when they get to
a certain age of being highly feminine. So they're
not relating to them, we're not educating our boys
into young adulthood, adolescence and young
adulthood in a manner that is useful and helpful to
them.

So it's very important if we're going
to look at ways to provide economic mobility with
increased access to financial assets and housing,
transportation, job skills and entrepreneurials so
they can get on the track with the privilege we have
in our region that we understand what we're missing.
So that was one of the things that was very
important.

The studies also highlighted the
unintended impact of child support policies as it
impacts impoverished and poor communities, so we
have to look at that.

Another thing we talked about and
learned was in-service provision, we are not only
segregated racially and socioeconomically in our
community, but we have race divide and segregation
when it comes to service provision. So we need to
look the at a model to encourage and collaboration
and cooperation across industry sectors -- sectors,
so whether that's health care, education, jobs and
employment, we've got a lot of things going on, but
people just aren't collaborating, so we're wasting
both time and money and we're not getting the
greatest impact and certainly isn't efficient.

So we're having our next working group
meeting, the next working group meeting will focus
on housing. It will be at Friendly Temple
Missionary Baptist Church, that's 5515 Martin Luther
King, so we with invite you to join us there on May
20th. We'll be tackling the issue of
transportation. Site to be determined. But we invite you to join us there.

And I would like for the Commissioners to know that we will be bringing a Call to Action for affirmation to our working group and then back to the Commission around child development accounts.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: For this final section of the working group updates, I'm representing the co-chairs Dr. Grayling Tobias and Miss Becky James Hatter, who weren't able to be with us here tonight, but offered the following report out to the Commissioners and to the community.

And Reverend Starsky Wilson, we thank you for joining at this time as well. Perfect timing.

So here the working group update for child well-being and education equity, the desired outcome, very similar to the work that we do to economic inequity, it is a basket of breath within this one working group. So we have actually two desired changes that are defined by the working group, one in child well-being is a reason that ensures that all children -- children is defined here as zero to 25 -- are thriving in their daily lives, and there's three sub bullets of what that
means for this working group and for our community
the way that the community is defining it. Growing
and developing to their full potential, retaining
the ability to be children, and preparing to become
fully -- fulfilled and contributing adults.

As defined by education equity,

education equity here, the desired change is
securing educational achievement, fairness and
opportunities for youth, and there are specific ways
to do so. One, setting high expectations; two,
recognizing unique differences and developmental
stages. Number three, to advance outcome based
approaches. Four, aligning and coordinating
customized services, and five, producing college
ready and career ready students.

So to get to this desired change, on
the next slide there's very tactical areas of
approach that this working group has identified and
prioritized for their work coming through the
summer. Number one, school district and school
accreditation is a key area for their recommendation
generation. Second, food instability. Third,
public education funding. Fourth, college access
and affordability is a critical area. Fifth, human
capital in education. Sixth, social service
coordination with schools. Seventh is caring adults
as defined by our community, mentors, coaches, and
others. Early childhood education, parent education
and engagement, and childhood health.

So at this time in terms of our
process, these have been the working group updates
and first, we're going to allow for Commissioners to
ask questions and then ask the community if they
have additional questions on our updates. I'll turn
this over to Rich at this time.

MR. RICH McClURE: Okay. So why don't
we see, first of all, if there are questions from
the audience here on any of the working group
updates. We'll see if any of the Commissioners have
questions and then we'll turn to a couple of cross
cutting action recommendation.

Mr. Hyatt.

MR. DAN HYATT: Thank you.

MR. RICH McClURE: Is there a
microphone we can just hand to him? Just stay where
you are.

MR. DAN HYATT: Okay.

MR. RICH McClURE: This is microphone
six, guys.

MR. DAN HYATT: The question -- I
believe the underlying problem is the relationship of the municipal courts with municipalities courts --

(Sound system failure.)

MR. RICH McClURE: Wow. Something happened.

MR. DAY HYATT: Is it something I said? On the municipal courts, I believe their relationship with the city has created the whole crisis because they're so close to the city that they don't supervise the city, they don't supervise the police because they're not independent. Was there anything on the municipal court workshop where they were going to address that, I call it nepotic relationship with the city.

MR. RICH McClURE: T.R. there's a mike behind you. The question is is the working group looking at the relationship between the municipal courts and the cities.

MR. TRUMAN ROBERT CARR: The answer is yes, we're looking at -- we want to achieve a system where we believe a value is autotomy of the municipal courts within the governmental system such that judges are not going to be taking directions from mayors and city council members to generate
revenue. That's been a problem in the past and that's a concern that we have.

I know the House Substitute Bill deals with judicial appointments, it deals with the roles of judges, and other legal officials in municipalities so that is an issue of concern.

MR. RICH McClure: Thank you. A couple of questions back here.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Yes, I have two questions. One is whatever happened to -- I remember when I was young, you would -- if you got a ticket and you got pulled over again, you wouldn't get that same ticket again. You would show the police officer the ticket, and they would give you time to, I don't know whether you guys thought about that or included that in your solutions.

And then also, I didn't see anything to do with towing. I mean, I know we stop locking people up for the warrants, then that would kill what the police officers -- they are getting kickbacks from towing. Okay. You remember what happened to the chief that got fired or whatever, that's still going on.

So we do all this and we don't include towing, the police still are going, when they pull
you over, tow your car, and it's nothing you can do about it. So we really need to try to get somebody amend and put something to do with towing in there. They need to quit towing people -- poor people car. They don't have two or three hundred dollars to get their car out of tow.

MR. RICH McCLURE: So two questions, the repeat offense, the duplicate ticketing, and the second on towing.

MR. TRUMAN ROBERT CARR: One thing we might say, the issue of duplicate ticketing is -- may be a product of the fact that we have 61 different police departments in St. Louis County, so there's no guarantee that if you get ticketed by one municipality, one police department, and you MOVE into another municipality, that they will not ticket you for the same offense because it's a different police department. So that's one of the issues that we're trying to grapple with. When you have that many police departments and that many police departments that are -- that many municipalities that are sometimes seeking revenue from traffic tickets, that's an issue. That's something that they're looking at and trying to find a mechanism to resolve. It's very complex, but we do hope to
resolve that because not appropriate -- we believe,  
I believe that law enforcement, traffic enforcement  
to be for public safety, not for revenue generation,  
and that's a value that we hope to instill.  

One thing I did not mention, probably  
because I couldn't read, it's too dark there, is  
that one of the amendments to the House Substitute  
for Senate Bill 5 would require that municipalities  
to either employ or to contract with an accredited  
law enforcement agency. We have a lot of  
municipalities, a lot of municipal police  
departments that are not accredited and some are  
accredited by CALEA, the Commission on Accreditation  
of Law Enforcement. There are mechanisms to allow  
us to insure the quality of law enforcement, such  
that we're not trying to deal with generating  
revenue from traffic stops. The last thing that  
really -- that we need in a region is for people to  
be stopped and think that we're simply trying to get  
their money, not for public safety.  

   UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Also, for  
suspended licenses too, I forgot to say that. My  
daughter got her license suspended in every  
municipality in St. Louis --  

   MR. RICH McClure: One thing, Miss
Washington, I think you raised two really good points from my limited understanding of the Substitute for Senate Bill 5. One of the things we might do for tomorrow's working group meeting is we'll ask our research team to look at this duplicate ticketing question. I don't think the Bill addresses it, but there are some limitations on fines and how much you can pile up a fine, and so it could be that that provision gets at that question.

Towing, as far as I know, is still a remedy available to a municipality or a police department, and I think you raised a good point that needs to be put into the discussion.

Yes, ma'am.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: On the education equity part, tactical approach, is there anywhere were you all are looking at school board members and how they are held accountable for what's happening in our school since like -- like charter schools, we have no say as parents who's on our board. They're not elected or anything. They're there, and when issues are brought to schools boards, where is the accountability for the discipline that's happening in the schools and all the issues that are being bought to -- brought to school boards. Is that
going to be included in this tactical approach?

MR. RICH McClure: So Becky and

Grayling aren't here, but, Monique, perhaps you can
help with this. The last working group meeting on
child well being and educational inequity, was there
a discussion of governance by any human capital
working group?

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: It was one --
there has been discussions specifically about
administration. I know specifically we've been
calling out SB1 and HB42, which kind of starts to
address some of the governance issues. It's coming
up the pipeline, but it hasn't been confirmed what
we're going to be doing.

MR. RICH McClure: In the back, yes,
ma'am. We'll have time for one more after this one,
and then we'll see if Commissioners have any
questions before we move on.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: So my question,
or maybe it's more of a concern, is that in the
education equity arm, much of that has been tried
before, and so similar to the municipal court
reform, which really wouldn't have been -- we
couldn't have dreamed it, we might have talked about
it behind a closed door, but it wasn't possible. I
really urge the Commission to look at things that are innovative that haven't been done before that don't concentrate poverty. Because many of these tactics that we've tried in our region and they haven't met our needs in terms of having a truly public and equitable education. So I would urge them to think big, as we did with municipal court reform.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Yeah. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. RICH McCLURE: Okay, one more over here. Mr. Jackson.

MR. RICKY JACKSON: I just want to kind of piggyback on what she just said about being innovative. I think the silliness of 61 municipalities really needs to be looked at. Seriously. I mean, you're never going to get 61 municipalities do anything in a -- in a --

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Make money.

MR. RICKY JACKSON: Yeah, but make money, that's true. But I really think, as a Commission, I don't know how --

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: It's criminal.

MR. RICKY JACKSON: -- how important you guys are or how -- how much impact a Commission
is going to make, but as a Commission, if you say to
whoever you're going to speak it to, let's get rid
of all these municipalities, let's get one big city,
let's get one policy about policing and about
fairness, and all these other words you guys are
using are great, but they're just words. You know,
action is what's needed and some serious innovative
stuff that hasn't been done before. St. Louis
hasn't never had one city -- one big city and it
needs to be tried, in my opinion.

    MR. RICH McClure: Thank you for those
two comments and those two areas of encouragement.
One quick comment and we'll see if we have questions
from the Commissioners. The standards that
Commissioner Carr mentioned that were added to the
legislation and the revenue limitation on fines, it
remains to be seen how far those get through the
process and what impact they have on just the issue
you raised, the question of consolidation in a
number of municipalities, but it is a much more
vigorous debate now than it was when the Commission
started work, and for that we're grateful, but still
remains to be seen.

    Thank you, Mr. Jackson.
of the working group chairs?

Mr. Gore.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: I have a question for you, Monique, since neither of the chairs from the education group are here. I was just wondering whether in the educational working group meeting whether there's been any discussion, I think a couple of months ago there was an article in the Post Dispatch about the -- the disparity St. Louis was I think the number one ranked school system in terms of the disparity, the racial disparity in school suspensions, and I was just wondering is that something that's being addressed in the working group at all?

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: Yes. Yes.

No, it's a great question, Commissioner Gore, and the subgroup that manages that is the group that looks at social service coordination with schools, and so one of the working group members, Mr. Carron, he's the one that kind of has been sponsoring that and pushing for that, so when we think about child well-being and talk about that, you know, he's about making sure that their potential is fulfilled.

One thing he talked about is figuring
out those two things. One, thinking about the root
causes of that. The root causes of that as it was
related to that subgroup had to do with looking at
how we are coordinating services and social services
for the students so as they come back into their
environment they're not necessarily stigmatized or
called out as that one particular student.

So they are approaching it, figuring
out how we can embed certain social services in the
school, to manage how to deal with students behavior
as an alternative to just kicking out and
suspending, so that's how they're looking at it
right now, but it's something that's in flux, but it
definitely came out two meetings ago directly
addressing that. So right now that is being
addressed as a solution for social service
coordination when they return.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: Okay. I just
think it's an issue that would be important to be
looked at as a stand alone issue because there was a
national survey where we were highly ranked in a bad
way.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Any other questions

from Commissioners?
MR. RICH MCCLURE: Okay. Bethany.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you for the Commissioners feedback and thank you to the community for your questions and for your comments and for your hand claps as well, that affirms input that we need in order to meet our charge.

What you're going to look at next, both community and to Commissioners, is the proposed next steps that is needed for the working group. I'd just like to remind us all, center us on the next line, if you will, of the charge of the Commission convened on November 18th, and specifically the Commission is charged to collect data and research around these specific areas, even more than that, to think of implementation around these recommendations, and specifically, in this public call we are required to deliver a report to the community as well as the Governor's office by September 15th of 2015.

Within this charge are the working group standard operating principles. Just to remind us all to the co-chairs and to each of the Commissioners, we agreed in our very early meetings.
that these would be our operating principles.

Number one, that we honor community expertise, in addition to the academic expertise, and youth perspective that we've heard numerous times in our work.

Number two, to look beyond what is today to create a model for what can be, which is what your feedback is tonight, this evening.

Number three, that we have existing data that we don't need to go reinvent the wheel, we can leverage existing data to look at evidence based practices and recommendations.

Four, we understand the principles of equity and justice to be the center of the work that we design and develop.

Five, prioritizing action with a sense of urgency.

And six is an additional component that tonight we will be asking for affirmation from the Commission, intentional application of the racial equity lenses.

Rich, at this point did you want to jump in on point number six?

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Good evening.

Again, my apologies for my delay, but I fly both
commercial and coach, so I don't have the
opportunity to make those decisions.

But one of the things that we've talked
about since very early on, talked about the
affirmation of justice and equity in our work.
There are tactical and very clear ways that we can
do this work, and one of the things we also
discussed was modeling for the community ways that
we might move forward.

Perhaps we need no more reminder than
our time lines and twitter feeds right now the state
of emergency that has been called in the state of
Maryland and the recognition that while we discuss
municipal courts, and while we discuss child equity,
while we discuss educational equity and economic
inequality, we recognize that the core of why we are
here and the spirit of the underlying sin, if you
will, I will use that terminology, that we're
dealing with is one of race and racism.

So if in our work we do not model an
approach to public policy and recommendations that
does not get at the racial disparity that comes
through public policy and laws, then we are not
really doing our work.

So the next recommendation that we have
here that we're asking that we make an official part
of our work, for those of you who have been in our
meeting before, know that we've discussed that but
we're asking for affirmative vote from the
Commission, and that is simply --

(Sound system failure.)

REVEREND STARRY WILSON: -- inequity
and reconciliation, we ask working groups to, quote,
intentionally apply a racial equity lens to the work
by asking the following two questions.
First, who does this recommendation
benefit. Second: Does this recommendation
differentially impact racial and ethnic groups.
What this is very simply is the
application of a racial equity lens to public
policy. It is something that we will do for all
comprehensive recommendations that come at the end
following this affirmation, but as we talk about
next steps --

(Sound system failure.)

MR. REVEREND STARRY WILSON: I'm just
going to use my preacher voice.

As we discuss next steps, we want to
make sure that this is something that's being
considered in the work right now.
So with that, on this recommendation which would apply A) to the work that's going on in working groups right now, B) to the final recommendations, which isn't noted here but I want to note it for the record, would apply to all recommendations that are in the comprehensive report due September 15th.

So I'm going to ask if there are any questions from Commissioners about this first -- (No response.)

REVEREND STARSky WILSON: Any questions from the public on this point? Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: My main question has to do with the --


UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: -- the racism component. I went to a conference over the weekend, Dr. Frances Welsing, a very noted psychiatrist, gave the presentation, and one of the issues that was really brought out focused clearly and squarely on racism and white supremacy.

When we dismantle this and the difficult conversation it is, we have to be open for that, because racism is a system. It is a system focusing around economics, around education,
politics, entertainment, and a total of 12 different components. If we're going do dismantle this, we have to first look at the core root of it, and then have open conversation.

One thing that really stuck out in my mind that she brought out, and by no way can I even begin to address it with the depth that she does, but that a lot of people who are white were asking her what they can do. They said well, I have a white friend, isn't that enough, or those issues. She said well, you don't have to have -- just when you note someone who is demonstrating racist behavior, step in there and do something, don't just be quiet.

See, that's the problem. Everybody wants to be quiet. Let somebody else handle it. We have to take responsibility to set forth a new paradigm and that paradigm means open conversation and understanding that racism is a system that has to be dismantled, and I don't know how much depth the Commission is addressing that, but it's certainly something we need to look into.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: So with appreciation for your statement, I totally agree with the critical aspects of what you're saying.
That's one of the reasons why we committed the last couple of our meetings to this discussion of really kind of setting some basic definitions for the differences between equity, equality, diversity, inclusion and equity, and we'll continue that exploration of individual Commissioners and as a Commission broadly. But the relational aspect we recognize we have some limitation on. So we will continue to encourage people and invite the community to equip and support organizations who are doing the kind of relational work that's required and we have several of them in the community and even in the room.

We also note that while the relational work is happening, there are tactical things that can be done and strategic things that can be done as relates to policy. This is -- this is something that could be done, quite frankly, in any policy setting, any city council, any county council, any legislative body, can ask these two questions before they make a policy recommendation.

And what we're seeking to do, quite frankly, is to make sure we're holding ourselves accountable to the systemic elements you're talking about. Systems are created by policies, so we're...
making policy recommendations, so we want to make
sure we run these things through this kind of lens
so we can approach this while the relation work
continues to happen.

Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Yes. In 2014,
the Department of Justice, United States Department
of Justice, along with the National Academy of
Sciences, came forward with a 440 page study that
addresses exactly what you are talking about, the
single policy that has impacted African Americans
more than anything else. I hope you folks have read
this.

Now, the growth of incarceration in the
United States, if you've seen that report, and --
good, I'm glad you're shaking your head.

This report addresses those issues in
great depth on how in fact the war on drugs -- and
this is the Department of Justice -- has been a war
on black males and all the resultant impacts in the
communities.

I would urge everyone on this
Commission to read that report. This report has
caused such people as Neut Gingrich and Cory Booker,
and the Koch Brothers, and liberals on the left, to
form organizations to free some of the 2.2 million people in prisons, bring them back to the community, okay, and stop the mass incarceration.

So I'm glad you shook your head on that. I think that is the single most important document this group could look at.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Okay.

Appreciating that.

One of the things we also wanted to note as we talk about this particular thing, this is not just -- we don't want to isolate here, this is cross cutting. So when Commissioner Gore asked about disproportionate suspensions for students, that those talk about that as a school and prison pipeline, if you apply racial equity lens to your policy as it relates to behavior in the classroom, then you don't end up in that kind of situation -- you don't end up in that system. So this is something we're going to do across the board as well. I just wanted --

Maybe two more questions.

Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: I was glad to hear you talk about the racial equity lens. One of the things that, among many things that we're doing
in Ferguson, we have a race relations reading group
in the library, and it has been wonderful. We
have -- it's kind of even, maybe about 30 people,
even black and white people, and we sit down and we
have honest, courageous -- it gets a little
uncomfortable, but we all have agreed this is a
setting to really talk about race, and we -- because
all of us, you know, are residents of Ferguson, we
want to move the community forward, but it has been
so helpful.

And that's what we do, we put on the
racial lens through the reading of various books.
Like we're reading The Invisible Man for next month,
and we read the New Jim Crow, so many interesting
books. But it is really helping us residents in
Ferguson to really just discuss and put on our
racial lens and just be honest and courageous, it is
helping us, it is helping us form relationships,
come together to move our community forward.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Thank you for
doing that. That's the important relational work
that has to continue to happen.

Last question here.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: All right.

First, I'd like to thank you for enlarging to this
sixth point about racism. I also was at the
conference Mr. Williams mentioned. Is there any
possibility that Dr. Frances Welsing could possibly
be a consultant? She is no renown and at 80 years
old, she's done a lot of work and she's written a
lot of books and done a lot of public speaking. Is
there any way at her level, which most people don't
have, with such elegance, that she could possibly
have some input? Thank you.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: You and I
have had some conversations in the past about the
requirements for engaging consultants, and so we
recognize the relative constraints that we have. We
are informed by the work of more than 70 experts who
are committing their time. We would invite, or
course, anyone who desires to provide that kind of
voluntary support to provide it, but within the
constraints that we have. I don't know that we can
make that happen in under a few months, at which
time we'll be needing to put out a report, to quite
frankly honest. But we are seeking to take in as
much information as we can.

I do want to make sure we clarify, we
can be clear about the two lanes of work. There is
relational work around reconciliation that needs to
done. Reconciliation is something that in many ways
is social. For some of us spiritual. But it is
also something that is structural. When we talk
about social disparities among people, this is
structural, meaning it is impacted by policy.

What we're discussing here is the
application of this lens and a question before
policy is made. So we want to make sure we talk
about -- it's important for us to do the relational
work, but this is about saying before I pass this
law, in our case before we make this recommendation,
we're going to ask how does it impact black people
versus white people versus Hispanic people. And
that's a critical element.

So I think this is a point of
education, because we're used to dialoging, we're
not used to asking the Ferguson City Council how is
this piece of legislation, this ordinance, going to
disproportionately impact black people. That's the
question. That's what this lens is about.

I know a couple of Commissioners have
questions now.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: Forgive me
for not thinking of this during our portion, but I
think perhaps there needs to be an amendment to add
a third question because as much as we interrogate
the recommendations and proposals that are there, we
also need to be interrogating what's missing. So
I'm wondering at what point, either -- both looking
at individual recommendation and comprehensively to
the point that I think has been made by several
members of the public, as well as Commission Gore,
this third question around which inequities are not
being addressed, which communities are not -- which
communities are not being addressed and making sure
that we're looking at what's not there, just as much
as we are looking at what is there, and how it
affects people disproportionately.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: So would you
accept -- so we're talking about asking the question
intentionally and the application to the work and to
the recommendations, which inequities or which
communities? I'm trying to figure out how you would
frame that question to say that we are -- just
because we're asking --

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: I may give
the wrong answer. Simply because this point about
disproportionate suspensions, right, is something
that that third question would get to in the
education and child well-being working group, and
that is about a particular inequity, and it is also
about a particular community, right, but I think
when we ask the question about a particular
community then we might have issues of language
barriers and things like that come up, where it
might not come up if we're talking about a specific
inequity. I don't know if that example made sense.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Okay. So is
this an acceptable read? The third question would
be, and perhaps the Commission will want to write
this down if it's appropriate since we're asking you
to add, the first question who does this
recommendation benefit; the second question is does
this recommendation differentially impact racial and
ethnic groups; the third question is which
inequities and/or communities are not being
addressed with this recommendation or policy.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: Yes.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: If we were
being all parliamentary, I would say I accept that
as a friendly amendment.

MR. RICH McCLURE: I would so move with
the amended question.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: So move with
the amended question. So -- so the recommendation
has been -- has been moved, is there a second?

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: I've got a mike.

Second.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Okay.

Second. With the friendly amendment, so we just have a little discussion at this time. Commission Pulliam.

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: Just to be clear for the record, when we ask the second question, does this recommendation differentially impact racial and ethnic groups, community has to understand that sometimes the answer to that question will be yes.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Yes.

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: The work coming out of the economic inequity and opportunity working group is specifically designed to address the disparities that have our region at number 42 in terms of economic mobility when we want to be in the top ten. So don't anticipate that this will always be a neutral answer, sometimes it will answer to the affirmative based on the work.

So I just want that in the record. We don't want to hear that raised, you know, that discrimination thing.
Anyway, and the other thing is when you look at this and think about this equity lens, this work is happening around the globe and it is happening nationally. What is most similar to this is called compassionate community. There are entire cities where their boards of aldermen have adopted this lens to say as a compassionate community, are we recognizing, understanding, and questioning our work to see how it impacts our community at every level.

So what — what our co-chair is asking you to do is something that’s in line with progressive communities, and if you want to know more about it and what it might look at, go to compassionate community.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Thank you for mentioning that. We also note that the Interfaith Partnership is leading some compassionate city conversations in the St. Louis Region right now. So that’s another local resource for that.

Any other questions from commissioners?

(No response.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Seeing none, I'll invite all Commissioners to act. All those in favor of the amended —
I'll take one question. Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: The third question being proposed by this friendly amendment is more of a combination of both questions, because they can be -- that question can be asked using both of these questions. The question that needs to be raised is that can we do this one in a -- with the lens, as in the effect of comprehensively digging to the root within the working groups that we have sustained right now.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Got it. So you make a good point. So a couple of things -- a couple of good things, so we should note that, and I will take this action.

So we got some additional support. So this is a policy by policy, a recommendation -- I should say recommendation by recommendation, and we recognize that -- that while we'll have a orientation for root causes and we'll enter some conversations about how we can get some support to map those things. That will happen in each of the buckets, and we recognize that they're intersection.

What we're saying is here is that we won't say anything that we've not assessed on a particular recommendation. I do -- I see what you
mean about the third one kind of getting at a couple
of the others. I think what you're talking about
though is a separate conversation about root causes.
We do have a commitment and a standard operating
procedure about assessing those root causes, not
just looking at what is but also projecting towards
what can be. We invite more conversation about how
we can effectively do that. But I think what we're
suggesting is these things, we want to make sure we
apply this across the board and that each group is
given some attention to the fact that they're
intersections, the work groups are not silenced
[sic] that way. Okay.

Good deal. Commissioners, all those in
favor of the recommendation as amended, please note
by saying aye.

(Board members aye.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Any opposed?

Nay? Abstentions?

(No response.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Thank you

very much.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Thank you very much.

We're going to do a few process slides here and
we're going to ask the Commission to look at our
timeline and our process and formally adopt that so
that our working groups have a timeline instruction.

You all saw this in draft late lass
week and have had a chance to think about it
perhaps, and see if you have any questions. I'm
going to get out of the way of the slide of the
community and let you reinforce the notion that we
do look at policies, systems, practices and
individuals to build on the earlier discussion as
part of the work group final product.

This is our process that we have been
following that many of you have observed that have
been to a number of meetings and have been in our
working groups, flowing from community input,
through the working groups, subject matter input,
back to the community for input, and Commission
approval, then calls for action and implementation.

So this is a flow chart of the
processes that we have been following. This is the
timeline, Commissioners, that we're asking you to
adopt, and that is that we've been in this April/May
timeframe of developing urgent calls for action and
other recommendations, using the month of June to
prioritize and finalize those models, across working
groups, but realizing that we would like your
recommendations finalized, if at all possible, by
June the 1st, and then we use to use June to
prioritize those recommendations, sort them across
working groups, make sure that we have applied the
lenses which we just talked about, and process them
thoughtfully with the community review, as well as
working group review, and then use July/August for
the finalization of our reports.

So this ambitious timeframe and working
group effort is important in order for us to
complete our work on time, as well as to keep the
calls to action in front of us.

So I would invite any questions or
comments from the Commission on this timeframe,
realizing that our working groups have meetings
already scheduled and others to be scheduled.

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCLURE: Questions or
comments?

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCLURE: Okay. This is our
process and this is our commitment to work together
to reach this. I need a motion and a second.

Ahlbrand makes the motion. Miss
Windmiller the second.
Any further discussion?

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCCLURE: Okay. All in favor please say aye.

(Board members say aye.)

MR. RICH McCCLURE: And opposed?

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCCLURE: Okay. This is our timeline. So we're now going to do a deeper dive into three particular calls for action that are on the table for this evening. I believe first we're going to start with Citizen-Law Enforcement Relations and -- I'm sorry, we're going to start Child Well-being first and Bethany is going to fill in our co-chairs there.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Again, standing in proxy for the co-chairs unable to be here tonight for Child Well-Being, and I'd like to direct your attention here to the screen. One of the specific immediate calls for action that's coming from the Child Well-Being and Education Equity working group is here before us tonight for Commission discussion.

This working group would like to launch a regional Call to Action, thinking about the
summertime, which basically is upon us, to coordinate 30 new summer feeding programs in the North County area, specifically so on your left you'll see that as I talked about earlier one of their very specific areas that they want to begin to implement now is around food insecurity.

The specific Call to Action and looking for is to able to build a framework for coordinating summer food programs and the accountable body that they'd like to target to work with and to inquire of the regional food banks and capacity building organizations.

Just a little background research that is provided about food insecurity. Let me just ask a show of hands to those in our audience how many are aware of this issue of food insecurity already.

(Showing of hands.)

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: And Commissioners as well.

(Showing of hands.)

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Very well aware of that.

So I'll make this very quick. We understand that nutrition is a very important element for child development, and so this is one of
the key strategies that they feel undergirds their work moving forward.

This there is data that says 26.64 percent of the population in the St. Louis City and St. Louis County are considered food insecure. This amounts to roughly 243,000 individuals.

So with this Call to Action, this is the thought of the Child Well-Being working group to want affirm the working groups ability to move forward to implement this over the summer.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Questions.

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCLURE: As I listen to discussion, I know this was driven in part by the fact that such a substantial part of the population in these areas are free and reduced school lunch, and so when school is out, this becomes a more significant issue.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: This is a question more for Monique. Thinking about denoting that several of the current summer feeding programs are actually coordinated by the cities, was there a conversation about making the accountable bodies, the cities, the county, or county-related funds or departments that may need to fund organizations to
do this work.

MS. MONIQUE THOMAS: They have been --
they have been named, and so how Commissioner
James-Hatter and her working group have been
operationalizing this, they've been taking on each
level so they have public policy recommendations,
institutional systems, organizational practices, and
then individual contributions, and so they did mean
especially the one we're looking at, policy
recommendation, they called out those bodies.

For this one in particular, I think
there's an opportunity to add one because they
didn't park a conversation, but right now it was
broad, it regional food banks and broadly noted
capacity building organizations. But I think
there's an opportunity to add, and I think -- I mean
I would assume that -- excuse me -- that
Commissioners would be amenable to it, if you did
want to make an amendment.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: I would offer
an amendment to add the departments, particularly if
you're talking about the North County area, to add
the St. Louis -- the St. Louis County and its
relative departments. That may be human services,
that may be help in those municipalities to have
capacity and responsibility for young people in
their respective communities as well. So I would
add those --

MR. RICH McClure: Under accountable
bodies, St. Louis County and Municipalities.

Reverend Starsky Wilson: Yes.

Ms. Brittany N. Packnett: What

conversation occurred around coordination with
schools? Here is why I ask, so given that a number
of parents and guardians actually are inspired to
enroll this children in enrich -- in summer school
for enrichment simply because this is free breakfast
and lunch, what is the conversation about insuring
that if a summer food program is now available that
that doesn't adversely affect due to -- would they
choose not to enroll in summer enrichment programs
at schools because they can get the food elsewhere?

So how has that been discussed?

Ms. Monique Thomas: So when we look at
regional food banks, and maybe this is improperly
represented, but that was inclusive of those school
programs. Now based on the conversation they've
had, because what we've done is, and this is for
everyone's understanding, is that so their
conversations that happened in the working group,
but there also conversations that we have champions, specifically I'm calling out Dr. Katie Frack, who goes ahead and starts to design and build some of which I'm seeing some of the context. But I don't know if they've addressed unintended consequence, but I do know that schools are considered in naming food banks. I'm not sure there needs to be an amendment.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Ms. Packnett, would you like to add schools to this coordination occurrence --

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: Yes, I think that would be good.

MR. RICH McCLURE: All right. So we have three additional accountable bodies to add here. Okay. With those amendments, we need a motion and a second.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: I make a motion.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Mr. Gore moves.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: I second.

MR. RICH McCLURE: Miss Packnett seconds. Additional discussions or questions?

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCLURE: Okay. Hearing none, all those in favor, please say aye.
(Board members respond aye.)

MR. RICH McCLURE:  And opposed.

(No response.)

MR. RICH McCLURE:  Now we're ready for Citizen Law Enforcement Relations Call to Action.

So Commissioner Packnett and Commissioner Isom.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT:  Thank you.

So before we kind of jump into the details of this, I want to provide an overview and narrate what this both is and is not.

So you all heard earlier kind of our pillars or our tactical area that we are paying attention to. What you are about to be walked through is a proposed model for the Commission's consideration that will address training around three of these pillars. Not all of them, just three.

What I also want to name is this operating principle that's been discussed before, but this idea that we are not looking to what currently is, but what can, I will say quite frankly, must be. Right. So obviously the status quo is what got us into this situation in the first place, and if we're really going to seize the opportunity to be a model for other communities,
Baltimore, Cleveland, all of these other places that are dealing with the same issues, then we need to not be limited by what the current status quo is, what we currently afford, what we currently have expertise in, what people currently care about, but actually push passed that and make sure that we are moving forward to what can be.

The other thing to remember is that what we are proposing, again, it only addresses training around three of these elements and it is a base line. I want to be very, very clear, it is a base line.

What we are presenting is a very basic package that we hope will be moved on immediately and taken into immediate action because obviously this issue is of the upmost importance and urgency. But commenting -- actually testifying to the President's task force, we asked the question of several senior law enforcement officers, if you had your ideal in terms of the number of hours, days, weeks, months, you could spend training and retraining and reeducating your officers, in particular around anti-bias and cultural competency, but many, many different tactical pieces, how much time would you spend. And people were naming
amounts of time as high as three and four weeks a year.

So what you see before you is a base line, but we certainly hope that departments will take it upon themselves to actually increase the amount of time that they are spending reeducating officers.

And so the model that we are going to propose this evening calls for a couple of things in an overview. One, it calls for the development of -- no, no, no, the last one.

It calls for a development of core curriculum and mandating tactical officer wellness and anti-bias training each year, and actually increasing the amount of mandatory hours that are currently spent by an additional 24 hours per year, which would total 120 hours in a three-year reporting period.

Again, we recognize that this would require additional funding, trainers or trainers time and resources, but the demand for pushing passed that status quo far outweighs the cost. So that is what we are proposing this evening.

MR. DANIEL ISOM: So the proposed training model is in three different areas as
Brittany indicated. The accountable body will be the peace officer standards and training, the POST Commission.

This would apply to first class counties with a charter form of governance in Missouri. That would be St. Louis City, St. Louis County, St. Charles County, and Jefferson County, and also Jackson County.

As you can see, in the area of tactical training and use of force would be eight hours every year, 24 hours in a three-year period. The same for anti-bias and cultural competency, and also for officer -- officer wellness. Currently, right now POST requires 48 hours in a three-year period.

There is no mandated number of hours every year, so those 48 hours could be taken at the end of that three-year period. Our recommendation would increase that to a total of 120 hours in a three-year period.

In addition to that, we have some specific areas that we wanted to focus on, at least give some direction in terms of what the training should look like. So for the tactical piece, we got input from community members, experts, and also from our working group, and Commission members as well.
The tactical piece is important because we know that these skills need to be practiced. We know that these skills need to be reinforced; and if you don't do that, that they degrade over time.

The importance of practice is it gives the opportunities for officers to make different decisions. It both protects officers and citizens alike. So some of the areas that we think are important, but not comprehensive of the training that should go into tactical training is that officers should be taught to do threat assessments, and specifically dealing with people with behavioral health issues and mental health illness.

This issue of training about time and space, meaning that scenarios in which officers have more time to make decisions, scenarios where officers have the appropriate amount of space between themselves and a person that they're trying to control, issues of cover, verbal command, calling for assistance, and backup element.

In the paper today, Chief Belmer talked about this issue of a second man, and having a two-man car is often very helpful in controlling situations. Well, the same is true for backup. If you're a one-man car and you need assistance, if you
call for backup, the outcomes often times are a lot
better when you have two officers as opposed to one
officer.

Considering tactical retreat and other
tactical elements that might play into controlling a
dangerous situation, and also defensive tactic
skills, and looking at tactical tools, less than
lethal tools that you might use, a Taser, baton, et

cetera.

So the Commission believes that this is
something that police departments and police
officers should do on a yearly basis, and that
recommendation is that police departments would have
eight hours of tactical training a year, and do that
biannually in two four hour segments so they keep
these skills up-to-date and refreshed.

The second proposal also came out of
community involvement. We have many experts in this
field who came to our working group meetings who
gave us very good information about anti-bias
training and learning on cultural competency, and we
also want to make sure, as we talked about earlier,
that this doesn't just focus on race, that we look
at anti-bias in a more broader perspective, race,
gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation or sexual
identification. These are all areas that we need to focus on in terms of this training.

Looking at bias, stereotypes, fair and impartial policing, unbiased behavior responses, and also the implications of bias in terms of hiring, policies, and supervision.

It was recommended that we have eight hours of training in these areas every year as well. There was a recognition that all of us have biases and that we need to work at dismantling these biases and there needs to be constant attention to doing this on a regular basis.

The final area is a recognition that officers have a very difficult job, that they are confronted with very high stress crisis situations and traumatic situations on a daily basis, and that there must be attention to officers well-being as well.

As you might expect that if an officer's mental and physical health is not taken care of, then their professional performance will suffer, and so we believe that paying attention to officer wellness is very important. And these three pieces actually go -- fit together very well. That we must pay attention to issues of stress, PTSD,
addiction, how officers are given the skills, the
techniques to cope with stress, cope with the
difficult situations, promoting employee assistance
programs, recognizing that the stress of the job and
the things that officers have to deal with have
impact on their family and their friends, doing
self-assessments and peer discussions are all
important to officers well-being, but more
importantly to how they perform on the job.

So in the same vein, we recommended
that there be eight hours of training in this area
every year as well.

So these are the three recommendations
that we have, tactical training, anti-bias training,
and also officer wellness training. In each area,
eight hours are a mandated year. 24 hours over a
three-year period for a total of 120 additional
hours for law enforcement over a three-year period.

Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Yes, I do have a
question. Concerning tactical training, is there
any truth to the -- I've heard conflicting stories
about this. If a policeman has to pull a gun, is
there any truth to when he does, does it have to be
fatal. Does he have to shoot to kill. Is that
true?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: So --

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Like no shooting in the leg or the arm and that kind of thing to stop somebody, he has to shoot to kill somebody. Is that true? Is an officer trained to do that?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: So officers are not trained to kill anyone. Officers are trained to stop the threat. In terms of law enforcement training in firearms, they're trained to shoot at center mass.

The reason for that is it's very difficult for anyone, any marksman to be able to shoot someone in the arm or a leg, that's very difficult to accomplish. So they're not trained to shoot to kill, they're trained to stop the threat. But the way they're trained to do that is to shoot toward center mass.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: So there's no -- so -- I'm sorry. So if you're shooting at center mass, that means you're up here, and it's going to be fatal if that what they're trained -- if that's what they're trained to do, right?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: Right. So it is more likely to be fatal. But the comment that I will add
to that is that there is a progression of use of force, at least there should be, and so they're trained to do that when there is a deadly force encounter against them. Okay. So if it's not a deadly force encounter, then they're trained to use some other option, whether it's baton a Taser, it could be hand-to-hand tactics, but that deadly force is only used in situations where there is a deadly force encounter with an officer or they're trying to prevent deadly force from someone they're trying to protect.

And to your point, shooting someone in the leg doesn't mean that they won't die. So I mean I understand what you're saying, but if you get shot, then it's potentially fatal no matter where you get shot. So I'll just add that point as well.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: This is part of the reason why tactical tools and less than lethal tools are listed very specifically in the training standards that we want to have be mandatory through this model, right, because what you are -- what Commissioner Isom is discussing about this kind of scaffold approach, right, that you are not automatically going to your gun, but you are using other tools that are non-lethal first, will require
people being continuously trained on that, whereas right now that's not always happening, so that's one of the reasons we specified that.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: So can I ask, so if you -- if you want to increase the training, how does this help when as a department there's never really any accountability for what's happened? It's always about I was in fear for my life. So if cops get the extra training, what does that do when cops are told or trained to cover their ass so the police department doesn't get in trouble or doesn't look bad?

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: That's why I pointed out at the beginning that this training model only addresses three of the pillars, right? So there are two other pillars, accreditation accountability and policing standards and civilian oversight that go toward what you're talking about, and our next working group is next Monday at 5:00 at UMSL, so please do attend, and we will be going systematically through the rest of those pillars.

There was one -- yes, ma'am.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: And so one comment, I talked to many police officers and it seems like maybe they need to be, a lot of them need
to be retrained because I have talked with police
officers and higher up in the ranks of law
enforcement that have actually told me that they are
trained to shoot to kill. So I'm getting these
conflicting stories, you know, stories.

Also, the three areas, the tactical,
the anti-bias, and the officer wellness, I know what
the recommendations are, what is currently? How
much hours are they currently spending in these
areas?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: So currently, there
is 48 hours required in a three-year period.
Specifically these areas are not required. Other
than anti-bias or cultural competency, there is
three years that are mandated in a three-year period
right now currently out of that 48 hours. But these
specific areas, they are not specifically mandated.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: So none? They're
not fitting any of in those?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: With the exception of
anti-bias and cultural competency. There are three
hours that are required.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: One question
about people that do not speak English, so I know a
situation like in St. Ann, what happens police, a
person doesn't speak English, so a friend of mine,
her husband, he's getting near 80, he's been doing
this a long time, he volunteers at two in the
morning, he goes out and translates into Spanish for
people. That's not cultural competency that you
have a volunteer for over ten years because you
won't hire somebody to be on call to come in. We
cannot have children do these translations either.
You can't have a little kid translating and expect
competency in determining investigations.

So is there anything being looked at at
those who do not speak English -- and they could
also be deaf -- what can you make sure in this
competency that they are going to provide on call if
it's after work hours? That's especially the worst
time. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: I have a request,
Chief Isom. If I were a policeman, and I was on
patrol, and I told somebody to stop and hit the
ground, and they didn't do it, and they reached for
something in their belt area, what would you expect
me to do?

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Were they
murdering someone or was they walking down the
street.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Or if he's black.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: No, it has nothing to do with black or white. Whoever it is, if I'm a policeman, and I say police, stop, please hit the ground, you're under arrest, and they don't do it, they get up, and they go to their belt or their pocket, and they look like they're going to pull something out and shoot and kill me, what am I supposed to do?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: Well, every situation is going to be differ. What we're trying to do here is expose officers through training to different situations, so when they get in those situations they might have other options to make better choices or to make different choices. So every situation will be different and there could be a lot of different elements, but we have to give officers and we have to train officers and give them the tools to make those decisions. Okay. And tactical training is one way that provides officers more options.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Maybe one more from the audience and then I'll see if any of the Commissioners have any.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Commissioner
Isom, so I am clear, I'm a counselor and today I worked with a group of young black males, and one of the things they have asked me -- as a matter of fact it came up today in our group discussion -- is -- and I just want to be clear as to what I just heard you say so that next time they ask me this, I can explain it correctly.

They have asked can policemen rather than shoot the first time to kill, can't they, you know, wound you, or whatever, rather than the first time just shoot to kill. Now you just explained that they are trained to shoot center mass, and are you saying if they have a threat, they're trained to do that the first time if they feel there's a threat.

MR. DANIEL ISOM: No, I didn't say that.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Okay. I need you to explain it so I can explain it to them.

MR. DANIEL ISOM: So let's go back to the first question. Are officers trained to shoot to kill. No. So officers are the not trained to do that. Okay. Are officers trained to shoot at the first threat. No.

So officers are trained to respond to
threats proportionally, right; and so if there is a
deadly force threat against an officer or someone
he's trying to protect, then they're authorized to
use deadly force. Okay.

What we're trying to do here is make
sure that officers have an opportunity to process
that threat in a very tactical way. Okay. And
hopefully, if they're in a good position, it offers
them the opportunity to do different things besides
use deadly force.

So that's what we're trying to do, and
that's a skill that needs to be practiced because
when you're in a high stress situation, you need to
have practiced these skills to make those decisions.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Okay, thank you.

REVEREND STARSky WILSON: Let's see if
the Commissioners have any questions.

MR. BYRON WATSON: Commissioners, I was
just wanting to know in terms of the first class
cities, as we know, a lot of our small
municipalities don't fall into that category of
classes of cities. Mainly the ones that are in that
category are already accredited as we already know.

Is there any future plans or is your
committee looking at possibly including the second
and third class cities, which in my opinion, get no
training close to what the accredited police
departments get.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: It's not first
class cities, it's first class county. First class
counties with a charter form of government. So it
would be every city within St. Louis County.

MR. BYRON WATSON: Good.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: St. Charles
County, Jefferson County, and Jackson County.

MR. DANIEL ISOM: Thank you for that
correction. Thank you.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Any
Commissioners have a question?

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: I would like to
know what is post traumatic growth. I just don't
know what it means, post traumatic growth.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: That's simply the
healing process after -- after experiencing a very
traumatic incident.

MS. FELICIA PULLIAM: Okay, the
therapy. Thank you.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: I want to
make sure we get -- respectfully, I just want to
make sure the Commissioners have the opportunity to
ask questions they need to ask because they're being asked to act on this, so I want to make sure we give them that time to do so and then we'll be able to come back.

Commissioner Gore.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: Is there -- under their officer wellness, would that be where you would consider the pay that officers receive, and whether or not officers are being compensated at a sufficient level, or would that be a different area than I'm looking at here?

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: I mean, so we're talking about training in regards of officer wellness right now.

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: Okay. Is that an issue that the group is going to consider?

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: It hasn't been brought up thus far, but --

MR. GABRIEL E. GORE: Okay.

MR. BYRON WATSON: I just have one last one, Commissioners, I'm sorry. This last one are we going to address the municipalities that I just saw something recently on television that some of these municipalities can't even afford to buy weapons for these officers to actually go out on patrol, they
have to buy their own weapons, they have to buy
their own bullet proof vests? Are there standards
that we're going to be able to look at for these
police departments be able to have in order to call
themselves a police department?

MR. DANIEL ISOM: We actually have
other priority areas, this is just on the training
piece, so the other priority areas we have are
accreditation, accountability, and there was another
area.

MR. BYRON WATSON: Oversight.
MR. DANIEL ISOM: Oversight.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Any other
questions from the Commissioners?

(No response.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: We'll take
one community question. Just take the one. What
was queued up next so we can act and then move?

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: Can I make
an appeal? We understand that this is for a lot of
us what brought us here. I want to acknowledge that
there are lots of thoughts and feelings and really
excellent suggestions that we absolutely want to get
into, that is why we've tried to really prioritize
the working group time in particular.
I understand that everybody can't make
a Monday afternoon, but if on the off weeks of the
Commission meeting, so it's at this same time next
week at the University of Missouri St. Louis, where
we go into the rest of these conversations, to make
sure that we are getting your suggestions and
feedback for what we can be doing to implement a lot
of these things.

So I just want to make sure that if
you're not able to comment today that you might
consider either attending next Monday or on future
working group meeting or submitting your thoughts
on-line.

I don't know who was next.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: The question I
have with regard to officers well-being and I
want -- the question I am often asked, and I have
some family members that are in law enforcement --
is how often are they evaluated as far as the mental
aspect? Because I understand as y'all said, it's an
extremely stressful job, as the way they perceive
danger and their perception of their job and so
forth is how they're going to react to various
situations. So how often are they evaluated on the
mental aspect of the job?
UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: And for substance abuse.

MR. DANIEL ISOM: So every department in terms of officers evaluations, psychological evaluation is going to be different. There are a number of different things that you have to consider when you talk about psychological evaluations. Particular department policy, you have to look at the union contract with police departments. All of that has an impact. So those -- those areas are very specific to each -- each police department.

What we're trying to do here is give some attention to that through training, and allow police officers and police departments to at least make officers aware that these can be issues in terms of their performance and address it on a regular basis, so that if officers are experiencing problems in these areas, the hope is that they will seek out help.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: And unfortunately, you and I both know as a counselor, you and I both know, and as a counselor, I also know that a lot of people who do something for different psychiatric illnesses and stressful situations and so forth, will not reach out. So how -- I'm just
wondering how is that based on, you know, different
police departments, how is that going to be handled?
Because if you can't trust that a person that is
having a stressful situation wants to be stereotyped
in that way and won't come out with it.

MS. BRITTANY N. PACKNETT: And that's
something we hope to explore more in depth beyond
the training you see in this officer wellness focal
area. There's some recommendations that came from
the President's task force that we will be able to
look at and say is this the direction that we want
to move, and also y'all's input in our working group
sessions will be critical to that.

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Good deal.
Thank you very much for your questions and dialogue,
and Commissioners for yours as well. This comes
forth from the working group and our co-chair, so it
would require a motion and a session because it's
coming out of the Committee, if you will, so we just
ask all the Commissioners, you see the
recommendation on the proposed model for Law
Enforcement training standards, all those in favor,
would you please notify by saying aye.

(Board members respond aye.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: All those
opposed nay.

(No response.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: We thank the co-chairs for their work on this particular proposal.

(Applause.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: We now move into an administrative portion of our meeting, so back in the hands of our managing director.

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Thank you. I appreciate all those that continue to stay. It's an important part of our meeting. I'd like to direct your attention to two lines of business. The first one is the Ferguson Commission budget. That will be on the screen momentarily.

For Commissioners, if you look in your packet, you do have the budget that is before you. Okay. So I'd like to direct your attention to the Ferguson Commission financial statements, these are prepared by United Way, who serves as our fiscal agent. These numbers are
current through April 22nd of 2015.

Again, as a reminder to the Commissioners and to the community, this budget reflects what was approved on January 10th of 2015. These financial statements are prepared on a cash basis, which means they do not include any pledged revenue or accounts payable.

To date, as you can see in our revenue lines, we have secured 350 thousand in total revenue, and we are grateful for the support that we've received from regional players, a little over $300,00.00. This brings our total revenue here to $668,957.00.

We anticipate two additional funding streams that have been committed to the Ferguson Commission by the State of Missouri, and those two funding streams together total $775,000.00, which will bring our total revenue to 1.125 million.

Just to be clear, these are black grant funds that will be recorded as revenue at the point in time that they are reimbursed -- that they reimburse the Commission for expenses that we have incurred, and we anticipate these funding streams to be able to come on-line in May.

On the expense side of the budget, it's
broke down so everyone can see. All right. Our expenses currently to date total $191,537, and these are generated from payments in basically three categories. Independent contractors, 42,445, and professional fees, 62,204, operations, 4,504, and a fourth category, sorry, for community engagement that is required to support the Commission, public engagement structure as you've seen tonight, that total is 82,383.

So including in In-kind expenses, our total expenses to date are $510,494. This provides us with a balance currently of $158,462.

So that's the overview. These financial statements can be found as well on our website due to the Sunshine Law as well.

Any questions, Commissioners, on the budget to date?

(No response.)

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Okay. Then as a second report, I'd like to pull up the work plan to give both Commissioners and the public a sense as to at our midway point how the Commission, specifically its staff and independent contractors, plan to work over the next course of the few months. So -- thank you.
As it pulls up, again these documents will be able to be found on-line. We are in the April timeframe and so we've categorized our work in the following buckets.

The official Ferguson Commission meetings like what you're at tonight, working groups that are taking place in our community, the public engagement strategy that we'll be talking about shortly, what transition or translation, implementation will look like. That fourth -- fifth bucket is data and policy analysis which is needed to make sure that we have the evidence base work; and finally, the media and community engagement section.

So what I could use to paint a picture that this at looks at time from April through December.

So in the Ferguson Commission meeting, we will move forward continuing to bring and engage national models into the conversation. In May, we'll be focused on health policy and disparities. In June, again we'll be highlighting these national best practices all the way through the submission of the report to ensure that we have talked to all that we need to and to ensure that our recommendation are
well rounded.

The working groups, they will continue, and I've just affirmed at the Commission level we will ask for each working group to please begin focusing now on models for development based on your recommendations for submission to the staff by or before or close to June 1.

Moving forward from that, we will begin to design those first drafts of the initial report to the Governor's office.

Under the constraints of the Commission, we have to work a backwards plan deadline. If the Commission report is due September 15th, you in essence need to be writing it in June/July to be able to give ample time for community venting. That's the public engagement piece. If anybody is surprised by what we say on September 15th, we have not done our job well. So we need to have plenty of time for feedback like tonight.

(Unidentified person speaks from the back, too softly to be transcribed by the court reporter.)

MS. BETHANY A. JOHNSON-JAVOIS: Translation, translation simply means all this is
for naught if nothing happens after September 15th. So our strategy around translation is to begin now thinking in parallel as to the recommendations are being generated at our working groups to say who owns this work, who monitors this work, who funds this work, who collectively is accountable for this work, and so those answers need to be asked now, to begin to be answered now, so that as part of this report we understand the path forward.

I talked a little bit about data policy and analysis. It's a critical resource that the Commission needs and we are still in the process of engaging those resources. That should be on-line in May, right in time for this critical work.

One thing that's missing that I will add to this as the Commissioners approve this work plan is the need to address the racial equity lens to those recommendations. So we will add that bullet to the June timeframe under data and policy analysis.

And then finally, engagement really is the core of the work that we have done, it's why we keep opening up for questions, it's why we keep extending the time for this type of engagement.
input. So you will continue to see all the way through the course of the Commission's work time for feedback and engagement in the process starting from beginning of the inception through the submission of the report.

Just to clarify as well, you do see October/November timeframe, and so the question is a very good one if you say what happens after September 15th. So some of the funding streams that we have are accountable bodies who need final reports. There will be other engagement. The people will ask lots of questions we'll need to answer. We think about translation after September 15th, that's another activity, and the United Way will need to keep all of the files for Sunshine Law requests for what, five to seven years, I think Danielle, on file, so all of that needs to transition very smoothly prior to the Commission's sunset.

So with that, I present this to the Commissioners for input and also for affirmation so we can put this on our website as well.

Any questions?
(No response.)

REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: We receive
this as an operating update of report that requires
a course of action from the body, but we appreciate
the work that's been done by the staff team, and
also the intentionality about making sure that the
path forward is very transparent for the community.

And so as we prepare to close on
tonight, we do so with earnest thoughts and
conversations what's going on across our country.
We do so with thanks to all of you for the
commitment of your time, your intellect and sharing
on tonight, and for many of you for your continued
engagement throughout the process.

We are becoming perhaps some -- at
least friends in this process, folks that we
continue to see and engage, we illustrate -- we
illustrate that kind of commitment to community.

We thank the Commissioners for your
dedication of time, not just in these spaces, but,
of course, in working groups spaces, and the
realities that this means that you're living much
more public lives than you were before October and
November, and that you have all kind of
recommendations and advice and counsel that you're
getting all over and everywhere you go. So thank
you for allowing people to stop you at Dierbergs and
Schnucks and the mall so they can tell you what you should be doing on the Commission.

We invite all of you as we close on tonight a couple of things we are inclined to do. Number one, we always close with a bit of silence just to center ourselves for the work ahead.

I'll also invite you as to transition on today to connect with someone that you do not know. Just look around the room, there may be somebody still, you may have to look all the way on the other side to find someone that you do not know, just say hello, introduce yourself, thank them for coming out, make a different kind of connection if you would on tonight.

So I'll invite you to stand as we center and prepare to go. I'll invite you in your time, you're not directed at this time, but I'll just offer to you perhaps as you spend this time centering in the silence to send positive thoughts, and if you are so inclined, prayers to our friends who are in Baltimore, who are in Nepal, and who are visited by tragedy, both human and natural throughout our nation and our globe. So I invite you to a moment of centering as we go.

(Moment of silence.)
REVEREND STARSKY WILSON: With thanks to our hosts here at the Y of Greater St. Louis YMCA. We are now adjourned.

Remember, meet somebody.

(WHEREIN, the meeting was concluded at 8:09 PM.)
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