COMMUNITY COMMISSION for PUBLIC SAFETY  and ACCOUNTABILITY
SPECIAL MEETING
August 14, 2024 7:15 p.m. DuSable Museum
740 East 56th Street Chicago, Illinois
PRESENT:
MR. ANTHONY DRIVER, Commission President; MS. REMEL TERRY, Commission Vice President; MS. SANDRA WORTHAM, Commission member;
MS. KELLY PRESLEY, Commission member;
MS. ABIERRE MINOR, Commission member; MR. AARON GOTTLIEB, Commission member; MR. ADAM GROSS, Executive Director.
ALSO PRESENT: MR. DAN HINKEL (Via Zoom);
MR. NORMAN KERR; DR. OTIS MOSS III.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: The August 14th, 2024, 1 Special Meeting of the Community Commission For 2 Public Safety and Accountability is called to 3 order at 7:15 p.m. 4 We will begin by calling the rolls 5 6 to establish a quorum. Commissioner Driver is present. 7 Commissioner Gottlieb. 8 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Present. 9 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Terry. 10 VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Present. 11 12 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor. COMMISSIONER MINOR: Present. 13 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Presley. 14 COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Present. 15 PRESIDENT DRIVER: With all six members of 16 17 the Community Commission of Public Safety and Accountability present, we now have a quorum and 18 can conduct the Commission's business. 19 The next item of business is public 20 If you would like to share something 21 comment. 22 related to the Commission's work on public safety and accountability, you have a few options. You 23

can speak at a public meeting. You can also

submit public comment in writing by emailing your comments to

CommunityCommissionPublicComment@CityofChicago.

org, or you can bring a copy of your comment to

one of the Commission's public meetings and give

it to someone on the Commission or someone on the

Commission staff.

People who want to speak during the public comment period tonight were asked to submit their names in writing. Names will be drawn at random by a member of the Commission staff. Speakers will be called in the order in which their names were drawn. If your name is called to offer public comment, we ask that you approach the microphone and line up in the order in which your name is called. When it is your turn to speak, please say your name and spell your name and offer your comments. Each speaker will have to minutes. We've allotted a total of 20 minutes public comment.

Our first three speakers are Madeline Hicks, Reverend Chris Griffin, and Pastor Leslie Glover.

MS. HICKS: Amen, amen. My name is

Madeline Hicks. I was in a coma and paralyzed for three and a half months. I was thrown through the windshield of a car, but we -- I made it through, yeah. So I went to go celebrate with some friends. Pow, pow, qunshots. I didn't even know I was hit because the young man that fell across my lap, his blood ran down my legs. When I tell y'all -- see, this is not just about, oh, the police, oh, the politicians, the Mayor and all of that. I'm speaking on behalf of my brothers and sisters. What is going on with us, y'all? Well, I'm not gonna say nothing because Ray Ray and them. I'm going to say something. I'm going to say something. See, if my little cousin, he found a gun, Excuse me, officer, he found this gun. I'm going to say something. Or my brother who he think he is hard because he got all these pistols. I'm going to say something. Y'all don't say nothing because you might get hurt. You might get shot. I already been shot. I already been in a coma and paralyzed. Somebody want me here. Come on now, you know that's my Lord and savior, right? So guess what, it got to start with me, yeah. Let it start with me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Because God is trying to tell you something. Let it start with me.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. GRIFFIN: Good evening. My name is
Reverend Chris Griffin. I'm a member of Soul
City Church here in Chicago, and I want to speak
on behalf of the ordinance for the Office of Gun
Violence Reduction.

From an article in Crains Chicago Business dated October 24th, 2022, neighborhoods such as Garfield Park and Austin during the 2000s already were plagued by poverty, drugs, economic underinvestment, and a home to some of the City's highest homicide rates. Data from the University of Chicago's crime lab shows that much of the west side has fewer healthcare, banking, and grocery options than other parts of the City. But now it's worse. The per capita murder rate in Chicago's Police Department 11th District and Austin has climbed to 274 percent between 2010 and 2020. 115 per 100,000 residents. 11th District where I live, serving Garfield Park, the increase was 114 percent and the per capita murder rate reached 146, according to the data of University of Chicago's crime lab.

Those homicide rates were up there with the most violent cities on the earth.

According to data analytics compiled by Statista, the world's most violent city, Tijuana, Mexico, has a murder rate of only 138 per 100,000 residents.

It's been eight years of

frustration. Eight years. We first presented

this information for an ordinance to Mayor Rahm

Emanuel's administration from 2015 through 2018.

It was once again brought during Lori Lightfoot's

administration from 2019 to 2023, and now Mayor

Brandon Johnson's administration to the present.

What will be our legacy? Why doesn't Chicago

have a ten-year plan yet? While New York City,

Los Angeles have made huge strides in reducing

gun violence in the past 20 years in their city,

President Biden announced his administration

implementing an office of gun violence reduction.

Governor Pritzker announced his administration

implementing an office of gun violence reduction.

It's time for the aldermen and the Mayor of the City of Chicago to step up and make every effort to preserve life and protect all

these citizens of Chicago. (Audience applause). Chicago has had an opportunity to be a national leader in gun violence reduction, instead, our leaders have embraced our title of a second city. It is time for Chicago's office of gun violence reduction.

PASTOR GLOVER: Good evening, everyone. My name is Pastor Glover. Leslie Glover.

L-E-S-L-I-E. Glover, G-L-O-V-E-R. I am a part of the southeast side of Chicago. I have a church, Global Ministries House of Prayer, 8226 Muskegon. So I'm in the South Shore area. I'm also -- and I have to say this -- I live free every day, seven days a week. I eat and breath and live free. We should all be free. Praise God.

And also I am honored to be the mother of the executive director of Live Free, Ciera Chamberlain, and in her absence, I stand here for my daughter, and I work also for Live Free as a trauma specialist. But we're here for the gun violence. The office of gun violence. Everybody even said basically the same thing. So I had a lot of things written down on my the. We

got two minutes, so I'm going to be transparent with you.

The South Shore area, south side is traumatized. I'm a trauma specialist. I deal with people outside of the church. I'm not just a pastor in the four walls. I'm in the highways and the byways in the most other part of the gutters where there's not sinners for people to recover from the gun violence.

We need more everything, because people are traumatizing each other over and over and over, and the community -- the community cannot heal. And we have to be a part of the -- we are the voices for the community. And I thank God for being not only to work for Live Free and to have the opportunity and a privilege to be able to be a voice for those who don't have a voice and those who are traumatized and still trying to recover.

I stand in for God for them today. They need more resources. They need more help, and they're crying out for your help. And it's hard for me to stand here and hold back tears because I feel their pain every day. And I have

lost members in my church, and I have had to speak over their bodies and talk to the family and comfort the family. And still I have to go home and try to sleep at night.

So I'm asking you to -- the cries now and the bloodshed don't have to -- you know, it just don't have to be a consistent bloodshed. We can be the voices that make the difference. The people on there, one is power and one, and we are the voices today and stand in solidarity with Live Free.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

Our next three speakers are David Williams, Dion McGill, and Maurico Najura. So first person, David Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: My name is David Williams, and I was invited here for an organization called Live Free, but I also work with the organization called NAYP, National Advocate Youth Program, and also Williams Aftercare Recovery Center, which I'm the founder of.

The reason I'm speaking about this is expungement programs. That's one -- one of the problems that are going on is that a lot of

these youth or individuals in general who have that -- having over their head having records. myself have had a record as well, and I went through the process of going down to 35th Street, pulling my records, going through the process of seeing if I could have what was expunged and sealed. But what holds back a lot of individuals, one, not going to process, which Live Free is offering that process, too. Myself being able to talk about the process of going through it. But that's what a lot of things holding a lot of youth, individuals who just want to be able to get advanced and get a better job. They see no difference and no way out, because they actually not knowing the process. And then the process allows you to, one, say, Hey, I'm doing something better for myself. Not having that to actually -- one is just being proud. A lot of times they are afraid of even talking about it, being ashamed about it, but you can't be ashamed of something that has been always holding you back. But, again, going through organizations like Live Free, going through other organizations that teaches you and tell you how

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to go and get your records clean and then start a new life. That's something that definitely needs to be looked into. Thank you very much.

MR. McGILL: Good evening. Dion McGill. Seventh District Council.

There are two things I want to comment on. The first one, I want to go back to the July 15th special meeting, and I want to say thank you to Commissioner Gottlieb. Something he said specifically about COPA and the service that they provide to the community and how we feel about it, and I 100 percent agreed with those comments.

I'm down for everybody who is willing to hold CPD's feet to the fire, because obviously BIA isn't going to do it. And I always remind myself while we're here, because I hear this talk about fair and balanced views to policing. No. We're here because CPD is a broken institution. It was broken before I was born. It's still broken today. Remember, members of that institution could torture a hundred people in our communities, did nothing — nothing happened. The ring leader lied about it.

Did four years for perjury. Rode off into the sunset with a pension, and we want to talk about accountability. I haven't forgotten. That's not right. It's not right.

I feel bad every time I come here.

I feel like I'm angry.

Second thing I want to comment is the last meeting you had, Commissioner Wortham made a comment that I felt I would be remiss if I didn't comment on, and that was the idea that the term "pretextual stops" was inappropriate, and I completely disagree with that. The term is completely appropriate.

Boulevard. Anybody who is in the streets sees it every day. Every day. Right? It's not inappropriate. It is completely appropriate. What's inappropriate is the 700 percent rise in traffic stops since 2015. 573,313 stops last year. Only 1 percent that ended in guns or contraband, less than 4 percent a citation, less than 3 percent an arrest, which means upwards of 92 percent of those stops resulted in nothing but angry residents who I have watched yelling and

screaming expletives at officers because they spent the last 15 minutes getting harassed.

Let's call it what it is. That's inappropriate. That's offensive. Not the term, right, the practice. We got to stop trying to do those little dog whistles. It's not the term.

Call it what you want. But if it's happening in front of my house every day, that's the problem.

MR. NAJURA: My name is Mauricio Najura.

M-A-U-R-I-C-I-O. Last name Najura, N-A-J-U-R-A.

I am a peacekeeper. I'm one of the leads. I

work for a nonprofit organization. And I am a

gun violence victim. I got shot about 22 years

ago, and it still feels like it was yesterday.

I'm 42 years old. I got shot about -- I was

about 21. And just tell you the truth, it's a

domino effect to me. That's what I see. You

know what I mean? So we need all the resources

for safety. We need a lot of safe zones.

And I grew up on the southeast side of Chicago. Went to Bowen High School. So you know what I'm talking about. And, you know, I just want to see change. That's what made me become a peacekeeper. And always try to help.

And I don't want none of these kids to be going through what I've been through. It's like I said, a domino effect. We need change. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Our last three speakers are Demetric Parrott, Monica Gate, and David Johnson.

MR. PARROTT: How you all doing today? My name is Demetric Parrott. Spell my name D-E-M-E-T-R-I-C. Parrott, P-A-R-R-O-T-T.

I was speaking up on behalf of the G.O.D. program, and I wanted to be a part of them for about two years now. Finally got into the program. At first I was trying to get in on the west side, but I end up getting on the south side. But I wanted to speak up about the job — about the job fairs and stuff like that, and like — and extending — extinguishing probation cases and stuff like that, because I just got off probation. And since I got off probation, I been trying to find a different job, but they look at my old background when was like 19, 20, 18, and stuff like and that, and talk about my — talk about what I did wrong with the job, and they

don't be trying to teach me like what can I do to like get those DNRs and stuff like that fixed so I can be able to go back to work, because I don't have no work for a minute. And then I like live in the community where we off work at. It's always violence and stuff going on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I was just harassed by the police like a few weeks ago. Like two weeks ago -- a week ago. It was a week ago. They just pulled up on me talking about they had suspicion I had a gun, but I was just passing from one off to the other, and I was trying to explain it to him, but he just kept like indulging on wanting to be more violent and stuff like that, and I was just trying to speak up on the police actually being peacekeepers instead of like belligerent people and always hysterical and like drastic towards us. Even when you walk down the street, you can just look up, and they just got to stare at you like you doing something wrong, and you just feel like you doing something wrong, you feel like you got to hide. And I hate feeling like that, like I always got to hide and stuff like that. It's an odd feeling. You feel me?

So I want to speak up on behalf of 1 2 that and just say that we need more resources for working, we need more resources for expunging 3 cases, and help people find better-paying jobs so 4 5 there won't be much violence. And like help the 6 youth start working earlier. Because I started working when I was 17 years old, and I had to 7 quit because I had to go to school. You know how 8 parents feel about grades, you ain't got no 9 grades, can't get no money. It was that. So, 10 you know, I love working. I like working. 11 12 That's all I got to say. I got two seconds. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Did Monica come up? 13 Demetric, Monica, and David. Did David Johnson 14 come up, too? 15 16 MS. GANT: I did speak. 17 PRESIDENT DRIVER: You submitted two? MS. GANT: I submitted outside. 18 PRESIDENT DRIVER: I think there is another 19 Monica. I just want to make sure. It might be 20 you. It might be another Monica. 21 Is there 22 another Monica in the audience that filled out one of these slips? Is there a David Johnson in 23 the audience? All right. 24

That concludes our public comment period. We value all of our speakers and thank for your input.

Our next order of business will be our subject matter hearing on establishing the Office of Gun Violence Reduction through ordinance. This meeting is being held in accordance with MCC 2-80-060 which states that, "Upon submission to the Commission of petition filed by 2000 Chicago residents, the Commission shall hold a special meeting."

On July 19th, 2024, the Commission received a qualifying petition.

Although the Commission does not have the power to establish an Office of Gun Violence Reduction, we are always open to hearing the communities' ideas regarding public safety in the City.

For context and to educate both the Commission and the public of the substance of this special meeting, we have invited a representative from the petitioning body to give us a summary of why the petition was submitted.

We also have assembled a panel of experts who can

speak to this subject matter. After that introductory statement concludes, there will then be questions from Commissioners.

Before I introduce our panelists, I would like to invite Artinese Myrick of Live Free Illinois to the podium to briefly describe what brings us here today.

MS. MYRICK: Hello, everyone, and thank you, Commission. I am appreciative of your role of making sure that communities are uplifted and the community representation on the panel here today.

I'm Artinese Myrick. I'm the director of organizing and policy with Live Free Illinois. We are a faith-based organization dedicated to ending mass incarceration, gun violence, and police violence in black and brown communities.

Through our work, we organize over 60 congregations in the City of Chicago and over 120 congregations statewide to develop justice ministries within churches and community -- and empower communities to being architects of policy change.

We're here today as the first

organization ever to trigger a hearing through the CCPSA, gathering over 3,000 signatures in just six days by mobilizing congregations and community members from every corner of Chicago.

We have successfully submitted 2,737 signatures to the CCPSA demonstrating this urgent need and demand for action. You can clap after that.

Today I stand before you to emphasize a critical need for a fully-funded Office of Gun Violence reduction in Chicago. This is not merely a proposal. It is a transformative step essential to the safety and well-being of our communities.

While our City is no stranger to new strategies, we must now advocate for long-term, sustainable approach to end gun violence by vetting this office and to the very foundation of our city through ordinance; namely, that every time there's a personal shift or change in administration, the plan also changes. The City should have long-time fully-funded strategy to end gun violence.

The call for such an office began

years under Mayor Emanuel's administration, 1 driven by our faith coalition Advocacy for Real Solutions and Response to Violence in 2016. The advocacy led to a creation of a 5 blueprint for the Office of Gun Violence Reduction in 2018, which was passed down to Mayor 6 Lightfoot; however, the office was never fully funded or operationalized long-term, representing 8 a missed opportunity to make lasting impact. 9 Mayor Johnson has committed to 10 establishing this office and recently praised the 11 12 vice president for creating the nation's first office of gun violence prevention which he named 13 as a crucial step towards transformation. 14 While we agree with the Mayor, 15 16 Chicago has yet to experience this 17 transformation. Other cities like New York, 18 Philadelphia, New Orleans, Denver, Washington 19 have made substantial investments in their 20 violence reduction strategies resulting in 21 22 minimal change. Despite our smaller size, Chicago 23

continues to struggle with high rates of

homicides with less investment.

The proposed Office of Gun Violence Reduction ordinance will be a linchpin in executing a comprehensive, fully-funded, fully-staffed strategy.

This office will not only focus on essential services like street outreach, victim support, witness protection, and trauma care, but also would prioritize co-governance and oversight.

By leveraging the powers of City agencies and uplifting grass roots organizations that have long worked without adequate support, this office will make sure that these efforts are sustainable and effective.

Co-governance is not just a concept. It is the cornerstone of trust building and ensuring that community solutions are genuinely community driven.

With oversight from a multidisciplinary team, like yourselves, including survivors of gun violence, this office would be empowered to regrant resources to neighborhood-level organizations like G.O.D.,

allowing them to expend their crucial work. It would streamline all violence prevention efforts, ensuring that funding and agencies work collaboratively and transparently with a clear evaluation and reporting that is visible to community members like myself.

We know that real change takes time. Experts say that it can take up to ten years to see, feel, and sustain the reduction in violence.

Yet Chicago's approach has been inconsistent, often shifting with new administrations, particularly in staffing, and this lack of continuity has cost lives, especially in our black and brown communities.

Gun violence is no longer confined to just the south and west sides. It is a public health crisis affecting every neighborhood in Chicago. And this is why we must commit through ordinance to establishing a fully-funded and again fully-staffed Office of Gun Violence Reduction.

This is just not about saving lives. It is about transforming our City and

ensuring that every neighborhood, family, and child of Chicago can live free from the fear of gun violence in our City.

In closing, we need an ordinance to make sure that a violence prevention plan cannot be wiped away due to political priorities, and we need clear coordination of government services.

We deserve transparency about how violence prevention funds are allocated throughout the City and funded, too. We deserve community oversight and genuine co-governance and power to effect the policies that could impact gun legislation but also gun reduction in the City of Chicago.

Again, I'm thankful for all the members of the congregations who have come here tonight, all our stakeholders, all of our partners, and to our faith coalition for taking on such on such a courageous act. And, again, thank you to the Commission for providing space to advocate for a comprehensive office to reduce gun violence in Chicago.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you, Artinese.

A member of the panel is Norman

Kerr. Norman Kerr founded Trajectory Changing Solutions, a consulting firm specializing in violence prevention and reduction strategies.

He is an international expert in addressing violence and trauma who has promoted community wellness in various contexts for 30 years.

TCS works with cities and municipalities, foundations, law enforcement, and nonprofits to support the local entities best suited to implement proven approaches to reducing violence. Thank you for being here.

Also joining us is Reverend Dr.

Otis Moss the Third. He is the senior pastor of
Trinity United Church of Christ in Chicago.

Dr. Moss is ordained in the Progressive National Baptist Convention and the United Church of Christ.

Dr. Moss was identified by the Baylor University George W. Truett Theological Seminary as one of the 12 most effective preachers in the English language in 2018. He founded the Unashamed Media Group, a justice centered, faith-based agency committed to

producing and curating stories to inspire the heart and challenge the mind. Thank you for being here, Dr. Moss.

And also joining us virtually, I believe -- can you see us? Is Dan Hinkel, a longtime Chicago journalist who has specialized in criminal justice reporting over his award-winning career. He has served as a reporter for Chicago Tribune, The Times of Northwest Indiana, Janesville Gazette, Illinois Answers Project, and currently Injustice Watch. His work has spotlighted official ineptitude and corruption, particularly within law enforcement, and driven changes to policy and leadership in police departments and prosecutor's offices. Thank you for joining us.

With that, we will begin by some opening questions. With the first question being directed to Norman Kerr, can you speak to the history of City-initiated violence prevention efforts in Chicago?

MR. KERR: Good evening. It's good to be with you all.

So I joined the Office of Violence

Reduction. It started in 2019 under Mayor Lightfoot, and I joined it in September of that year.

Prior to that year, funding for what we call CVI work, community violence intervention work, had only been funded for one year under Rahm Emanuel's administration.

Prior to that, there was no City funds that went to street outreach, violence interruption. None of the work the peacekeepers are doing or anybody is doing. So that was very monumental.

Like I said, I've been doing this 30 years. I helped to start Cease Fire, Cure Violence, worked at other organizations, and all the funds were previously through private sources or the state.

The City had never funded anything like this. They funded other initiatives like CAPS. But boots on the ground, the City never touched that.

More programs like mentoring, Rahm Emanuel funded \$30 million of mentoring programs for preteens at a time where we were leading the

country. We always lead the country. And I'm not saying that prevention isn't important, but when you think about the levels of violence, you have to go to the population that is the most violent. That's how you reduce violence. We're not talking about reducing violence five years from now by working with young kids. That should happen, too. But we need to go to the population that's the most violent now.

And I use the example of COVID.

With COVID, we went directly to the people who were infected. That was the mission. Get to them, vaccinate them, quarantine them so they don't spread it. Did we do prevention as well?

Yes. We did PPE distribution, we talked about six-feet distance, stay home, wear a mask, and all those things.

But if we didn't get to the population that was infected, we'd be at home right now on Zoom calls having this conversation.

So the Lightfoot administration was trailblazing. I got to give it up. That's why I joined the team, because I said, man, we can really do some things that the City has never

done before.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There was an office that was established, the Office of Violence Reduction, under the Deputy Mayor of Public Safety.

We didn't get the traction that we needed because the funds weren't there. Enough The structure was there. funds weren't there. The intentions were there. And what we are seeing, mentioned by the young lady Artinese, in other cities, everybody wants to do an office of violence prevention or whatever they call it. It sounds so good to do it, and it makes them feel like they're doing something, but the details are missing. How we going to get the money? Who is going to do it? What's the long-term plan for this? It's like these things don't exist in other places. Even some of the cities that were mentioned, they're struggling because they are vulnerable. A new administration comes in, and they have a different focus, guess what? off of that now. They on something else.

So it's important that we have very committed conversations around this. This is not a process that's going to happen quickly. So we

have to be committed and stay at the table, because we all love Chicago. And hearing all these people that been victimized. Aren't we over this yet?

So we got to come together and say what do we need to do and let's not leave until we figure this out and make it happen.

But I have to give credit to the Lightfoot administration. I think the Johnson administration kind of fell in line with some of the things that were already in place. Now we have to take it to another level, no doubt. But let's acknowledge what's been built, because in many cities, they don't have anything like this, nothing. Groups are calling me, boots on the ground, community-based organizations are calling for help, and they're not going to their cities.

So we have a great starting point here. I just think we have to build up.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Our next question I will direct to Dan Hinkel, and that is, can you speak to how the City of Chicago currently handles public safety budgeting, particularly when it comes to spending on

violence prevention and violence reduction?

MR. HINKEL: Well, I can't cover that necessarily in a completely holistic way, but, you know, the police budget is what it is, obviously generates -- can you hear me by the way?

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HINKEL: Okay. Good.

The thing that I've written a lot about in the last couple of years is how this City has used its -- the money that it got through the American Rescue Plan Act. Lightfoot administration put a lot of that into its antiviolence programming under the -- sort of the parameters of our City, our safety. And I've written a few times about the programs that are pretty desperate in nature in terms of what they do. Like some of them deal directly with victims of gun violence and things like that. Others, you know, could be in her administration that she defines pretty broadly what would be an antigun violence program, so it included things like planting trees and things like that.

One of the stories that I had

written related to the City's effort to spend —

I think it was \$400 million, the bulk of which

was American Rescue Plan Act money. And as of

the end of last year, that was going out the door

pretty slowly, and a lot of the programs were

being set up, you know, kind of slowly, and it

wasn't clear eventually what they would get set

up.

So I guess if you're -- my answer would be if you're looking for the City's spending on things that could be considered antigun violence, I think a lot of that stuff lives not just under CPD and their budget, but in, you know, other departments, such as Department of Family and Support Services, the Health Department, places like that. The Chicago Recovery Plan is a good place to look. There's a bunch of documents on the City's website there showing the progress that the City has and hasn't made in spending the money. It has -- they have to allocate the money by the end of this year and spend it by 2026 under the federal rules.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Dan, I have a follow-up question. I just wasn't sure if I heard you

correctly. You're saying that there was violence prevention money that was allocated to planting trees. Did I understand you correctly?

MR. HINKEL: I read a story that was about —
it was in the Illinois Project, and it was Our
City, Our Safety plan under the Lightfoot
administration. She had some things that were
marketed or promoted as being antigun violence
programs. And an example of the thing — one of
the things that the City defined under that
heading was, you know, a program to plant trees.
They were cleaning vacant lots, and some of that
money went to — was earmarked anyway to put
pickle ball courts in the park. It was a fairly
broad definition of what antiviolence spending
would be.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you.

Next opening question I will direct to Pastor Moss, and that is simply what have been your observations or thoughts about establishing an office of gun violence prevention, and do you have any context to how it may have worked in other states and cities and how you think it is applicable to the City of Chicago?

DR. MOSS: The fundamental question is can Chicago implement the best practices that have been operating all across the nation?

Within Richmond, California, they instituted an office of prevention about 18, 20 years ago of interruption in reference to violence. The first year was roughly about 15 percent reduction, and then to 25 and then 30 and upward of 80 percent reduction.

Within Baltimore, New York, specifically the Bronx, Miami, Cleveland, Ohio, all been implementing some form of violence reduction or prevention in those cities and have seen immediate results.

The cost to a city when someone is shot is roughly about \$1.6 million. The cost to invest in interruption is roughly about 30 to \$50,000 per person. 1.6 million for someone who was just shot and injured or 30,000 to 50,000 for someone — to prevent someone from getting killed.

The simple economics of this idea makes complete sense. I do not understand why the City of Chicago will not invest in an Office

of Gun Violence Reduction and Prevention. It makes complete utter sense.

So let me give a broader context.

Police are designed to respond, not to prevent.

They are not designed to prevent. That's not the structure of the police.

Firemen are not designed to prevent, they respond.

Roughly in 1960s there was a period within American history — there were a variety of fires that were happening in houses and also in forests, so therefore they instituted an office of fire prevention. What did they do? They started teaching young people to stop, drop, and roll. Make sure that you put an extinguisher in your house, how do you handle a grease fire. Then somebody came on TV by the name of Smoky the Bear, and Smoky the Bear said, You can prevent forest fires.

An education program started and then prevention and interruption put in place, and as a result, we saw a major decrease in what? Fires that were happening in the homes and also in forests. They were able to save roughly \$500

million by investing in 3 to \$4 million of education.

It makes economic sense. The City of Chicago just needs to follow best practices that are not connected to CPD, but look at it as a public health strategy. When there is a public health strategy, all institutions are involved. If there is a virus that is a hitting a city, we don't just call the hospital, we make sure that all institutions are involved to ensure that everyone is safe and is able to thrive. It just makes sense.

Let's implement an Office of Gun Violence Prevention and Reduction and save some lives.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Thank you, Pastor Moss.

I will now open the floor up to Commissioners. As you are asking your question, if you can ask them in succession. I understand that as other Commissioners ask questions, you may have a question to piggyback off that. If you can ask the question that you have. Start with Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: All right. Good evening. Thank you to all the panelists for your time this evening.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So in my review of a lot of the literature related to this proposal and to Live Free program in general, I see repeatedly as one of the main tenets the end of mass incarceration as a focus or the decrease in the carceral state.

Often when we talk about gun violence and violence in the City, we talk about this tension between the realistic need to address root causes and the very realistic need to have immediate solutions for those of us who are suffering violence in our City. And so as it relates to a proposal for an Office of Gun Violence Reduction and these tenets of ending mass incarceration and ending or reducing the carceral state, I'm interested in a response from anyone about how you reconcile those things. Because I consider qun violence a violent crime, and I do believe that incarceration is a tool in the immediate for violent offenders. And so I'm wondering what the position of this initiative will be as it relates to the incarceration of

violent offenders in coordination with the long-term strategy of addressing root causes and working with those, Mr. Kerr, as you said who are most involved or impacted by the acts of violence. It's to anyone who can answer.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: You referenced Live Free. So I don't know if there's anybody from Live Free who specifically would like to speak to that.

MS. MYRICK: Thank you, Commissioner, for your question. I just want to be clear that this office would not be responsible for the holding of the tenets of Live Free Illinois. And so this office has a separate job to do.

At Live Free, we believe in reimaging our public safety.

We do not believe in arbitrarily throwing people away and locking the key, but we do believe that folks should be accountable and cannot just shoot up our City without impunity, but we do not believe that the current structures are equitable to the people we serve.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Would anyone else on the panel like to address this?

DR. MOSS: I would add when we talk about

incarceration, 79 percent of the people incarcerated, whether you are talking in Chicago or nationally, are non-violent offenders.

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The second piece is that Chicago has the largest mental health facility in the nation, better known as the Cook County Jail. So we don't have the necessary investment in mental health facilities. We end up placing them in the Cook County Jail. 70 percent of the people who are incarcerated are nonviolent offenders. they are incarcerated, because they do not go before a jury, but usually they plead out in the process because there are dealing with people who are poor who are incarcerated. Once you are incarcerated, you put yourself within a particular cycle that you then can become preyed upon by those who want to utilize you for their own economic benefit; in other words, doing dirt on the street. So as a result of that, you end up creating a cycle where certain community is injured in the process, instead of looking and reimaging the solution so that we can create a community that thrives, not just survives.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: So thank you, Pastor

If I may, because I want to be clear, Moss. that's why I prefaced the question by talking about gun violence, violent offenders, because I understand the larger scale conversation about mass incarceration, meaning we do not benefit as a society by overly incarcerating nonviolent offenders. I understand that point. What I'm talking about is the position on violence, on violent offenders and the use of incarceration to immediately stop that. So I appreciate the response, and I do understand that in the larger context of mass incarceration, but my immediate concern, frankly, is, again, that tension between immediate solution, long-term solution, and violent offenders. I think anyone who has been shot or had a family member murdered would agree that shooting someone and killing them is a violent offense.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. MOSS: I appreciate you clarifying that. In all the cities that an office of gun violence prevention was instituted, this is about a prevention of violence, so that people will not have to watch their loved ones being buried in the process, as a result, they have been able to

reduce violence. This does not remove from the books that someone is to be accountable when they harm or shoot an individual. We are specifically talking about strategies put in place to ensure that we don't raise a generation of people who are harming other people. That's what the office has to do. We want to ensure that we are not raising up, teaching, and pouring into young people so that they feel that the way in which they must function is through violence.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Minor.

COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank you. So I kind of want to change gears a little bit and get a little bit more into the background, right? I know a similar ordinance for this office has been passed a few times, right? First in 2019 by Alderman Sawyer and then failed in June 2023, and then a similar ordinance called the Office of Neighborhood Safety was put in -- enacted by Alderman Taylor, and then it failed in May 2023.

So I kind of want to know a little bit more about why the previous ordinance had failed. I also want to know how will Alderman Yancy kind of account in his introduced version,

how it will be different from some of those ordinances that failed, and kind of what are the things that we need to be paying attention to when it comes to City Council negotiation.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: I'll let Artinese answer.

I don't know if they failed. My understanding
they haven't came up for a vote. But I -- can
you speak more to that? Is that correct?

MS. MYRICK: You are absolutely right,

Commissioner Driver. It never came to a vote due
to political priorities, which is another reason
why we're pushing for an ordinance.

A mayoral election happened, so that made a lot of alders have different priorities.

our hearing for public safety, there was also a hearing for the Oath Keepers. And I will also say members of the CSCC had spoken at our hearing that also pushed back for us to actually have a real chance to advocate. So aldermen at the time did not get to hear what this office could or would do.

So, again, many attempts and

political priorities were what made barriers occur.

Pastor Beth, you -- Pastor Beth
Brown is also a member of our faith coalition and
can speak to the trajectory of how these
ordinances have ran into barriers.

PASTOR BROWN: Thank you. And thank you all for your service. It's good to see you up there. Yeah, I will add to what Artinese said in terms of political will. And I think we cannot overstate what happens when a change in administration happens, and when the going back and forth between mayor and alders begin to happen, and so alders who want to go with the mayor on things, then don't want to do something that's going to go against the mayor. And so if the mayor doesn't support, then it's very difficult, as you all know, to get an ordinace passed.

We know that from the ECPS struggle. There has to be political will for it.

And I think one of the things that happened at the -- we were fortunate the ordinance was called for a subject matter hearing before the Public

Safety Committee. Unfortunately, they did have the Oath Keeper hearing before it that lasted close to three hours. So most people had gone by the time we came up. But also at the very last minute, the mayor at the time, not Mayor Johnson, had Allison Arwady, the head of the Public Health Department, come and talk about why gun violence reduction needed to stay solely under the Department of Public Health, and, you know, she went on and on, and that was unfortunate.

And so I think part of the obstacles that we have faced have just been really getting a fair hearing but also misunderstanding. We're not saying that -- I mean Pastor Moss spoke to it. Absolutely it's a public health issue and absolutely needs a public health response.

We don't need a public health director trying to figure out how to do gun violence reduction. It's not her area of expertise. And so what we're calling for is an office where people with expertise.

We have had -- in the office of gun violence prevention, reduction, community safety,

we went from Walter Katz to Susan Lee. Norm Kerr was in there for part of that time, to John O'Malley, to Elena Gottreich, to now Garien Gatewood, and that's only in five years.

And so, you know, again, part of what we're trying to get to is having a long-term established strategy.

You know, our faith coalition, every spring we have meetings, and we all take a deep breath and we say, When are we going to hear about the summer violence plan, and every year — it's sort of like Charlie Brown and the football. Every year we think there's going to be a great strategy for summer violence, and there never is. And part of that is we don't have an office with expertise that is going to work with community groups and all of the groups working on this.

There are a lot of people doing violence prevention, interruption, and reduction in the City of Chicago.

I mean we've heard from so many all across the City. There has to be somebody that is coordinating the strategy across the years, across agencies, and that's really what we're

after. 1 COMMISSIONER MINOR: Thank vou. PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Gottlieb. 3 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Thanks so much for 4 5 that. So a question I have is about the 6 money and how you would intend to spend it. 7 So by my calculations, given kind 8 of a percent of the corporate budget that you're 9 asking for, which is 1.5 percent, it would be 10 about \$86 million or so. This will be the same 11 12 budget as now. So how much of that might go directly to these sort of community violence 13 programs versus how much of it is going to go to 14 coordination? 15 16 I guess I'm just trying to figure 17 out how much of this is about making sure that existing things are coordinated well versus how 18 much is about providing new resources to these --19 PRESIDENT DRIVER: Who is your question 20 directed to? 21 22 COMMISSIONER GOTTLIEB: Anyone. I quess it might be best directed to, I guess, the Live Free 23 folks, given it is their proposal, but... 24

MS. ARTINESE: I'm going to pass it to our faith coalition, again, Pastor Brown.

PASTOR BROWN: So, actually, we would love for it to be more than 1.5 of the corporate budget.

I think initially we were asking for a hundred million, knowing that there is 85 million that's kind of rolled over.

I think one of the hopes for this is that because there would be an office or department or whatever you want to call it that would oversee all of this, that some of the separate offices that exist all around the City would be able to be consolidated. Not that the work would -- not that the work would stop, but that we'd be brought under one roof, so to speak. And so oversight would be a lot less ideally. So instead of having a separate community safety coordination center, a separate public health, a separate victim services over here and separate -- everybody could be in one space, one building, potentially share some staff, share some equipment.

So hopefully some of the money

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

would be saved in that way.

I think -- you know, money is always going to be the issue. I think one of our fears and one of our hopes, if I can name it that way, is -- and I would love for Dan to say something about this, too, because Dan knows a lot about the money and how hard it is to find the money.

Right now, CVI is mostly being funded -- and I mean the big CVI that's happening, is mostly funded by foundations and business people, right? Civic people who are concerned.

We are at the whim of where-the-wind-blows foundations and civic people in the City of Chicago. If we don't start funding and increasing funding rapidly for public safety, we are going to be in trouble as a city.

And so our hope would be that CVI funding could come under this office and this fund so that it's permanent.

We don't want foundations to decide year after year how much money they're willing to give to CVI. I mean we love the foundations. So

let me say, we love the foundations. We love that they contribute, and we need permanent funding.

And until Chicago gets serious about long-term and permanent funding, you know, who knows where the wind is going to blow.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. I have a question for clarity. And anybody -- I assume, Mr. Kerr, you might be best to answer this. So this is titled Office of Gun Violence Reduction or Prevention, and there has been offices like that under mayors, but it sounds like I'm hearing you all saying you want a separate department. So can anybody on the panel -- also, Dan, if you have something to add about the budget, because she did address you, but can anybody speak to the difference this would make if it was not under the Mayor's Office or CSCC, if it was something separate.

MR. KERR: I think what it needs to be, it needs to be a department within the Mayor's Office, because the office doesn't have the stability. The Office of Violence Reduction, which I lead, we didn't have grant-making

ability, so we couldn't fund organizations. We had to partner with the Department of Public Health, we had to partner with the DFSS to get funding out. And this is a similar model that we're seeing nationally as well. But it just slows the process down tremendously to go through the RFP process with another department. It's just really slow.

So we need -- in the City of Chicago, we need a department that's focused on this. And that's going to really improve the longevity of this work, right? Because if you have it as an office -- I mean we're talking about offices. I can say we've had an office since 2019, but your definition of an office is different, right? So we have to be clear about the definition of an office, because for some it means permanency and some it means an office during this administration.

And I think we've been fortunate that the past -- to the current mayor and past mayor are aligned on the fact that we need some sort of work to address violence, but the next mayor could say, You know what? I'm not going to

invest in that if there's not permanence.

DR. MOSS: I was just going to add in terms of thinking about budget and allocation, budgets are moral documents. And I say they're moral documents to say what our priorities are. So you look at a budget to determine what a household's priorities will be. You look at a budget in a hospital to determine what the hospital's priorities will be, and we look at a city to see what the city's priority should be.

If our children are our priority, and if we are tired of going to funerals and watching people die, we need to invest in the future. It is a moral -- I'm putting that out as a framework, just to say let's think morally in terms of how our budgets are structured.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Did you have anything to add, Dan?

MR. HINKEL: Just briefly to what Pastor
Brown brought up, which is, you know, she had
mentioned CVI being funded through the City. I
know as part of my reporting on the American
Rescue Plan Act spending with Casey Toner at
Illinois Answers Project, we had written about --

I think it was 16 million out of the 400 million that was going to antiviolence programs, or what the Lightfoot administration considered antiviolence programs, was going to CVI groups, and that was part -- sort of a bigger pot of governmental money that started flowing there.

Again, obviously, that money is poised to go away in 2024, so the question of whether to replace it comes up.

And to the point about how the money is spread around disparately throughout the City, I recently wrote with my colleague Kelly Garcia and Justice Watch about a program that is also funded by that same pot of money that the Rescue Plan Act that was supposed to be delivering diversion services to kids who get arrested by Chicago Police Department, and we had found that the -- only a fraction -- the City was only saving a fraction of the kids that it had aspired to serve, and to illustrate the way that money is spread around, that's DFSS, CBD -- mostly DFSS program. It's not -- there's money going to all these different places.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Commissioner

Presley.

COMMISSIONER PRESLEY: Thank you. Again, I just want to thank you guys for being here this evening.

I do have a question, because I want to better understand. I know that there are a number of jurisdictions who have offices of gun violence prevention or reduction, and I wanted to know specifically what has been successful and what takeaways would we take from those offices that have been successful that we need to be thinking about that we need to consider if Chicago were to have such an office?

MR. KERR: So the immediate thing that works is going directly to the population that's violent, so establishing peacekeepers, street outreach workers, violence interrupters that are going directly to the incidents, mediating those incidents, and supporting those individuals, whether they're returning home or they live in the community, but going directly to that population. Again, just like we would address COVID.

Now, the thing is, we struggle with

ample resources in many of these areas. So you're working with individuals and they say, Yeah, you know what? I'm yours. I'm ready. Right. What do you have for me? We can't really deliver the amount of jobs that we need. Even the amount of mental health providers that we need, because many of them will not go to some provider that they see -- like somebody they see on TV. They have to look like them, be from the neighborhoods and understand them.

So there's a lot of nuances that we have to really be thoughtful about when we're implementing a program, and we see this struggle around the country.

People get funds. They're not -that's my job. I help them decide what to do.
Because here they are with money, ARP money, or
whatever it is, and they're clueless.

Most cities give this money that's for CVI -- this is specifically to work with the highest risk. They give it to programs, and they're doing chess programs, they do after-school programs with little kids, and it's like later on, somebody's coming at them, What

did you do with the money? So the accountability is missing upfront.

Again, I'll continue to say, the Office of Violence Reduction, we funded street outreach. Was it at the level that we needed it to be? No.

Now, in Chicago, they talk about this 21,000 that are like the highest risk, right? 21,000 people. These are people that are on somebody's radar. There's probably an additional 60 or 80,000 I would imagine that aren't are on nobody's radar that are violent.

The programs collectively in Chicago work with about 3,000 of the 21,000.

One of the reasons why we aren't seeing reductions on a Citywide level is because we haven't hit a tipping point working with this 21,000. So we need to ramp this up. More workers. The G.O.D. program needs to be bigger. Other programs need to be bigger. Until we get to that point, the great strategies that are being done right now are overshadowed by the fact we are not seeing the reductions, because there's some great programs.

And I tell you what, Chicago leads 1 2 the country in homicides annually, but we lead the country in strategies as well. We really do. 3 But the issue is we're not at a tipping point 4 where we're going to see those reductions because 5 we're only working with 3,000 out of 21,000. 6 When we get to 18,000, we'll start seeing more 7 drops. 8 Again, I look at this as we're 9 addressing COVID. 10 If we're only working with 3,000 of 11 12 21,000 infected people, how do you think that would turn out? 13 So prioritizing, we have to reset 14 our priorities, right? And you alluded to it. 15 When we were addressing COVID, everybody was at 16 17 the table. Churches were definitely at the table. Schools, the libraries, community-based 18 organizations. With violence, it's relegated to 19 law enforcement and maybe if you got a street 20 outreach program. 21 22 All these other entities don't feel compelled to participate. I'm speaking 23

generally. In some communities, it looks

24

different, but overall, all the City departments aren't addressing this.

So we have to prioritize this. And we could use the way we address COVID as a model and say everybody at the table, we all got a role in this, we all should own this because COVID didn't relegate it to public health professionals and medical people. How do you think that would turn out?

MS. ARTINESE: In addition to what Mr. Kerr said, I have had the pleasure working with mothers groups, auntie groups, if you will, uncles groups, individuals who form nonprofit organizations because of their experience with gun violence. G.O.D. is one of them. And what I see is mothers and uncles and aunties who look like me creating and filling the gaps in their neighborhoods.

And when I talk to people about clearance rates and how homicide investigations and how services actually touch them at their front door, they go to those individuals, and those individuals are doing this work with paperclips and bubble gum and out of their own

pocket.

And so what I've seen and talked to individuals from other offices like New Orleans and Philadelphia, they have -- these offices have procurement power to make sure they grant to the organization that people actually trust.

And if the Office of Gun Violence

Prevention is enacted through ordinance, the City
will be able to back those individuals who are
actually the foundation of our City.

It will be able to stand up the strength that already exists. We don't have to create anything new. We need to support the people who are actually doing it on the ground.

I would also like to pass it to Pastor Moss, because I believe he has more information about how this has impacted other cities as well.

DR. MOSS: Thank you. I'll use the example again of Richmond, California. And I know this intimately because my uncle was a police officer in Richmond. He shared with me that they were struggling with a higher homicide rate proportionately than Chicago had ever witnessed.

Much smaller city. What they decided to do was, as Artinese already stated, they raised the level of funding for community groups. Then they hired people who were in the trenches to be the coordinators for the intervention programs. that became the difference, that they had the money, they had the coordination, but it was not solely for the police department. It was all hands on deck, and we want to invest in the future of our city. So it was education, it was the libraries, it was churches, it was businesses had to make sure that they had summer programs and internships for young people during the It was all hands on deck. So that summer. approach becomes incredibly effective when we take that approach.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Cleveland, Ohio, takes the approach of making sure that the data that they had in reference to violence was not solely coming from the police. They made sure that the data was coming from a third-party to be able to check to see if the police data was accurate in reference to what was happening in the community, because there was no political stake for Case Western

Reserve in reference to what was happening in the city versus the Cleveland Police Department.

So my point is that there are all of these wonderful best practices. Let's sit down with New Orleans. Let's sit down with Philadelphia. Let's sit down with Richmond and the Bronx. The Bronx is doing some great work, just as a borough in New York. They are doing tremendous work of reducing violence.

I'm going to say this -- and Father Mike will back me up -- we are tired -- Pastor Beth will back me up. We are tired of doing funerals. We are tired of seeing people die. We are tired of seeing lives completely obliterated. And there is a way to do this. And here is the thing that for me personally that just drives me crazy. It's not expensive. It's not expensive. It's not expensive. It's expensive when someone dies, because the scar never leaves. It is truly expensive. But for a small portion of allocation and the budget -- because they're moral documents -- we can see a new generation thrive.

MR. KERR: When you talk about cost -- and I'm going back to my COVID example -- over four

years, the U.S. spent \$14 trillion addressing COVID.

In the beginning of the pandemic, they said, You know what? Let's allocate 14 trillion. They probably said let's just put 50 million.

And a few months later, add another 20, another 50, whatever, and it totalled up to be 14 trillion. But the point is, it costs what it costs. It costs what it costs.

If we are trying to get rid of it, why would we limit ourselves and say, oh, just put 500 million. That's it. Don't come back for anything else. That's what we usually hear.

Make it work with this. How about we find out what it takes to do it, and we focus on that.

That's what we need to do.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Commissioner Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Okay. As it relates to violence interrupters -- and this is for anyone on the panel -- my understanding I think -- and someone just said this -- was the value is their proximity to the trenches, I think was what someone just said. In terms of if this is going to be a city-funded department or office

and then our -- our time of transparency, how does the, like, report back or report up work when a violence interrupter who is in the trenches -- I presume that means close to the proximity of violence or crime -- how does the transparency mechanism work in this vision in terms of what's being done and also establishing the efficacy of the violence interruption work?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. KERR: So there's a whole structure. Like this is not just a bunch of workers that's running out and doing their thing. This is like a structure, like a corporation; there's managers, there's supervisors, there's reports that are being done monthly. We're looking at the data. You know, what's working. Do we need to change things? Are we working the times that we're supposed to work that coincide when violence occurs? It is a whole thing. This is a technology that's been around the country that most programs are operating this way. So it's not just arbitrarily we feel like working this time of day. No. We know the time that violence takes place in Chicago are during the evenings, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, overnight.

We know that. And our workers are working that. Over the summer, they're working 6:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. Sometimes they're longer than that, depending on what the data says in that specific district.

So I want you all to know this is not some fly-by-night thing that we said, Oh, get a bunch of guys with a basketball and work with the kids on the street. No. It is very organized. They get training. We look at data, and we use that to really figure out when we need to be where. So we look at where violence takes place and not old data.

A lot of times we look at some neighborhoods and be like, Oh, clearly that's the problem spot. That hasn't been the problem spot for 20 years. What does the data say right now? This is very fluid.

So there's a Chicago violence reduction dashboard that is on the City's website that will give you information on your community. It's CPD data, to your point, but it will give you information with a 48-hour turnaround, right?

So this is something that didn't

exist before. We're getting information that's two weeks old. Now it's 48 hours behind, which is very groundbreaking.

So this is a site you can go on.

It's public facing. A lot of teams are already using it to determine what does it look like in their specific communities. You can bring up by geographic area, by ward or district, but the Chicago violence reduction dashboard, that's something that can help you all see the data that's in your areas.

PASTOR BROWN: Can I just add --

PRESIDENT DRIVER: We're running short on time. We're going to get to Commissioner Terry's questions and then get ready to close.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you all for being here. I have a quick few question. The first question I have -- Beth, you probably can speak to this, you or Artinese. It really deals what's been the conversation with the current administration related to this particular topic? And not only the administration, because I think it does need to be a coordinated effort considering we do have the epidemiologists and

things of that nature with the Public Health
Department.

So what has all of those conversations been related to this topic from the current administration, the existing epidemiologists that exist within the City of Chicago, the Public Health Department, and -- yeah, those are all the people I have right now. So can you give us in any insight?

PASTOR BROWN: I can try. So when Mayor

Johnson was running for mayor, we met with him,

and he expressed support for having a permanent

and funded office for gun violence reduction. We

met with him after he was in office, and he still

expressed support.

We had a meeting with Garien

Gatewood, and -- I'm not sure if I would say he
expressed support. His main question was, Why do
we need it when we have it? It's just been
established because Mayor Johnson, if you
remember, by executive order established an
office when he came into office. It's not a
permanent office. It is just the office while he
is the mayor, right?

So that's the issue, is that -unless it's by ordinance, it's never going to be
permanent.

So then they spent months coming up with their public safety plan, and we approached Garien Gatewood and said, We're a little surprised that we're not in this conversation around your safety plan, and he said, Oh, don't worry. We're saving you for Phase 2. I don't think any of us have been contacted to date about Phase 2.

And so part of the frustration on our part has been it isn't enough to say, Don't worry, everything's in place.

If you go to the website for the Office of Public Safety right now -- sorry, neighborhood community -- wait, Office of Community Safety I think it is. If you look, one of the cornerstones is they really want to address root causes. And absolutely that is critical. And there isn't anything about a citywide -- because it does have to be city-wide. Even if some areas are heavily impacted more so than every other area, it has to be a city-wide

strategy. There is nothing about the violence reduction strategy.

Now, separately, if you meet with all the CVI groups and the people who are funding them, you might hear some things about strategy.

But, again, it's -- yeah, I should stop there, because we're short on time.

And I think Father Pfleger said at the press conference that the Mayor has reached out to us and is going to meet with us on September 7th about this ordinance and establishing the office. So I think we have hope that he's going to be supportive of this, because, honestly, for him it would be a huge win, because it would be a huge win for the City of Chicago. So we're hoping that's the case.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you.

So another quick question for Mr.

Kerr or Dr. Moss. This question deals with
addressing what has worked, because we've heard a
lot of things. I'm speaking specifically like
what sorts of programs, initiatives have you seen
work and what does that look like? Do I come in,
I get training, or I get access to housing? What

does the structure look like that you've seen the success to get us to the results we're looking for?

DR. MOSS: It's all over the map. Some cities have invested specifically in interruption mentoring programs. Others have taken a position by strengthening education, community engagement with interrupting programs. Others, for example Baltimore, is utilizing connection with youth programs, community engagement, along with the police. It literally is all over the map. Every violence intervention program that has coordination, along with trusted partners, there's always reduction.

Coordinators with trusted partners,
I have to say that. Not just, Hey, anybody want
to start a violence interruption program? No.
There's usually a track record in every city of
organizations that have been doing the work 20,
25, 30 years. They have just been doing this
work, and they're pulling those pieces in. And
so those are the programs that end up working.
But literally when I say it is all

over the map, it is all over the map, depending

on what region you are in.

Seattle is using something completely different than Portland. Like I said, Richmond, Los Angeles is using something that is completely different than what you will see in Philly. And the Bronx is completely different than what you will see in Miami. It is all over the map. But the beautiful thing is Chicago has the opportunity to take the best practices across the nation, and we can implement those best practices and be a modeling of how to do things. And I think that is the opportunity that we really have at this point.

MR. KERR: So in addition to what Dr. Moss mentioned, we have to remember the underlying thing here is going to the population that's the highest risk.

Every city that he mentioned is focused on the highest risk. They are doing other programs as well for younger kids and so forth, but they're not neglecting working with the highest risk. And then the critical thing is consistency. What we've see in Chicago -- for those of you paying attention -- for the last 20

years, every year, for the state fiscal year, we would shut down these programs from June 30th to sometimes October. We lost a lot of workers.

They were going into other fields. Work in a factory because it is more stable. Some people would just volunteer their time and wait to come back. But it was an inconvenience. We're trying to legitimize this work. And it's got to be comparable to other industries where you're getting benefits and all these different things, right? So this is part of the longevity, is that we have to make it a real job. But we need consistency. We cannot reduce violence if we're not consistent.

We start a program. It's great and then it stops for whatever reason, right?

Personnel changes, philosophy changes, right?

All of it we need consistency.

So this proposal about this office being permanent, the boots-on-the-ground work has to be permanent, too. Everybody thinks that, Oh, let's just do it for a year and then -- no. This is a permanent job now, like we have police, like we have teachers, boots on the ground, street

outreach workers, permanent jobs. They're not going away. They shouldn't go away.

VICE PRESIDENT TERRY: Thank you. And my last quick question is for you, Mr. Hinkel. I want to know, what role do you believe media plays in highlighting the need for things of this nature, as we often see the other side of highlighting the violence that's happening in these communities, but not necessarily speaking to the solutions or the need for solutions or even more highlighting of those more heavily than the bad stuff who are trying to resolve these issues?

MR. HINKEL: Appreciate that question. And, yeah, I'm here as a journalist and not an advocate with, you know, a dog in the fight in any direction, but I will say that obviously the work that I've done speaks to the fact that I think that it's important to cover the things that -- you know, to hold the city accountable for the money it's spending and the effort it's making to try to, you know, impact this job.

Sometimes I feel a little bit lonely in terms of the Chicago media sphere in

terms of doing that. I should say there are others who do it also, but I think it's really important that I wish more people would write about it; more people pay attention to it.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. We have now reached the conclusion of our -- actually, I do have another question, comment. And I also know Commissioner Wortham asked to make a remark as well.

Admittedly, I'm not exactly objective here, and I want to be clear also that I'm speaking on behalf of myself, not on behalf of the Commission, as I do currently hold the title of president of CCPSA, I'm not speaking on behalf of CCPSA, I'm speaking on behalf of CCPSA, I'm speaking on behalf of COMMISSIONER Driver.

I would like to thank everybody in the audience who came and offered public comment, the folks on this panel. This is something that means a lot to me. I'm a person who's experienced a lot of gun violence in my life. That is the driving force behind why I'm currently in this position today. This is not exactly fun work. Sometimes I wake up thinking

that this is the best job in the world, but for me, I think it's absolutely critical that I ensure that people coming behind me don't have to go through what I went through.

And so with that, I as an individual, as a commissioner, but not on behalf of the CCPSA, fully endorse and support unequivocally establishing an office of gun violence reduction and via ordinance. And the question that I have, which is my last question before passing off to Commissioner Wortham, is how do we win? And that's to anybody. When I say "win," how do we get this ordinance passed?

MR. KERR: As I said before, we have to stay at the table and work it out, because if we're walking away and this is not resolved, come on, what are we doing?

So I know it's tedious, you know, but we have to stay at the table and continue this conversation. We have to be committed to it.

I mean the world is watching. Come on. Like aren't we tired of leading the country in homicides every year? When was the last time

we didn't lead in homicide? Nobody can tell me. We should be sick of it. Sick of traveling around the country or abroad and when they hear you are from Chicago, this is what they talk about.

We got to stay at the table. We may not like what we're hearing from the other side, but we have to work through it. We owe it to our families. We owe it to our kids. We owe it to our communities.

MS. ARTINESE: I agree with Mr. Kerr. We have to stay consistent. We have to be open-minded. We can't be swayed due to political priorities, and we have to be able to leverage the full City's power through every agency, through every community. We have to be able to make this happen.

Also talking to our alders because they should be a part of this conversation, too, and we have reached out to them, and they have decisions and votes that matter that can very much determine if this office happens or not.

So I encourage everyone in this room talk to their alderman about supporting an

office of violence prevention. I also encourage everyone to continue coming back to meetings like this where community input is really valued. And without community input and talking to our aldermen and making sure we are all on the same page, we can make a bet that political priorities won't win.

So I say we win by continuing to use our voices in the City agencies that matter and by pulling everyone together.

What I see right now is a lot of puzzle pieces all over the City. They can make one picture, but they're scattered.

And so what I see is us being able to pull together a full picture that can get rid of the global notion that we hear about Chicago, and that we can truly pull together the City where, again, the City agencies reflect me, the people that I serve, the congregations that we work with, and the blocks that we know are truly impacted, and that doesn't happen without talking to our aldermen and exercising our civic rights as well.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Commissioner

Wortham.

COMMISSIONER WORTHAM: Thank you. So I'm going to put this under miscellaneous or -- I don't know -- not new business.

But I take very seriously our charge to increase public safety as a portion of our work here. And District Council McGill made a statement and public comment that I do feel the need to respond to because it misquoted me and relates specifically to the totality of our City using every tool possible to increase public safety.

So at our last July 25th meeting, I did make a statement regarding pretextual stops, but not in isolation as was indicated by District Councilor McGill. What I said was, President Driver announced that we receive petitions to have a hearing on pretextual traffic stops. I expressed an opinion that I thought it was inappropriate for us as a Commission to title a hearing a hearing on pretextual traffic stops as "pretextual" is a legal conclusion.

I think it is very important for us to have hearings to explore issues related to

public safety in any way.

I've discussed this with CCPSA staff. I understand staff's position as it relates to the interpretation of the ordinance and why we are titling the hearing in the way that we did. I did not in isolation say pretextual stops is an inappropriate term.

So I will stand by anything I say in any of these meetings always, but I do take issue with being misquoted or quoted out of context, because I think it's very important that everything that each of us say, you know, it relates to our long-term mission of acting out our responsibilities per ordinance, and I wanted to clarify that because that is what I said. I take issue with titling it with a legal conclusion when it really should be a hearing to explore the totality of the issue. And I want to clarify that, because it is important for me to have my record clear. Thank you.

PRESIDENT DRIVER: Thank you. Any other questions, comments, concerns from the Commissioners or panelists before I adjourn the meeting?

(NO RESPONSE.) PRESIDENT DRIVER: With there being no further business before CCPSA, this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you, everyone. (WHEREUPON, the proceedings were adjourned at 8:46 p.m.) 

STATE OF ILLINOIS ) SS: COUNTY OF C O O K ) MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, C.S.R., being first duly sworn, says that she is a court reporter doing business in the City of Chicago; that she reported in shorthand the proceedings had at the hearing of said cause; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of her shorthand notes, so taken as aforesaid, and contains all the proceedings of said hearing. MAUREEN A. WOODMAN, CSR License No. 084.002740