

Deirdre:

So we're gonna go ahead and start this morning's meeting. A couple of just quick housekeeping things. The microphones that are at our table here, for everybody's benefit, the microphones that are at our table here are really intended to allow for good recording of this meeting. They will do some minor amplification to the room, but they aren't intended as the amplifier for the whole room. If folks are having a hard time hearing I'd encourage you, there's plenty of space up closer to the front, so I'd encourage you to come into one of the first two rows. But if we could also, particularly those who happen to have their back to the audience, if you would be thoughtful about speaking up, amplifying your own voice. That, I think, would be helpful. So that's one thing I just wanted to let you guys know.

The agenda for this morning is slightly hidden in your packet. It's on page 1, which is actually the third page of the pamphlet that was sitting in front of you. So if you – and it may be even slightly more confusing because immediately behind that are sort of ideas for agendas for the next two hearings. So if you turn to a page that says page 1 at the bottom and at the top it says Task Force Public Meeting Agenda and University of Maryland. So it looks like this. Okay. And it's the shortest agenda that's in your packet that's at your table. But that's the outline of the work that we're gonna be doing in the morning this morning.

And before we get to this though, I did want to let Will take a moment to introduce – Monday night we had, at the dinner, there were some folks that were not – we ran a little bit behind. And so we want to make sure that you are aware of all of the folks at DOJ who are very intimately involved in this project. So Will, can you help us?

Will:

Sure. Good morning. Let me first just say if anybody has not submitted their nondisclosure form and you feel comfortable doing so, please see me. If you need a copy of the form, Deirdre can give that to you. Just sign it and give it to me. I will make copies and Deirdre will mail a copy back to you. I will keep the originals on file.

As Deirdre indicated, there are a couple of folks from DOJ leadership that have been vital in moving this project forward. And I just want to introduce them this morning. ___ Ms. Katherine Pierce. She's the associated administrator of the child protection division and my boss. So if you want to –

Katherine Pierce: I'll just quickly say, as Carol said the other night, this has been a _____ for us. There have been a small and very tight group of us representing _____ violence against women, _____ office and different components from within OJD. Really a very – we have been working to create this task force within a very small window of time. I give Will an enormous amount of credit for everything that has happened from the **beginning to the end really within** six months. We are so grateful and thankful to NCCD for everything they've done on our behalf and on your behalf. And we just cannot tell you how very grateful we are to all of you and look forward to working closely with every one of you. Full disclosure on my part, for 17 years I worked in the Office on Violence Against Women. I feel very, very strongly that the connection between children exposed to violence and violence against women is inseparable. And as Robert actually said to me the other night, we can't protect our children if we don't protect their mothers.

So I thank you all so much and I turn it back over _____.

Will: And Marilyn Roberts. She's the deputy administrator of OJJDP. She works directly with Jeff **Slobokoski**. She has been – her support has been vital in, I'll just say it publicly – she is _____ in helping to getting this meeting approved. So I publicly want to thank her for her efforts in that. So you want to say a couple words, Marilyn?

Marilyn Roberts: Thank – these two people are vital. Not me. But I really appreciate your work here and I was able to sit in yesterday and I'm very impressed with all of your very thoughtful questions and your – and so thankful for your willingness to serve on this really important task force. So thank you very much. And I look forward to following along as you proceed. Thanks.

Will: We also have some program management staff in the house. If you all could just say hello. Say hi to folks from – _____ introduce yourself _____. So I think it's folks are really excited from the department. Please, feel free to reach out to any folks here or engage _____ and breaks if you have any particular questions about the office. So with that, I'll turn it back over.

Deirdre: All right. So this is a – again, this is an extension of yesterday. It is a public meeting. As I mentioned, it is being recorded. It's being recorded for transcription purposes. The recording's not being, you know blasted across the internet like it was yesterday. I

think it's being audio and visually recorded, but it's not gonna be something that we're gonna post or broadcast. So I do just want to let you know that.

Reminder that it is a public meeting. People will be coming and going from the audience. And the other thing is that it is a meeting of the task force. So Bob and Joe, as the co-chairs of the task force, are gonna be doing some of the work with us today as well. Although, we're happy to facilitate all of the conversation. Alex and I are. So if you want to tell us to facilitate it as co-chairs, we take that responsibility.

On the agenda, let me just quickly review the pieces that we're gonna be talking about. We're gonna be discussing the hearing presentations and the materials from yesterday to get feedback from the taskforce on both the process of the hearing and the materials that were provided to you in preparation for that. So that we can find out how NCCD as your staff have been doing in meeting your needs and what you'd like to see different. We're gonna take a quick look at some ideas that have been drafted for hearing two and three. We're also gonna confirm dates and locations to make sure that it's on folks' calendar and to get a sense of if anybody does have a conflict with those.

And then we will take a morning break. We're gonna talk after the break about – we're gonna flip the two pieces in the later morning. First, after the break we're gonna talk about a preliminary discussion of the final report. During that conversation, we will be referencing several reports that have already been drafted. There are examples of those reports that are over on that side table. I think a couple of people picked them up and are looking at them. There's only two hard copies of those reports in the room today, so if we could share the – or with the **NPRAC** report there's more than two. We're happy to get hard copies of those reports to anybody who would like them, but those were not – we didn't want to give everybody another thousand pages of reading material. So just those are more examples to take a look at today in terms of framework of the report. It's not the content. It's not the substance. It's more how the language is written and how the recommendations are framed that we wanted to share with folks given that this group is gonna be writing a report.

So we're gonna talk about that immediately after the midmorning break for about an hour. And then we'll finish up with some additional opportunities for public input. See if we can get some

ideas from you about how we may be able to get through some of those additional opportunities for public input. It says then that we're gonna break for lunch and then we'll come back for about an hour for closing discussion. We'll take kind of a sense of the group. If we want to go through another half an hour of wrapping up, then we can break for lunch and be done for the day. There will be box lunches available upstairs. You're welcome to stay here. We can all be up there having a sandwich kind of, you know finishing the debriefing. But also if you need to catch a plane, you'll have a few minutes extra to do that.

And in terms of that logistic, at break if you know that you will be needing a cab to the airport some time between 1:00 and 2:00, why don't you let me know so we can schedule that? Cabs are not running past the corner on the street here like they are in DC or New York or some of the other cities that we're used to seeing them fly past frequently. So we need to call and have them scheduled to come pick somebody up. Okay?

Are there any questions about the agenda?

Female 1: Sorry, Dee Dee, would you clarify? We could have the closing discussion before lunch and then leave early? And are we voting on that or are we just deciding?

Deirdre: We can kind of see how the conversations go after – I guess what I would say is let's wait till the midmorning break, see how folks are feeling, see if folks want – if at the end of a conversation – if at 11:45 it looks like we do have another full hour, hour and fifteen minutes of conversation to get through topics that everybody knows they need to get through, then we need to decide if we're gonna plow right through or wrap it up before lunch. But I think we'll have a sense of that by the time we take a midmorning break. If that's okay.

The one thing that's not on the agenda that I think we are gonna start with is the bylaws. These were sent out to all the task force members a couple weeks ago in Erin's lovely Monday morning memo or Monday memo to the task force. Hopefully you guys – you can also let us know if you find that helpful when we talk about the materials and the process. If you like getting stuff once a week or if you want to have stuff more intermittently.

But the bylaws were emailed out once before. We have had copies for all the task force members. Is there a hard copy at everybody's

table?

Multiple: Mm hmm.

Deirdre: Okay. So if you want to take a second and just take a look at that. That's one of the pieces of business that we need to take care of in terms of the task force.

Will: Just as you all review, I took the liberty to draft these and have them reviewed by our Office of General Counsel. They are certainly open to amendments or revisions by you all. The only thing I would ask if that you allow me an opportunity to review those and review those with our Office of General Counsel. And I will re-provide those to you if necessary. In lieu of if that is necessary I would move that we approve these in their amended form. And then I'll have the amended copies provided to you all.

Male 1: This is the amended form?

Will: No –

Male 1: Oh, you mean if we –

Will: If you need revisions. They are written pretty general.

(Audio Skip)

Speaker: *[Inaudible Comment]*

Will: Right. And that is fine. So if you need to miss one, that would be fine. If you need to miss two or three, then that might be a situation where we would discuss whether you would want to continue to participate.

Speaker: *[Inaudible Comment]*

Will: Exactly.

Speaker: *[Inaudible Comment]*

Will: Correct. You notify me and notify the chairs.

Male: I apologize. I didn't hear that full discussion I know there was –

Speaker: *[Inaudible Comment]*

Will: Right. But we were just saying that there wasn't a hard and fast rule written in the bylaws that if you missed X number of hearings then you're no longer able to participate. What we discussed was basically with three hearings left if you need to miss another one that would, for whatever reason, that certainly would be understandable. If you need to miss two or three more, at that point you may want to have a discussion with me and the chairs about your ability to continue. Either way it would be a decision between you and the chairs.

Male: Having been chair of one of these task forces before _____. _____ at the same time, _____ recommendation _____ so that we won't have a _____.

Will: Correct.

Male: _____ hearings though _____.

Will: Yes.

Male: _____ additionally _____ matter. Prior notification _____.

Will: Right. We will have three more hearings. There are some additional listening sessions and some other opportunities. There are opportunities for you all to have subcommittee work and opportunities to have ongoing conversations and dialogues in smaller groups as well. So you all's full participation may or may not be required again. That would be a decision between the group and the chairs.

Deirdre: Are there any other questions on the bylaws?

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Okay. Is there a need for a formal calling of the meeting to order for the purpose? Okay. This meeting is formally called to order. We have the bylaws before us. We need a formal motion to adopt the bylaws.

[Cross Talk]

Okay. There's a motion from Chief McDonnell to adopt the bylaws _____ second.

Robert Macy: Second.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Seconded by Dr. Macy. Question? All those in favor indicate by the usual sign.

Multiple: Aye.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: All those opposed? Are there any extensions? The motion carries.

Male: _____ resubmit this today.

Deirdre: All right.

Male: Nice job. Now we can go.

Deirdre: I'm gonna follow that example for the rest of the day today.

[Cross Talk]

[Laughter]

Male: I think we should put him on the super committee.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Can I just make one comment? I have a lot of background almost as a Quaker. And one of the things that Quakers do is they really make almost all their decisions in formal meetings like this by consensus. And we have experts here. And you all bring phenomenal expertise to this issue. My general choice, __ consult with Joe on this, would be to hear what you have to say before we reach the point where we have to vote on something. And so your opinion is really valuable. I'd ask you to, you know pick and choose what you say and how you say it so that we don't waste a lot of time, but we really want to hear what you have to say, as we did yesterday when we had the witnesses come up. We try to make sure, Joe and I after our discussion that, you know your input, if you wanted it, was there. And each of you brought something different to that discussion as the people came up. We thought that was very well done and very _____.

Joe Torre: Although everybody contributed yesterday, which, you know at the end when I thanked you for your passion. I mean we're all here to, you know to make sure that we come away from these meetings with something definitive and not too confusing. So, you know we have the chance to move forward. But I agree with Bob, the fact that whatever you have to say – I mean you're on this committee

for, this task force for a reason. That you have things to contribute. And it's certainly important for us to hear that.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Turn it back over to our facilitator.

Deirdre: Thank you for those comments. And actually, It's a nice segue into the next, into the first item that's on the printed agenda. And that is a discussion of the hearing presentations and the material from yesterday. There were – yesterday was a series of panels. The presenters were instructed to provide relatively short verbal testimony. There was an attempt to ensure that there was 30 minutes or more for the question and answer period after each set of testimonies so that there could be a conversation and engagement of those witnesses. And I guess we'd like some feedback on how that style of information gathering works for this group and hear what your thoughts are on a similar style for future hearings or different information gathering activities that you'd like to see occur.

Sharon Cooper: I'd like to start by saying that I appreciate ____ and I particularly appreciated _____ resolution. They are _____. So I know that we had Nigel Cox. I think he was _____ young person that was included. And I think perhaps we might want to at least have maybe more than just one ____ youth participating in _____.

Male: And to add to that I think __ the audience _____ from hearing what the adults had to say about _____. And, you know _____. Because oftentimes we just look at the audience and just _____ important _____.

Deirdre: Okay.

Thea James: A lot of them, um, as I had been saying before, the work that I do is downstream. You know working with kids after they've been injured. But, you know I have had a window into seeing, and actually we talked about this last night walking back to the hotel, like we talk about people having PTSD and that type thing after they're injured. But actually they had it before they got injured a lot of them did. So I'm thinking maybe if we can have someone presenting who has been injured and can give some context to that about what their life was like leading up to that point. It may give us some insight into, you know potential interventions earlier on

upstream dealing with children. And when they were children, how they grew up in their homes. That type of thing.

Sharon Cooper:

And to segue on to that, I do believe that we should include some type of _____, either via a parent or a child who has been _____ because _____ has, you know _____ . But I _____ that _____ by that particular _____. _____ both – we have _____ either been victims of child pornography or they've just decided _____. And I absolutely believe that we need to include that. In light of the fact that at this particular time we have 45 million images of child _____ internet at this point. So to not include a victim or a family of a child who has been _____.

Male 3:

I have some concerns about the first panel and the victims' statements. I've dealt with this. And it's a – I'm stumbling because I stumble in thinking about it. I really want to hear the voices of people who have been victimized. But I think there's a really fine line in terms of, and I don't mean this is any kind of negative. But there's a fine line between what constitutes a kind of exploitation of vulnerability and what constitutes really useful information. I would propose that, and maybe it's the clinician in me. I was on a panel once where a victim basically it was televised, etcetera. And I had to help put her together from, you know clinically. So I have maybe an oversensitivity to it. But I guess I think there are those people, and this is the flip side, where being able to speak, as we're all saying, is so important. And it's a part of mastery.

So I guess my, and again, it can be dismissed, but my personal preference would be that in choosing victims who are gonna be witnesses, that they're people who have already made a decision in terms of becoming active. So I thought that, you know two of our witnesses yesterday were already, you know very, very involved. And we have members of this task force who are very involved. And I think that the issue of being able to be a voice and not just the victim and the revictimization is something that I would – it would make me feel better. But there you go.

Georgina Mendoza:

I actually found that panel to be the most enlightening for me. _____ had a lot of researchers and doctors and experts. But to hear that raw kind of experience and personal testimony was something that I think, at least for me, got me thinking the most. I think Ms. Kuhn, who was the lady sitting to the left facing this way, had very

strong factors going in her favor I feel without being a clinician and psychologist by any means, that she was more developed in her sense. Whereas **Ms. Almand** I think was still very **new**. I feel like it was only a year since she was –

Female: Less.

Male: Less than that.

Georgina Mendoza: Less than that. And she actually then admitted, which is very powerful, you know in, for her to have done, to say, and I was molested by my grandfather. And that just felt like, wow, like she still needs counseling I think to go through that. So I think it was a little too raw to have somebody like that. Whereas Ms. – but the testimony was amazing, of course.

Male 3: Right. But I think that your point is exactly where I was – that was my reaction. And I think that the – I think the difference is apparent and maybe it's instructive. But we don't want it to be at the cost to the witnesses. And, you know so I would agree with you. I think that those differences and everybody else who spoke who have their own experiences, they're already on the way to the recovery piece. And I think it's a good distinction to make.

Sarah Deer: If I could add something to that. I was also – I ____ a brief ____ survivors ____ discussion. I was a little bit concerned too about one of the public members of the public –

Male: The sister.

Sarah Deer: His sister. Because I'm thinking, I'm thinking about his sister and whether or not she _____. I don't know if he has ten sisters or one sister. But I'm worried about her. I just hope that she either he let her know he was gonna do this or that she is _____.

Gregory Boyle: Just a _____. How much vetting is there or do you know what they're gonna say?

Deirdre: So that's a great question. And for the panel that we had in the morning, there was quite a bit of conversation with the witnesses. We went through a number – you know we, and I can ask **Sue Jotha** to talk more about it because she was the one who did all of the work with the individuals who testified during that. Actually, **Annette** helped as well. Particularly with finding folks here in Baltimore. But with all of the witnesses, there was hours of

conversation, multiple times of talking through, what is your testimony gonna be about, are you comfortable with this, you know is this something that you're ready to do. There were a number of folks that we were involved with that we said, "You know what? That's not gonna be the right thing for them at that point." Or, "They aren't yet ready for it."

But all of the three that came in and talked with you, presented to us as very strongly, you know interested in sharing their story, where they were right now in the process. And so I realize that Ms. Almand's story was much more recent. And I think it's phenomenal that as a group of folks sort of tasked with national level policy you're thinking about the impact on individuals for their testimony. But she was really very, very interested in ensuring that her story was part of it. And in many ways she sees what her story is as a story of strength. And, you know one of the examples is that she hasn't had to go through seven different protective orders that are getting released without, you know that she's backing out of. She backed out of one and then made her decision to be done and walk out of that relationship.

So it may not be the traditional path, it may not be the traditional trajectory, but she as an individual felt that she was ready to do that and participate in that. And I think that I do have to really, you know applaud Sue Jotha and Antoinette who did so much of the leg work and really did do a lot of vetting of a number of different witnesses for that panel. So that –

Gregory Boyle: But you have no control over the _____.

Deirdre: The public we have no – you know we were basically –

Female: [Inaudible Comment]

Deirdre: Yeah. That's the –

Gregory Boyle: But you don't have a heads up even that this –

Deirdre: What we get is – you know what we did is we said there is gonna be an hour of public testimony at the end. It's gonna be three minutes. You have to sign up. You know you have to register to do that. We had a number of people, and there's a web link to register. And so when they register they are not required to say what they're gonna – you know they aren't required to tell us what they're gonna say. They aren't required to submit written

testimony in advance. It's public testimony. And so that's what we get. So –

Robert Macy: Well, it's within our charter under the bylaws with the support of the DFO co-chairs to cease the testimony if we believe it's not appropriate.

Female 1: You mean to stop them while they're talking –

Robert Macy: Yeah.

Female 1: - or not allow them there in the first place?

Robert Macy: That's how I read the bylaws.

Georgina Mendoza: Well, we would have to be careful that we're not censoring.

Robert Macy: Yeah, of course.

Will: That is correct. And I would also just point out to the group, when we close a meeting that has some other implications. Because this is a **FACA** committee. So yes, there are opportunities where we can stop at that moment. We can close the rest of the meeting. But that does – that's not as simple as just closing the meeting. That has other implications that may or may not be positive to the group. So I just wanted to – and we talk a little bit about the specific implications later. But I just want you all to be mindful of that.

Joe Torre: Let me ask a question. Throw it out there. You know I know what I've dealt with in this short period, not me personally, but in our foundation. The fact that you want to talk about something finally. Because how long has it stayed inside before you decided to talk about it. So even if it's raw, I think it's sort of –

Male: Therapeutic.

Joe Torre: Sort of gives you some relief, even though you fumble over yourself. I mean I need to hear. Cause, you know I've gone through, you know counseling and stuff like that. But I'd be interested to hear the opinions.

Jim McDonnell: How about if we were to give a paragraph or two to the public comment folks before they speak just to bring out exactly that. That we want to be respectful of the rights of the victims, whether

the victims are yourself or a secondary victim. And make them aware of some concerns we have that they may not have. They may have tunnel vision on the issue. But just something to be able to say, "Hey, think about this before you speak." That while we value your testimony here and it's gonna be helpful in the big picture, there may be unintended consequences for you to keep in mind.

Antonio Taguba: We also want to remind them that ____ ____.

Female: Right –

Antonio Taguba: ____ _____. Somebody's ____ ____ in the audience ____ ____
____ saw them or not and they'd be recording something.

Female 1: Well, CSPAN was recording all of it.

Antonio Taguba: I know. It's just a matter of, you know how much do you want to have the victim expose or disclose to you. Because we want to hear their stories. Whether it's raw or whether it's research driven or whatever the case may be. I think part of our task here is to gather just about everything we can gather from the public. It is a public hearing. And we just have to warn them that there may be some ____ here that will not be _____. ____ there's certain rules of engagement ____ what we have to do as a group. And the rules in this game _____. And after ____ _____.
_____.

Deirdre: They are all gonna get recorded. They are all public meetings. I don't know that CSPAN is gonna be at every hearing. But, you know the fact is that it's a public hearing and there is no – once they start speaking, there really is no control whether it's that somebody in the audience is recording it on their cell phone or it's, you know being ____ streamed in _____.

Alex: So a couple of ideas were, we've been thinking the same thing as you, Chief. Maybe something you can hand out to all the public comments _____. The co-chairs who are moderating that public comment can say something at the beginning of a comment. That I want to just warn you all –

Deirdre: Similar to what did you _____.

Alex: Also we thought that we should have a victim's advocate available for both, to the extent of the voices panel to ensure that we have

somebody there regardless of whether they bring somebody or not. But also particularly for the public comment period, where people are just coming in and we don't really know anything about it whatsoever. That we have somebody there to help assist and do this.

Sharon Cooper: And I think there's the one thing that, and I'm sure she'd be _____ it. _____, my concern is not so much the publicity of it, it's the **legality and** danger to the victim who is talking about her spouse, for example. I worry. Because it's one thing to make those kind of disclosures behind closed doors. But when they are on the internet _____, then _____ all of the people _____ will hear about that. And that can spur a person to putting _____.

Male: I would agree. Yeah.

Male 3: Joe, just to get back to your question. I think in terms of the public, I think these ideas are great. And I think, you know we don't have nor should we have control over who wants to speak, etcetera, etcetera. So having the advisory, having the, you know following – I mean just professional ethical liabilities, it's a great plan.

In terms of the question that you raised, Joe, I guess, and again, what we don't know is what the implications are like for somebody after. And, again, we have no – I don't think we're in charge of deciding who does what, you know. But I do think that there are some things that we know clinically about folks where there may be greater risk after testifying. And I would completely agree with you. People who have gotten to the point where they can and want to talk about what they're doing, they're not only providing an enormous service to the general public, they are providing a service for themselves. And just in terms of the vetting, all I'm suggesting is is that choosing folks who, you know have a bit of a leg up in that process is hedging our bets or maybe addressing some of the concerns.

Joe Torre: Yeah, as opposed to having somebody out there, as Sharon was saying, that's lurking. That could stimulate it again. Stir it up like she said.

Male 3: Well, also for the individual. And, again, that's not our decision. But we do know that if somebody's still, you know freshly in the midst of the very thing that has led to their traumatization, etcetera,

that a public disclosure maybe on the one hand feel like a step forward, but we don't know what goes on for them afterwards. And I'm just – I'm erring on the side of caution.

Joe Torre: No, I want to know that.

[Cross Talk]

Female 1: We use survivors, sometimes they're called genuine, you know people or authentic testifiers. Whatever. People who represent reality. And I would say 90 percent of the time they feel better afterwards. They feel that they've, you know even if nothing happens, somebody has listened to it. They haven't gone, "Oh, my god." They're taking them seriously.

What I wanted to emphasize was that of the public speakers, we don't know if anything they said was true or not. I mean they could get up and say anything they want. So just for our perspective, especially with the last person who testified, I mean I knew some of her data was wrong that she was throwing out on child death. I knew a lot of what she was saying probably didn't happen exactly that way. But what she was saying could happen, has happened in certainly other cases. She was talking about losing her children to the abuser and all of that. That has happened. I don't know if happened to her or not, but it is an issue that I think we can listen to. Not so much as this is testimony that, you know that is going on public record as absolutely true, but I go back to having an advocate or someone who can, you know see them right after they testify. Escort them, you know out of the room or to their seat or whatever and see how they're doing. But giving them that voice is so important to them. They feel that whatever they went through will make a difference now for other people. And I think that's very important.

Deirdre: So what I'm hearing you say that – I think what I'm hearing folks say is that there were some – that the voices panel prompted some thoughts about the safety of those that were testifying, either because of what they were gonna experience emotionally after their testimony without and whether they had the support to manage that and continue to heal through that. Potentially about whether the – if they were victims of violence, if their perpetrators were gonna see it, were aware of it, were gonna be coming back. And so that there is a desire to do some – to ensure that there is some thoughtful process around protecting them and supporting them through that, which is a piece that I'll comment on in a

second too. But that overall there is a desire to continue to hear from victims so that their testimony can be part of the process and their experience can be part of the information that shapes and informs the policy recommendations that get included here. Is that adequate?

Georgina Mendoza: Yeah, and actually just a really quick term. Survivors is a preferred term instead of victims.

Female 1: Right.

Deirdre: Okay.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: One other thing. During the course of the hearing we were faced with a person who went well beyond the three minutes. I'd like some brief discussion about how we might have handled that. You know as a Deirdre of that particular section, Will and I were basically having some discussions verbally and nonverbally about what should happen next. But we didn't want to cut her off. We didn't want to interrupt her. I wanted to be polite, respectful, concerned and also provide opportunities for comment from members of the panel or of the task force rather. Those are all things that were going through my mind. Any other suggestions about how either Joe or I might handle that particular section as we go through, and particularly from Will as well, about is there an end point where you have to step in? Because that's an important thing to know in advance.

Jim McDonnell: If you were to get just a light that would light up, yellow when they get to their time and red when they really need to curtail it and maybe make it a, you know at three minutes the yellow light comes on so they know their time is up and then 30 seconds later, hey, cut it off kind of thing. Everybody plays by the same rules. And they can see it so that they know when to start winding it down. And then I think one of the chairs step in and say, "Okay, to be respectful for everybody's time we have to conclude you at this point."

Female: _____, there's a red light. You're still being –

[Cross Talk]

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: I don't know if you could all see them, but I could see the cards. I could see the yellow cards. And I could see the red cards. Could all of you see those?

Multiple: Yes.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Okay.

Gregory Boyle: And I think Deirdre, you had said to one of them, you know or somebody said, you know wrap it up. It doesn't mean end it, just bring it to a close –

Deirdre: It was with the – it was actually with the first public testimony when we held up the stop card. Dr. Hawkins said, "I've been told to stop." And Sue Jotha said, "Finish your thought. Continue and finish your thought, but yes, you do need to wrap it up."

Georgina Mendoza: I thought that was really respectful. That was very good.

[Cross Talk]

Joe Torre: Will came up at the end with the last speaker and asked us what we thought. I figured she was eventually gonna start _____ gas here cause –

[Laughter]

And as it turned out, she did wrap it.

Will: Thankfully.

Joe Torre: Even though she didn't know how to –

Deirdre: And I will offer that I think that this is a – while the public testimony, particularly the very last speaker, my guess is in part because she was the very last speaker of the day, but also because of the length and the organization of her thoughts it was – the same issue will need to be addressed when those that have been invited to provide testimony go to 14 minutes instead of the 5 that they've been asked to provide, you know.

Female 1: How did they do?

Deirdre: How did they do?

Female 1: Yeah.

Deirdre: There were folks that went to 12 and 13 minutes in the invited testimony. And we were holding up the cards for them as well. You know there is a point at which you know we have the stop card and it's just sitting there and the entire audience can see that it's going. And the intent is that the – so we can look into getting one of those lights. I know I've seen them at like city council meetings and at board meetings. But they're usually on a podium and wired, and so I don't know who starts them and stops them and things like that. So it's once of those pieces that we'll research and figure out if that's a feasible alternative for the following hearings. We'd be happy to do that.

Female 1: Maybe you could say before they start, "these are the lights, you know you're limited to – sorry, you're limited to three minutes. If we have to interrupt you, we apologize."

Deirdre: Right. So we'll figure out – we'll research the options that exist for how we can prompt the speakers that their time is ending and we can also draft language for Joe and for Bob to say as the panel start. And I think it is, as silly as it may seem, I think it's helpful at the beginning, you know so the introductions and now we're gonna ask for your testimony. As a reminder, we're asking that the invited testimony be five minutes in length. We have your written testimony, which may be longer, and we look forward to questioning all of you after all of you provide your five minutes of written testimony. Like say it several times in their introduction.

Joe Torre: And while we're on the subject of protocol, when we had the panels and questions, you know I know there are a number of us want to ask questions, we could just go through the chair. You know and sort of have us tell you, okay.

Sharon Cooper: I was trying to figure out how to do that. I keep looking back.

Joe Torre: Okay. So –

[Cross Talk]

Just raise your hand is fine and then, you know I'll say second or third or whatever.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: I want you to know Joe was a real gentleman yesterday, because he wanted to ask a question himself and he kept letting everybody else ask questions. _____ I didn't get a chance to ask my own question.

[Laughter]

[Cross Talk]

Joe Torre: I wish I had written them down.

Will: I saw yesterday also, and that was one of the things that we will work to address. I think there are also come call systems and signaling systems that we will be able to get so that we'll have an electronic tool to help us out. The configuration made it difficult because while the chairs could see kind of the room, it was difficult for you all to kind of recognize when you were being recognized. So that's something that I definitely took note of and we will work to address that. Real quick, Ms. Deer, just to say I will also work with the chairs offline to on the process for how you want to end things with folks. I will just say for the group that I certainly do not mind ending things when instructed by the chair. We will figure out the most appropriate and most sensitive way to do that. But it really becomes a parity issue. You don't want folks that have really worked to have their testimony, their heartfelt testimony in a three or four minute span and then you have another person to have an eight or nine minute span. It just didn't come off as fair. So we will certainly work to address those issues.

Robert Macy: I just have a number of comments about the protocol piece. I would like to just go back for a moment and revisit our witnesses who are survivors testimony. I mean I think the lights is a good idea, but if I look at the overall effect yesterday, not throwing roses, I think everybody did a great job, especially the co-chairs and Will. However you ended it we ended up ending on time and starting on time. And the overall effect I thought was very positive. I do agree with the parity issue. I mean I think many of the speakers – some of the speakers would certainly feel like they were short ended if they didn't get the eight or ten minutes. Other speakers realize that's what happens.

But, you know I've testified before Congress and the Senate and in both my experiences and in standing and watching, every time a speaker starts, whoever the chair is says, "May I remind you, you have three minutes. May I remind you, you have five minutes." And then if you start to go over they'll say, you know there's one minute left. Because you've already stated the rule upfront. In the case of one wonderful congresswoman from California, she kept

going and the chair said, “You now must yield.” And she goes, “I will not yield,” when she was _____ DOJ.

Female: Those California people.

[Laughter]

Robert Macy: No, she just – but it was interesting because – and I do a lot of group work with different types of people. So if you state the ground rules upfront. And then you remind them of the ground rules very polite and everybody gets the same treatment and there’s a rhythm there. I think especially with the public testimony. I don’t know what the protocol is with respect to your visibility, Will, but if people know that you are part of us and you are, in fact, DFO and that you, in fact, will be the protocol maestro for the day, whatever your title is.

[Laughter]

Will: That’s a first, Dr. Macy.

Robert Macy: If you have to evoke something, people are gonna be fine with it. If all of a sudden Will comes up from the back of the _____ and says, “Hey, we’re gonna need to stop this,” which I know you never would, I think that’s gonna be an issue, right? So if there’s a way that you’re recognized at the beginning with the co-chairs as making sure essentially that the audience is treated safely and treated fairly.

Deirdre: Yeah, I think Sarah had a – did you have a statement or?

Sarah Deer: Yea. This is a great discussion about protocol. I’m very grateful that we’re having this conversation. I still would like to go back to _____ about yesterday because I don’t want to leave here without resolving them. And in terms of Ms. Almand, I know that Sue Jotha has some more information about her legal representation. Cause I was concerned that she has a pending court case _____ that’s one of the issues in terms of safety. I still am very troubled by the sister. And I know we cannot predict what somebody from the public will say, but I was – I found it difficult to sleep last night because I thought, you know he said that she didn’t know that, you know that she never talked _____. And now it’s on the internet. And so I’m very concerned about what we do in the future if that happens.

Jim McDonnell: If I could, just to follow up. I did contact him afterward and we did make some arrangements to be able to follow up that it wasn't just left open.

Sarah Deer: Okay.

Robert Macy: Right after you were speaking to him I came up and thanked him and asked how he thought his sister was doing at this point. And asked him when the last time he had spoken to his was. Which was I think two days ago. And I asked if she knew that he was gonna be testifying in this manner. And he said that he hadn't specifically told her that but he was going to tell her that. Now this is after the fact. And I said, "Well, I think it would be a really good idea – I didn't say it that way but, I said, "It would probably be very important for you in your relationship if you tell her, you know what you have done." And I said, "Will she be upset?" And he goes, "No, we talk about this all the time. She knows I tell other people about it. We've agreed that it's my – I forget how he put it. It's my story that I have to tell.

Male: - him too.

[Cross Talk]

Robert Macy: So I agree with your concerns. I just thought I would try to help alleviate your worries, which are considerable and appropriate that there was some conversation. He's done this before. Maybe not in front of CSPAN. And they talk about it. So I'm hoping that he'll, and especially if you're gonna follow up, Jim, hopefully they'll be able to connect with that.

Gregory Boyle: Can I just – I don't want to derail this, but something else about the content. You know if you look back at some of the survivors' testimony, you have Sonja who characterizes her father as a monster initially. And then you scratch the surface. And then she'll say, "Yeah, he was mentally ill." It was sort of a discovery. And for Rosa, you know and you want to kind of figure out, I do anyway. I want to know what would work with, you know her husband, you know anger management, he went. But, you know you can lead a horse to water, I guess. But *(Audio Skip)* all of them, even as the public testimony *(Audio Skip)* for 60 years she's carried this thing. Then she says, "My mother was mentally ill." And, you know the 17 year old who sexually abuses Jacqueline. You kind of – so part of the idea here is obviously to protect children. But wow, what if you could go back, deliver the mental

health services that you needed to to those perpetrators. You would no longer have a need to protect anybody. You'd be preventing something from happening.

So the difficulty sometimes, and I get it, with survivors is it leads to a place of demonizing, which is not only never helpful, it's also untruthful. And so the minute you move from a monster to mentally ill father, everybody in the room felt some compassion. You went, "Wow, what must that have felt like for this guy?" And all of us who deal with mentally ill people who are out of control and aren't taking their meds, you know there's this look in their eyes that says, "I hate what I'm doing." Or perpetrators of domestic violence, of the gang members anyway. You know they'll break down in tears and they'll say, "My dad beat my mom and I told myself I never wanted to become this."

So my point is, I think it, and we threw a lot of terms like PTSD, psychopath, bipolar, things were being thrown out there eventually that at some point on the panel, you know someone to walk us through this. What's the profile of a perpetrator? Cause if we could get at that I suspect we'd be – one of the reasons why we don't make progress in this issue is because demonizing gets them away. And we hear survivors and we should. But we don't get at what's this about?

Male 3: But I think that the other, just to jump off that really quickly, the issue for our task force is also enormously significant. Because, you know perpetrators do stir up a lot for all of us. And we forget that they are the outcome of the very things and the reasons we're so concerned. So finding some way to, you know really close the loop on that would be I think important. I don't know that I have a –

Gregory Boyle: How would we do it? I mean who would we have that we could –

Male 3: I think that, you know the problem gets back to the whole issue in terms of – so I personally wouldn't choose somebody who's still actively involved in battering their partner. But if we were to have somebody who had turned themselves around and were now actively involved in working with batterers or whatever, that might be a useful way to do it.

But just before we – I mean I think this is a substantive issue, Greg. And it has implications for closing the loop in terms of the

message and eventually our report. Because it's easy to get lost because we're so upset by the actual perpetration.

I want to go back to just two things operationally really quickly. We can't, as we've all agreed, we can't guarantee what's gonna happen. But I do think that the issue that you're raising about, even in terms of guidelines. And it's all, you know it's a crap shoot once somebody's in front of a panel and a camera and all that. And that stirs up its own stuff. But I think even the issue of respect for not using, you know some line about what it is you're going to reveal. Some parameters without getting controlling. But being respectful to the unintended consequences is something maybe we can devise some language about.

Two other really quick things. In terms of the who cuts whom off, I still think that down home is best. And the idea of letting – the chairs letting somebody know in the begging, we just want to remind – you know just smile and okay, I want to remind you that out of respect for the schedule. And then it can be the return of a smile, I know how hard it is to keep it – whatever. But I do want a report on some of the, what I heard from some of the invited witnesses. In anticipation of doing the panels they're thinking, "Oh, my god, you know five minutes. This is ridic – you know right? But you know in fact, it worked really, really well. And what was fascinating, and I was just delighted because the discussions afterwards were, I thought, great. I think if there's a way of, again, in a down home way and, you know as part of the packet to the invited witnesses saying, "Our experience has been that everybody thinks it's impossible _____ five minutes. Five minutes is the opener. We have your written. But what we found is that the discussion that follows when we're able to stick to it, there's really ample time." There's some way of conveying it that I know that the witnesses afterwards, the ones I talked to, they said, "Wow, that worked out pretty well." You know. And it was often the discussion was less stiff than some of the five minutes, so-called five minute presentations.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: If I could add to that. One of the things that worked out well was lunch. You know Sonja came up for lunch and we all had a chance to talk to her in different ways. One of the things that I wanted to ask her was about her father's military experience. And in fact, what I did was I asked her to talk to Tony about it because I figured that, you know he could address some of the issues that were being raised. I wasn't sure whether he was a vet who had been involved in combat and had some PTSD or whatever. But I

wanted her to have a chance to talk to him about it. I wasn't able to get in there in the discussion because everybody kind of collapsed around her, but I thought, first of all, having some people join us for a lunch is a good idea. We could have further conversations. I don't know how you pick and choose, but I thought that was helpful.

And I had one other question that kind of struck me last night as a lot of the testimony was going over – I was sort of going over it in my mind. And that was, you know how is this gonna impact me. I mean some of the testimony was so powerful yesterday. And I was wondering as I've sort of thought about some of my experiences, both within family, within my practice with children who have been shot and who were, you know victimized. You know I was just – it was tough to kind of deal with. So I wondered if there is something that we might do to give ourselves some advice about how to deal with this or think about this. Because, you know the testimony yesterday was very, very powerful. And we absorbed all of it one way or another. And I just wanted to raise that.

Georgina Mendoza: I would really second that. During lunch, I think I told Sharon and a couple of other, one of my friend's friends got killed by her husband who was a San Jose police officer. So it was a case of DV that went to an extreme. And I was very, very shaken up. I told you I feel numb right now. And it was right after hearing this testimony and I just felt numb. Like I – I mean and, you know to talk about it obviously helped a little bit. But it was rough. So, you know it just it brings up memories, both personally and family too. So I would absolutely agree with that.

And on a very _____ point, if we could make lunch an hour instead of 45 minutes –

[Laughter]

I think it would really help too. Just to –

[Cross Talk]

Alex: If I can just use lunch as a transition to this conversation so _____.

Deirdre: I think Robert has –

Robert Macy:

I just think it's I'm glad we come back. And Sarah, I appreciate you. Cause the protocol discussion was important, but I loved your segue back. Cause I felt that we jumped ahead. And I think it's worth the time. So at the risk of sounding either pedantic or philosophical, hopefully more philosophical, I have a couple of comments that I wanted to make. Which is I'm gonna end with what you just brought up, Robert. And you may want to pitch in. When I saw who was testifying I went right to Alex and Deirdre and the staff and said, "Okay, what's the set up? What if they decompensate during – not the public, but these wonderful courageous survivors yesterday. And you are a victim until you speak to somebody. And then you become – then your survivorship starts. So there's a important distinction. Speaking in public with CSPAN is a whole 'nother level. And I'm not sure how many knew they were gonna do CSPAN. So your idea is great of a written thing. And I think we should, again, with great safety and security just remind them, you know in the morning when they come, I just want to remind you it is gonna be televised if it is, so that they understand that.

But back to the basic point. I think a victim advocate in the next rounds is gonna be fabulous. I think each witness who has suffered trauma and violence and is disclosing – in this case we had a first disclosure, which might have been frankly partly survivors competition is what I think was going on there. Which is pretty normally. If you get survivors in the room, and that's good in a way. But they should each have the treatment providers either standing by or in the room. And that's what you tried to set up. And at the last minute one of them did not show up. So we should have a – we need a plan B for if the treatment provider is not there who's gonna be there. Luckily the sister's in the audience. I went up and thanked her. But I think it's up to us, frankly, NCCD, but I'm certainly willing to help. I know Steve would be. To just make sure we've got, what we would call clinical risk management for the people that we have agreed to let speak as part of the empanelment for whichever discussion period it is.

And then we can't force any of us to take care of ourselves. But we can – there's certainly a number of protocols we can discuss at some point, which we could do at the end of the day. And everybody's very tired at the end of the day, but that's also when we're all – we've been together all day as a team. We could take 15 or 20 minutes and do a type of – we don't use the word debriefing, but do a type of coping and sharing that allows us to connect. Essentially sitting in a circle and going over, wow, that

was pretty intense and what's our self-care plan tonight and how are we gonna make sure we get good sleep.

The whole thing is really about something that, you know I should have started with, which is we're doing something that hasn't been done before for good reason. I mean I was just looking at this amazing – this is the president's task force for VOC that turned into legislation and has changed really how the United States works with victims. That must have been pretty tough. But there is focus on the kids in here but not really. We're talking about kids and their mothers. So it's the most tender underbelly part of human nature and attachment. But we're not talking about how great mothers are treated and how well these children have been brought up. We're talking about the absolute opposite, which is why it's been kept invisible and under the radar for so long. And as many of our witnesses yesterday said, the numbers belie what's really going on. So if there's 7 million that are reported, there's probably 21 or 44 or who knows the numbers that actually are really being abused every single year.

And here we are saying, let's shed a spotlight on the thing that's the most egregious part of our country's behavior with respect to children and education. So it's gonna, as you've said many times, it's gonna reverberate in a lot of different ways. So prior proper preparation prevents a lot of things. So I think having a discussion around how we might talk to each other at the end of the day, having a full hour lunch is important. We take care of ourselves that way. I know we've got a lot to pack in. And then maybe some kind of a closing after people leave that does not, because of the _____ obviously we're not gonna enter into any discussion with respect to the content of the hearing, but just with respect to our own reactions. With the focus not on, oh my god, that was the worst thing I've ever heard. But more focus on how do I take care of myself tonight and tomorrow when we come back and meet.

Male: I just – sorry.

Sharon Cooper: _____. One of the things about content that I thought should have been in this particular location has to do with _____. Because that's a huge passage _____. I remember when I heard when _____ to speak about his _____ center, Father Boyle. And because I think of two things that this report needs to address. Because gangs are such an issue in our country, I think making a better attempt at how we _____. And the second thing is that, and it's

already been alluded to, ____ ____ mental health services. And that's a huge part of what our report ought to be talking about. The fact that we have so many parents that _____ and had mental health disorders. And our lack of knowledge about whether or not they were ever able to access ____ _____. We know for sure children are not able to access mental health services around our country in a meaningful manner at all. So I think that's part of what our report needs to reflect in respect to what are some of the recommendations.

[Cross Talk]

Female: Yeah, I'd also like to comment –

Male 3: But, but –

Female: I'm sorry. Please.

Male 3: I just wanted to – cause I didn't want to lose Robert. Cause it's a very practical suggestion and it makes a lot of sense. On a personal note, I mean I've been working with kids and adults who have seen and been involved in the worst possible things for moments after awful events to years. And you know people say, "Well, how do you do that?" And part of it's the self-care, etcetera. But there's a really important ingredient that I think it's important for all of us to keep in mind. The things that are most overwhelming, the sine qua non of trauma, is what we can't control and where we remain passive. And the case that, you know the situation that stirred up as much, at least for me personally, were you know the parts where, you know there was nothing that we could do. You know and that feeling of helplessness I think is part of what the reverberation. In addition to the memories that are gonna be stirred up, you know anyway just by the content. So I think that it also speaks to the idea of not only having a practical way of addressing just the wear and tear of doing the work, but also recognizing that part of our experience is also part of our decreasing the risks as best as we can in terms of the issues that we may not have any control over.

I just think it's part of the – we get to experience, sometimes people call it the vicarious traumatization, but the vicarious experience is always about where we can't step in and do something and be active. And then we're left feeling like we're holding the emotional bag.

Robert Macy: And that's what – sorry. That's what – this is 30 seconds. That's what at the end of the day we would do something which allows us to mobilize. So what he's talking about is a mobilization scenario or what I think it was – I forget who yesterday talking about indirect exposure. So we really are recipients of indirect exposure. We can sit with it. And we all go through it and we figure out a way to put it in the back drawers. But if we have a mobilization circle at the end of the day and have a 20 or 30 minute brief discussion, I think it can be very helpful.

Deirdre: Sure. So if we can get Sue Jotha to share and then Katherine. Is that okay?

Sue Jotha: Just really briefly, I'm happy to discuss it further with people at lunch or during break. But just in terms of concerns that you may have about her emotional and legal safety, Rosa in particular. I did spend quite a bit of time up front with her making sure that she was in counseling with a domestic violence organization. And just stepping back for a second, how we located her was through Michael's organization, the statewide coalition suggested a few shelters. I reached out through her shelter, through her counselor and said, "Is there somebody who you feel is healed enough on her journey to _____?" She said, "I know exactly the right person who really, really wants to start speaking now." And so then I spent weeks in conversation with her. And actually at some point was like, you know this is really recent. Let's not – I don't know if she – she was so adamant and insistent that she do this.

And so there is a piece of it in her own journey where it wasn't really my place to tell her not to. I was just there to sort of flag for her, here are some safety mechanisms that we want to put in place legally for you, as well as emotionally for you. And so will you promise me you're gonna see somebody later in the week after the hearing to make sure that you're checking in, there can be this healing after you've done. And in terms of her – she agreed to do that later this week or early next week.

And in terms of her legal – her custody battle is over. All the things that she sort of confessed nationally, including her use of medication, are things that are on the record in terms of custody battle which is already done. And the legal battle in terms of her restraining orders, etcetera, are already set in place. It's a monetary matter in terms of her divorce that's still pending. And she's actually in contact with her batterer around custody matters. So it's not the kind of thing where she's in hiding and she's

standing up and announcing something where he doesn't know where she is, etcetera. So we did put those pieces in place.

And in the end, she just really, really, really wanted to do this. So that's how the decision got made.

Katherine Pierce:

Well, I'll just add I think in the future we'll do better. I think we made a mistake here. No matter how much she really wanted to _____ no matter how much we need to respect the individual's agency, I'm very concerned for safety. What we know is that **women who leave and** when a woman starts talking about the specifics of the violence that transpired, they are most at risk for _____. Those are very clear statistics. Research has been done here at Johns Hopkins. _____.

Female 1:

Let me just say, in response to something Steve said about feeling that we need to do something. We need to not just hear it, absorb it and then feel bad. One of the reasons – I mean I go to autopsies of little kids. I deal with horrible things every single day of my life for decades. And I think the reason I survive is I'm so busy doing stuff about it. On almost every issue that comes up, I have a task force or I have a committee or I have an expert. I have somebody who could have been out dealing with the aftermath of our survivors testifying.

So I think some of the issues we need to deal with really are the grief and loss and the trauma that these people going through these situations suffer and what are we gonna recommend to make sure that these kinds of programs are set up. We haven't dealt with drugs and alcohol really out there that much. But drugs and alcohol are in 90 percent of the severe abuse cases that we deal with. If you eliminated drugs and alcohol, our caseloads would plummet. The mental health issue is, frankly, less than the substance abuse issue in terms of the caseloads that we have, although, it's a very clear one. And then the whole issue of isolation, not having anybody in their lives to give them support. And I think to determine who's in your life to give you support as we did a little bit yesterday.

But as a recommendation, I think assuring that there's always some resource for a victim who may or may not become a survivor. And then we have the professional survivors who testify over and over again each time their victimization is worse. But the reality is that there are these issues we've just identified. And the whole compassion fatigue thing, what it does for people who feel

so bad, what do we do for you? What tangibly can we say you can do to feel that there is an action you can take so you're not helpless or hopeless. Because just to hear about bad things, I personally deal with the worst cases imaginable and I can deal with them. I can go to the coroner's office I and I can listen to the torture this child went through before he died. I read something in the paper or see something on the news about a child who was killed, I'm a mess. Because I can't do anything. You know It's like, whoa, where was that and who can I call to provide some help for that family. Why is it so late before we found out about it?

But within the scope of what we have, we can make recommendations that will really address the sadness in this sense of really depression over knowing things that happen to kids and women that we don't have any control over. But we I think should think about what is it we could do. And I think we can address that isolation, the mental issues, the substance abuse issues and the horrible grief and traumatic loss that these people suffer.

Alex: You know and I think those are all very – ideas that resonate I think here. I just want to suggest ____ _____ talking about some of the recommendations for the final report to a later time. I just want to sort of get us through this piece of it. What we really haven't gotten focused on is the larger sense of what do we think of the hearing, right? So it's a long day. What can we do to think about the length of the day? We couldn't have coffee in the room. Next time we're gonna make sure we have –

Female 1: Thank you.

Alex: - a way to get you coffee throughout the day. Lunch, we'd like to make it an hour. Right. So we know some things, right? Pretty clear. We sent you a lot of material. Did we send you too much material? Did we overwhelm you? Should we send you less? _____ you have questions. Were they helpful? Do you not need them? Do you want more? Do you want different kinds of things? We put four people on a panel, we gave them each five minutes and left time for questions. I think we thought that was a good dynamic. You know we thought maybe four people might be too many. Should we go to three people. What's the general kind of – _____ other kinds of, you know tricks up our sleeve for other panels and the structures of future –

Deirdre: Was it something that you want to – you know we had the key – we had welcomed single speakers sort of in the beginning with the

welcomes. But we didn't have any single speakers during the day. Was it too repetitive to have panel after panel after panel? Those are some of the structural processes that we also want to just get some feedback on in terms of the hearing content and process.

Robert Macy: I'll take a stab. Yes, yes, no, no.

[Laughter]

No, no, yes, yes.

Deirdre: And it's recorded so we got it.

Robert Macy: That was in reverse order. One more yes. That's great. I think those are perfect parameters.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Those are the answers to the Miranda questions.

[Laughter]

Sharon Cooper: I think having a survivor in every panel is really important. I think it frames what we're talking about. I also think that there were other types of participants that I think would be very helpful. And that may be another session further in the day. But I think having survivors really – because it really, because as you, you know the titles of your sessions are for instance, for example, _____. But I think when we got to the section on the national _____, we were hearing primarily on the job folks who were providing services, etcetera. But I honestly think that _____ included benefit each time for having a survivor. _____ perspective _____ talking about that _____. That's _____.

Deirdre: Okay.

Georgina Mendoza: I found the questions to be very helpful. I really appreciated those. And I know you said, well only if you can't think of any other ones. I'm like, well, I would have asked them anyway.

[Laughter]

Alex: The first panel using a draft question. I was like –

Georgina Mendoza: I did.

[Laughter]

I actually read everything that Erin sends me.

[Laughter]

Female: Yeah, me too.

Georgina Mendoza: - the Monday memo. It's like – actually, I asked my secretary to block off all of the afternoon so I can catch up with all my reading, not just this, but just reading in general. So it's like perfect timing. So I like that. And I don't know why, but I think four panelists are too many. Three I like. No reason. No rationale behind that.

Thea James: I agree. I agree.

Georgina Mendoza: Other than it just feels better.

Thea James: Yes.

Male: Ditto.

[Cross Talk]

Georgina Mendoza: Once I saw it was four, I was like, “Aw, man, it's gonna be so intense.” And there was numbers and stats just thrown at me. And at one point I was just, okay, I just kind of listened and I couldn't take it. So I think three is good. Under one of the panels for impact on a neighborhood, I wish I could have heard a community voice. Somebody from the community telling us about the impact of it. And it was, and again, _____ researchers we needed. Absolutely necessary. But I feel like we need more of that voice. Not just survivors, but somebody who is a resident of the community to say, “And this is how I feel.” Oftentimes we don't hear enough from the actual residents to let us know on the streets what's going on. Usually they can represent what other community members are feeling. And eventually we start seeing that the same trends are the same regardless, with some minor modifications throughout the country.

And just to second a couple of things that Sharon said. I also would like to see the youth more. I think it was so brave for Mr. Cox to come up here and talk about that. But he was handling his own amongst everybody. And he told me, “It was so scary to look

at you guys.” And I thought that was really great. So if we can get more. I mean he was perfect.

And also a little bit of bias to, and maybe Father Greg shares it too, but I would like to see more of the gang aspect brought into this. Because that is a youth – that’s a youth crime. And a lot of it comes because they were exposed to violence at an early age. So I think I’ve shared with you before that I’m also part of the National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention. White House initiative that has chosen six cities throughout the United States. Cities being Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Memphis, San Jose and Salinas. And so one of the things that we do is we look – we take a comprehensive approach. And we look at prevention, intervention, enforcement and reentry. This is a prevention. This is exactly what we’re talking about. Prevention and intervention in that. So I think they’re closely kind of linked.

And as I was thinking about this I said, “This is completely what we talk about.” And I wonder if in the future there’s gonna be any talk between this task force and the National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention, because they’re really intertwined in a way. At one point, I don’t remember who it was, but somebody, “It’s just Department of Justice that’s here. Where’s the rest of the federal government?” And I thought, “Well.” You know and I kind of had my different hat on for the national forum hat, cause I felt like saying, “Well, this isn’t just one department. There are other offices involved in it. And not just in this task force, but in the kind of other realm where we have, you know Department of Education and HUD, and HHS and a number of other departments that are working kind of comprehensively in coordinated efforts.”

Will, I think I talked to you about for the future meetings if we can have more community residents. You know ____ _____. And you said maybe having fieldtrips or something like that. I think that’s a great idea. And I know we do that in the national forum. Before even the sites were picked, there was a federal team as they called it, composed of a DOJ rep, DOL, DOE, kind of different reps that went to the city so they can see what’s going on wearing these different hats. Again, we say we can’t work in silos, we need to work together. And yet it needs to be done on every level. You know so just to kind of put that out there.

Deirdre:

Okay.

Male 3: I'd be curious to hear more reaction to Sharon's suggestion. I have a different reaction in terms of mixing it up. But I'd be interested in hearing what other –

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: As do I for different reasons.

Female: [Inaudible Comment]

Robert Macy: For which suggestion? On the gang or on the?

Female 1: On the survivors.

Male 3: No. I mean I think I'm in agreement with the suggestions about, you know gang members and we may have, you know some access and community voices about what it's like living in a neighborhood that has such a over representation of, you know violence of various kinds. But I was thinking about the panels and Sharon's idea about having, you know survivors on each of the panels. And, you know my concern is is that, number one, there's solidarity that witnesses often feel when they know that they're not sitting with, you know the academics, etcetera. But I also think my concern, just at a gut level is, is that, you know we as task force members wind up feeling, I would think, you know sort of content wise we may want to go in one direction but we want to be balanced, etcetera. It may put more of a burden on us in terms of being able to really, truly focus. So for those reasons I –

Sharon Cooper: On the scientific side.

Male 3: Not just the scientific. But, you know if you have, for example, I hear the three person panel. But you've got, you know two people who are talking about sort of programmatic or, you know scientific stuff and then you've got the survivor, doing the balancing act in terms of paying respectful attention to each becomes more of a burden for us. Coupled with the notion of solidarity that a survivor may feel in being with other survivors where they're not feeling judged. They're not, you know – so that was my reaction, Sharon.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: If I can comment along the same lines regarding the panel, the need for **knowledge** measuring children's exposure to violence. That was a really important panel from my point of view because ultimately we have to be able to justify whatever recommendations we have based upon knowledge that's been gathered in the field. And we have to advance the process of gathering knowledge. You know statistics, gathering evidence. So that we can make a case

for it for recommendations. And without that basis, we're not gonna be able to really make a strong case because people know there's violence out there, but they just don't know how much, where and what circumstances, how to categorize it, how to fill in the gaps and that kind of thing. So I felt that that panel was very helpful to me.

I didn't mind having four people on this particular panel because their written work had preceded them. And I thought some of the written work was really outstanding. I was very sorry I hadn't really read it before I encountered the task force. But I thought that, you know having four people on this particular panel is fine. And the need to have a panel, not necessarily without a survivor in this particular case, because I thought that would have been unbalanced in a certain way. So this particular kind of panel I think really doesn't need to be mixed in with _____.

Deirdre:

And just to comment on that as an observer yesterday, I think that there is – you know I appreciate that everybody really enjoyed hearing Nigel Cox and was thankful of his presence as the only person who was a youth member testifying yesterday and there's a desire to see more. And we certainly appreciate that and will do our best to engage the youth or young adults as we can.

The challenge from my perspective is that issue of sort of, and continuing to – because we do say it's very short testimony and you'll be involved in a conversation after, it may have been part of the set up that he happened to be at a table by himself. But he really wasn't involved in that follow along conversation. There was one question to him at the very beginning of the question period. And then there were no other questions to him. And so I think that's where, from my perspective, I think that there is a challenge to, you know it could be a piece of seating and all of that stuff. There are lots of different dynamics that play into it. But I would want to – I would have the same concern about having a survivor on a panel with the content experts and how the questions – how that conversation can then evolve. Because really they're very different perspectives on the same issue. And I think it's important to ensure that everybody would feel comfortable. I'm sure there are survivors that would be comfortable in engaging in that conversation with academics and practitioners. But there are others that – I just don't know that we have the ability to vet them in that extensive way as we're preparing for these hearings all of the country.

Will: We also want to be mindful, just to chime in, that we don't also don't want to get into a situation where you begin to get finger pointing across the aisle. So you have a survivor who may – it's just a fine line you want to walk with you when you have interventionists. So you have folks doing services. And then you have folks saying, you don't want them basically saying, "You didn't do this for me." You want to set that context of something not happening for that person without individually saying, you or your agency didn't do something for me. So I think that's also a consideration that you all might want to take in – think about as you're making your requests for these panels. So.

Thea James: When we bring youth in, I think we should include LGBTQ youth in. I mean we do have an article in there about them. There's been enough of that nationally, you know suicides and bullying. Suicides as a result of bullying and that type thing that I think it's important to hear their voices.

Gregory Boyle: Just a cautious. Cause, you know I have leukemia, but don't invite me to a panel about the cure of leukemia. I'm not an expert on this. If you want to, you know hear about how you manage chemo, I could talk about that. But am I an expert on this? No. And I don't go to my hematologist, what do you know? You've never had leukemia.

[Laughter]

But that's a problem. You know because I think, you know who are the experts? You know and gang members, god love them, I've spent 25 years working with them, but some gang members have no access to their experience. And I was listening to Chief Goodwin yesterday and he said, "You know kids join gangs because they want to belong." Well, it's nonsense. Sorry. Because where did he get that from? Well, as an outsider he goes, "Why would a kid join a gang? I bet he wants so belong." We get it from there. And you ask gang members, "Why'd you join a gang?" "Well, I wanted to belong. So you join a gang, see the world. Wine, women and song.

[Laughter]

That's what they'll say because they have no access to this. My mom used to put cigarettes out on me and she used to hold my head in the toilet and flush till I nearly drowned. Ladies and gentlemen, that's why you joined a gang. He's not going to tell

you that. So here's our dilemma, you know part of it is we romanticize. I want a gang member on this panel and talk about his experience. Well, yes and no. Some have access to it and some are absolute strangers and they're 30 years old and they're total strangers to their experience. And part of what we do in a kind of therapeutic model is try to get them to talk about what this is really about. Cause once they do they can re-identify in the world and then everything is –

Thea James: Can that happen in the vetting process? I mean –

Gregory Boyle: Excuse me? I guess you can. It's just it's my dilemma –

Deirdre: No, can I offer – it can't. It can't. because the thing is that when we go in – you know the way that we find – I mean as Sue Jotha said, the woman that came to testify yesterday about whom everybody is so concerned and saying it was a mistake and it'll never happen again, is someone that we spent 20, 25 hours talking to. Talking with professionals who referred her to us as someone who was ready to – so all that you guys are saying needs to be done to vet witnesses was done and yet we're being told that it – so I think that it's unfair to say that we will be able to vet survivors in a way that's gonna absolutely meet – like we aren't gonna be able to know if we talk to the 30 year old on the phone even for 25 hours and they come through their service provider or some speaker's bureau that they have actually achieved the level – we aren't gonna be able to know until –

[Cross Talk]

Katherine Pierce: I think what we've heard, and we've heard it from Steve and we've heard from others, is that if – what we're hearing from Father Boyle, is that we may or may not have access to that understanding. And that comes after years and years of advocacy and clinical work. And unless that person's story has been told before and not been _____ for the first time in a venue like this where you're gonna start disclosing some things that have never happened before to you. And we _____. And we have people on the task force who can help us do that.

Gregory Boyle: Yeah. I could get you gang members without a doubt who are at a point where they can say, "I know what this is about." And there are others I would say, "No. You can't speak in front of this group." And I can absolutely categorically _____. So and there are people out there in every kind of category, from, you know

whatever kind of subgrouping of ____ and survivor that we could identify who could say exactly I think the concern _____. They know what this is about. They've spoken about it many times. And they know all the contours of it. I just think there ____ you could identify.

Female 1:

Yeah, I think the task force itself could – I could identify survivors who have –

Alex:

Okay. I mean clearly this the revisit _____. We are revisiting it now. We're gonna be _____ part of the journey of this task force I think is gonna be sort of working through this. And I think this has been very helpful to us and all that. I do just want to be a bit mindful of our time. I don't have a yellow or red light to turn on. And so I just want to make sure that we got through some of the mechanics of the hearing and the set up of that. And then I wanted to make sure we can sort of talk about the next couple of hearings and have some _____ into that. So I'd like to move to that.

I wanted to introduce Katherine Huffman. I think some of you have met her from the Raven Group. She was here yesterday. When NCCD applied to DOJ to work with you all on this task force, part of our team was Katherine Huffman and the Raven Group. So I just wanted her to just give a – and because one of our fundamental beliefs is what is critical to the success of this task force is not just the work that we do in rooms like this around the country and not just the conversations and emails we send back on Monday or the conference call. But it's around communications. It's around ____ bringing of a larger message to the public and engaging the public, engaging concerned people, community members, advocates, policymakers, decision makers, those impacted by this, survivors, etcetera.

So from the beginning we felt that that sort of communications piece of it all is very important. Notwithstanding having some people on CSPAN saying things that we wish they hadn't said. You know the brother talking about this sister. Right. _____ fantastic thing that got said, right? And that people had access to information on a topic and issues that they have not really heard about and thought about in the ways that we're able to think of them.

So I just wanted to introduce Katherine. You want to just give like a quick, Hi, I'm Katherine, this is the Raven Group so then –

Katherine Huffman: Great. Yeah, thank you, Alex. And thanks to all of you. I'm Katherine Huffman. And I'm sorry I didn't get to meet all of you individually yesterday. But it's really a pleasure and an honor to be able to work with you all on this project. As Alex said, The Raven Group is a policy and communications firm here in DC. We've worked on a lot of different issues related to particularly justice and access to justice. And we see this as a really critical part of that work.

Coming in to think about it, we've worked with other task forces in the past on this issue of communications. And, as Alex said, this is something that many of you all have a lot of experience with. The importance of really thinking about who is listening to you, who needs to be called upon to act based on the work that you're doing from the get-go so that at the end you come out with a product, but also with the right audience that's waiting for that product. That's ready to hear from you and is ready to then take your reporting, your recommendations and good advice and really make that something that has a lasting legacy and a real impact in terms of safety of children.

And so certainly there's a component of that that's media and press, but we actually see that as a really sort of small part of it. And it's really a much stronger focus on making sure that throughout the year this task force's work and the legitimacy here work and the respect that it is owed is something that people, advocates, communities, the policymakers, elected officials and the list goes on, all know about, all trust, all see as something that they can point to at the end of and say, "Wow, this is a task force that knew what it was doing. It came up with some great recommendations and that we can now act on." And that's something that has already begun in terms of starting to communicate with various relevant fields. As we say, you know many who already see themselves as very invested in these problems and these concerns, and many who don't but who need to start thinking about themselves as invested in these problems and these concerns. And letting them know about the task force. Letting them know about all of you who are such an important part of legitimizing the task force and its work. And getting them ready to provide input so that they'll feel that they were a part of it. And then also being able to hear from you.

So we'll talk more about – there are obviously aspects of this that have to do with the hearings and have to do with sort of, you know

_____ the hearings are one of the most public moments for the – again, only one part of the information gathering that you’ll do, but clearly the most public and visible. You know there’s an aspect of those audiences and having them in mind that goes into making a lot of _____ hearings. But there are lots of other ways and lots of other things that want to do over the year to make sure that the long term goals of the task force are being met. And that we are communicating both ways with all of those audiences throughout the process.

So I’ll stop there and these are all things that we’ll have more chances to talk over _____.

Georgina Mendoza: Yeah, I just wanted to thank Katherine. You were really helpful yesterday.

Katherine Huffman: No ____.

Georgina Mendoza: Are you available for an interview? I’m like, “Sure.” She was practically grabbing me by the hand.

[Laughter]

And I really want to thank Alex, Deirdre, Will and all the staff for all the work that you guys have done. It’s so much work. I’m usually on that side. And I know how just some details that we don’t think of, really how time consuming they are. So I saw you guys diligently taking notes here. Which was awesome. By the way, I really like that. Cause I know sometimes I get so invested in the testimony I forget to take notes. I saw them when they were trying to get people to stop and they were just like, “Forget it.”

[Laughter]

And I know how hard that is. You know keeping time, making sure everything’s scripted and structured. And I just really want to thank you, cause I know how much work that is.

Male: Second that.

Thea James: Yeah. Yep.

Robert Macy: Got a brief question to Katherine. Can you give me a concrete example of one of the things you say that you’re doing? When you say the communications, is it you working with NCCD and the

people that we're bringing together to do the testimonies? Or are you doing optics for the whole task force for constituent groups or?

Katherine Huffman: It's really more the latter that's the piece that I'm working on. And it's obviously the post communication and coordination with staff and also with DOJ and a lot of the great communications staff there that are also supporting the task force. But, you know in the sort of short terms since the announcement of the task force, putting together constituent lists, starting to make sure that, you know in addition to the press release that goes out there's also a communication to multiple organizations and their list serves and –

Robert Macy: Okay. Good.

Katherine Huffman: - they had a phone call ahead of time knowing that this was gonna be announced and that they should let all their friends know that _____. And you know like that kind of work. And that'll, I think, just continue and grow over the course of the year.

Robert Macy: Good. Thank you.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Can I just add also? I really appreciate a lot of the talking points. We know that we're not scripted and required to use them verbatim, but they're very helpful starting points. There were a couple of times we had an opportunity to speak with the media yesterday and they were really sound references that we were able to incorporate into our discussions _____. At least I did.

Georgina Mendoza: Oh, I did. _____. They definitely asked about, at least in both interviews that I did, they asked about the cities and why they were picked and kind of what the main purposes of the task force were. So the talking points were right on point.

Deirdre: Well, it's a great group to work for. Really. All of you have been incredibly thoughtful any time I've had an individual conversations with you, all of you are very committed to this process obviously and the content of the work, you know clearly, based on all the work that you're doing. So while you appreciate our work for you, I think we all appreciate working on this project and working with you to move the process forward and move the agenda forward and move the conversation forward.

Katherine Huffman: Can I ask one more tiny thing –

Deirdre: Yep.

Katherine Huffman: Just to quickly follow up on the communications. Lest you wonder, I will also be in touch with – my team and I will be in touch with each of you over the course of the coming couple of months. Because your input and advice about the communities we need to be sure that we're reaching and the best ways to go about that will be invaluable to us on that piece. So just wanted to go ahead and start putting that in your brain as well.

Alex: _____, you know for every week at the Department of Justice and OJD, _____ is a sort of subcommittee as part of the larger Defending Childhood Committee that meets. And you've heard over the past couple of days the folks here sort of lead that **or are part of that on** this task force came out of that process. Deirdre, and to some greater or lesser extent other folks at NCCD participate in that – it's a Tuesday meeting now that goes on. There's also a separate communications meeting for this task force that's begun I think on a regular weekly basis also. And Katherine and Deirdre and the folk, communication folks, and some of the policy programmatic people at DOJ are part of that. So it's this whole sort of little shadow thing going on behind all of the work that guys see.

Deirdre: So with the idea of work that we have ahead of us, the second piece that we wanted to try and get through before we break for the morning is just kind of a quick glance conversation about at least an opportunity to open the conversation or let you guys know that we're open to hearing from you about the agendas for the – there are two draft agendas that are behind here. Yeah _____. So there are two draft agendas behind here. One for Albuquerque that's a bit more fleshed out and then one – or actually one for Albuquerque, one for Miami, both that are somewhat fleshed out and address some topics that have already been raised.

We do – I would like to just kind of get a sense – I think we've heard from one task force member, but if we could get a sense, is everybody thinking that they're gonna be able to be in Albuquerque for January 31 and February 1? And those will be, you know you'll be there early morning January 31. So flying in on the thirtieth. We may be able to do – we may – I don't think we will have a content rich working dinner like we did here where it's agenda and materials, but we would likely try and do a group dinner to, you know, again, continue conversation and work on some materials. So you'd be flying in on the thirtieth. You'd be

able to – I think we would time it so that we would hope to be able to get most people out on the afternoon of the first or evening of the first so that you'd be able to get back home. So everybody will be there? Great.

Okay. And then March – the March meeting in Miami is gonna be March 20 and March 21. Again, you'd need to fly in on March 29.

Alex: March 19.

Deirdre: March 19. I'm sorry. It's been a really long week. And it's only Wednesday morning. March 19. So you'd need to fly in March 19. You'd be there March 20 and at least through the morning, early afternoon of March 21 and fly out – the goal would be that folks would be able to fly out the evening of March 21. Okay?

Female 1: Does anybody else have a problem with that date but me?

Deirdre: No.

Female 1: Because we have a big children's traumatic grief and loss conference on the twenty-second. Which obviously I can get to, but I'm gonna have trouble since I'm running it being there ahead of time. But I can work around that. I was just hoping somebody else had a problem.

[Laughter]

[Cross Talk]

Gregory Boyle: Was I dreaming or did I hear Detroit? Was Detroit somewhere in here?

Deirdre: Detroit is. We don't have a draft agenda yet for Detroit in part because I figured, look, let's get through these two agendas and then we can figure out what else we need to cover in Detroit. So the Detroit is April 24 and 25.

Male 3: Why couldn't we be in Detroit in February? I heard it's beautiful.

[Laughter]

Male: Father, were you dreaming about Detroit?

Female 1: No, it's not.

Deirdre: So I would like you guys to take a look at calendars too. But the Detroit – there's actually two other dates that don't have agendas in this packet. It's Detroit, April 24 and 25. So you would be flying in to Detroit on April 23. I hear that the Detroit Tigers – is that the baseball team?

Alex: Yeah.

Deirdre: Okay, the Detroit Tigers are in town that week.

Joe Torre: We'll facilitate that.

Deirdre: Okay.

[Cross Talk]

Fieldtrip. Exactly. Fieldtrip. We won't be able to buy tickets, but I think we might be able to get some block seating there.

Sharon Cooper: That'd be good.

Robert Macy: Wait, what are the dates again for that?

Deirdre: So it's April 24 and 25 will be the hearing dates. You will need to fly into Detroit on the evening of the twenty-third. April 23 you'll be flying in. We'll have a hearing on the twenty-fourth, the twenty-fifth and we'll be leaving the evening, afternoon of the twenty-fifth.

And then the final dates that were also emailed out a bit ago, a month and a half ago, were in June, June 5 and 6. And that's gonna be a – basically that's sort of a tentative working meeting for report review drafting piece. There will be no public testimony. There will be no – that is not gonna be a hearing. It's gonna be a working meeting. My guess is that it'll be similar to this in that it's gonna be a meeting, we're all gonna be sitting around looking at each other talking about documents in front of us, but it will be a public meeting. So –

Female: Where would it be?

Deirdre: It would likely be in DC I think is what we've talked about.

Georgina Mendoza: What about the West Coast? I mean.

[Laughter]

[Cross Talk]

Will: And just so you all know, we'll certainly – cost will be a major driver.

[Cross Talk]

That will be something that we certainly consider as we're moving forward. But also scheduling and what would be best for the group.

Female 1: So that could be a listening session like LA? Not northern California. We've got a bunch of LA people here.

Deirdre: So the – are you talking about the June 5 and 6 dates?

Female 1: No. Washington's fine for that.

Deirdre: Okay. Okay. So we'll have another conversation. Later on this afternoon we're gonna be talking about other opportunities for information gathering. But we wanted to just kind of – so everybody has those dates on calendars. You know the June dates are tentatively in DC. It's not solid that it'll be there. We certainly can take a look at other options in terms of travel and proximity for the – but there is an issue of the federal staff being able to participate in that final meeting.

Male 3: In terms of the content and witnesses, is that something we should communicate with you all privately about or?

Deirdre: So what we can do is – what we'd like to do is get feedback on the agendas.

Alex: There are no witnesses names ____.

Deirdre: There are no witness names. Okay. And the idea is that these are – because of the quickness with which all of this was pulled together. You know just a little bit of detail, NCCD didn't get our – we didn't our formal award for this process until like mid September. So having the – the task force was officially announced in mid October at the OJJDP conference. Here we are six weeks later having successfully gone through the first hearing

that had some really powerful witnesses, some really great testimony, a lot of media coverage. And so we did not have an opportunity to really run draft agendas past you as a group. The first meeting of this group was Monday evening. So what we want to do at this point from this point going forward is just kind of, you know, again, share what our ideas are for the structure of the agenda for getting different information into the conversations and in front of the panel.

And so what we have is the draft agendas here. Yes, we definitely want to hear from you about recommended witnesses, professionals, practitioners, academics, survivors, people that would be strong speakers on these topics, on the topic for this issue. There are ideas about how we can pull some conversations together, because this is a very broad issue of inter familial violence, community based violence, school based violence, bullying, you know the other internet – the cyber crimes that are beyond bullying. So there's a lot of content topics. And it doesn't really serve anybody well to say, "Here's this one panel on this," and just sort of checkerboard it, hopscotch through a grid. So what we're trying to do also is look for what are the themes. LGBT is an issue, but it's an issue that impacts rural and Indian country. It's an issue that impacts urban youth. It's an issue that impacts immigrant youth. So it's not like let's do the LGBT panel. It's more like let's make sure we hear those voices across these different hearings.

So I think that's our perspective. And what I would offer is that given that we're sort of at a breaking point now, rather than get into the content of the discussion, in part because if you guys can take, during the break take a few seconds to look at this and then, you know also get up, stretch your legs. There is coffee in the upstairs room that you're welcome to enjoy in the upstairs room and in the hallway.

[Laughter]

But not in here. But if you guys can take a look at that, then what we can do is have a short conversation when we come back and I'll say that we'll limit it to just like 10, 15 minutes of feedback, kind of broad topic feedback. We'll also be able to communicate with you individually over the course of the next week or so, have follow up calls similar to the first calls that I made to you just introducing us and getting your input. We'd like to do some

follow up calls to this hearing to you as individuals. And then we can also – and we can get feedback that was well.

A general comment is absolutely we want your input on witnesses, topics and how the information is shared. And you are welcome to get that either to NCCD directly through me or Erin, both of us, you should have our email addresses and phone numbers. You are also welcome to give it to Will. He's gonna shoot it directly to me and say, "Take a look at this." So whichever works easiest for you.

Sarah Deer: I have one logistical question. Is there funding to bring ___ witnesses in who are not from the local area?

Deirdre: Yes. I mean we had folks traveling in for this hearing.

Sarah Deer: That's what I thought.

Deirdre: Yes. Yes. There is.

Gregory Boyle: But it's sort of mainly more ___ yesterday ___ Baltimore was pretty well represented.

Deirdre: There is an idea that we are in those locations for a reason. That there is some sort of local – and by local, I mean here in Baltimore it was a bit easier. There were quite a few folks that came down from Philadelphia. There were quite a few folks that came up from DC. So there's this northeast corridor. You know Albuquerque is a three hour drive from just about any place that is even remotely a pinpoint on the map. So we do want to take advantage of the local community there, but we know that, particularly because there is an intent to have some, while it won't be the only time we hear from those working in Indian country, it will be a time where we will have more conversation about that. You know we're gonna hope to bring somebody in from Alaska or from Montana or both. Or somebody, you know from some of the – so it's gonna be a time where we are gonna be bringing people in as well. And that is gonna be the idea at all of the breaks.

Alex: Right. And so you'll see when you look at this, we don't have a voices panel on this one. We weren't sure how it worked and what we wanted to do, so we sketched this out _____. We have an hour for lunch on this _____. Right?

[Laughter]

[Cross Talk]

So, you know we have kicked around some ideas about how to handle the –

Deirdre: It ends at 5:15.

Alex: Ends at 5:15, half an hour earlier. I was able to tighten it up a bit. So you – so and clearly what we've heard in talking today, ___ today and yesterday, right, we're gonna sort of factor into it. It's not that we want to sort of walk out of here with it all in ink, but ___ that sort of broad input. Is this moving in the right direction. You can see hearing two and three, hearing four is sort of a couple things we could do there ___ sort of clean up. Right? We're gonna – three months from now somebody's gonna say, "We really need to have recommendations ___ in this particular way." And we'll say, "Wow, you know we didn't hear from anybody about that." You know maybe we should, as part of our fact finding, make sure we're ___ people that give that perspective and sort of ___.

Deirdre: Right.

Alex: So but let's take – we'll take our break.

Deirdre: Take a break.

Will: I just want to say, operationally, as you all have these suggestions, please keep your co-chairs involved. Because ultimately the final approved agenda is approved by the two co-chairs and myself. So they should be involved and privy to these discussions. I just wanted to have that out there. Thank you.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: How long is this break? From yesterday's experience.

Deirdre: Okay. We're saying ten, so we'll be back at quarter till.

[Laughter]

[Cross Talk]

Joe Torre: Yeah, we said, say five, it'll be ten.

[Break 1:48:51 to 2:10:06]

Deirdre:

All right. So we're gonna get going again. Otherwise my offer to leave a bit early or reorganize the afternoon is off the table. In the interest of trying to get feedback on the agenda, as well as respect people's desire to move through the topics with some efficiency in order to not have to come back after our lunch break, what I would offer is that I would be happy to set times with people today to talk about the agendas, the content, the structure. You know we talked about the structure, the way that you guys would like to organize it, the length of the day, the breaks during the day, the ability to drink coffee and have some nuts or something on the table as we're listening. And those are all heard and will be respected as we look at the next site.

But in terms of the agenda themselves, if there is a broad statement that folks would like to make about it. I think to go through the agendas piece by piece, panel by panel would be counterproductive to getting out in a timely manner. But I really am interested in hearing feedback piece by piece, panel by panel. And I would love to be able to set times to do that with you individually and then summarize the impact all of those conversations have on the final agenda with a second draft that would come out.

Male 3:

Can I ask a general question? And, again, if it's something that it may be one of those questions that you all will talk to everybody and then be able distilling it back to us. So it doesn't need to be lengthy. But you know as I was thinking about the agenda, I know that there were three specific areas that I would find useful. And I don't know – can I just throw them out? But then you can – so one, and it came from yesterday. One is in the area of law enforcement. I don't know if Jim would agree with me, but having another chief who has broader range of experience, particularly in terms of community oriented policing. Clearly I have somebody in mind. Jim knows who I'm thinking about.

But the other one has to do with legislative process. And not just the dry kind of – and I know our colleagues from the Justice Department know more about legislative process than they might want to know. But actually hearing from somebody who's also a potential ally. And I don't know what the deal is, Will, in terms of actually asking a congressperson to actually testify. But if not that kind of person, somebody who's got experience in terms of lobbying and the legislative process I just think would be, for me, personally useful in terms of trying to establish some of the parameters of and the scope of the report.

The last area had to do with public awareness. And I thought Howard's comments – I mean everybody's comments were fascinating. But it's come up again today. I don't think – I certainly as a psychoanalyst wasn't trained or a professor in psychiatry wasn't trained in public awareness. In spite of the fact that I'd like to think I know everything about everything. But I don't. And so the public awareness thing. I think it'd actually be fascinating.

It's kind of like what you were saying, Greg. You know you can have lots of ideas, but I'd actually like to hear an expert talk to us about, well, how do you raise public awareness about something nobody wants to know about? I just would – I would find that really fascinating. Because I think if part of our report is something about – I don't want it to just be, yeah, let's raise public awareness. Let's do PSAs. That we know don't work. But I'd like to hear from an expert. How do you market? How do you brand? How do you get an idea ____? Especially when it's really _____, ugly.

Deirdre: Okay. Are there – if there other –

Georgina Mendoza: I have someone that maybe you can talk to about that.

Deirdre: Okay.

Georgina Mendoza: It's kind of an expert in that field. So we can touch base on that later.

Deirdre: Sure. Sure. Other comments, broad ideas, thoughts like that?

Male: Go ahead.

Georgina Mendoza: Okay. Thanks. Just I wanted to make sure that there was a little bit more of an education voice. That education was represented. You know the comment was made yesterday that people, a lot of kids feel safe at school. Sometimes I see the reverse in ____ Salinas and other areas in Monterrey County where they don't feel safe. And that's why they don't go or they're truant. Because they don't feel like they have a safe environment or the protection by teachers and the superintendent. So at some point I would like to hear more from education.

Deirdre: Okay.

Robert Macy: Do we get to – and ___ suggestions about that?

Deirdre: Yeah. I mean, again, I think that I know – I understand that all of you have ideas. And I guess my vision of how I would get some of this information – how this information sharing and collecting on building the agendas will go is that I'll be talking with folks and I'll be hearing that there is a desire to have, you know folks who can help the task force understand public awareness campaigns. And how do we build public awareness on an issue that is difficult to hear about. I mean we just had a two hour conversation from experts on how tough this is to hear and how sometimes we hear things we don't want to hear and we have a hard time then processing and dealing with and feeling good about what we can do or not do.

So if I hear that that's something that is desired, then, you know during talks with others it would be, you know as there are follow along conversations and in talking with the co-chairs about building the agenda, it would be, you know these are the topics. You know do you have ideas? In your conversations with your task force members have you heard people mention ideas? Are there people that you want me to check in with on the task force, whether they have ideas about this or not? So I think that there's gonna be – it's not gonna be a one conversation, give me what you want and then we're gonna take it away. It's gonna – the dialogue is gonna build between, you know within this group from NCCD to this group, include, you know from DOJ to the group. So the spider web is just gonna get denser and denser on the lines of conversation.

Male: *[Inaudible Comment]*

Deirdre: Yes.

Antonio Taguba: _____ to this _____ time manager. So it's a zero sum game I would imagine. The one constant thing is time _____. Set a stage for a ten hour hearing. Well, ten hours is standard. Is _____ huge volume of information that we all want to have and that we have to distill then _____. You know _____ determine what are the common themes. You know _____ bunch of common themes yesterday. Lack of money and _____ resources. Nobody's accountable. Blah, blah, blah. _____ common themes _____. But if we go with all of our wish lists, cause I have my own, and I'm listening to everybody else's wish

list is, you know setting this agenda that is reasonable, that can be time managed, somebody making a presentation in three minutes. That's not enough information as far as I'm concerned. So I think if we extend the hearings to one and a half days as opposed to just one day as opposed to two days or whatever have you, you know we may be going forward _____ our limits in terms of gathering information.

Deirdre: Mm hmm.

Antonio Taguba: Not every setting is gonna be the same. I like _____. This is called an _____ _____. How do we need to _____. And next hearing we'll probably do another one. And we'll know what right looks like by the fourth hearing. _____. So again, unless somebody says 12 hours is what we can manage, but then you have information overload.

Deirdre: Right.

Katherine Huffman: And just to follow on that. And one thing just to remind you with my communications hat on. You know the public hearings are, again, just one way that you can gather information, including as a group. And so thinking about, you know maybe it doesn't make sense to have somebody come and talk about sort of the feasibility of the legislative process as part of the public hearing, but that's really important for you all to have somebody present on in this type of setting the next day. Or, you know so I'm just throwing that out that like there may be – and that may not be exactly what you were talking about, but there may be pieces that could be accomplished that just don't have to be fit into the eight hours of a day or –

[Cross Talk]

Antonio Taguba: - we all say we want to do _____ _____. _____.

Deirdre: If you add something on to the agenda, you're either gonna take something off explicitly or implicitly.

Will: Just so folks know, those are the discussions that we have behind the scenes and that we certainly take into consideration and that I will be working with the chairs and NCCD to ensure that we are being as responsive as possible without giving you all too much. I think, and this is just my personal view, I think yesterday was about the limit of what we could have accomplished in one day.

And I think it was very – it was a different scenario because we had the AG. This was the initial framing of the issue. So the other hearings won't necessarily have this same type flow. It'll have a different flow as the general indicated. So just so folks know, we are certainly mindful behind the scenes. What we certainly want though is for your ideas to rise to the top so that we, again, can take the commonalities from everything we hear and ensure that you all get the maximum bang for the buck.

Male 3:

I really appreciate what you were saying about, you know different ways of getting information. I could imagine, for example, you know somebody who knows the legislative process and special interests, you know approaches to the Hill like the back of his hand presenting to this group in a way that would be actually much more direct and informative than doing it in a public hearing.

The issue about what's on the agenda, I just want to keep in my own mind that we're moving towards writing a report. And I've been involved in reports that says, raise public awareness. The reason I put it out there is, you know we've all said that. Or – and when I was uninformed, and I'm still uninformed, but you know I thought, "Well, we should we have a PSA campaign." Well, then colleagues from communications said, "Guess what, pal? You know lot of money and they don't do a whole lot. It's got to be part of a broader campaign." That's something, if we're gonna have a recommendation, I'd like us to be informed about.

But I agree with you, you know it means that you pick and choose. I just want to keep in mind, we have a report to write.

Sharon Cooper:

One thing that I think will be ____ ____ to the end point is that when I first saw a title ____ ____, I ____ ____ think that you're talking about meetings. And I think that this report should not exclude exposure to media violence because ____ _____. And some of the sexual behaviors that we're seeing in sex offenders today, I think the report should not exclude that. We may not be focused on that. Where ____ ____ some more. We'll ____ _____. But I think ____ ____ to exclude that aspect of violence ____ ____.

Joe Torre:

But everything that's gone on in violence and abuse has been kept a secret for so long that, you know even though it may not be comfortable to watch or listen to, it's still necessary. Cause, I mean I was here yesterday for, you know as long as the rest of us were and I learned things. It's just stuff that's reality. I think the

biggest issue with what we're talking about is the fact that it's not talked about. You know nobody looks at it. It was raised yesterday. It's a health issue. Certainly it's a health issue. They raise money for different diseases. I mean breast cancer and heart disease. They're all worthy. But this is a health issue. And it's something that people need to know, even though that's not comfortable to watch. Cause they may – you know not enough people know how deep this goes as far as how many, you know different people. You know I know the children aspect of it. But not enough people make that connection. That if you're gonna end the cycle, children are the ones that really need to be taken care of.

Male 3:

And the other thing is about free consultation. I mean this is per the communication thing, you know getting out there, talking about it. It's much more likely that we get, and I'm just using them as one example, somebody from young _____ agreeing to do their public service at a federal commission hearing and doing a private consultation with a group like us. I mean maybe I'm being ridiculous, but I think there is something about a focus on the need for public awareness, you know. And then how do we use the task force as an opportunity to draw on public service from people who we couldn't afford.

Joe Torre:

And maybe enlist some people that'll get somebody's attention.

Antonio Taguba:

It's part of this larger broader issue of public awareness. It's the strategic implication _____ that says you're not just telling the public _____ in _____ private sector. You know all that stuff. _____ social responsibility fall _____ our kids. On a broader scale it says how do we weave that into the report that _____ strategic implications plan to make – you know it's not a shot gun blast. It's a manner of engagement of community. Cause what we heard yesterday, a lot of the _____ saying, "Well, just do things on our own." So the public awareness piece is down at the grassroots level. And it's gravitating up to the top and where _____ well, I need more money because _____ are _____. So how do you bridge that gap? Unless you have some sort of _____ communication.

Alex:

We agree wholeheartedly with that. About a strategic communication. Of how do you enlist partners and what's the legacy of this task force. And so when I use this, we're saying here is a segue into the next piece of conversation, right? We're gonna follow up on specific ideas and thoughts and suggestions for

the upcoming hearings. The issues that we need to address in all of that. We have our smart phones and our calendars here. You have your smart phones and your calendars. People who are interested in it, let's set some time today for tomorrow, Monday, Tuesday, to talk. Right? Because January 31 is around the corner with the holiday and New Year's break, people need to make their plans. It's not we just call people up and say they, "Great, let me clear my life for you." So what we can do, obviously if you have thoughts and you're sitting on your plane or your train, send us an email, right, and let us know. You don't have to wait for us. Yes?

Female 1:

We've done a number of public awareness campaigns. We didn't do it, but we all know about the Surgeon General has determined that smoking is harmful to your health. Smoking has plummeted. SIDS deaths of babies. The public health community really documented the importance of putting babies on their back after years of fear of why babies were dying. SIDS rates have plummeted. There's certain public awareness campaigns that work because of a clear consistent message. That's the challenge here. Because I'm sitting here thinking, "Wait, let's talk about the newborns and the pregnancies and the very young children." And then we're talking about the gangsters. It's all a part of a continuum.

But I think the challenge for us, if we're gonna do public awareness, we have to have a really good message that everybody can listen to hear and adapt. Because if it's just a whole bunch of research put together that proves that we have this national emergency, which we did with child abuse and the family violence people did, I think that we have to say something. We have to have a really good central message that we can expound on. And I think it's something for us to think about. What is it we want the public to hear?

Alex:

And I think that's the perfect set up for the next part of our conversation, which is about the final report.

Female 1:

Okay.

Alex:

Right? So whether it's a public service campaign, whether it's a press release at the end of the day, whether it's Eric Holder standing up and announcing the work of the task force, whether it's a Congressional hearing that comes out of this or something that happens at a state level or county level or the school board level, right? Whether it's discussion that happens on a community

hospital and a parents' group. Wherever the conversations happen, right? When this task force is over, what is that message? What is that legacy? What is that work that we're doing here leading to? And how does that sort of exist in the world and beyond? Beyond this. Right?

I mean honestly, we're not the Casey Foundation. We don't have big money to pay for a national PSA. We can try to do some things and think about, you know how we might set that up or help people segue into that. That's great. We're not a foundation. But we can think about some things we might be able to – that could move foundations in a way. We're not Congress, right? We can't appropriate funds. But we can think about how we might be able to get state, local, federal bodies to think about how they spend and invest their funds. Right?

But ultimately the thing that we do have control over, is the final report.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Alex, one of the things that's already begun is the framing of the issue by the literature that you all have sent to us and also the Attorney General's speeches on these issues. There's just the talk about, you know violence in the home, violence in school, violence in the community. So that much of the framing it seems has already begun in terms of three general categories of places where this is going on and perhaps we might think about adopting that kind of a framing.

Thea James: I'm thinking that – I'm sorry. Go ahead. I was just gonna say I was thinking this morning, whatever we come up with in the final report, we are able to affect policy, correct? Right?

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Yes.

Thea James: I mean because I'm thinking –

Male: - policy.

Thea James: Sorry?

Alex: We hope it will affect but we suggest, right?

Thea James: Right. Exactly.

Deirdre: We recommend.

Thea James:

Because for it to go anywhere, for it to become active, to activate it, to me it has to rest in policy. I mean because otherwise there's nothing to mandate anything. There's no mandating for screening, protection, intervention. You know none of these things. It kind of, to me, needs to be something, in terms of how you best protect people and how you best provide them for what they need after having been affected by this stuff is it has to be something that's mandated. That has to happen. You know screening kids for violence in school like, you know is something that you have to do as a school, as a teacher, as a school system or whatever. To me the foundation, the first thing that has to happen to make this thing, as people talked about two days ago, not collect dust and that type thing, is it has to be rooted in that.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Can I just add something there? I mean the policies that have been put forth by the office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention have dramatically changed juvenile justice across the nation. So policies coming from the Department of Justice have a tremendous impact. Everything from looking at recommendations for functional family there, MST, those have been adopted across the nation because they came from the federal government, they were very well researched, very well documented. And they've gone out into the lands and they've been funded often by the local governments in the counties and cities and also by the state government.

So I don't think we have to necessarily decide that we're gonna get new legislations that's gonna send money out across the nation. I think we need crystal clear ideas about what needs to be done. I think those ideas, once out there, based upon sound recommendations, will take root. It'll take a while, but they will take root. Because what comes from the Department of Justice and the federal government just has a tremendous impact in the field I work in, in juvenile justice. And people are just saying, "What are they saying at the national level," because, you know we have the most resources at the national level to really define the problems. Just I wouldn't worry about.

Jim McDonnell:

Just a couple of themes came up yesterday that I'd like to throw out just so we kind of weave it through where we go from here. But Joe talked a lot about silence and the whole silence thing, trying to raise and move that out of the way. But I think it comes back to what Father Boyle was talking about. The demonization. That's what drives the silence. As long as we look at someone as a

monster, it continues to make it that black cloud hanging over us. The public awareness piece and the public health issue I think then opens up. If we can, you know like you said yesterday, when they said, oh, this person was a monster, but then they were mentally ill, it changes the dialogue. And opens up, I think more of an ability for us to be able to get people to talk about what they've been through if it's a health issue rather than I'm embarrassed about. You know so to the degree that it makes sense to weave this through the rest of the dialogue I think it might be helpful.

Male 3:

So two things in terms of your clarifying comment, Alex, about what we can recommend and what happens and also the issue of money and what we can and can't do. What we can do is make recommendations and that we're all agreed on. But there's also a power of that, you know show me, don't tell me school of collaboration is the one I believe in. So the idea of going back to public awareness is there are people that if you build a movement, if you build and there's leadership from the top, from the White House, from the Justice Department, etcetera, there are people in the public information world that would be interested in being part of the communication piece. This is just for example.

But I want to go back to the point you made, Jim, about and that we raised in terms of the demonization. Because of the demonization, we actually lose part of an argument about the cost side of things. Right? So if we're able to follow through on looking at the history of the perpetrators, gang bangers, etcetera, then we're actually strengthening the ____.

So the one other area, because I think this does get back to the issue of the report, I actually like to hear in some shape or form a healthcare economist. Because we can throw out the numbers and our academic colleagues can throw out the numbers, but the people that I've learned the most from are people that do this for a living and they're experts. So I think that, again, the issue of making recommendations, part of it has to be able to address the enormity of the scope of the issues that we're dealing with.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Can I just piggy-back off of that? Because in the homeless discussions in Philadelphia, the economists who looked at the cost of having someone homeless go to the emergency room for care, you know 25 times in a year versus getting a home to stay in and getting regular care and the tremendous savings that was incorporated was a phenomenal thing. So I think, you know that idea really could, you know hold sway as one of the, you know in

the recommendation package, to cut cost dramatically by having some of these issues dealt with up front. So I think that is one of the things that I've seen in terms of policy that has made a tremendous difference in Philadelphia, and I think even New York followed some of the recommendations for dealing with homeless who had mental health issues and physical health issues based upon that kind of an argument.

Male 3:

Especially important when the political climate is we can't spend anything on anything. But we're spending lots and it's going out the window and it's costing our country, you know billions and billions of dollars. So this is part of within the recommendation to not just be the whining, you know what we sound like the whining sort of. This is a big problem. This is a big problem. But policymakers say, well, there are lots of big problems.

Gregory Boyle:

And I also think that, you know we have to aim high I think, you know. Cause listening to the testimony yesterday, you know you'll get the argument that says if only we had more resources. Well, that's certainly not gonna happen. Or you get to the level of really specific recommendations like, let's **ban formal** _____. If we can go that route, you know I think there are lots of ways to, you know findings, recommendations. But, you know and Steve just use the word movement. What if the result was not so much a document that collects dust, but the creation of something that could be a movement? Or, in fact, what would the movement be relative to home, school and community? You know what would the movement be? Or what would the creation of a tipping point look like? Where suddenly we were a part of something that kind of shifted this thing in such a way that we never returned to an old way of thinking. I don't know what that is exactly.

_____ you know sort of anecdotally. And this is a dumb example. But, you know I spent 15 years trying to get gang members to do therapy. And I'm still _____. I'm not crazy. Not group. Not individual. And then in the last ten years, this is gonna sound very silly, but, you know I'd pick up gang members at an emergency room who have had anxiety attacks. And I say, "Well, you know it might help if you talk to somebody." "Oh, you mean like *Analyze This*?"

[Laughter]

Well, suddenly I start hearing all these references to *Analyze This*. And I don't know how to explain it, but it was the identification of

a tipping point. It is no longer stigmatized in this population to see a therapist because of that movie.

Male 3: And this is where the interconnection is, because this is where you decrease the silence and you have voices that are able to speak for not only the shared experience that made us all feel small, but also the experience of getting help.

Gregory Boyle: But then we're part of that shift. You know and it's not a PSA exactly or it's not a slogan. And it's not even more money, you know. It's really how would this task force conceive of some kind of monumental shift. And that's bigger than policy. That's bigger than a piece of legislation. That doesn't even require more resources. That gets people, just everybody's on board. And it's not this rarified give me more resources. It's spacious. It's people saying, "Oh, okay, we'll never return to that way of thinking again." I don't know what that is exactly but.

Georgina Mendoza: You're talking about actual social transformation –

Gregory Boyle: Yeah.

Georgina Mendoza: - the way that people see things –

Gregory Boyle: - transgenerational _____ movement. Or _____.

Georgina Mendoza: I know we're working on a similar –

Alex: If we could just go to page 11 of our agenda, cause it's the structural content of the final report. And it really is what you're talking about, Greg, right? And the first _____ run through and sort of get some feedback from people on the various bullet points. The first one is what is the overall goal? Right? And I think that's _____ talking about. Your sort of vision of our focus __ the task force report, the legacy, but also, you know how this might fit into a vision in the future. And I have to confess, I love big dreams. Right? I love reaching for the stars in these kinds of things. And I _____ possible. I don't think it's _____. And so I really would love to hear people talk about what are the overall goals.

Joe Torre: Overall goal for me is to, instead of continuing to tend to people who have gone through what they've gone through is to try to reduce that number. It's about education. It's about counseling.

Whatever it is. Because, you know we're victims of our families. And a lot of these, you know youngsters, their role model is not a good role model. That's the only thing they know. And I think our overall goal is to reduce the number. I'd like to say eliminate it, but we know that's not possible at this point.

Georgina Mendoza: Can I just kind of think out loud? So it may not make sense. But it seems like that's absolutely our overall goal. And kind of the mandate that we've been given is to come up with a report to serve as a recommendation for the Attorney General to have and have significant impact. On the other hand, I think the purpose of that report and the purpose that the Attorney General wants to have, this report is so it can have an impact on every level, not just federal. Not let it get lost in legislation. But something that can be enacted and implemented on a state and local level. And in order to do that, I feel like we need to come up with more specific strategies. Which is kind of contradictory. You can see where I'm going with this. Because the recommendation is big and policy and federal, and yet we want something to be transformational on a local level. Cause as we know, unless the community buys into it, it's not gonna be successful. It's not gonna go anywhere. And the feds can say what they want, if the people don't buy it, it's not gonna go anywhere.

So we need to make sure that somehow there's a component where residents and localities are gonna be able to buy into it to. And then once they do, just that seed is planted, then the leaders of that community are gonna be able to expand it. You see what I'm saying?

So I don't know. I don't know how to reconcile that. But I just wanted to put that out there. Is that there are so many different levels that we need to get to and yet the report itself, I just feel can't be that specific. But almost parallel, we're gonna have to come up with something that we can, for lack of a better word, feed into localities, you know cities, counties, states. That's gonna be –

Sharon Cooper: And I also think that the report needs to be guidelines. Some guidelines _____ that _____ guidelines is the healthcare system. Usually we become aware – domestic violence is really sort of the part that brings our children into a violent circumstance for children. And that's the most comment. But there may be others, but that's _____. And I would say, you know that our healthcare system already has recommended a screening

instruments for domestic violence. However, most doctors don't use them. And that's a problem. But we're mandated reporters for child abuse, but we're not mandated reporters for spousal abuse. So that is a policy change that could potentially become _____.

Another part of it is that one of the reasons that doctors don't screen for domestic violence is because they don't know what to do when they have a positive response. Because we don't have a system that's readily available. Who are you gonna call in the situation. So I think if we look at that component, the healthcare process in a child's life, which starts at prenatal care. You know and then it goes through that delivery process and then through the early years of the child's life before he ever goes to school. _____ exposure to violence once a child goes into a school setting.

So I think report, one of the things that the report could do is to give us some algorithms and help us, have healthcare providers at least find the right resources. And the last thing I'd like to say is that _____ this way. And that is, and I work in both. Both the DOD children and the civilian children and _____ fit. The DOD, if there is a violent family member that's a soldier, that person will be removed that day from that house. There doesn't have to be any charges or anything. That person will be removed until we can ferret things out. We can take the pressure off the family and you can start to think, okay, what can we do to help this family? They have a right _____. Whereas in the civilian community, if the child is in a home where there is domestic violence going on, the child gets removed by CPS if the family is not together enough to work things out or to take the danger out. That's where I think the disconnect is not the best. To remove the child _____ causes the child to say, you know I didn't know this was gonna happen. All of that _____.

So I think that having some avenues and some really concrete doable at the city level and county level recommendations for how to _____ will be _____.

Male 3:

Which also, that's beautifully put and it's kind of – it's the parallelism, you know to everything that we've been talking about. So that yes, it's the idea of a movement and defining how big are we thinking, right? But it's practical in terms of, and it's a beautiful description of you know as a college of obstetrics and gynecology years ago also developed a screening tool for all

pregnant, you know all women in terms of domestic violence. But the whole issue of, well, now who do I call, gets back to resources. Right? So that algorithm and looking at the points of entry and where do things go, you can't just say, "Here are the guidelines and here's what you do," but then not have the resources. You can't change a system of care, as Thea's done in the emergency department, and now we hear Dr. Corbin describing something similar in Drexel. Jeez, that's a perfect point of entry, but where is the resources to make it happen, etcetera, etcetera.

But in terms of size, the issue is, going back to your point, Greg, I think it's a really fundamental question. I don't know. I mean I don't know answer. If I were to get, feel grandiose I'd say, yeah, well, maybe we're talking about the scale of Children Exposed to Violence Act. I mean as just an – I mean who knows.

Female 1: Which could –

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Can I add something? Because the question of who do you go to and what do you obviously raises an issue of courts and the courts' response to issues. I don't know what it's like in other big cities, but in Philadelphia there is a court that is called Love Court. It is a domestic violence courtroom. And the way that issues are resolved there, I don't know how they are now because I haven't been in the courtroom for many years, but the specific issue of children exposed to violence in may day was never addressed. You would basically see if you could gain some control over whoever the offender was, most often the male, and, you know how soon they could return to the home. And the women would come in, and they would not want to testify. Or if they did, it would be to lower charges. You know you try and work things out was the general approach.

But this issue of children exposed to violence was not addressed. Maybe those same courtrooms exist in most major cities because it's not viable to prosecute all people in those circumstances. If it is, then maybe some of the thinking we have to put into this is how to address those kinds of courtrooms in terms of resources and interventions, the point of contact. So that we address the issues of children exposed to violence there. And then, of course, we've heard about the protection from abuse orders. Maybe something we need to do is have something at that point of contact, which happen every day by the thousands, in the rural areas and in big cities. What do we do for children? And maybe some protocol or checklist or assessment at those two big points of contact and

others that are similar to that. But we have to kind of think about those two. And perhaps even add to our list. And I've been reluctant to recommend it, but, you know some representatives from the courts who testify about how those two major points of contact are addressed and what might change in those areas. And actually ask them, what could we do better to address children who are exposed to violence? Because once we recognize the problems, we have institutions that are highly structured, that are command like institutions like the military, and that the courts could issue orders and directives and people will follow them.

One of the things that happened across the nation was the development of inter branch commissions in gender, racial and ethnic fairness. I think most states now have them as coming in through the supreme courts. Maybe we might need the development of certain kinds of committees run by supreme courts that recommend, deal with the issue of children exposed to violence in our state. You know and that's a state wide committee directed, developed by the chief justices of the courts. And use the courts as a structure for entering into that whole realm in states.

So, again, just some ideas to toss out there that might – that have worked in other areas that may be viable in this _____.

Female 1:

There's two sides to this. I'm listening to what you're saying and I'm wondering – I don't think this works. Can the Department of Justice mandate law enforcement departments enter a box on their reporting form that indicates whether or not on a domestic violence call there are children in the home and whether or not they were interviewed? Is that the kind of thing –

Will:

- we at the department don't like to use the term mandate.

[Laughter]

What we try to do is to provide leadership, guidance and resources so that states and localities have an incentive to come around to whatever the national policy is that we're trying to put out. Also just saying being, having worked most of my career at the state level, states, you can't dictate to a state and a locality as well. To Ms. Mendoza's point. You want something that will be large enough so that states and localities can have some room to one, think it's their idea and that it's great, two, to be able to develop it for their particular community or state. And then you also, there's

always a cost piece that you always – you know no state or locality will do anything absent of recognition of the cost piece.

So we don't necessarily want to mandate, and we don't like to use that specific term. We just want to provide guidance and incentives and recommendations that can set policy. And I will just say, having an opportunity to be involved with subcommittee conversations and just spent some time yesterday prior to the hearing with the Attorney General, he said to me directly, as many of you, this is his legacy. He wants this to be his legacy. In doing that, I think it certainly speaks to the more systemic transformation, systems transformation that several of you all talked about. I think that is probably where you all will wrestle the most but will probably find the most positive end product. To stay high level. To stay at a place where it can be changing a system, changing the way business is done. Now again, whether that comes through legislation or sort of policy recommendations, I think that is still up for discussion.

Male 3: Will, just to add one proviso to what you're saying – tell me if I'm wrong. But one example of where there's the integration of the nonmandate and resources, which is Sharon's point which lots of police departments have boxes –

Female 1: I know. They do in California.

Male 3: But the same issue comes up that Sharon was describing. Cause if you check the box and there's no place to send these families to, then you're up the creek and you stop checking the box. I mean you're a cop on the beat and there's nothing you can do, you put the blinders back on, you don't check the box.

Sharon Cooper: Right.

Male 3: But there are block grants that go to states that are sent out by the federal government that have to include certain practices in order for those incentives to be redeemed. Right? Is that accurate?

Will: That is accurate.

Male 3: Just wanted to be clear.

Female 1: Okay. That's a good point.

Sharon Cooper: - and not created by the Department of Justice.

Male 3: No, no, I agree. But this goes back to the issue of having a legislator that's a partner, etcetera –

Female 1: And provides the incentives.

Male 3: And having an alliance that says, the department has recommended this, we're gonna drive the train to make it happen. Yeah?

Female 1: I would say, I'm sorry I used the word mandated. That was a problem. But in California we did have a state task force that recommended that the box be put on all reporting forms for all law enforcement. And it has made a huge difference in identifying children in homes. And by and large, they tend to get attention. At least we know they exist. They're not hiding under the bed and we don't know they exist. But aside from that, I'm thinking about the awareness and the fact that we're dealing with a continuum from pregnancy to 18. And I'm wondering how we do this from the eyes of a child watching violence going on and seeing how it affects the child or having some sort of time lapse where you see all of the different ages where a child can be victimized until they are finally behind bars. Or something like that, as a result of observing violence, being exposed to violence.

I'm really struggling with the message here. Because children exposed to violence is huge. I mean it's so huge. So can we maybe narrow it down to, okay, let's have a child at every age, a child at every age and how this makes a difference in their lives and what the end point is. And try to convey that point in the same way as those babies who are dead because they were put in unsafe sleeping or those horrible ads about smoking, before somebody dies of lung cancer. I mean those were the really the worst. But on the other hand, it's a negative message that really nobody forgets.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Thea, can I add one thing about age. Because you know current ____ and development and the professionals on this issue can correct me if I'm wrong here, but the general perception is that children's brains mature in somewhere between 22 and 25 years old. And so in thinking about the age 18 that's just a societal norm of the past I think. And the US Supreme Court in three major decisions has looked at that issue and really concluded that we're talking about the adolescent brain as having, you know going up to about that age. So I would –

Female 1: That's true. That's true. That's true. And also that –

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: - comment on our thinking, not on – I'm not trying to decide anything here, but I'm just asking us to think about that and incorporate that thinking into our ____ _____.

[Cross Talk]

Gregory Boyle: Oh, I'm sorry. Here's the difficulty. And Sharon raises it. It's really important is if we start to address systems. So think of the systems. I mean just yesterday, if we just spoke about juvenile justice systems and children exposed to violence, just there, my god. That'd be huge. But all of a sudden it's courts and it's education and it's healthcare and it's law enforcement. It's schools. Yikes. And so our dilemma is, and maybe you guys can help, is that there's aerial view versus in the weeds. And I think it's more realistic that we be more aerial view. Because then I think then we can – and that's a challenge. Because I think we can get into the weeds very fast. What would you do? What would I do at juvenile hall? What would I recommend? Or what would you recommend in the ER? We could get there, I guess. But that I can't imagine handling in three hearings – I couldn't imagine doing that in a year.

Alex: We can't either.

[Laughter]

- and a whole host of things. But I think beyond that is we've sort of talked about it, our thinking coming into here. And remember, you guys are like a new car for us, right? We dreamed about it. We –

[Laughter]

We've thought about it. Right? And then –

[Cross Talk]

So we've been doing a little dreaming too. And one of the things that sort of you keep coming back to is that aerial view, that, you know change the conversation, define the conversation, move some things in a very big way. Certainly it's a call to action. This is a big problem. Here are the numbers. Here's the cost. Here's the impact. Here are the places we have to focus on. Interfamily,

community, schools. But then you get to the, what do we do? You know. It might be nine recommendations. It might be 15 recommendations. But it's not gonna be 200. Right? And to then think about, you know we've had ideas beginning to come up and beginning to sort of think about the frame. But also then to what goes into those ideas. And we can tease those out.

Male 3:

But is what you're suggesting, I mean it's really like it's good to struggle with this with everybody cause it's exactly where we need to be struggling, right? So one way of thinking about it so we don't come up with the in the weeds identifying 200 varieties of weeds, right? That we go back to identifying the problems.

So, for example, the idea that identification is a major issue. And the issue of silence and hidden, you know perpetuation, it's also a prevention issue, is a major issue. We know, for example, that there are ways of increasing the identification through all the venues that everybody's just been talking about, right? And more. But it's enough. But we also know – so that might be, you know one thing that we're saying. Yes, we know one of the protective and risk factors. We also know that there are ways around that. There are well established practices that have worked in terms of increasing, right? But that may need support, education, training, etcetera in those various areas.

But the other one is the problem of where the resources when you've asked people who are on the cutting edge of contact with kids who are at greatest risk. And that's a problem. That the resources aren't there to follow. Whether it's inadequate numbers of domestic violence advocates that are court based or police department based or mental health resources, etcetera. So that maybe rather than – maybe I'm trying to relieve myself of the burdens of being in the weeds, but rather than coming up with the dollar figures, that the idea of being able to say, these are clearly the issues that we have been able to identify as the challenges, knowledge known – we all begin with knowledge known, challenges, what has worked, what the – and go through almost a list rather than saying, so therefore, you know, we're gonna – here's the price tag on, right? Is that –

Alex:

Let me take ___ identification. So let me just use that for a moment, right? So let's say the recommendation is something around identification. Right? Identification is checking the box. Identification is what the pediatrician does. Identification is what the school teacher does? It plays out in lots of ways. And if we

can improve identification, that seems to be, right, let's say that's the recommendation, a key component to sort of then getting people help, giving people voice, ending the – a whole host of positive things are then possible once we better identify.

Our recommendation isn't boxes, pediatrician, OBGYN, this is what judges need to do, teachers need to do, what daycare people need to do and this is how it plays out in 50 states what you need to do. But it's around identification. And saying that's what we need to do. And so later people can take this report and say, "Identification is key. Look. Police department, I'm telling you, you need to have a box to check."

Male 3: But then I guess –

Alex: - in this county, we will follow up on that checkbox and we can do something. Judge, if you do what you're supposed to do on identification and we bring you ideas, that's key. This is what you can do. If you do this as an OB/GYN and a pediatrician, this is what it means here. In the military, if you do it, this is what it means. And so it becomes that –

Male 3: But I think we also have information, we're learning not just about the common sense and what's been demonstrated to be effective. But I think it's incumbent on us to then say, "But here are the problems." Right? Because I don't want to see the RFA come out about increased identification. I don't. I mean I do, but I want it to then – we know that the problem is if you identify and there's nothing to do with it, then why identify?

Thea James: Do we agree that this is a public health problem?

Multiple: Yes.

Thea James: We do, right? I mean I don't know how much –

Will: Wait, wait, that sounded like consensus or something.

[Cross Talk]

It does. I'm looking at my co-chairs like, does that sound like consensus, Joe?

Thea James: I mean that's, you know that's –

Male: That's significant. Yeah.

Gregory Boyle: But if you listen also to yesterday with the researchers, they all had sort of a consistent thing. You know like we don't have any excuse. I can't remember who said that. We know more than we use. How do we – how is it that we keep ignoring what we know? I think that's a window onto something. You know cause that's a larger issue. Because a lot of this stuff we know and there's not a – it wasn't really new. It's just why is it not becoming part of the air we breathe? Why do we ignore it?

Male 3: But even stating that is part of what we learn, part of what many of us have known, but I want that – I mean personally I'd like to be part of the report.

Sharon Cooper: Thea, are you thinking about it from a public health perspective because you're thinking that justice should not be the only player at the table and perhaps CDC and others should be more present at the table?

Thea James: Well, because it's public health does that – I wondering does that mean it doesn't fit within justice, Department of Justice? I mean I was thinking, you know I work in a hospital that is deemed a safety net hospital, quite accurately I might say. But it doesn't operate like most safety net hospitals. You know most safety net hospitals, they just treat people and street them because that's all they can do. And if you really think about it, it actually makes no sense. Because most people who go to those hospitals are ill, like diabetes or hypertension out of control, not for the reasons that most people, you know who can afford to go to other hospitals are out of control. It's either because of something caused it, made it worse or prevented them from getting access to treatment.

And how we are different, we certainly don't have more money or more resources. But we make our interventions at those lesions. To sort of like break the cycle. We absolutely – people call our ER seven point Jiffy Lube place, cause we have a checkbox for everything. Right in triage. You know. Including domestic violence. And we don't have a lot of money for people who can do this or that, but we have people – we have a direct referral system for people who have those things. We absolutely have a phone you can call or a person you can send them to. I mean we have people – we started at the very basic. We check for – to see if you have a primary care doctor. There are people who work in the ER who all they do is give people primary care appointments cause

you know that without that it's like a parent without a kid. So, you know nobody's gonna be able to coordinate your care or anything like that.

I mean I'm just saying you don't necessarily need all these elaborate – money and all of these things. It's maybe just how you restructure how you operate with what you have.

Alex: Well, I think in the report right, you know what you see in many of the success – what I would call the successful reports and they do a couple of things. One is they give voice to the voiceless, right? So quotes and other sort of mechanisms in the report that focus around this sort of reality in sort of a personal way. And I think one can use the report to put a spotlight, not just on the underbelly, but put a spotlight on what can work and what's possible. Right? Not to say, you have to do it this way, but things are possible you might not have thought about that we're telling you, here's somebody who did it, you might want to think about some _____. You don't necessarily need the whatever.

Sharon Cooper: I think _____. We can't afford to wait the 20 years it's gonna take for this research to be done to prove that yes, this is the best thing we can do. Because this is 20 years of, you know _____. And I think that the report should also _____. _____ researcher that people respect. And I think that maybe we wouldn't use the word best practices, but promising _____. You know how you have those phrases. Promising.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Promising approaches.

Sharon Cooper: Yeah. That's a good one.

Will: We're good at phrases. We'll take care of that.

Alex: The other thing is I think there is sort of what do with sort of – _____, you know and we hear this from people all the time from many of the witnesses. Some of you – we know this, right? There was a task force I was on or a report I read or a thing I did. Like we don't reinvent the wheel, right? Nor do we want to rewrite the wheel, right? But, you know we have the opportunity to, again, give them a space. You know in this day and age, right, most people will see this and access this not as a hardbound copy, but as something they get to electronically. And so because of that we can build an electronic appendix, an electronic sort of

supplemental __ section where we are able to gather that sort of bibliography, that sort of literature review and put it out there for people. And so people who want to focus on a particular issue, pediatrics, they can go and read some of the pediatric materials and follow that. Or pediatric resources on this that might be helpful to them.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: I think that's very important _____.

Deirdre: And I think that that's the other thing is that if you do – if you keep the overall, you know just to go back to sort of the idea of having a discussion about final report and looking at what is the overall goal, what is the audience, what is the content, physical and practical output, the process questions. If you think about this, and I think Dr. Cooper you used the term a parallel document where we may have the, you know 9, 12 big ideas that are gonna be included in it of improving identification or recognizing the importance of early identification or some phrase along this issue. And in this parallel document or, you know practical ideas for practitioners. For pediatricians that would be here's a tool that already exists about screening for exposure to violence.

Male 3: That's the bibliography or the –

Deirdre: That's the bibliography, appendix. It's not within the content of it. Because if we did that, given the scope of children's exposure to violence, if we included that type of information in the report itself, simply getting the words on, you know simply writing that between now and September is going to be a challenge. And I think that's the other piece that thank you Mr. Listenbee for yesterday correcting that it's December 2012 that the final report is due.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: I felt compelled, but it didn't obviously help the discussion.

Deirdre: And I appreciate that for the public, for that side of the room.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: It was for the public. Yeah.

Deirdre: That they're thinking December. Because the reality is that for this group, you know we need to have this document – I mean we're starting to think through the drafting of this document now. We're gonna be hoping to present something to you, some framework or some, you know first through DOJ and then to this group early,

you know very early next year. And September is when we have the document done for all intents and purposes.

Alex: Cause it has to go to a printer and it has to go to DOJ and it has to – and there's gonna be a communications roll out. Everything has to sort of be lined up.

Male 3: Just to use another example without going into the details of the messaging and all that. But if, for example, there was consensus around increased public awareness, you know if just hypothetically that was a consensus, would the report, the language be, again, the aerial versus weed view, exploration of, you know private, public partnerships and, you know venture capital investment in, you know right to make this a major – is that the sort of language that we're talking about?

Alex: Right. I think yeah, and that would sort of be, here are some ways, and we're not prescriptive in that these are the four things that must happen. But there are if that's the goal ____ happen. And the language might be, you know so 15 years ago people didn't talk about autism. They didn't talk about autism. Look what's happened. They didn't talk about breast cancer. Look what's happened.

Male 3: And I think the –

Alex: - why are those campaigns successful? This is an issue that, you know –

Male 3: And being able to –

Alex: - what can we do, here are some things that.

Male 3: And putting in the concerns. Do it in a piecemeal way is not going to. Right.

Deirdre: Right. Right.

[Cross Talk]

Jim McDonnell: A piece I think, a challenge that we have is trying to stay at that 30,000 foot level. The value of that is that we don't lock ourselves into silos where it becomes, okay, this is the help piece, this is the education piece, the police piece and so on. I think we have an obligation to stay high on this thing so that everybody who's a

specialist takes their own piece of out it, but that we do as a web rather than allowing ourselves to be locked into silos. I think we lose value if we do that.

Alex: And I'd have to say, you know we've talked about 30,000, 80,000 and I completely agree with all that. I would just say this is that for me at least, part of what this opportunity is is to not just go to 30,000 and look down at the landscape. But to go to that 30,000 feet and to redefine the landscape. Saying, I want to move the mountains over here. I really want the river to go this way. I really think I want to tilt it over to _____. I really want to look at identification. Right? I want to sort of, you know that's what I want. That's what I want to do at 30,000 feet. I just don't want to capture that image. I want to remake that landscape.

Gregory Boyle: But when somebody yesterday said, you know our science is way ahead of our political will, that kind of gets at ya. Because I think we've got science, and we don't want to just repeat the science. But I want to redefine the landscape. I want to be able to say, how do we get at political will? How would we ever get at that? Cause that's the task.

Sharon Cooper: Well, you know it's funny you should say that because the White House 2010 health sheet talked about ten points, ten different health problems. Eight of the ten were, in fact, about domestic violence. It was really _____. It was very interesting that domestic violence was present. They didn't say domestic violence specifically. But they were able to show domestic violence was relevant in all eight of the ten health outcomes for their _____. So if we talk about health insurance _____ domestic violence, which is sort at the root of what we are _____. Really requires our – that mountain that needs to be moved. That's the mountain.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Speaking of the mountain, there are a couple of topics that were touched on yesterday. And I think Joe touched on one at the end of our discussions yesterday concerning Penn State. And Penn State in and of itself is just symbolic of interactions with children around sports. As far as I can see it. We haven't talked a lot about that, but I'd like us to decide at some point to what extent we're gonna address that.

The second thing we haven't talked about is children involved in religious organizations and institutions, because that's been part of one of the biggest scandals we've had in the country involving

children exposed to sexual violence. And I don't think we can do a report without at least addressing some related issues and be fair and honest. I mean we need to at some point have some conversation about how best to approach that without violating what our legal limits are.

Female 1: May I ask something about that?

Alex: - level we began to talk about some of that. And _____ that's something that's very real in there. It certainly ties into a larger idea around sort of the power relationships that people have with children and the use of that power relationship, whether it be a priest, a coach. Whoever that might be and –

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: And there's some extensive reports already done on that that can provide maybe some insights. Because I think certainly religious institutions are trying to deal with that in ways that – you know I mean they're way out there trying to address the problem right now. And I think the major universities as regards to sports are gonna try and deal with it as well. But that still leaves the Little Leagues and the soccer teams and all the other kinds of institutions, which are a mainstay of our society. And I think that if we're gonna look at points of contact that are beginning to come into the media, we have to think about that as well. Especially for smaller children cause that's _____.

Female 1: I think it's a little bit dangerous to start talking about every group that has supervision over young boys in particular. And let me just go beyond that. I think though that there is a key issue that permeates everything we want to do. And that is the fact that it isn't just the violence, it's the people who don't report the violence, the people who allow it to happen, the people who don't see it as their business to do anything about it. It seems to me that almost in every once of these cases, whether it's the Catholic Church or Penn State or the local Boy Scout troop or the school teacher, somebody knew about it and accepted it. And we have to make it unacceptable and make it very, very clear that the right thing to do is to report it, not to let it keep going. Because these kinds of abuses go on for years. Well, in the Catholic Church for centuries. But the reality is, I think if we – I hear people saying, oh, you know my husband is a Boy Scout leader and he's thinking maybe he doesn't even want to have to worry about, you know any allegations that might come. I mean it's a really gnarly place to go if you do that.

Alex: So one of the things that can be talked about and think about this and you talk to Deirdre and staff about the agendas for the upcoming hearings is what we get to do is, you know we could have a hearing of, the panel on this issue, right? ____ some way to be defined. And that's the way to sort of also road test, is this something we really need to do, what do to, ____ to do, make sense? It doesn't mean that just because we talked about it at a hearing or had a witness that we have to have it in the final report or it has to be a recommendation at all.

Female 1: I think we –

Alex: - as a way a group collectively ____ to gain the knowledge and information and to use that in our –

Female 1: That's fine. But I still say overall it's making it unacceptable and making it acceptable to report. And making it important to disregard your relationship with a person you suspect might be a perpetrator. And that this is an American responsibility toward children. Is to assure that there are no secrets. That we don't continue keeping these secrets. It's pervasive over –

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: But _____ is that a recommendation to do that, but it would be the Department of Education or some other, Department of Health and Human Services that would actually work on those kinds of nitty-gritty protocols, back down in the weeds, I think, to do that. Because they have the expertise to do those kinds of things, whereas I think if we were trying to do the expert – provide the expertise for how you deal with those kinds of sports or how you deal with different kinds of Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and the kind of thing. That's expertise has to come at a different level.

Female 1: But the general public – we want to reach the general public. Because they're the ones we need to tell us. We don't want to for an official person, because that's been the problem.

Male 3: But I think again this is an issue of distance. Because you know if we say that because it's not just about, you know I agree with mandated reporting, etcetera. But one of the biggest issues with child sexual abuse is that the shame and humiliation and loss of control makes kids feel awful about themselves. And they don't report and the general public is horrified because of the incest fantasies that it raises, etcetera, etcetera.

But, we again –

Female 1: Somebody else has to report it.

Male 3: - how much detail we go into it. It's more about maybe one of the areas, and I'm just throwing it out, but this is an example of within the public awareness. That we take existing knowledge about some of the impediments to stopping, you know this behavior and apply that to – it's about making the match, doing the match making between what we know about, but what hasn't been translated in operation. Right?

Deirdre: And I think that –

Alex: - and I think that's all good and we're gonna sort of move forward. I just want you to make sure for the final report, and I think we've sort of got –

Sharon Cooper: _____, and that is that – cause you said it's the proposed framework. I think that as a country we should not only talk about our country. I believe that we are too – it's just we are too much a world to day to just say, **well, here's what it is in the United States**. I think it would be smart to have at least one little section on children exposed to violence in other countries and what's different about those countries that makes that exposure less or more. Because that can help us to think about looking at international policies that might help our country. That's _____.

Alex: So I think it's been helpful. Obviously we'll be talking a lot about all of this and sort of moving this forward and working this _____ But this has been very helpful. I wanted to make sure we have time to talk about some of the other sort of information gathering, listening devices and.

Deirdre: Right. So we're just gonna, just to kind of do a check in with all of you, we're at noon right now. There will be lunches upstairs in about 15 minutes. We can go through the listening session, just sort of a brief description of listening sessions, how we were thinking that they may be able to be additional information gathering activities. Also just to alert everybody to the issue of gathering written testimony and how that needs to be submitted so that it can be considered by the task force members. All of you are very involved with many professionals with whom you respect incredibly. And we hope to use your connections with those folks to bring appropriate people in to testify and those that are needed

to share information with the group. But there's no way we're gonna get everybody that you know, that you respect, that you really want to have be part of this, into one of the hearings. And so we really do meaningfully ask that you either, you know connect them with us so that we can ask that they submit written testimony, that you encourage them to submit written testimony, that you encourage the professional organizations that you're involved with to submit written testimony. But submitting that written testimony, the easiest way to get it into the process is gonna be to go to the DOJ website, have folks click on that link and either submit a Word document, a PDF or just, you know paste it into the email and get it into us. And that way it'll be part of the collection of the written testimony.

Female 1: You're talking about written – to suggest people to testify, how do we do that?

Deirdre: Let us know.

Female 1: Okay.

Deirdre: You let us know. Suggesting names to testify, I mean in all of the conversations that I've had with folks already, you know I've got my list here. I've got lists, you know we're collecting that and we're keeping track of it. But you are welcome to remind us. You're welcome to, as I talk with each of you over the course of the next week about the agendas for the upcoming hearings and things like that, I would encourage you to continue to suggest.

We will not be able to get every suggestion on an agenda. So I appreciate that many of you know many, many people and, you know but I can just tell you, you know there's 13 of you here. And we heard from about not even – we probably had 16 professionals that – not even 16, you know nationally recognized professionals that testified yesterday. So if all of you give me two suggestions, that's it for the rest of the hearings and we're done. Actually that would be fabulous. I don't have to do any more work. But the reality is that that might now build the best panels or really get to the issues that we've already talked about.

So we can spend 15 minutes quickly going through listening sessions, break for lunch and come back, or we can spend about 25 minutes and try and see if we're comfortable wrapping it up. And then if there are following, you know very informal conversations we want to have over the sandwiches upstairs, do it that way.

[Cross Talk]

So I'm hearing consensus. Okay.

Georgina Mendoza: At some point are we gonna discuss about subcommittees that are mentioned –

Deirdre: That is where we're moving right now.

Georgina Mendoza: Cool.

Deirdre: Okay. So –

Robert Macy: So before – this is gonna be, can I just put this as a footnote in the record. Cause we need to at some point, actually, we can do this offline. But what's glaringly missing and I don't think it's obviously on purpose, but there's no discussion about suicide. And do you want to comment right from there or I can just be quiet?

Deirdre: I can simply comment that I think that in one of the draft agendas we did talk about it. If we didn't put it down, we've talked about it in the subcommittees and within NCCD about where that would fit and how it would best fit. So we're alert to the issue. That it is something –

Robert Macy: Well, the issue it's tremendous. It's the third leading cause of death for 15 to 24 year olds. And it's a hidden second leading cause of death for young black males and females. And the epidemiology, which is quite new, so it's still being verified, is that that population is growing.

Deirdre: Right.

Robert Macy: And there's a mythology around the whole mythology that, you know white people do heroin and look inwards and kill themselves and black people do crack and look outwards and shoot each other. You know it needs to be debunked because it's part of the cycle of violence. There's also new emerging evidence, which I'm part of the research, that's looking at the link between essentially hostage taking, which a lot of gang members do hostage taking, homicide, suicide. And at a youth level. It's usually a profile for older men, but now it seems to be creeping down. So we don't have to get into the weeds around that, but I think we need to have that

summary in the report. Because there's only 5,000 completions of adolescence a year in the United States, but every completion impacts approximately 200 people at a very, very deep level. So you're getting into some large numbers. And a lot of professionals doesn't know what to do it. So just a footnote for the record.

Deirdre: Yep. Yep. It's on our –

Robert Macy: And I'm happy to help with the –

Deirdre: That would be great. And so when we can talk we can look and see where that would fit best. Because in some ways that is one of the issues that it seems that it would be a disservice to say, let's capture it here and think that we're done with it. Versus saying, is there some way to weave it into the conversation about teens in rural America, teens in urban America, how it looks different and how it plays out –

Robert Macy: And all that's captured The American Foundation for Suicide Prevention. So AFSP, all we need to do is link in the final report around, let's say, identification. That's the problem with, case finding is what you're talking about on the identification, is you're gonna find cases. Then what do you do? But AFSP is set up. They've got the social media piece down. So we can just make a link and all the homework's already done.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: I think that's critical. You know those suicides seem to come in packs in school. I know at my daughter's school there were two or three of them one after another because the kids were imitating one another.

Female 1: In clusters. Yeah.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: In clusters. Yeah. So I think that's something – that link is very vital to people who are trying to address the issue. They're looking for it. We can just direct them to it. That would be very helpful.

Deirdre: Great. So noted. Thank you.

Robert Macy: Okay. So back to.

Deirdre: So back to the listening. So if you turn to page 7 in your agenda, we talk a bit or there has been some information shared, both on Monday evening, about the Federal Advisory Commissions Act

and the public notice and the public hearings and the public working meetings of this which is one. That was a poor sentence. But the idea is that there are – most of the work that the task force will do will be, you know well publicized and open to public audience. There is the opportunity to do some subcommittee work, which would be less – which would require fewer task force members. Not everybody has to be there. It also –

Male: Phone.

Deirdre: It can also be done by phone. And it can also – but it allows us for – and it's gonna be because of both of those options it's gonna be able to be accommodated within the budget that we have. We would not be able to have listening sessions if everybody says, "I want to be there and I have to be there." And we cannot have a pseudo hearing in Oakland for half a day and fly everybody out there for it. We can have a listening session in Oakland that's where our NCCD's office are. We have – there are very good contacts with the open community. So we'd be able to get a space very easily because of the contacts that Antoinette, Sue Jotha and Karen have out there. We'd be able to have Georgina, Alicia Lieberman, who is not here because of a family emergency, are both in driving distance. There are several folks on the West Coast who could easily, you know for \$100.00 ticket between LA and San Francisco we get them up there for the day type of thing. Or not. You know we could just go with the folks that are local.

But the idea of a listening session is that it would be community focused. It would not be a public hearing. It wouldn't be coming up and testifying. It would be much more of a round table facilitated conversation with people who are in a community who are impacted. The community of which is impacted by violence. Yep.

Sarah Deer: We need to do this in Alaska.

Deirdre: Do we need to do this in Alaska?

Sarah Deer: We need to.

Deirdre: Oh, we need to do this in Alaska. I lived in Juneau. I'm happy to go back up to Alaska. I'd love to have the opportunity.

[Cross Talk]

- Alex:* - in all seriousness, that is the time and resource issue.
- Deirdre:* Issue. It really is.
- Alex:* If we go to Alaska, we have to fly everybody into Alaska.
- Sarah Deer:* Well, what if we just did a listening session?
- Alex:* No, but it's not to say that we could not –
- Will:* Could I jump in and say it's certainly not something that we will say no to right now. I certainly appreciate that –
- Sarah Deer:* I mean cause otherwise Alaska people will not participate in –
- Will:* Right. We certainly understand that. What we will do is go back with a subcommittee and go with the co-chairs to see, again, if it will be cost feasible to do so. It just will come out to the ability to pay for everything and everybody. We don't to leave out any population of folk. We certainly have talked about places in the country that we have not been able to really address like we want to. So I think your suggestion of Alaska is a very good and solid on. And if not, then at the very least to be able to include somebody from that region or neck of the woods and bring one or two folks from Alaska to another session. That might be a more cost effective way to proceed.
- So we're not gonna say no to anything right now. I think it's about taking your suggestions, being able to massage them and put them back to you all in a form that will be palatable. But that will just take some time. So thank you for that suggestion. I think it's something that we can surely follow up on. Again, if not having a listening session in Alaska, we certainly have enough resources to bring selected individuals from Alaska to another one of those –
- Male 3:* I'm a little confused. I'm a little confused about the listening sessions. And I understand the – I'm not sure how representative we're wanting to be. Because if that's the case, there are lots of parts of the country that aren't gonna be – we're not gonna hear from. So could you help clarify that?
- Deirdre:* Sure. The listening sessions are not intended to be the sole secondary way of gathering information. They are also not intended to ensure that we plug all of the holes that are existing because of the limits of doing only four hearings. It's not, okay,

we can do only four hearings so let's do listening sessions everywhere else we cannot get.

They are intended, from our perspective and from our suggestions, the hearings are all opportunities where we are, because this issue of children's exposure to violence is relative raw, as we've all struggled with this morning, the hearings are intended to be times where individuals from around the country are coming together. And to some degree, national experts, although each of the hearings will have a slightly local flavor, the hearings are national in scope. And give the – and support that 30,000 foot view.

If our goal is to really reshape the landscape, it's helpful to know what that landscape looks like in at least some areas. Or have, not even necessarily a comprehensive representation of what the landscape looks like, but at least the ability to have some representational view of what a landscape looks like, close to the weeds.

So the listening sessions are intended to be an opportunity to do that. If we go to the two communities that have been identified or that we are recommending, and at this point the recommendation is consensus between NCCD and DOJ to the co-chairs and the task force. The two representative communities would be Oakland, California and Fort Hood, Texas. If we go into a community that is like Oakland where we are in the weeds, and they are, you know to some degree, they are trying to address the issue of community violence sustained over decades. You know a community that has substantially been impacted by violence. And they've had some successes and they've had some not successes. And, again, the resource issues have been ones where we are saying, "Look, if we want to pull this off in January and plan for the next hearing that's happening within a few weeks after this, where can we do it successfully?" We successfully can do it in Oakland.

And we can pull in sort of a multi perspective converse – we can pull into a multi perspective conversation task force members who can hear from, if not youth, then very young adults who are able to say, you know, I'm gonna participate in this as an adult, but I can tell you what was happening two years ago when I was 16 and my exposure to violence. Or I can tell you about what was happening prior. And the services that were there, the services that weren't there, the service providers that did help me.

But it's a closer to the weeds. And it's also a shorter time. It's two to three hours. And it's in a less formal setting. It's going to be in a, you know a school auditorium, in the conference room of a community service provider, in the church basement type of thing. And the desire would be to get schools, religious organizations, service providers, families that have used services, youth that have been impacted in and be able to have, and you can see that there is a description, you know page 7 sort of lists the purpose, the when, the where and the who. On page 8 there are a couple of suggestions about locations. The format is described where there would be – you know it would be 15 to maximum 20 participants. There would be an opening conversation – sort of an introduction to the process. There would be a framing of the conversations. There would then be breaking out into smaller groups where if we had a couple of task force members there, they would be at different tables to hear the different perspectives and the issues that the group agreed to talk about in this very big conversation of children's exposure to violence.

And the youth. And then there's a comment about youth involvement. You can also see that there's sort of a draft agenda that's about three hours.

Thea James: Deirdre. There's a place in Oakland, just a throwing this out that you might want to note called Youth Alive. And they have a hospital based violence intervention program. They're part of our network actually. And there's probably a lot of – they would probably be a good resource.

Deirdre: And **Karen Drucker** was just like, yep, we've talked with them. So for the Oakland one, they're on the list of –

Female: - haven't talked with yet, but they're –

Deirdre: They're on the list.

Female 1: May I ask a question?

[Cross Talk]

Deirdre: Okay. So does that – so that description answers – so does everybody understand the intent of a listening session?

Female: Yeah.

Deirdre: Okay.

Female 1: I do understand the intent. I don't understand the process for deciding where they are. Because even – it sounds like we're pretty –

[Cross Talk]

So we were told that we would participate in deciding where the listening sessions could be, but actually we aren't involved in that.

Female: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't understand that.

Will: Well, what we are doing is we are putting forth these suggestions. These suggestions were based on several weeks of discussions, internal discussions between NCCD based on their resource allocations and the, to be direct and frank, the parameters and limitations that we're working with because of the amount of funds devoted to this project.

So these were places where we thought that, again, your charge is to have four public hearings. This we thought would be a great opportunity to supplement that information that you all are hearing. And also as a reminder, this would not necessarily rise to the level of public disclosure. So while we would include that information that you all glean from these listening sessions into your final work, it doesn't necessarily rise – they don't rise to the level where we would have to submit all of those documents for public review. So, again, it just provides a different venue, different opportunity to have a little more maybe inter person, direct personal exchange with individuals in a less formal setting. So these specific locations, again, were really driven by cost, time and other resource allocations as noted.

So I know that you've really expressed a desire to have one an LA hearing.

Female 1: Well, we have four of us from LA. We have law enforcement. We have a gang program. We have our chair. We have a huge child abuse network. It would be so easy to bring people together in LA. And if there were one of you there, it just seems like we're losing out on some really significant input from the largest county in the nation that could be helpful to our final project.

Will: What I can say is I've addressed offline, I do think it's worthy of discussion. I don't know if we necessarily need to make a decision on where that will – whether that will be here now. I do think we need some frankly, again, we need to look at our resources and be able to make that determination. I think the DOJ staff, I think the co-chairs in consultation with the full task force would be able to make that determination relatively soon. But I don't want you all to feel like you have to decide right now, it's Oakland or LA or bust. That is not –

Female 1: Okay. As long as it's not decided I'm fine. It just looked like it was decided.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Can I just interject here for a moment? Can we look at the issue of Fort Hood at the moment. Cause that seems to be – I suspect there may be consensus around that issue. What is the thinking about that? And I'd, you know go first to Tony to get his input on that. What is your thinking about Fort Hood?

Antonio Taguba: First of all, I didn't make that recommendation so –

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: No, I know you didn't. I'm not suggesting that you did, Tony. But I'm just asking your thinking on it. Because –

Antonio Taguba: I think it's a good choice. Another good choice I would probably recommend would be Virginia Beach. _____.

Will: Send me home.

Deirdre: That would be easier.

Will: So, General, you know I'm a Navy boy, so that would be sending me home.

Antonio Taguba: I think the intent here was to get a number of _____.

Will: Exactly.

Antonio Taguba: _____ murder/suicides and multiple deployment and the stress on the troops and TBI and all that stuff. It has now become _____ as an individual _____ troops. It's a national issue. Because, you know _____ residents life _____ _____. The issue of child violence is a family issue. And my own, I was based there –

Will: Fort Hood?

Antonio Taguba: Fort Hood. So I'm very familiar. I had my share of parents murdering their kids. ____ violence. ____ programs do we have in place. And commanders of ____.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: And as I understand, it's 60,000 troops there thereabouts?

Antonio Taguba: It's about 45-, 50,000. And you have the town of Killeen that surrounds it. You have another town _____. It stretches all the way down to Austin. Because a lot of the concentration of the troops is not on posts. The troops just train. Families are about 20 percent. But there's not enough housing for all the troops. But then you've got all of that associated services that extends all the way down to Austin, Texas. _____.

Male 3: It's also it's a nice geographic representation opportunity. I hear the Virginia Beach thing. Growing up in the area and liking to travel not a whole lot. But also the geographic distribution in terms of where the listening –

Deirdre: Right. Right.

[Cross Talk]

Deirdre: In Fort Hood.

Antonio Taguba: At Ford Hood. Because the high schools are off post. ____ the elementary schools are on post. Middle schools are also _____. And I think it's a good selection. I mean _____ because the Army today has at forefront of dealing with domestic violence, sexual assaults, child abuse, gangs and _____. _____.

Male 3: Well, and your familiarity also gives an enormous leg up.

Antonio Taguba: - have to go there.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Would you be able to attend that, Tony?

Antonio Taguba: Pardon me?

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Would you be able to attend at some point in time?

Antonio Taguba: Sure. _____.

Deirdre: Would you think that it would be beneficial for you to be attending or do you think that there would be a challenge or just as the –

Antonio Taguba: I don't think so. I think because I'm familiar with the area, I'm familiar with _____ in general who lives there, I'm familiar with some of the folks that are out there. And how do they – and the programs that the Army has is structured, but it's not – they don't call them very successful. Because the military's not _____ for the troops and the family members and the like. But we do have a process _____ is _____. And it's, frankly, I can give you a copy of the Department of Defense policy guidance on dealing with domestic violence. _____ a copy _____. It's not a perfect _____.

Deirdre: Right.

Antonio Taguba: I'll tell ya that when the troops, the commanders are deployed, there's a rear detachment that takes care of all family matters. Could be a major. That major is held responsible for the conduct of the troops that are left behind. And the family members. Well, he is the acting commander. And he's _____. And if something happens within the _____ report, he is responsible. And there's a _____ when Hassan killed those 13 _____ Americans. Two senators showed up, cause the headquarters _____? And the question was, who are you gonna _____? It was a colonel. And Senator _____ rephrased the question, who are you going to leave behind? Well, which means a two star general was left behind to take care of all the issues. That's how serious they are. That's Congress is very adamant that _____ dealt with domestic violence _____ issue is the military is not really a _____, you might say. But it's a whole lot of issues that typically are kept within the bounds of _____. _____ Huge. So anyway.

Deirdre: Okay.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Are there other committee members who have any thoughts on the Fort Hood recommendation?

Female 1: I think it's great. Where is headquarters at Fort Hood? It goes down to Austin, but where is –

Antonio Taguba: It's about 70 miles north of Austin. Austin, _____ and Fort Hood _____ . It's a huge installation.

Female 1: So they would be happy to have us there?

Antonio Taguba: They will be once you ask them.

Female 1: I know there's some installations sometimes. That's great.

[Cross Talk]

Robert Macy: I certainly think it's very, very important, that we'd be remiss not to do, at least a listening session at either US **Sencom**, Tidewater or Fort Hood.

Deirdre: Okay.

Antonio Taguba: Just, you know be aware of what the _____ .

[Cross Talk]

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: There seems to be a growing consensus.

[Cross Talk]

Deirdre: Okay. We'll check in with Joe.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Okay, good. All right.

[Cross Talk]

I think it ought to be longer too.

Female 1: Yeah. Yeah.

[Cross Talk]

Sharon Cooper: - really nice if you all could _____ . _____ .

Deirdre: To the best of our resources we will try and at least, we will try and record them. I don't know given where we're gonna have them, we can try and get audio visual recording.

Georgina Mendoza: Well, we'll be getting copies on the notes as well.

Deirdre: But you'll be copies of the notes. And the other thing is that we can't –

Will: The entire group.

Deirdre: Yep. We can, you know yeah, we'll have to see how it would work. I think that it would be difficult to just listen in on a – you know we could also potentially offer to have somebody listen it. But I think that –

Female: [Inaudible Comment]

Deirdre: Yeah. I think it'd –

[Cross Talk]

Sharon Cooper: - both in the content and the _____.

Deirdre: Skype it. Exactly. We talked about doing that.

[Cross Talk]

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Do you want recommendations from the task force on other cities in the South or _____? Or do you want to go ahead and make your own recommendations?

Deirdre: I think that we need to do – quite frankly, what we need to do at this point is after we complete this hearing and get the expenses tallied up and take a look at projecting that out against three other hearings and a meeting in DC and two – and trying to minimize expenses for two listening sessions, we need to see if we can a) afford a third listening session and b) where we are in time and whether we have the manpower resources to do a third listening session.

Sharon Cooper: Right. Can _____, who are we listening to. I notice that you had gang violence folks and ___ folks. But I did not see _____. And I think school is huge.

Deirdre: Okay. Sure.

Alex: Sarah.

Sarah Deer: Is there a budget allocated in the event that would need – I just saw wheelchair accessible, but _____ that we would need language interpreters or sign language. Do we have that?

Will: Mm hmm. Yep.

Deirdre: We would attempt to do that. Yep. As we need to do we will do that.

Male 3: I guess I just want to underline, and maybe it's – but first of all, it's really clarifying it. And the other thing that I was just noting with Thea is that this is also an opportunity to pick up on some of the issues that are not necessarily gonna be in the formal hearings, which is great. The issue about funding is also crystal clear. And the practical issues about location and, you know who can travel. It's a big deal. And there are also restrictions on, you know the travel of Justice Department employees. So there are real limitations that I know you guys know and I've learned about. So you'll tell us what the, you know what the options are.

Deirdre: Sure.

Male 3: But these sound really good.

Will: We will explain those –

[Cross Talk]

And then ask for you all's feedback.

Male 3: But these are really – I'm really delighted with the choices.

Sharon Cooper: You know what Sarah just said brought to my mind that we must make sure _____ spouses and is children. Because research is so clear that we need _____.

Will: We have specifically talked – I know I and Deirdre have – and Katherine, as a matter of fact, we have specifically had that very conversation. So you will see that in agenda repeatedly.

Deirdre: Yep. So it sounds like, Joe, when we were talking about the listening sessions, there was consensus that we would attempt to engage folks from the Fort Hood area for a listening session there. The goal that would be that we would do that listening session

between the January and the March hearing. So we would attempt to do that in February or the first week in March. So.

Gregory Boyle: You'll arrive at those dates pretty soon –

Deirdre: We will – yes.

Gregory Boyle: Cause I think some of us get around. And if I'm in sufficient range of Oakland, I'll just – you know I can be there.

Deirdre: The Oakland one I think we're looking to schedule the date within the next couple of weeks. But it sounds we need to _____ location.

[Mumbling and Cross Talk]

Will: I think we'll be in contact with the chairs. Right now Oakland is looking like it's it – I've heard some signaling from some folks that Oakland would be okay. We could certainly bring folks from LA down to Oakland.

Deirdre: Up.

Will: Up. Sorry.

[Laughter]

I'm thinking about Seattle.

Female 1: Bring them down to Oakland and we'll be in LA.

Will: I'm at the 100,000 foot view. And my GPS is not getting the signal. So it actually took me 20 minutes to just get back to 395 yesterday because of that. But I think we will certainly be in contact with each of you all after we get confirmation from the chairs that it's okay to proceed. And that will happen after we've heard from everyone as a group, be able to report back the yeas and nays, and then we'll have the chairs to be able to make a determination. And then move forward. But that will happen relatively quickly. Say Deirdre the next week or so? Simply because we'll want to get that in place.

And also, if you want to participate in these listening sessions, and again, as Father Boyle indicated, you may be close or you may

think that you may close, please go ahead and let us know so we can make those accommodations to get you there.

Female 1: If we happen to be near them, for example, Austin is my hometown, could some of us get there ourselves there?

Deirdre: Yes. Absolutely.

Female 1: Okay.

Will: Yes.

Deirdre: Absolutely. So the agenda items that we had on the list for today, I feel like we've done a good job of walking through, of sharing with you our thoughts and ideas, of hearing from you your concerns or input, your desires, your goals. And we have a good – lots of information on which to build a framework for the report, I think, that we would share with you and kind of run past with you in the next couple of months.

I don't know if there are any ideas that – and so I guess from my perspective I think that there is most of the work has been done. I know Katherine has to leave, so I'd like to thank her for being able to come. Because if we're gonna do a few wrap up comments, I don't want her to miss whatever she's darting off to.

Katherine Huffman: Thank you all.

Multiple: Thank you.

Deirdre: And feel free to stop upstairs and grab a sandwich. But I guess at this point from my perspective I'm ready to turn it back over to the co-chairs to wrap up the meeting and then we can adjourn to the –

Will: Prior to that, let me just say, again, for you all submitting – you want to submit your comments or additions or any information that you want Deirdre and I to know, please just send as an email. Copy your co-chairs. I think that would be a great way to keep them in the loop. We will compile all of your responses, have a discussion and move forward. So we certainly appreciate it. And on behalf of the Department, it's been an extremely long haul. And you all have done a great job in pulling your load. So thank you all very much. So with that I guess we can turn it back over to the co-chairs.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: It's been turned back over to us. There are a couple issues left. One is subcommittees. A second is there's been some discussion about whether the listening sessions are long enough. Whether three hours is adequate. And we –

Female: [Inaudible Comment]

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: And we had another item. I'm sorry.

Sharon Cooper: _____ and Sarah and I were talking about in the New Mexico meeting where you have that meeting, we felt that, at least I felt and so did Sarah, that of all the places that we go that you omit voices that would not be the place to omit voices. Because you _____ about Native American _____ to omit their voices I think there'd be –

Alex: And I have to say, we drafted this up before this morning, right? Before yesterday. And our takeaway from yesterday was we need to have voices there. So.

Sharon Cooper: [Inaudible Comment]

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Okay, voices issue settled. How about the three hour length for the talking sessions?

Robert Macy: Just I think I brought it up. I think you mentioned it too. I'm thinking something maybe more like 4 ½ hours with two 15 minute breaks or something where get to just have a little more time. People tend to show up late. Again, I don't know how impactful that is on the cost of it. If we're having a free venue, it just seems like, especially if some of us are getting there, be paying to get us there to capture a little more information.

Deirdre: Sure.

Will: We can do that.

Deirdre: Definitely.

Robert Macy: I don't know what the magic time is. I just think three hours is gonna feel like an hour and a half.

Female 1: Yeah.

Deirdre: Right.

Robert Macy: Especially to people that have come to speak to us.

Will: One of the issues we've also talked about is availability. So we will ____ ____ have discussions about – you know and we've talked before, Dr. Macy, you know our folks that we work with, they can't get here now. So we do want to be able to have some opportunity to reach those folks. And we'll try to do our best to accommodate that during a listening session.

Robert Macy: Thank you.

Georgina Mendoza: And the reason that I just keep bringing subcommittees is just cause it's in the charter. It says we're gonna have subcommittees. But at this point I have no idea what those – the purposes of those subcommittees are, how they will be broken down. And the reason I want to know, and maybe the rest feel similar, is cause we want to make sure that our time commitment is there and that we kind of know what we're in for. So that's – we don't need to have a discussion now, cause I know we have lunch. But at some point I just wanted to put it out there.

Will: Well, really quickly, the co-chairs will basically appoint folks on this to be a member of a subcommittee. The subcommittee will then choose a person to represent that subcommittee and report back to the chair and to the larger group. That does not have to be made in person, so that's something that the chairs can have a less formal interaction with in terms of making that appointment. And the basic use of the subcommittees would be to facilitate these listening sessions. So that's really – and it really is a procedural thing. Based on **FACA** we need to have this subcommittee established so that now we can have those works not necessarily brought up to the level of public review. So it's really just a procedural issue.

Georgina Mendoza: Okay. Thank you. I didn't see the connection between listening session, subcommittee. So that makes sense.

Deirdre: Can I just offer too that the issue of the – for a significant part of this sub – the reason that the listening sessions are being identified as a subcommittee activity and something that is because for these hearings, Will and I have prepared documents approximately seven weeks in advance to schedule it and get the public notice into the federal register. And that public notice has to go through a process within DOJ. So Will has to get documents. He's got to prepare.

I've got to help him, you know give him the information. We've got to fill it out. He has to send it through the whole process. It's got to be in the federal register. It's got to be published for 15 days before the hearing can be held. And just –

Will: I was trying to keep you all from those details.

[Cross Talk]

Deirdre: Well, in terms of FACA and clarity, like it's not like we're trying to hide these listening sessions. It's not like we're trying to keep them underground. It's just that logistically within the timeframe that we have, we want to be able to have a little bit more agility in scheduling. If we can find a site that's available and you guys are available and we can get you there in three weeks, we don't want to say, "Oh, bummer, we can't do it cause we have to publish."

Will: Right.

Male 3: One thing just to pass on to the group. The folks from the research panel, Dr. **Stinklehore**, etcetera, and **Leathe** and Thompson, they all said that they would be more than happy to continue to serve in some function. Again, in terms of helping to clarify what do we mean by useful research or, you know what needs to be built in. You know that sort of thing. So I just wanted to pass that along.

Will: And that is something that we did. That's another opportunity for a subcommittee to be formed, let's say, and I think Mr. Listenbee, I know Dr. Marans, we had a conversation about being able to follow up as Dr. Stinklehore indicated he would be amenable to do. Scheduling wise, the group may not necessarily be able to participate in a call or a video conference or whatever. But it's a way that we could still have that conversation. We could have that information notated or televised or some form shared with the group, but that you could move forward on that. So that's another

Male 3: So no pun intended, but I think it's a testimony to how engaged a lot of the panels were. I mean it was cool. They wanted to participate. So.

Antonio Taguba: Would it be possible to have a list of numbers of points of contact _____? _____?

Deirdre: Yeah. I thought you guys had it. I think we had a long time – we'll get you – what we can do is either we can put it into a

document. The website that we set up late last week that has the very large appendix document on it and the hearing binder on it is gonna be a site that you guys are gonna have access to and we're gonna – I don't even think we got that information to you guys cause it was like Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

[Cross Talk]

Well, no, I don't think I sent it to Will.

Will: I'm like _____ .

Deirdre: If we can post V cards there, then what we'll do is just post V cards for all of the task force members. That way you can click it, open it and save it to your contacts.

Male: That'd be great.

Male 3: What's a V –

Alex: I have everybody's V card.

Deirdre: We did, and then I think we tried to send it out, but I don't know if it went out. Like it's just one of these –

[Cross Talk]

So we'll either send out V cards or we'll post V cards.

Alex: That would be great, Deirdre.

Deirdre: Yeah. So. So Monday's memo will have that website. And really what we're gonna do on Monday's memo is just make sure that at the bottom of the Monday's memo is the link to the website, because we're gonna just start posting all the documents there. That way you don't have to go back through and remember which Monday was it that we got that cause I want to take a look at that and never saved it. It'll be there.

Female: ___ reports are all on that website already.

Deirdre: The reports that are there are all on that website. If anybody wants those – so two things about the reports. Anybody who would like to take the hard copies that are here are welcome to take the hard copies that are here. If you would like us to mail you a hard copy,

then I will be happy to mail you a hard copy. So if you would like a hard copy or need a hard copy and it's not there, just give me your name and we'll get them you.

Female 1: Deirdre, what is the website?

Deirdre: Go ahead. Yes. I will mail them. It's FDMdata.org/CEV I believe, but I don't know. So what we're gonna do –

Female 1: Your website that you were just talking about.

Deirdre: Right. We'll email it to you.

Female 1: Oh, okay.

Deirdre: We'll email it to you.

Alex: We have to official adjourn I guess.

Female 1: What time's your flight?

[Cross Talk]

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: May I have your attention for just a moment? I don't know whether we – I think we need a formal motion to adjourn the meeting. Okay. So –

Antonio Taguba: So motioned.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Motioned? The General makes the motion. Second?

Male: Second.

Thea James: Second.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: All those in favor?

Multiple: Aye.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: Anybody opposed?

Female 1: No.

Robert Listenbee, Jr.: - meeting's hereby adjourned.

Deirdre, Will, Katherine Pierce, Marilyn Roberts, Female 1, Male 1, Robert Listenbee, Jr., Robert Macy, Joe Torre, Sharon Cooper, Thea James, Male 3, Georgina Mendoza, Gregory Boyle, Jim McDonnell, Antonio Taguba, Alex, Sarah Deer, Sue Jotha, Katherine Huffman

Deirdre: Okay. Anybody who is rushing out, feel free to go upstairs and get a sandwich please because they are there and a student will enjoy them and you can't. But we'd encourage you to enjoy them.

[End of Audio]