

Speaker 1: – started it. I know Marilyn Roberts would like to take a few minutes. Go right ahead.

Marilyn Roberts: Yeah, not many. Maybe only one minute because I don't wanna take up your valuable time, but I did just wanna take a quick opportunity to say to all of you thank you, thank you. You're just so wonderful, and I wanna make sure that you always know that you are so appreciated by the leadership of OJJDP, of course by the leadership of the department, obviously, but with OJJDP, Jeff, Mel, and I were all three at the Baltimore meeting. I know Jeff was with you in Albuquerque.

Mel had intended to come to this meeting and was unable to, and so I got the opportunity, and I'm grateful for the opportunity. She plans to be with you in Detroit, I believe, so just thank you. You're doing just such wonderful work and we look forward to not only what it's gonna mean to the world or at least to the United States, but also what it's gonna mean to our office because we keep struggling with trying to be the voice for at-risk children and your work is gonna help us do that even better, so we look forward to that part of it too for OJJDP, so thanks so much.

Speaker 1: Thank you. Thank you, Marilyn, and I'm gonna have to leave at 2:00. I have a flight to catch, and I just wanna say of the three hearings that we've had, this – it's hard to say that one was better than the other because they were all so different, but this was certainly engaging and I really got a lot out of it. There were so many things that I never gave thought to that have enriched my perspective on what we're trying to do here. I think the one thing that really in my mind is – in trying to help our youngsters and protect them, although I still think they have to have a say in the solution is the fact that because, as Deanne said, they spend a great deal of time in school, I think.

You mentioned that, Georgina, also, that we need to give – not only take care of the teachers. They are grossly underpaid, but to make sure that they have the tools to be able to deal with and help these youngsters and make them feel good about themselves. I'm still of the mind that I still think we need to have an awareness campaign, a widespread awareness campaign, and I am in the process, because of my work on the NAT committee, of looking for maybe corporations and companies that can partner with the justice department because we know it's not gonna be cheap to do that, and I know Major League Baseball, I already presented it to them. They've got a lot of money. I don't get paid a lot of money there, but they've got a lot of money and they are certainly in on

this that they would like to be a part of getting the message out, a healthy message out for the youngsters.

Everything else that has come out of the mouths of all these people, all these smart people out here, has humbled me and yet enriched me and I look forward to next month, I really do. Again, all have safe homes and thank you. (*Crosstalk*) Robert, why don't you take it over? You're so good at running stuff here.

Robert: We have not had a chance to publicly thank Joe for the baseballs that he left us last time (*applause*).

Speaker 1: No. I'm sending a couple more dozen. I'm making that public so she doesn't scoff.

Deirdre: Yeah, and for those that haven't _____. Yeah, Father Boyle is over here with his lip quivering.

Speaker 1: But anything anybody needs, I'm easy to get a hold of if you need something for friends or relatives or whatever. I'd be only too happy to accommodate because I've still got friends in high places.

Speaker 2: We've got some extra Red Sox hats if you ever want them.

Speaker 1: No problem. No problem.

Robert: Well, **Joy**, I think you heard the spontaneous outpouring of just thankfulness for folks for what you did. It was just wonderful and we all appreciate it. I just wanted to let you know that as well.

Speaker 1: Thank you, but I'm still trying to find, since my wife, **Ally**, who, by the way, wanted me to have her farewell mentioned to you guys. I'm still gonna try to figure out how I'm gonna explain our relationship, Sharon, but I have a three hour flight to New York trying to figure that out.

Robert: Need I remind you that you have the right to remain silent.
Deirdre?

Deirdre: You guys always give it to me to be the buzz kill. Okay, so we do have a little bit of work to finish up. We did want to go back. We asked everybody to do a little bit of homework last night, for those of you that were able to put a sentence together. I know I was pretty fried at the end of yesterday, but for those of you that were able to think about the report, to provide some feedback on the report, what I'd like to do is turn it over to Jennifer **Truan** to help

facilitate that conversation. I know that we did talk about having a conversation about the listening session, and I think that with folks' flights, I'm not sure we're gonna be able to do justice to that today.

What I'd like to offer or get feedback on is the interest in having a conference call that we would set up. We could set it up either as a conference call or as a webinar that we would be able to then have everybody who wanted to participate and listen in on that sit in and listen on and hear the conference call, ask question of Sharon and Tony and the staff that were able to be there. I just feel like if we try and put it in this afternoon, we won't do justice to the people who took time to have the listening session. Is that an amenable solution to folks? Yeah?

I'm seeing heads nodding. Tony, are you okay with that? Yeah? Okay. There are lots of different, specific topics that are coming up that we know we won't have time to cover in Detroit, either in working sessions or in the hearing, and I think one of the things that we need to think about is that if there are other conference calls that we should schedule, other topics that we need to address that could be addressed that way that NCCD, as your staff, would be more than happy to try and find the time that would work best for most to schedule those calls and to have those conversations, because we do wanna make sure that you as a taskforce feel that you have gathered the information and been able to talk with each other as much as possible about the ideas and concerns and both collaborative ideas as well as ideas where there may be conflict so that there can be a consensus about what the best information is to include in the report and the recommendations.

Speaker 3:

Deirdre, at some point before we stop today, if we could hear a little bit about what the Detroit hearing is looking like, that would be helpful.

Deirdre:

Absolutely, yeah. We can talk a bit about that. In fact, maybe what I can do is just start with that and then we can go, so the Detroit hearing, we are gonna be looking to have public comment on Monday evening again and at this point, we do not have plans for a structured working dinner, but we will be having public comment. It's at Wayne State University.

The public comment will be from 5:00 to 7:00 PM again and then Tuesday, the idea around the Detroit hearing is that we would have some information from systems that we have not yet heard from. We are really hoping to have somebody from education there,

potentially from the Department of Education, but we also have a call into the possibility of getting somebody from the Council of Great City Schools there and the Council of Great City Schools is a nationwide organization that works with the 200 largest school districts in the country, I think, so that would be a way to hear. Everybody keeps talking about the importance of schools in the solution and we need to be able to hear from education, so we hope to be hearing from them.

Speaker 4: All right, so when you say, “Education,” does it include a teacher? I would love somebody with in the class experience and classroom experience.

Deirdre: What I think would be a great way for us to hear from a teacher would be if we could bring somebody, if we could really encourage somebody to come to the public comment period for that. One of the challenges of bringing a teacher in is that they have their one experience and with the limited time in the hearings, what we’re trying to do is get a perspective that can comment on this is how it’s going in one place and this is how it’s working well in another place and here’s an alternate solution that works well in that community because we just don’t have the opportunity to bring in all those different communities, but yes, again, that’s one of those things that if it feels like the education input is limited, we can do our best to pull together a conference call, but that would probably be the best we’d be able to do.

Speaker 4: Yeah, I would like that just because although each committee is different, I think there’s some similarities, especially in urban centers that ____ __ teachers could.

Deirdre: Sure, so we can see what we can do about pulling together that.

Speaker 5: Deirdre, what about preschool? I’m thinking that preschoolers are expelled at a higher percentage than K through 12 grade because of violent behavior and black boys have four times the rate of expulsion from preschool, so in terms of the early roots of marginalization, I think it’s an important component to keep in mind.

Deirdre: It is definitely an important component and my concern is just gonna be seeing everybody go, “Oh, but wait. No, we have another. We’ve got a month.”

Speaker 5: No, we are thinking of the developmental continuum and one thing to keep it kind of present.

- Robert:* I agree.
- Deirdre:* We could look to have a preschool program or a national advocacy group or some voice for preschoolers involved in the education conversation. The other piece, and I know that this is something that Aaron as well as the folks from the Raven Group have been reaching out to all of you to do is that it is critical that you connect with your professional network and really, to the point that you can, mandate that they get in written testimony. We are not getting the written testimony from the professional organizational stakeholders from school systems, from superintendents, from advocacy groups. We have been putting the word out, but until people who they know and they respect say, "It is important that your voice be a part of this," it is important that we can point to your organization as one that has the information that supports this finding, that supports this recommendation. It's gonna be a much tougher chore on the part of your staff to get that information into the report.
- Speaker 5:* Could we give you the names of some key people that you could ask for written testimony or –
- Deirdre:* You are welcome to give us their names and you are welcome to give us the contact information and we promise you we will contact them probably more than once, but I can tell you that if I get an email from somebody I don't know saying, "I need written testimony," I am less likely to do it than if I get an email from you saying, "Deirdre, I know that you know a lot about stopping people from talking in conferences. Can you please give written testimony to somebody to do it," and I'm like, "Alicia, I'm gonna do it. For her, I'm gonna do it," so that personal request from you or from your staff is gonna go much farther with your professional network than one or more requests from us.
- Speaker 5:* And they should be written to you? The emails should be _____?
- Deirdre:* The emails? We will send out information in this upcoming Monday memo. We can send out an informational piece and we can also draft the cut and paste. Cut this email in, paste it in, put it to whom.
- Speaker 2:* That would be really helpful because we're all gonna be so busy _____ pro forma with instructions, then we can just tag our email _____.

Deirdre: Yeah, so we will draft that language for you guys and get it out this upcoming week, but that's gonna be having it come from your email address. They're gonna make sure that it gets into their inbox and it's gonna be much more likely to be read and much more likely to be responded to.

Robert: Deirdre, could you remind the group what the good idea cutoff date is for those written testimonies?

Deirdre: Yeah, good idea. Cutoff date is April 24th, which is the last hearing date.

Speaker 2: So there's no written testimonies after that?

Deirdre: No written testimonies after that, so we need written testimony by April 24th. That's the cutoff date for the written testimony.

Sharon: Deirdre, one of the things I was gonna say in conjunction with what Georgina said. If possible, it is good to have a teacher from a school, but it would also be helpful to have the contrasting perspective from a teacher from an alternative school since that's where so many of our children end up when they have been in violent circumstances.

Robert: Excuse me, Dr. _____. Deirdre, are there any perceived gaps in terms of written testimony that you think we need to have filled?

Deirdre: We have not gotten written testimony at this point, despite the fact that we've been putting the call out since we started the hearings. We have not gotten – I think we have less than 20 submissions for written testimony, and it's not that uncommon that people wait to see if they will be called, for people to wait to see if they would be able to be involved in the hearings, but now that we've had our third hearing and we are close to – we've got a strong agenda set up and many invitations out for the fourth hearing, it's time for the folks to realize that they may not get their voice into one of the invited testimony slots and put their written testimony in.

Speaker 1: Had you finished briefing us on the hearing?

Deirdre: No.

Speaker 1: Okay

Deirdre: Okay, so we have the first panel in Detroit. The Detroit hearing will look more like Baltimore and Albuquerque. We will have

invited testimony for the entire day on Tuesday and then we will do a working meeting on Wednesday. For the invited testimony for Tuesday, for the starting speaker, the keynote speaker if you will for that hearing, we are looking to have a national policy advisor involved and coming to speak to the taskforce, and we have an invitation out and we've had some response on that. We are looking to have, for the first panel, leaders who are trying to push the envelope and get cutting edge, well founded programs with positive outcomes into play.

One of the confirmed witnesses for the first panel is Vincent **Shraldi**, who has been the head of probation in DC. He's the head of both juvenile and adult probation in New York City right now, and some of the programs that he will be speaking about include bringing kids out of the state structured institutional care back into New York City and into community settings. He's also gonna be talking about setting up community storefront shops in the five most highly impacted communities in New York and what he's trying to do with that programming.

I'm trying to think of who else. Is Karen in the room? Who else is on that? Hector Sanchez Flores from the National Latino Fatherhood Initiative is gonna be on that first panel and who else is _____?

Karen: _____?

Deirdre: Jerry **Tello** was not available. Yeah, so his executive director is gonna be there. Then who was the third panelist that's confirmed on that one? Sandra **Blum**? Sandra Blum is the third panelist that's confirmed.

Sandra Blum is one who does trauma informed care across multiple settings, so she's the third panelist on that one. We have a foundations panel that's gonna be coming and talking about – so this is big funding foundations that are gonna be coming and talking about not only the programs that they're funding but how they make decisions about what direction they wanna go with major funding themes and major funding initiatives, so we're planning to get three or four major foundations along the lines of MacArthur, NoVo, Kellogg, Robert Wood Johnson. These are all some of the foundations (*crosstalk*) – Born This Way. Yeah, I don't think they're gonna be able to make it.

Speaker 6: As is part of their discussions about public/private partnerships?

Deirdre: Yeah, exactly. People like MacArthur use private money to leverage against getting the public money that requires match, so we also have Vincent Bellini from the Aces study, from the adverse childhood effects study coming to talk about the adverse childhood effects study. Oh, sorry. Sorry, and then we also have Alex Peekgrove, who is a cost benefit person. He's done a study on the impact of high risk kids or the cost of high risk kids, and so he's gonna be talking, so we're pairing those two. We've done a lot of looking for somebody who can talk about the cost of children's exposure to violence and the people – the cost benefit guys that I have been able to get in touch with are not aware of that type of analysis that's out there. Dr. Macy, I know you mentioned that you have the names of some folks, so we'd be happy to get those names.

Dr. Macy: Yeah, I'll talk to you after. He's an attorney and a clinical forensic psychologist, but he's been doing a lot of cost analysis, utilization analysis, and I mentioned to you first Dr. _____. He's a professor, so I think he'd be great if there's a slot.

Deirdre: So we were looking to either get an educational economist, a social economist, a healthcare economist, another person onto that panel of investing in prevention, the idea of what does it cost and why is it important to invest in prevention? The making public and private partnerships happen and then the last panel is really sort of about the idea of changing norms. Larry Cohen, who's been working for the prevention institute for a long time, is gonna be talking about the work that they're doing. Michael Casterly is the person from the Council of Great City Schools or some other education person. Mary Lee from Policy Link, she wrote an article, a paper, and Thea James was one of the folks who's read that.

It's called "Why Race and Place Matter," and it's about the impact of both race and place on outcomes, and so we're having her come. Reverend Hammond is another person that we're looking to invite to talk about the role that both the faith based community can play but also how a layperson, how somebody who just lives in the community can be a leader for change within that community and galvanize the community. That leads to much more than change within that community. I mean this is a person who's –

Speaker 2: This is Ray Hammond?

Deirdre: Ray Hammond, Reverend Ray.

- Speaker 2:* **Ten point course.** Has he responded?
- Deirdre:* No.
- Speaker 2:* I can get to him.
- Deirdre:* Okay, get to him. Then we're closing it out with a youth panel. We're gonna be coordinating with the Chicago Area Project a youth panel they'll be bringing in both from the South Shore Drill Team in Chicago as well as one or two other programs that they coordinate with to talk and the youth will be talking about this is what this program does, this is what it means to me, this is how it impacted my life. They will all have a mentor or a chaperone with them either from the project or their own guardian who will also be – well, we won't be asking for prepared remarks from the chaperone or guardian. They will be at the table and you will be able to talk with them as well so that youth panel is the way that we're gonna be linked there, and that's the current plan for Detroit. Again, Wednesday would be a working meeting.
- Speaker 2:* Until?
- Deirdre:* Threeish. My guess is that we will need until 3:00 PM to get through the draft section of the report to hear things like that, and it's always easier for us to say 3:00 and then if we end at 1:00 or 2:00, let folks go than have to let folks go or feel that crunch, which we're gonna be feeling anyway as I look at my watch. Oh, and Alex just said a fun to be announced activity on Tuesday night that we're hoping to coordinate, so don't make plans for Tuesday night.
- Speaker 4:* What's happening Tuesday night?
- Robert:* Play night.
- Deirdre:* We're gonna be doing something fun.
- Dr. Macy:* Group play.
- Deirdre:* We're gonna have Robert Macy guide us all through some dance therapy.
- Dr. Macy:* A flaming hoop dance, which I can do in honor of the tribal nations and us.
- Deirdre:* There it is, all right.

- Speaker 1:* Hey, is there any room to squeeze if we can get an industry captain or a capital markets guy in on the foundation panel?
- Deirdre:* We can talk.
- Speaker 1:* I mean it's three minutes ____ _ ____.
- Deirdre:* It doesn't work that way. We can talk about it. We can.
- Robert:* The answer is ____ send that information and we will certainly take that into consideration.
- Speaker 1:* Thank you, Mr. ____.
- Deirdre:* All right, okay, so that's the agenda for Detroit. **Steven**, do you have any questions about it, thoughts?
- Steven:* Nope.
- Deirdre:* Look okay?
- Steven:* Yeah.
- Deirdre:* Okay. Folks are generally okay with it, hopefully? Good? Okay, and we will work on getting an education conversation in addition to one or two folks to the Detroit hearing, okay?
- Robert:* Thank you.
- Deirdre:* All right. Thank you for coming, Joe.
- Female 4:* Thank you, Joe.
- Joe:* Thank you, guys.
- Deirdre:* Thanks, Joe.
- Joe:* And just one parting salvo from me from ____ **Boyle** suggested that we can renew our vows.
- Deirdre:* That's actually the really fun activity that we had planned.
- Speaker 7:* What can I say? Oh, my gosh. Oh, my god (*crosstalk*). Okay, so let's see here. I'm kind of short. In terms of the continued discussion about the draft outline for the report, I wanted to start off by saying that I thought that yesterday's conversation was

really great, was exactly how the conversation should've been in terms of starting.

Some of you, maybe all of you know that Deirdre, Alex, and Aaron and I continued the conversation with the three of the four writing advisors who were at this hearing, Bob, Robert, and Steve, and then Deirdre. Aaron and I continued the conversation over dinner, so we really worked that through and then also I feel like this morning's hypothetical scenario that you all played out, which I was on the edge of my seat. It was not only really interesting, but it was very – the collegueship that was shown through that activity I think was very encouraging to me in terms of the process of moving forward and actually shaping this report, because it's gonna demand a good collegueship. Also then just the second half of that where people really focused on what they thought the policy recommendations could/should be was extremely helpful to me and the staff in terms of moving the outline forward.

The expectation for the little bit of time that we have today is not that we will, at the end of – I don't know. What do we have, a half an hour, or 45 minutes? It's not that we will have a revised outline that we're all like, "Okay, we did that," but clearly the staff have more work to do in terms of making revisions, but we wanted to make sure that especially since we asked you to think about this last night that if there were particular, pointed suggestions about what are key paradigm shifts that we wanna make sure that we emphasize in this report that we have time when we're together to talk about those, so in terms of substantively, that's what I'm expecting we can do in the little bit of time that we have.

Also, we promised you yesterday that we would give you a sense of the timeline, a very broad sense of how this is gonna move from where we are now to having a finished report in hand. Basically, what we're gonna do is we are gonna work on refining this outline and simultaneously drafting a sample chapter so that we can start to work out issues of style and tone and how do we weave in these really compelling stories and quotes and what does it really feel like, the report? We're gonna do that leading up to the hearing in Detroit and the deadline that we have set for ourselves is that we will send that sample section to you on April 20th in advance of the Detroit hearing, and we'll talk about it in Detroit. We also, if not before, and I certainly personally hope before we'll circulate a revised outline as well, but it will be no later than April 20th, and I also feel like – I think it was the general who asked what is the cutoff for all good ideas.

I think the Detroit hearing is the cutoff for all big, new, good ideas. We really have to have a final outline that we are all really excited about by the end of that meeting in Detroit to have a hope of – well, to be able to produce a final report within the timeframe that we have. The next step is that we will produce a draft of the entire report to circulate to you all on July 20th in advance – not much advance but in some advance of a meeting that is scheduled in Washington, DC for the 24th and 25th, which is a Tuesday and Wednesday, right?

Okay, and at that meeting we'll talk through the draft report and I'm sure also there will be substantial discussion about rollout, marketing, all of those issues which we will then spend about the next month revising and refining that draft, and we have to have absolutely final copy by August 31st so that we can give the report to a designer and so that it can go into design and production. Just a little bit of a note on that, I don't have a date to offer you for this, but probably or hopefully when we're together in Detroit in April, we will also have some design mockups to show you, so you'll begin to have a sense of what it's gonna really –

[End of Audio]

Speaker 7: – look like if we don't have that for Detroit, we'll get them to you in some other way shortly thereafter.

Deirdre: Can I just stop for –

Speaker 7: Yes.

Deirdre: I think that one of the things that I'd also like to offer is that – so we will be together in Detroit in April 24th and 25th. We're also gonna be together in Washington, DC, July 24th and 25th. There's gonna be a lot of work going on in between then in terms of finalizing the language, writing reports. We will have communication with the co-chairs, with the writing advisors, and individually with the taskforce on particular subject matters, particular sections that you are passionate about, or you've made particular comments about, or have repeatedly raised in the hearings, so we will be reaching out to all of you. You are also all welcome to reach out to us and ask us where we are with the writing, let us know if you are feeling like you should be seeing more information.

I don't want you to feel disconnected to the process that is gonna be happening between the last hearing and your receiving a draft report, so however we can help you feel included in that process and part of that process and yet not overwhelmed in that process is what we are really trying to achieve. We need your input in that, so I'd also encourage you to think about that. That may be a period of time where we do say, "The first Monday of every month we wanna have a full taskforce conference call for an hour just to let you know where we are, let you know what information we've received, send out the draft mockups and get feedback," whatever it is. Okay?

Speaker 3: Before you go on, Deirdre, if that is an idea that everybody thinks is a really good idea, is Monday a good day, and if so, what time because you might as well put that in at least some possibility of _____ establishing today.

Sharon: I would say that for most people who are clinicians, Friday is a better day than a Monday because most people have half-day clinics on Fridays and the other half of the day is usually open. Mondays after the weekend is when a lot of referrals come in and we have a lot of stuff you have to do, so it makes it a little bit harder, I think, for most people who are clinicians.

Speaker 7: Friday is fine.

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

- Speaker 3: What time, Friday morning or afternoon?
- Speaker 7: It has to be afternoon, Eastern Time; morning, Pacific. Just because of the time zone thing, we have to do it in the afternoon, Eastern, and 9:00 AM Pacific, noon Eastern, or 10:00 AM Pacific, 1:00 Eastern.
- Speaker 8: And ____ ____ it is – we’re gonna be talking about ____ ____, right, so **three some a month**. Some people, that Friday is a different kind of a problem.
- Speaker 7: Making ____.
- Speaker 8: Making ____.
- Sharon: Teachers.
- Speaker 8: Okay, so ____ ____ mean.
- Sharon: Yeah.
- Speaker 3: What time are we establishing ____ ____?
- Sharon: 5:00 to 10:00.
- Deirdre: 10:00 AM Pacific. Okay, so we’ll throw that out there.
- Speaker 2: Send us a reminder.
- Deirdre: What Aaron will do is remember to send out a request for an appointment. Those of you that can make it, that you wanna put it on your calendar, great. It’ll be on our calendar and we will be on the phone. Those of you that can’t make it or that have a conflict and you wanna suggest an alternate time, please reply with suggesting an alternate time so we can try and float that with others.
- Speaker 3: Well, is there any problem with doing it that way? Okay.
- Speaker 2: Sorry for the remedial instruction, but we’re no longer scheduled to be meeting at June 5, 6, and 7 in DC. That’s gonna be the July meeting?
- Deirdre: Right. That’s the July meeting.
- Speaker 2: Thank you.

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

- Deirdre: Yes.
- Speaker 7: And that'll be 24th and 25th.
- Deirdre: In your calendars now, it's July 24th and 25th.
- Speaker 3: Does that mean we're coming to Washington on the evening of the 23rd?
- Deirdre: Yeah. Well, you would probably be able to get down in the morning but you're welcome to come in the evening.
- Speaker 3: What time are we starting, 8:30?
- Deirdre: I'll have to look. That level of detail I will figure out, but I would say yes, closer to that than 10:00.
- Speaker 3: And Friday at 1:00 is the time we've established for Eastern Time?
- Deirdre: Friday. 1:00 Eastern, 10:00 AM Pacific, and we will send an email out. I promise. Okay, go.
- Speaker 7: So really, we're almost to the end of this schedule, but essentially NCCD has a commitment to deliver what we're calling printer-ready files. That's basically the report electronically and ready to go to a printer (*electronics interference noise*). Is that me?
- Deirdre: Do you wanna just switch it (*crosstalk*)? Well, it's recording.
- Speaker 9: It's a telephone.
- Speaker 7: It's a telephone?
- Deirdre: It's these two?
- Speaker 9: Telephones ringing and that's ____ ____ ____.
- Deirdre: Go ahead.
- Male 2: Plausible denial. ____ ____ see you failing ____ ____, the computer not the phone.
- Speaker 7: I love it, so September 30th, that is the date. By September 30th, we have to deliver the report to the Department of Justice and then –
- Speaker 8: That's the submission date?
- Speaker 7: Yes.

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

- Speaker 8:* September 3rd is submission date?
- Speaker 1:* To DOJ, not _____. Not for release.
- Speaker 7:* To DOJ, not for release.
- Speaker 8:* I understand. _____ includes –
- Speaker 7:* September 30th.
- Speaker 8:* – presentations to the Attorney General or just we _____ at your leisure?
- Speaker 4:* Yeah, what is the presentation? That’s a good –
- Speaker 2:* Yeah, what is the presentation?
- (Crosstalk)*
- Speaker 3:* That’s something that we need to have continued conversation about. Right now we’re simply talking about the report. I think NCCD in conjunction with the DOJ folks are gonna reach out to you all to have conversations about what the rollout will look like, how you will envision that, and that’s also when we will hope to bring in some of our additional marketing resources to have available for you all, so I think that is part of a larger discussion that we can have as we move forward, because I do think it is important that we hear from each of you how you envision this rolling out, and then we can consult with our leadership at the back of the department to ensure that those two ideologies match up.
- Speaker 10:* And ideally we would love it if we made you _____ that some parts of our conversation, to hear from all of you about what you come up with, what _____ this process has been _____, maybe not that much of a formal presentation _____ at that point, but you have _____ 34 _____ and we’ll see what we can do.
- Speaker 3:* That would be my expectation. You commissioned us to do this, and I think we need to have an audience for them just to kind of close it out. I mean _____ because that’s part of that national commitment that you’re talking about.
- Robert:* Right. I think the difficulty there for us to be able to speak with any specificity now is it’s very difficult to be able to determine what the attorney general’s schedule is gonna look like, so I don’t wanna just say to you all now, “Yes, you will be there at that

particular meeting.” I think we are certainly envisioning you all being commissioned by **he** himself.

- Speaker 2:* We could just call him that now. If you give me his phone number, I'll tell it ____ save this window, Mr. Attorney ____.
- Robert:* You could have it like that, Joe, unfortunately. You can communicate that ____.
- Dr. Macy:* See, you have to do that, **general**.
- Speaker 8:* At least I got the weekends and the holidays. That's two weeks from now.
- Speaker 6:* And I think as DOJ employees, we've gotta be able to ____ about this, but the one thing that we don't have ____ that we are certain about is that we have a strong desire to be able to hear from all the people and to be able to have this present issue _____. We just can't make that commitment right now just because we made that commitment then and there's so many other factors with ____ setup. We continue to gather information and make recommendations on the _____.
_____.
- Speaker 2:* Can I just clarify or I should say bring up something that Tony mentioned yesterday, but I may have misinterpreted what you said. We were at the end of the day talking about how this might roll out. The general ed. suggested that perhaps we could send the executive summary to the AG's office before we do finalization to get a sense, but is that the normal protocol, or is that not usually done?
- Speaker 4:* I don't think that the ____ I don't have a clear focus in ____ the last time when these were done. We will ____ AG's office and we will ____ figure that out, but that's a great question.
- Speaker 2:* Yeah, well, I don't know if that's what you meant in general.
- Robert:* Yeah, in my time in government, multiple times, you give them a 150 page report, they're not gonna read it. They wanna know the bottom line, so you give them an executive summary of some sort. This happens in Congress, by the way, so we give them an

executive summary with all the key points, and whatever have you and then maybe the follow up with that. Then we present to him or he gives us his input or his reaction to that report, maybe an hour of his precious time and I think that gives us a closure of closing the loop because the next step after we get the report to him or whatever the case may be is that what's next? What do we do with that reporting? Where does that report go to, because we have a community that we're responsible at giving feedback.

Speaker 3: Just to jump in here for a sec. This is about staging and it's much more complicated. I think everything you're saying makes sense, but there are lots of ways to play this, and this – we have something to say and I agree. I expect that closing the loop – and I'm not disagreeing with anything you're saying, Tony, but just for example, there's a big difference between the Attorney General stopping by to have an informal chat before the report is done on the 24th and 25th as opposed to the Attorney General's office deciding that they want to do a press event with the publication and announcement of the report that is preceded by a 20 minute meeting with members of the taskforce.

I mean I'm just throwing that out there as an example, but having been through these kinds of things before, the issues of staging and determining the biggest bang for the buck, literally, maybe bang's wrong, but anyway, you know what I mean. I think that's something that the AG's office is not – that they're not only not unaware of it, but I think our saying, "Yes, we wanna meet with the AG's," that's great. Let's hear from the AG's office in terms of what they have in mind and hopefully that will also include some discussion with us, but the timing and all that stuff is –

Speaker 10: So conversation and staging are not mutually exclusive. I mean it doesn't have to be either/or and I think it's not that several of us haven't been thinking about this and working internally in the department about –

Speaker 3: Well, it might be useful then to talk to people about what you're thinking.

Speaker 6: I think we do.

Speaker 3: I think that's what we're doing, yes.

Speaker 6: _____ before _____ do other things. I just _____ other things that we wanted to hopefully get a little bit of

coverage of in the next few minutes before we have to begin to separate.

Deirdre:

Right, so your comments are really well received. We understand exactly where – I think the questions that you all have about what you would like to see or what is going to happen and how that can match with what you think should happen or how you would like to see this or with the opportunity you think that it presents is a conversation that we need to have. As Catherine has said, as Alex has said, folks within NCCD and DOJ, in terms of the team meetings that we have on a regular basis, we are looking at options and I think the best way for us to communicate with you all is gonna be if we can put a plan out or our ideas, our best thoughts at the time. Even if we wanna do that before, to share some information with you so you can look at it and comment on it in Detroit, then that might be the best way for us to really get the quality feedback from you all.

We certainly are thinking about how are we gonna inform Congress, not just the – how do we present this to the HE, but what opportunity does it present for the HE to really blow it up as we've been saying. How do we use it as an opportunity to publicize? How do we inform people on the Hill? Do we do that before the election or after the election? There are lots of things that are coming into play here.

Do we ask you all to come to Congress and go talk with your congressional members or do we simply give you information and help facilitate the organization of those meetings in your home districts because they may be there more than in DC in the next couple of months, so those are all parts of the conversation that we're having. I think Steven, what I'm hearing is really well taken. You guys don't know about any of that, and you need to. As taskforce members, we need to do a better job at keeping you informed – Georgina?

Georgina:

Oh, it was a stretch slap.

Deirdre:

Oh, okay.

Georgina:

___ ___ wanted attention.

Robert:

That was a Georgina move there.

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

- Georgina:* So this is a more individual question, but just so the group knows, Salinas is one of the six cities on the National Forum for Youth Violence Prevention, so our third summit meeting is gonna be –
- Deirdre:* April 2nd.
- Georgina:* And 3rd, yeah, so I'll be flying out again to the _____ first and fly back on the 5th, but on the 4th after the 2nd and 3rd, I'm meeting with my two senators and congressmen and a number of other individuals. Is it appropriate to talk about the work that we're doing or is that okay on that? What do you think?
- Robert:* That would be appropriate, yes.
- Georgina:* It would be appropriate?
- Speaker 8:* So if you're serving the public role here, this is a _____.
- Speaker 11:* Well, one of the things I wanna stress is while you were all were commissioned by the Attorney General and you all work in close concert with the Department of Justice, you all are an independent entity, so you are welcome to discuss the work that has been done and what you all have seen with whomever you like, so you are free to do that, and as a matter of fact, to a large degree we would certainly encourage that type of conversation. I think it will ultimately help to any communication regarding the work that has been done on this taskforce I think is good, positive communication.
- Sharon:* I have a question. Can we assume that some of the federal agencies – because we were talking about this as a public health problem – can we assume that some of the federal agencies that deal with public health such as the CDC and others, the Office of the Surgeon General or the public health service, can we assume that you all already are either in contact or will be looking at our databases, etc., and therefore we don't have to list it as it –
- Deirdre:* You can assume that we are looking at the information that they have available. You can assume that we are attempting to reach out to the staff there. We do not have direct access to those leaders. If you want them to –
- Sharon:* Submit written testimony or something like that?
- Deirdre:* Yeah, submit testimony. I mean the other challenge is that this is a taskforce that's informing the government, so how much do we

rely on the government information to inform the government of what the government should be doing. It's a bit of a circular thing, so we are looking to make sure that we rely on nongovernmental sources, but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't keep those players and those leaders informed, so the short answer is that you're welcome to share and communicate. To the best of our ability, we're doing that as well.

At this point I'm gonna ask that we go back to the report. We have a need to hear about your thoughts on the outline of the report, and so the other questions and comments and conversations that you wanna have about what we're doing to keep people informed, what we need to do that we aren't doing, things like that. I would welcome emails and phone calls, and I will be sure to reply to all of those between now and next Wednesday. Next Thursday I'm on vacation for ten days.

Speaker 10: And please copy Will. Please copy Will on those as well.

Deirdre: Please do.

Speaker 5: Please what?

Deirdre: Copy Will.

Speaker 11: Please copy _____ communications via email that you will have with Deirdre. That will just the DOJ _____ –

Deirdre: Just so we know what your questions are.

Speaker 7: Okay, if I can, because I know I saw Father Boyle this morning in the lobby of the hotel and he said he had done his homework, so would you mind starting us off?

Speaker 9: No. Well, ask the question, what exactly, because I just wrote notes but I don't – you know?

Speaker 2: They looked like some pretty good notes.

Speaker 9: No. I feel like I didn't do the homework assignment.

Speaker 7: No, I know you did. I know you did. The question is, again, we've been talking about paradigm change, and we've been talking about really moving the country in a different direction, so how do we capture the specific components of that. What do we wanna put in advance? I don't mean in advance in terms of time, but what's up front to –

Speaker 12:

On that issue, I think it's mentioned throughout the outline that you gave us and it was mentioned here a number of times this morning. Creating that sense of urgency, why are we doing this, and it's spelled out somewhat in here that it is an epidemic. It is a public health problem. It is bigger than all of us, and there's an opportunity now to try and get in front of this or catch up with it and do something. This is our attempt to do that and create a reason why people from all sectors would wanna read this and would wanna evaluate it for their own purposes. That sense of urgency concerns an outrage, I think.

We need to be met and too often in the big cities another kid murdered, and it's a big deal for a day, and then it's gone, but there isn't that sense either in government or in the community, outrage over hey, we just lost a five-year-old. That's unacceptable. It affects the family forever, but everybody else kind of moves on, but yet they're still scarred, and we don't ever address that. I think the slogan, the banner, that issue we kicked around yesterday is a critical piece to this and if we can somehow tie in the respect piece, which I think is also a very important part of this in with rebuilding America, or respect America's foundation, or a reality check for America, or finding our way back. Those kind of things I think resonate with people because again, it's that bigger than us piece.

It's America that we're dealing with. It's freedom. It's our values that we base everything we do on, and then another part that was kicking around quite a bit this morning kind of on the margins where we talked about – and I think that skit that we did, if you will, really was well done in that it brought out the complexity of what we're dealing with, but when we look at the suspect, the perp, or whatever you wanna call him, that person is often damaged goods as well.

In looking at that, there are underlying factors, the experiences, sickness, or exposure to violence that caused that person to behave the way they did. I think we need to acknowledge that very strongly, but at the same time not lose track of individual accountability because I think if we look at this as everybody's a victim, that doesn't resonate and we need to stress from the beginning everybody's accountable for their own actions. However, their actions may be as a result of something that they experienced or were exposed to or something that maybe had something been done on the front end, they wouldn't be where they are today, talking about then the cycle.

Speaker 5: As a segue, I agree with everything you said. I like starting with violence is the most important public health issue facing our nation and number two, I would follow with embed violence awareness into every system, with all systems serving children, and then under that, I think I would make screening for exposure to violence. Make the points underneath that, but I think it needs to have a follow up that is really – and as a result, violence awareness needs to be embedded in every system serving children and under that then, one can talk about invest in interventions that prevent violence and do it in a continuum, a developmental continuum ending with, I would say, the judicial system. But I think that it should start with babies and toddlers and the need to keep them safe and to embed the question of preventing violence, promoting safety from the beginning.

So I would reorganize it like that and the other thing is there are such exciting things here like the children's budget, and I think they should come right up where one is still fresh, reading it, and among that – and they reengineer funding to prioritize prevention I think should help create a children's budget number one and then concentrate resources where they are most needed. Number two, and kind of do it in a level of urgency. I think that all the points are excellent and rearranging them in a way that creates a sense of urgency would really convey the message more immediately.

Speaker 9: Can I –

Speaker 3: Oh, I'm sorry.

Speaker 9: I think that it's not just the urgency of the issue, but it's the restating of it because we've gotten this wrong so often in that I think that we want to treat illness and not punish it. For me, the parallel is from scripture where you have Jesus who deals with this man who is possessed by a demon. Well, as you describe it and scripture scholars go back, well, no, he has epilepsy. That's exactly what we do. We have this moral overlay that's so powerful that we think that we can communicate enough information to kids who are violent or whatever so that they'll finally see.

I was on *Dr. Phil* and they had a coffin and jail cell on the stage, trying to convince the kids, don't you see this'll end in death or prison? We have to get away from that because we want to do the, our country's going to hell in a hand basket and oh, my god, we've forgotten who we are and all that stuff just really doesn't help. It actually keeps us thinking this person's possessed by a demon

when in fact he has epilepsy and if you dealt with that – not even Jesus knew that he had epilepsy.

You wanna say, “Yeah, there’s something we can do,” and then we’re famous for disqualifying ourselves, so coupled with the urgency is to kind of say, “All hands on deck. Everybody can be a beneficial presence here. Everybody,” and so we have to straddle things like cultural competence, which I appreciate, but we forget that it’s a human thing, so when you get it, this gang member’s gonna listen to me because I’m a gang member more than he’s gonna listen to you, which is perfectly fine if the task is to get him to listen to me, but the task is to receive who he is, listen to him, help progress him in his own path towards healing.

Then all of a sudden, once you say that, everybody could listen to this kid. Do you have a pulse? Yes. Then you can do it. That’s the shift we need and consequently, this is why every entity comes up with their own comprehensive approach. You have this medical community.

Law enforcement does this a lot, all sorts of – we are gonna do the whole thing, which leaves everybody out, whereas you have to say, “No, we’re all going to do the whole thing,” and so I don’t know. For me, it’s always about the movement towards health in seeing these issues, not just seeing it as a health issue, but it’s the movement towards health. Someone talked about what we have to unlearn.

This could be helpful because it’s always like, “Do this, do this, do this,” but part of the wisdom that we’re trying to get at is undo this. Stop seeing it this way. Unlearn what you’ve accepted as the narrative myth about where this comes from and it’s complicated because we’re dealing with everything from cyber bullying to gang violence, but you’re not gonna be able to get people to roll up their sleeves unless you’re gonna call them to a thing that they can do, which is, I think, more human and less narrow and rarefied than we’ve been to date.

Speaker 3:

Well, just to the exclusion thing, I think it also turns on its head a lot of what we’ve been hearing in the hearings, which is a kind of polemic or a polarization, so if you hear professional groups saying, “Well, no, it’s the community.” I think that what you’re describing is exactly right. It is about everybody and it’s not about it’s not this place. It’s this place or it’s not this person, it’s that person. It’s all of the above.

The one thing, quickly, in terms of the issue, and I agree with Alicia in terms of the idea of where we start and the whole. That's part of the inclusion. We start early on. I think we ought to be careful. I wish I didn't have to say that.

I think we ought to be careful about using the word, prevention, and it's a really – maybe I'm being too concrete, but you mentioned foundations. Foundations, there's actually what I've been told by the foundations who have the most money in violence prevention, that they set the tone. Violence prevention, when you hear foundations and what they're funding, it's about classroom based, so I think either we redefine it and we make clear what we mean and maybe that's an opportunity here (*crossstalk*). Well, not just there, but Robert Wood Johnson has a whole violence prevention.

That's where their money's going and it's all curricular based, right? I'm just throwing it out there in terms of language. The last thing is see, your hands on deck, which all hands on deck, which sets the tone for the rest of the report, actually goes to Jim's notion about the appeal to our national price so that I think that they actually fit really well together. As a country, we've not always done so great. We've got a great Declaration of Independence and a _____. That doesn't mean we've been great at it, but when we've recognized that we've got a problem with how we're carrying out our founding principles and rallied together, that –

[End of Audio]

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

- Speaker 3:* We moved things forward, so I actually agreed that the idea of tapping into a sense of strength as we're asking people to confront things that are so ugly and painful, but with the American spirit, the best of the American spirit in terms of it is all hands on deck, right? That's all.
- Sharon:* I think that because we are stating up front that this is a public health problem, most people do not understand what you really mean by that. I think you need to define what we mean when we say, "Public health." We're talking about the individual, the family, the community, and society. Most people won't know that, and as our recommendations are gonna be focused, I would suspect, on all of those categories of public health, I think we should define that pretty early up front so that the reader will know that we're not talking about just taking everything to court and throw everybody in prison.
- We're talking about it because it's a justice report. I think people would initially think that's what we're talking about. How can we prosecute better, but instead we're looking at it from a totally different perspective and just to define that for them.
- Robert:* And I need help with that because I'm not sure that once you define it as a public health problem or set of issues, does that automatically mean that if you have a public health institution in a state, that the public health department suddenly will feel like it needs to reach out and grab this and make it its own activity or whether by the way we define it, which is broader than the institution. If we can make it clear that we're talking about, again, all hands on deck, a wider range of institutions that we're gonna be asking to participate in solving the problem. Can you help me with your thinking on that and also how other people might perceive the definition of a _____?
- Speaker 9:* Part of the thing that breaks that open a little bit is instead of the medical – help me say it. It's just health?
- Deirdre:* Health.
- Speaker 5:* Public health.
- Speaker 9:* Public health. Once you start to say it, when you say, "Public health," it conveys all sorts of disease things. If you said, "Community health," that there's somehow –

- Speaker 7:* Well actually, I like the way you put it, which is a movement towards health, which is not taking a problem that's been confined to one system and shifting it to confine it another system. What it's doing, at least how I heard you, really opening it up. How do the systems that we have contribute towards a movement toward health?
- Speaker 2:* That's why I love Jim's – some of the things. You threw them out very quickly and I hope somebody wrote them down, but some of those taglines were wonderful because in some ways they really do speak to this broader notion.
- Speaker 9:* Stability.
- Speaker 2:* Well, not just the list, but actually the slogans. You said something about bringing America back or –
- Robert:* Yeah, respect finding our way back and –
- Speaker 2:* Helping out America or something. A sense of energy ____ ____.
- Speaker 12:* Yeah, I got finding our way back, a reality check for America, rebuilding, making America even greater, respect America's foundation.
- Speaker 7:* You know – I'm sorry. Go ahead. No, go ahead. Go ahead.
- Speaker 12:* That's good.
- Speaker 4:* No, I was about to say something else and then all of a sudden as I was hearing the slogans, another thought came to my mind, and I don't wanna be like Michelle Obama and stand up someplace and say something and they go, "Oh, my gosh, she's anti-American," but I'm wondering. I don't know how many people in the community have that sort of – some people may not have that sort of thing for America, so I'm not so sure it'll resonate with them completely. That's just a thought that just came in and just went, just like that. I'm just saying that. The other thing I was gonna say, I really haven't heard anybody say anything that makes me think this should be a caution, but when Father Boyle was talking about being on the stage and there was a jail and a coffin, it has been shown and it makes perfect sense that scare tactics and things like that don't work in the community because it's normal for them. This is something that's an expectation, so they're not gonna be afraid of that, so I'm just saying in terms of the language

we used and that we wanna have the communities consider it as well, that we don't use things like that.

Deirdre:

Joe was one of the first folks to arrive this morning when I was here setting up the room, and he and I had an opportunity to talk, and he is also a very – so just to relate a bit of that conversation, he was also very interested in this idea of making sure that even if the entire report is not approachable and something that everyone in the community and everyone in the public would be interested in reading in its entirety, that the concept is. And that if there is a slogan, that slogan is something that is important, that everybody can somehow or another grab hold of or understand as a common aim and drive towards. And one of the ideas that I brought forward to that conversation from what Father Greg said yesterday is that that slogan really has to be one that doesn't instill fear but really it instills that sense of hope so that you don't have this lethal absence of hope that Father Boyle, you're always talking about.

So where there is that lethal absence of hope, whatever, we have to try to figure out how to instill that hope to really get those folks and the people who live in those communities, the people who are our neighbors and our friends and our relatives who live with that lethal absence of hope to be able to see the opportunity for hope again, because that's what's gonna get this report to a place of continuing to move forward regardless of who is in what body of government, right? From what I'm hearing from the taskforce members, that's really what you want. You wanna be able to have a report that can continue to live and move forward regardless of who is in what body of government.

Sharon:

Do you feel, and I get what you're saying, very similar to the Project Save Childhood moniker that we've had for a few years now in the process of training law enforcement on how to decrease the amount of child mental treatment, so tell me why defending childhood is not gonna be part of that topic or our title. Why is that?

Deirdre:

I don't think that there's a point at which we're saying it's not gonna be a part of the title.

Sharon:

Because I'm sure you all worked on just that for a long time. Defending childhood, protect, heal, thrive is a very good moniker, frankly, I think, except that –

Speaker 9:

It's the one that's on the sign.

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

Sharon: Defending childhood, protect, heal, thrive. The only problem with defending childhood is that children – just the word ‘children’ tends not to make congressional people jump up and down and say, “Oh, I wanna do that,” for some reason. I don't know why that is, but nevertheless, I think that that title is a very good, very positive title.

Speaker 9: I also feel like if you get to the place, where do you want people’s hearts and minds to be shifted? I always think, again, that – since you put me in this, I speak for all churches.

Deirdre: All religions. Not just churches.

Speaker 9: Acts and the apostles talks about a healthy community and it has this very curious line that says, “And all came upon everything,” and so the movement towards all is the movement away from judgment. It does not mean that people aren’t responsible for what they do, but the minute you start to feel awe for what people have testified here have had to – I mean the judge, you stand in awe at what he had to carry, and then you stopped standing in judgment at how he carried it. That’s huge because then we stopped saying, “Well, don’t you know the difference between right and wrong? He had a choice. He could’ve chosen this.”

Preposterous! How do we move the country to a place where they can go, “Wow, a kid who lives here has to carry more than a kid who lives here,” and that’s the whole deal. The minute you have that, then it’s not just about defending children, which I think is good, but _____, but you’re never going to get to a place where they’re actually protected, healed, thriving, and defended unless you are actually helping the people who are perpetrating these things and it continues and it continues and it continues and never break _____. Somebody is always judging. Somebody is always saying, “My God, I would never have done this because I’m morally superior,” and you strike a high moral _____ and that’s all we’ve ever done, but the minute we can – what was that thing that happened in World War II when you recycled metal and the war effort or whatever it is.

Speaker 2: Rosie the Riveter.

Speaker 9: That’s the kind of thing that you’re trying to get people to – everybody come together with less judgment, more awe, and you’re moving towards hell all the time.

Deirdre: That’s right.

Speaker 3: Well, it does go back to everything's everything but in a good way and to Thea's point about the country and who's listening, I mean the simple solution is whatever it is that we choose is, what we're aiming for is for community and country so that there is an opportunity. I got what you were saying. We want everybody, so we should walk the walk and be appealing at multiple levels. This whole idea, essentially what we're talking about is – but we've gotta choose the terms because I think Bob, your question about the public health – I mean I think we need to get people awed and I think we need to do it.

We need to get people in awe and we need to do it both in terms of the stuff we've been talking about, the economics from multiple plains and those too have to be up front really fast because the first reaction is what, you wanna spend more money? This other issue of choosing what it is we're aiming for, the public health has its problems on multiple levels, but there is something that we're striving for, isn't it, for our community and our country, and the focus is on kids and the questions, so what are the words? I was thinking about healthy development. I don't know, something, but let's try to call it as close to what we're talking about as it is. I'm not sure what the words are, but the community and country alike, that part.

Speaker 4: _____ and we can work with it, like healthy community and country, because what I like about that, about community and country is local. The feds don't _____ to the national level so it really captures one neighborhood in any U.S. city all the way up to federal, so I really like that we can play with that community and country concept. I think that's really brilliant. Just to mention to your point about public health, yeah, I think public health is such an essential partner, but I would not like to see them as the lead agency in all the _____.

Speaker 5: Do you think that if we take out public and we just call it, "Health," it transforms it?

Speaker 9: The problem is, is then it's medical. It's a medi-centric kind of thing. Look, we know what we mean, but in the public perception, if you say, "Health," or you talk about inoculation, _____, whatever, and so I wonder if there's something –

Speaker 5: Well, but if we want to change perceptions, we are saying, "This is health." Obesity is the result of trauma in many, many, many cases, so it gives the vector that connects many, many, many of them. I don't know whether you read a word of this, but the past

president of the American Psychiatric Association said that violence is to emotional health what tobacco is to physical health. He said it.

Speaker 8: Are we trying to solve or come up with a slogan today?

Deirdre: No, we aren't.

Speaker 5: No.

Speaker 8: Okay, well, something. I just think that everyone's sense of urgency, national crisis, public awareness. Why don't you ask the kids what they want the slogan to be? I mean that's another idea because we're trying to solve their problems for them and they may not be catching. That's really the focus of at least in my opinion in that particular sense. I mean we heard voices from people that we heard from, and I think an expectation is that we're gonna be their voices to put their interests into this report. I'm just mission oriented.

We were given a mission to do. The commander gave me a mission to do, and so it goes to my training that I'm gonna give him a plan because that's what he expects and then we move out. Whether he approves the plan or not is a matter of how he wants to resource that for success – we're all resourcers. Our expertise gives us the resource to try and help out with the community, so we provide what we can provide in that report. We can provide a three volume set, but if it's 150 pages, fine, but I always have – I guess it goes back to my mentoring.

You get this report and so what? How attractive is it to the kids? How attractive is it to the community? How attractive is it to the American Indian community for that matter that we address their issues? How attractive is it to say, "Merced, California"?

I don't know, but we try our best to do that and whatever strategy, marketing, staging, whatever we do, we're not off the hook. Remember, we were raised to roll up our sleeves. We had the report and we don't wring our hands. Why – because you're still in that profession. You can't wring your hands. Whatever the solution would be, we've got the dates, right?

We've got deadlines ____ the ____ cut is now the 24th. The 20th we have a meeting, second draft, think about the slogans. There's a democratic committee. Put them on the list and we vote; whatever the case may be. I don't know, but it's almost 3:00.

Speaker 7: I was just gonna say I think we have maybe about eight minutes left. I will say from my perspective as someone who's edited a lot of reports that conversations like this about – I hate to use the word, slogans, but big themes, like what you really want the takeaway to be, how do you wanna change people's minds and their visions, it's not only useful in terms of a title and a main message, but it's useful in terms of how you frame every single recommendation, so –

Deirdre: So it's been a helpful conversation?

Speaker 7: Yes.

Speaker 10: Can I ask one more question? How detailed are the recommendations in each section?

Speaker 7: I think the draft provides a model at least of what we're thinking now about level of detail. I don't think we're imagining. In terms of revising the draft outline, we have not been thinking about moving towards much more detailed, or as we've said earlier, in the weeds recommendations. If you think that there are areas in which we need to be more detailed, let us know, but that's not one of the things that we're thinking about in terms of moving forward.

Deirdre: So one of the things, just as we wrap up the conversation about the outline, the themes, the title/slogan, the message and recognize the questions that you have about the staging and the messaging and your role in post-hearing, post-writing taskforce activities or message carrying activities. One of the things that I would ask is that I think that I don't know that I feel like we've done justice to everybody in terms of getting your feedback on the draft outline report and I would ask that if you have made notes and you wanna hand those to us – Tony, I know you gave that to Jennifer. I see a paper over there that's not electronic, and if you wanna hand that to us, we'd be happy to go through that and see how that can be modified. I'm sure we can read it. I have three kids. I can read anything.

Speaker 9: _____ homework.

Deirdre: We would also be happy to have input electronically. In order for us to revise this draft outline and get you something next week, a revised draft outline, and really, we need to have a final draft outline to the end of next week at the latest in order to move forward, in order for us to get you that revision and make sure that you're comfortable with it, we don't anticipate – from the

conversations we've heard, from the context we've heard, I don't think that Jennifer and I are thinking that we would turn this draft outline on its head or that it would look so foreign and different that it would be unrecognizable. I think there would be modifications.

I think we would try and punch up the language and make it more urgent. I think that there may be some re-linguaging of certain recommendations and reprioritizing and perhaps collapsing of some ideas and expanding of other ideas or highlighting of other ideas. That level of detail, that level of refinement is something that is achievable if we have your comments by end of day Friday so that then we have next week to work with them, so if you haven't given us all of your thoughts, we'd ask you to give them to us either in writing, handwritten today, or else email them to us by end of day Friday.

Speaker 9: Just a couple – just the thing that –

Deirdre: We'll go around, one, one, and one, right?

Speaker 9: The thing that got mentioned, and this is jargon, and I never heard it before was that no wrong door approach.

Speaker 7: It was in one of the reports, yeah.

Speaker 9: Yeah, but is that something that people have heard of before? I've never heard of it.

Speaker 7: Yeah.

Speaker 3: I think it was there ____ ____ ____.

Speaker 9: Yeah, and it's an interesting concept because on the one hand, no wrong door approach means if you go to the fire department, they're going to direct you somewhere else. You're never gonna have a wrong door, but if you broke that wide open to include that expression, which is kind of compelling. No wrong door. There's nobody in the community that will be a wrong door. It's a little bit like see something, say something.

It deputizes everybody to be beneficial, so I thought it was good language, but it leapt off the page for me, and an unrelated thing is, and this gets back to when we say ____ ____ ____ as kids, the idea that we try juveniles as adults. Why – because the more egregious the crime, the more we think this kid is now likened to an adult and

I think part because it's already in the preliminary draft. We have to shift that. That doesn't even make any sense. Suddenly if a kid has sex at 12, then he's an adult? We don't think that, but if a kid kills somebody at 12 or 14, suddenly he's an adult. It doesn't make any sense, but it's the prevailing cultural, mythic way that if this is really bad, he did a very adult thing, so now suddenly we're going to treat him like an adult. I think it's a cuckoo bird, but it's part of the air you breathe. How do we get at that idea?

Speaker 6: Ironically, that comes from a very good slogan, which is adult time for adult crime, right? We're talking about slogans and we're talking about things that people can relate to. Adult time for adult crime and _____, yeah.

Speaker 12: You know where that comes from I think though is –

Speaker 6: Really _____.

Speaker 12: You age out of the system for juvenile crime at 25 in most states, so that way if you do a murder at 17, I think the expectation has been you're gonna do more time than that, and then you would certify someone up to an adult court.

Speaker 3: But again, it goes back to the punishment versus treatment, and treatment can include the necessity of containing behavior, which means longer than two years when you commit a murder.

Speaker 9: And a kid is a kid. At 17, he can't buy cigarettes, or drink, or serve in the military, or vote, but if you kill somebody, you're going to prison. Again, you can't have that both ways, but we have.

Deirdre: Right. We agree with you.

Speaker 2: So a couple of fragments. I think we received this draft document in PDF format.

Deirdre: Yes, you did.

Speaker 2: Could you send us the Word doc so it's gonna be easier to do, if that's okay. _____ . We won't circulate it, but that would be great. With respect to Tony's mission statement and your background, I completely understand the approach, but what I'm thinking about is there's a lot of pressure on us now, which there needs to be, because of the timing, and we've had an extraordinary day today. We've gotten closer every single hearing, so in one instance, there's more willingness for us to be more

transparent and really say what we're thinking and on the other we're still trying to caution ourselves to say, "We've gotta get this stuff in," but we talked last night.

We're really telling a story and so we have to think about two things. Who's the storyteller, which has been already prescribed. It's us, as a team, and to your point, Tony, who's the listener? When I sit with the sovereign nations and see them take rocks out of a bag and talk about intergenerational, transgenerational enslavement, I'm not going to walk away from those people, but I am not gonna try to take care of them in this report, because I will do them a disservice, so I think rather than think of the report strategically at this point, I would like to suggest we think of it tactically, which is in fact, instead of the whole campaign, if our readership is the AG and influential people of the AG and perhaps the Oval Office, what story is gonna compel them and not get them in trouble, frankly, which isn't really our job, but we can certainly think about that, that allows them to create all and to make change?

I think us wonderfully struggling with slogans is great because we're close enough now that that's a great risk for him to write those things down and say that and for you to come up with those. We're not gonna be good at it. We're just gonna be okay at it. We've got marketing people that can come up with a list and it'll blow us away, but censoring ourselves right now is, I think, gonna be dangerous as well as – and I completely get it Deirdre, but with your permission, I don't think that we're gonna turn this thing upside and also our esteemed writer, but if we have a change after Detroit, I'd like to throw it at you.

If you think of this as a script and how they write scripts and how they do storyboards, we're not gonna say, "Let's not do child violence. Let's do parental violence." It's not gonna be that drastic, but we may say, "Let's take this scene and put it here," because if we do that, the scene here and the scene at the end is gonna be mind blowing, so if we can think modularly around this, if it's not gonna just deconstruct how you write, I think it'll be helpful for us as well. If you just made this Friday, I just don't know how we're gonna do that.

Speaker 7:

I think what we wanted is to make sure that coming out of this time together, that we have all the thoughts that you have right now by Friday so that we can take this to the next iteration. Also, can I just add – I'm sure you all would do this anyway, but if you're gonna work in the document, which is great, I encourage you to do

that, please track your changes, comments, so that they stand out to us.

Robert: _____.

Speaker 3: The only thing I would add, and maybe it takes some pressure off, but I really hope it's central to the report is we do not need to reinvent the wheel, and just the last couple of days it's really been striking when people watch, not just us, but people get really excited about what to them is a new idea that's been in practice for the last decade or two and one of the complaints about the federal government is accurate, that good ideas come and go. I think that the reason it takes some pressure off is that we have an opportunity going back to the idea of **the awe** is also inspiring the hope and the can-do, right? The can-do part comes from the fact that we actually know what to do. It's a long menu, but we know what to do. We know some of the principals, and so if we could define the central principals, like **trauma informed, etc.**

The last thing I'd say is that the Child Traumatic Stress Network is an existing – Robert and I were talking about this – organization. I'm not suggesting it needs to be named, but I do wanna point out that the same people who get grants at the service level, they get them for three years and then they sweat because if they don't get another one, the services they offer to their communities stops in the same way that the Justice Department and other departments have funded innovative ideas that may even prove effectiveness, and there's no more funding. When we talk about being bold and the paradigm shift, I hope that what takes the pressure off is being able to zero in on some of these ideas, that this is what needs to change.

Robert: Can I just add one thought that has occurred to me? When the Attorney General issues a report along with a set of recommendations, there are certain people whose ears perk up because he is directing the law enforcement community. He's directing U.S. attorneys. He's directing people in juvenile justice systems because he is the top person in charge of those specific kinds of systems, so as we think about a report we're writing, I'd ask us to keep in mind that law enforcement will definitely be listening. U.S. attorneys in every single state and every single territory will be listening and looking to enforce what we're putting out there, as will people in our juvenile justice systems and criminal justice systems across the nations, so there's already an audience out there. We should make sure that we're clear to that audience that is gonna definitely be listening what it is that we are

recommending to the attorney general and if he decides to follow through on the recommendations, what he's gonna be actually implementing, because that audience is standing by, waiting to hear what we have to say.

Deirdre: All right. Yeah, we're at 3:04.

Speaker 2: Great job. Thank you.

Robert: Thank you very much.

Deirdre: Thank you.

Speaker 2: Deirdre? Thank you, Deirdre. Thank you.

Deirdre: Round of applause all the way around. Would anybody like to motion to end the meeting? Will?

Robert: We'll entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Sharon: So moved.

Robert: _____ second?

Speaker 2: I second.

Robert: Mr. Macy, the meeting is hereby adjourned officially. Thank you.

Deirdre: All right. Thank you.

(Crosstalk)

Sharon: And now you're dashing out the door.

(Crosstalk)

Speaker 2: Is anybody going to the airport?

Deirdre: I think **Steven** is and I've got it so that there may be a cab coming in for 3:15 to the Miami airport and another one at 3:30 to the Miami airport.

Sharon: Okay.

Robert: Dr. Cooper, are you gonna catch the 3:30 one?

Deirdre: You're welcome to sit in on either one of them.

Speaker 1, Marilyn Roberts, Robert, Deirdre, Speaker 2, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 5, Sharon, Karen, Speaker 6, Dr. Macy, Steven, Joe, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Georgina, Speaker 11, Speaker 12

Speaker 2: Yeah, I'll go on the 3:30 one with you.

Deirdre: Steven has a cab coming right now and I know I'm gonna have a few.

Speaker 2: There's a cab right now?

[End of Audio]