U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BUSINESS MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2023

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at Commission Headquarters, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Suite 1150, Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Rochelle Garza, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

ROCHELLE GARZA, Chair

VICTORIA FRANCES NOURSE, Commissioner

GLENN D. MAGPANTAY, Commissioner

MONDAIRE JONES, Commissioner

STEPHEN GILCHRIST, Commissioner

J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

David Mussatt - Director, RPCU

TinaLouise Martin - Director OM

David McGuire - Chair of the Connecticut

Advisory Committee

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

John K. Mashburn

Carissa Mulder

Thomas Simuel

Irena Vidulovic

Alexis Fragosa

Nathalie Demirdjian-Rivest

Yvesner Zamar

Stephanie Wong

SIGN INTERPRETERS:

Jeremy Mann

Edward Knight

Morgan Lee

Jamie Sycamore

A-G-E-N-D-A

I. Introductory Remarks5
II. Panel 1: Current & Former Government Officials: Alex R. Piquero, University of Miami Former BJS Director
III. Break
IV. Panel 2: Community Stakeholders & Advocates: Ruth Abaya, Senior Director, Health Alliance for Violence Intervention

V. Lunch Break

1
VI. Panel 3: Impacted Persons Nicole Nabors, Founder, Grace & Peace Counseling
VII. Break
VIII. Panel 4: Researcher & Policy Experts Patrick Sharkey, William S Tod Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs, Princeton University
IX. Break
X. Open Public Comment Session248
XI. Closing Remarks262
XII. Adiourn Meeting

(202) 234-4433

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1	FROCEEDINGS
2	9:07 a.m.
3	CHAIR GARZA: Good morning. This briefing
4	of the United States Commission on Civil Rights comes
5	to order at 9:08 a.m. on November the 17th of 2023.
6	And it takes place at the Commission Headquarters at
7	1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Suite 1150,
8	Washington, D.C. 20425.
9	Good morning, everyone. I am the Chair of
10	the Commission. My name is Rochelle M. Garza.
11	Joining me today in person for this briefing are Vice
12	Chair Nourse, Commissioner Heriot, Commissioner Jones
13	and Commissioner Magpantay. On the phone, if you can
14	confirm you're present after I say your name, I
15	believe we have Commissioner Adams? Commissioner
16	Gilchrist? Commissioner Kirsanow?
17	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: I am present.
18	CHAIR GARZA: Good morning, Commissioner
19	Gilchrist. Commissioner Kirsanow?
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Here.
21	CHAIR GARZA: Good morning. Will the
22	court reporter confirm for the record that you're
23	present?
24	COURT REPORTER: I am present.
25	CHAIR GARZA: Good. Mr. Staff Director,

will you confirm for the record that you are present?

MR. MORALES: I am present.

CHAIR GARZA: Great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

CHAIR GARZA: I welcome everyone to our briefing entitled, Racial Disparities in Violent Crime Victimization in the United States. commencing this hearing, I must address the nationwide rise that we have seen in reports of hate crimes and harassment, especially the alarming spike in disturbing incidents and threats to Jewish, Israel, Muslim, Arab, and Palestinians in the United States. All of these communities have а history marginalization and scapegoating that we must never forget.

The Commission has a long history of denouncing hate crimes that occur in this country. For example, our work on hate crimes, anti-Semitism on campus, Islamophobia after 9/11, and our recent report on anti-Asian hate after the pandemic all denounce bias and hate motivated acts of violence. This Commission stands for equal, fair and safe treatment for all people, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability or national origin. And today's briefing is absolutely no different.

In today's briefing the Commission seeks to gain an understanding about how the U.S. Department of Justice uses tools such as gathering data on victims of violent crimes to perform their duty enforcing the U.S. Constitution and Federal Civil Rights Law.

We will examine the following. What data indicates regarding increases crime affecting minority communities, whether there are gaps in data or other research regarding race and national origin in the jurisdiction of DOJ. And review what responses the federal, state and local agencies have made in recent years aligned, or not aligned, to the research that has been conducted by the DOJ into racial, ethnic and gender disparities between groups of crime victims in the United States.

nearly two dozen speakers that encompassed former government officials, law enforcement, community representatives and individuals that have been impacted by violent crimes as we seek to garner an understanding of the current trend in violent crime rates affecting minority communities. Specifically, we're going to hear from Panel 1, which will include current and former government officials. Panel 2 will

1 include community stakeholders and victim advocates. 2 Panel 3 will include individuals impacted by crimes. 3 Panel 4 will include researchers and policy experts. 4 And the day will conclude with an open public comment session during which the Commission will hear from 5 members of the public who wish to present additional 6 7 information for our consideration. 8 So I'd like to thank all of the 9 individuals who joined us today to focus on this 10 critical topic. Your testimony will help us fulfill 11 our mission to be the nation's eyes and ears on civil 12 rights. 13 I would like to thank our staff that has 14 diligently worked on preparing this briefing report. 15 I would like to thank Marik Xavier Brier, Bridget 16 Brew, Julie Grieco from our Office of Civil Rights 17 Evaluation. 18 I would also like to thank our staff for 19 the logistical preparation of this briefing. 20 how much work goes into setting this up so 21 appreciate that. Pamela Dunston, Essence Perry, 22 Julian Nelson-Saunders. You all doing are the

I will now turn over the floor to my Republican colleague, Commissioner Heriot, who will

majority of the work, I appreciate that.

23

24

give an opening statement, or remarks, on behalf of Republican Commissioner Adams, who spearheaded this project but unfortunately is not here with us today. Commissioner Heriot.

Garza. The most fundamental duty of any government is to ensure that citizens are able to live peaceably free from violence and coercion. Sure, governments build roads and deliver the mail, too, and that's nice. And in the modern world they even try to tell us what sort of showerheads we should be using. But in the end the most important function is to keep violence and coercion at bay for all Americans, not just for favored groups.

In the Jim Crow South, one of the most severe problems faced by African American communities was that many law enforcement officers just didn't give a damn. Especially when it came to Black-on-Black crime it just didn't interest them.

Swedish sociologist and Nobel Laureate Gunnar Myrdal exposed their neglect in his influential 1944 book about race relations in American entitled, An American Dilemma. But not a lot was done about it in Myrdal's time.

As crime rose to unacceptable levels in

the 1970s through early '90s, Congressman Charles Rangel, with the full support of the Black Caucus, which he chaired on in the mid-1970s, pointed out that the Black community was disproportionally victimized by crime. He pushed for stricter controls in drugs and greater police protection in African American neighborhoods. And eventually his view prevailed. Law enforcement agencies began to take crime in minority neighborhoods as seriously as they take crime in White neighborhoods.

When law-abiding people don't need to be constantly worrying about crime, they can spend their time achieving their own personal goals. Instead of staying home after they can take a course in a county, at a local community college. Instead of spending money on bars to put on their windows they can spend it on starting a business.

Whole neighborhoods can blossom. People feel more comfortable coming out at night. And once they come out their presence reduces crime all the more. Businesses are formed restaurants, stores and hair salons.

Alas, in the last several years we have been moving the bit backwards on this issue and as a result violent crime has risen. For example, as of

1 October 28th in Washington, D.C. there have been 821 carjackings in the year 2023. That's more than double 2 3 number from last year. Neighborhoods 4 suffering. And while we cannot bring crime down to 5 6 zero without creating a police state that I think 7 almost nobody wants, we can do a lot better than we've 8 been doing. I guess every generation needs to learn 9 the lesson anew. 10 Defunding the police was not the solution 11 to our race related problems. And when federal state 12 and local governments pass laws with tough on crime 13 names, but contents that are anything but, we are 14 worse off. More crime means more victims. 15 The Commission had a tough time agreeing 16 to hold this briefing but I'm glad that we are now 17 here and ready to go. I am very much, I very much 18 look forward to hearing from the witnesses today. 19 so I think I'm, with no further ado, let me turn it 20 back over to the Chair. 21 Thank you, Commissioner CHAIR GARZA: 22 Heriot. I now turn to Vice Chair Nourse to give some 23 remarks. 24 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Thank you, Chair. 25 Thank you very much, Chair Garza.

Slogans fly while crime is discussed in America. I know this from having worked on the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1990 for then Senator Biden on the 1994 crime bill.

Since 1990 crime has dropped precipitously if you look at the FBI's website. That's the good news. But in other terms we are in the same sorry state we were then.

In my experience, too many people refuse to listen to things that they don't already believe. Some do not want to hear that we are awash in guns and little children must be drilled on how to resist a mass shooter. Some do not want to hear that police officers are working class people who are trying to do good. Some do not want to hear that the very people who distrust the police the most are the ones who need the most protection.

The only way to solve this is to think beyond the slogans and to say all of the above. We need to do all of this. And the victims who will testify today deserve our highest appreciation and deference. In their honor we must move beyond the glib and trite to consider explanations that are not what we assume or might want to hear. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Vice Chair Nourse. I'm now going to turn us to beginning our briefing with a few housekeeping matters.

During the course of the testimony and the question and answer period I caution all speakers, including our Commissions, to refrain from speaking over each other for ease of transcription, and to allow for sign language translation. I'd ask that we allow for individuals who might need to view the sign language translation to sit in the seats with a clear view.

We have Patty Pacynski, who is a licensed clinical social worker with the Executive Office for the United States Employee Assistance Program. She is here because of her clinical expertise and extensive experience in the field of trauma. We have asked her to be here with us today to support us through these important but difficult conversations. She will be available if you need assistance. So please let a staff member know that you would like to speak with her, and our staff will direct you to the appropriate place.

As I mentioned before, after the four panels and an afternoon break we will reconvene at 4:25 p.m. for a public comment period. If you are

1 interested in participating in the public comment period, during each person will have up to five 2 3 minutes to speak, we will be honored to hear from you. 4 Spots at the public comment period are allotted on a first come, first serve basis. 5 So if 6 you did not already sign up for a spot online you may 7 sign up at the registration desk now. The spots will 8 be available until filled. 9 If you are one of the individuals who 10 signed up online, please check in at the front desk so 11 we can hold your spot. 12 For any member of the public who would 13 like to submit materials for our review, our public 14 record will remain open until December 15th of this 15 Materials can be submitted by mail to the U.S. 16 Commission on Civil Rights Office of Civil Rights 17 Evaluation 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Suite 18 1150, Washington, D.C. 20425 or by email. The email 19 victimsofcrimes@usccr.gov. address is So 20 victimsofcrimes@usccr.gov. 21 During the briefing each panelist will 22 seven minutes to speak. After each panel 23 presentation Commissioners will have the opportunity 24 to ask questions within the allotted period of time.

I will recognize Commissioners who wish to speak.

I will strictly enforce the time allotments given to each panelist to present his or statement. And unless we did not receive your testimony until today, you may assume that we have read your testimony.

So if you can summarize it, we will appreciate that so you can make the best use of the seven minutes that you have been allotted. So please focus your remarks on the topic of our briefing.

And I ask my fellow Commissioners to be cognizant of the interest of each Commissioner to ask questions. Please be brief in asking your questions so we can move quickly and efficiently through today's schedule. I will step in to move things along if necessary.

Panelists, please notice the system of warning lights that we have set up in front of you. When the light turns from green to yellow, that means you have two minutes. Two minutes remaining. When the light turns red panelists should conclude your statements so you do not risk me cutting you off midsentence. My fellow Commissioners and I will do our part and keep our questions and comments concise.

And now we turn to our first panel,
Current and Former Government Officials.

1	II. PANEL 1: CURRENT & FORMER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS:
2	CHAIR GARZA: And I'm going to introduce
3	our speakers for the panel in the order in which they
4	will speak.
5	We have with us today Alex R. Piquero.
6	University of Miami, Former BJS Director. Welcome.
7	Good morning.
8	Tom Hogan. Thomas Hogan?
9	MR. HOGAN: Tom.
10	CHAIR GARZA: Tom. Tom Hogan, Former
11	Federal Prosecutor and District Attorney in Chester
12	County, Pennsylvania.
13	Adam Gelb, President and CEO, Council on
14	Criminal Justice.
15	James Mercy, Director, Division of
16	Violence Prevention, CDC.
17	Paul Pazen, Retired Police Chief, Denver.
18	And Steve J. Mulroy, District Attorney for
19	Shelby County Tennessee, Former Federal Prosecutor.
20	I'm now going to ask each of the speakers
21	to raise your right hand to be sworn in. Will you
22	swear and confirm that the information that you are
23	about to provide to us is true and accurate to the
24	best of your knowledge and belief?
25	(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you all so much. Dr. Piquero, you can begin.

DR. PIQUERO: Good morning, Commissioners.

My name is Alex Piquero. I'm a professor of sociology and criminology and distinguished scholar of arts and sciences at the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida. I also previously served as the director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. I'm the first Hispanic to ever do so, whose mission is to collect, analyze, disseminate all data on crime and justice issues.

I'll focus my remarks today on data related to racial and ethnic disparities among victims on crime as well as issues surrounding disaggregated data. Let me begin by stating, unequivocally, that the federal government plays a fundamental role in addressing civil rights issues within criminal justice. In order to document and address civil rights issues, there is a need for a complete disaggregated data.

At present however, there are significant gaps across local, state and federal data concerning victims and offenders regarding violent crime and their demographics. Specifically at the federal level there are two main data collection systems. The FBI's

Arrest or Incident Based Reporting System, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics National Crime Victimization Survey. They measure the same phenomena but in different ways.

The FBI data focuses mainly on characteristics of the offender and the crime incident. All of you are very familiar with the FBI's change from summary reporting system to NIBRS. Those data came out last year.

And the NIBRS estimates were estimates because we don't have complete information from all law enforcement agencies in the United States. In fact, it was less than two-thirds, or it was about two-thirds of all law enforcement reported in the first year. This year those reports got better, but we're still lagging in federal data on all 18,000 some odd law enforcement agencies.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCVS data, the Crime Victimization Survey, is actually a really nice complement to the FBI's data. The NCVS survey actually collects information on over 200,000 individuals from over 100,000 households. It asks about victimization experiences, demographic characteristics of both the victim and the perceived offender, as well as whether or not people reported

their victimization and then sought services for their victimization. We can go into numbers should you want that information as well.

One of the nice things about the NCVS is it has information on the race, ethnicity and gender status of the individuals. Something that you don't have at that level of detail in the FBI data collection.

Right before I left BJS I issued a report that's online that you can actually look at that looks at race and Hispanic origin differences in victimization since the early 2000s. The first ever report that actually documented this information.

I want to highlight three specific findings. First, as the Commissioner noted, we have seen a drop in victimization in the United States since early 1990s. That changes at the local level for certain cities and for certain crime types, especially in the last three years.

Second, during the last five year period, what we've seen with respect to the NCVS data on victimization is that when you look at across race you don't find many differences. However, when you unpack race and ethnicity you find significant differences, especially with respect to violent victimization which

is overwhelmingly non-White.

Moreover, what you do find is that when Whites are victimized, they're by White offenders, when Blacks are victimized, they're by Black offenders. And when Hispanics are victimized, they're typically by Hispanic offenders, showing that most victimization is intra not interracial. The key point that you can only find through data in the NCVS.

As well, throughout the first six months of 2023, as director of BJS I was co-chair of an interagency working group that was called for in President Biden's accountable policing executive order. We were tasked with summarizing the knowledge about federal data with respect to policing. Where are the gaps in that.

On May 25, 2023, three years to the date of the killing of George Floyd, we released our report to the President entitled Equity and Law Enforcement cData Collection Use and Transparency.

One of our central points centered on the need for disaggregated data of all forms within the criminal justice statistical system to include age, sex, gender orientation, race, ethnicity, immigration status and so on. There remains a significant gap in our understanding of crime and victimization in the

U.S. and the nation cannot move forward toward true equity and equality without such data.

Absence significant improvements in data collection, reporting and dissemination, policy makers, researchers, academics, practitioners, and the American public will not have the information they need to make evidence informed decisions. Disaggregated data, transparent data, reporting and dissemination practices are a key part of building trust between the community and criminal justice actors and serve as the foundation to ensure that our justice system respects the dignity and rights of all persons and provides equal treatment to all.

Before closing I want to highlight two of my own studies that are relevant to the issues at hand. That highlights the power of disaggregated data.

In the first study we look at the imposition of fines on juvenile offenders in Allegheny County, which is Pittsburgh. And we what found was that financial penalties were associated with higher recidivism and that non-Whites were more likely to still owe costs and restitution upon case closing.

In a second study we just published in Florida, which is really important because we were to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

look at Hispanic offenders as well, we found that Florida courts were more likely to assign fees to Black and Hispanic youth in disadvantage areas. And they levied higher fees when they do, and that youth with court debt were more likely to have future system involvement. In particular, Black youth with restitution had a high recidivism likelihood.

In short, monetary sanctions imposed on youth, for example, in the juvenile justice system has a potential deleterious impact on recidivism. And it varies by race and ethnicity.

While significant challenges remain, I am confident that there is enough moment and interests within and outside the federal government to improve the collection of data, especially as it pertains to key demographic information regarding offenders and victims. And the locations of those victimizations.

Data, especially disaggregated demographic data, is critical to informing policy and practice as we seek to drive down the violence that effects our communities. Including here in the District. The American people deserve nothing less. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Dr. Piquero. We'll now hear from Mr. Hogan. If you would proceed.

MR. HOGAN: May it please the Commission,

I have three simple points to make here today. People
usually ask me to turn off the microphone not turn it
on.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOGAN: So the three simple points are: there is extreme racial disparity in homicide victimization in the United States, particularly in our cities. Second, it is so extreme that some young men in some of our most dangerous cities would be safer at war, on the front line of combat then they are on their own streets. And the third point is that DOJ has the capacity and capability to start to fix these disparities right now.

So my name is Tom Hogan. I am currently a law school professor, South Texas College of Law in Houston. In a prior life I was a local prosecutor. I was a federal prosecutor for the Department of Justice. One day I woke up and I was the elected district attorney in Chester County Pennsylvania. When I wasn't in public service, I was at law firms usually doing criminal defense. So I've looked at this from every side of the aisle.

So I look at homicides because it's the one statistic, as Professor Piquero knows, that really

is reliable all across the justice system. Every agency captures it, and we know that it is reliable. And a dead body catches a lot of notoriety. So it is a very reliable statistic. And the public pays attention to it because it's how they judge: are we safe in our cities?

So my three main points now. I started with raw statistics. If I can get the first graph up? So I looked at six cities. Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Birmingham, St. Louis, and Baltimore. Six cities across the United States. And what I looked at was their base rate of the homicide population of each race, and then the homicide victimization.

And if you look at Chicago, this is very typical. Whites, 33.1 percent of the population, eight percent of the homicide victims. Black, 29.2 percent of the population, 76 percent of the homicide victims. Hispanic, 28.7 percent of the population, 12.4 percent of the homicide victims. Asian, 6.8 percent of the population, .4 percent of the homicide victims.

This is typical of every city I looked at.

In every city, the White, Hispanic, and Asian population, the population was much greater than the

homicide victim population. But for the Black citizens, their homicide victimization rate was much higher than their base rate in the population.

The worst city actually was Los Angeles, which actually has less than ten percent of Black residents, but they were at over four times the population rate in the homicide. Over 40 percent of the homicide victims in Los Angeles are Black. Huge disparities.

So some very good researchers in medicine and criminology looked at this in a commonsense way, and if you could move to the next slide, and said, let's compare this to the risks of war. And what they found was, in two of those cities I looked at, Philadelphia and Chicago, the young men in the ten most dangerous zip codes in those cities would actually be safer in the front line of combat, in war in Iraq or Afghanistan, than they are in their own home streets.

That is an outrage in the United States of America, that if a judge was looking to sentence a young man for a crime, he'd be safer sending him to war than back to his own home streets in Philadelphia or Chicago.

So what can we do about this? Now I know

the federal government, the answer a lot of times is, well, it's a local problem, local government will have to take care of it. But you know, I look back at this and I realize that back in the history of DOJ, at one time they played a very significant role in taking on these racial disparities and crime overall.

The Department of Justice, in the 1990s and early 2000s, started with something called Operation Ceasefire, and then morphed it into a large scale operation across the nation called Project Safe Neighborhoods. It concentrated on what we call the "power few": the five percent of violent offenders who cause over 50 percent of violent crime in the United States.

And it gave them a carrot and stick approach. The carrot was, we'll give you training, we'll educate you, we'll give you vocational opportunities, we'll give you counseling. That's the carrot. The stick is, if you don't decide to go that way, then that 50 percent of violent crime you are causing, you're going to be incapacitated with long federal sentences.

And it worked. Violent crime went down in every city where we applied these programs. And it worked best for our minority communities. They were

the ones that saw the biggest drop in violent crime.

So I got curious and said, what's DOJ up to now? And if I can see the next slide please. I looked at DOJ's level of prosecutions over the last ten years. What you see actually is a very steady downward trend. That spike in 2018 and '19, that's just immigration. All right. Take those out and you see a steady downward trend.

By 2022, last year, DOJ is at its lowest level of prosecutions since 1998. They have abandoned our inner cities. They need to come back into play to protect our most disadvantaged communities. And they already have the blueprint. They have Operation Ceasefire and Project Safe Neighborhoods.

And the good news is, since it only focuses on that five percent of violent offenders, it doesn't cause mass incarceration. Instead, what it causes is mass safety across the United States. Justice is what we're looking for here. We need to protect our most disadvantaged citizens.

Right now, DOJ, according to this graph, has not only the capability, because they've done it before, but they have the capacity. They could move up their level of prosecutions by just 10,000 cases. Take on the hundred most violent criminals in the

1 hundred largest cities in the U.S. and everybody, but particularly are most disadvantaged citizens, would be 2 3 much safer. 4 So the bad news: there are extreme racial in homicide victimization across 5 disparities the 6 United States. The good news: DOJ has the opportunity 7 to fix this. They have the capacity and the 8 capability right now to get to work and get back in 9 the game protecting our most vulnerable citizens. 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Hogan. 12 now going to hear from Mr. Gelb. If you could please 13 proceed? 14 Thank you very much. MR. GELB: Yes. 15 It's great to be here with you this morning. 16 Gelb, President, CEO and founder of the Council on 17 Criminal Justice, which is a nonpartisan think tank 18 and invitational membership organization. If you're 19 familiar with the Council on Foreign Relations you can 20 think of CCJ as sort of the criminal justice analog of 21 CFR, except a good bit younger and way hipper. 22 (Laughter.) 23 MR. GELB: My job this morning is to put 24 some of these crime trends and disparities, with 25 respect to violent victimization, in context with how

that plays out in the criminal justice system. Particularly in imprisonment. And that's been a good bit part of the focus of CCJ. Let me try to unpack this.

So I want to just note at the beginning, similar to what Mr. Hogan said here, that is really important to distinguish population-based disparities from behavior-based ones. Almost all public discussion of disparities revolves around the former and discounts the possibility of the latter. However, as you just demonstrated, multiple data sources and homicide trends indicate that Black individuals experience far higher levels of offending victimization.

And it's also important to note that scholars have concluded that this is not due to any type of inherent factor but is largely explained by disproportionate exposure to a nexus of discriminatory historical, structural, and economic factors.

So we've been working very intensely with two researchers at the Georgia State University, Bill Sabol and Thaddeus Johnson, and other leading experts to try to understand the extent to which the criminal justice system might be mirroring or magnifying these disparities that occur in society and offending. And

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to work to advance understanding of why these disparities in the system have been declining over the past 20 years and to identify which policies and practices might further narrow the disparities imprisonment.

So, I'm going to try, quickly here, to walk through three pieces. There is fairly extensive written testimony. I'm not going to try to hit everything in here, but three of the five points of the written testimony about violent crime trends, disparity, and imprisonment. And if I have time a little bit of issues around what we know from data about police-community trust.

So first I want to hit crime trends, long-term and short-term. Professor Piquero explained to you the two different sources. If we could hit the next slide please.

You see here, the first one that he mentioned, the Uniform Crime Reports here. And you see the huge rise from the '60s to the peak in 1991.

And then the slide, in reported crime to police, 50 percent lower in '22 than it was in 1991.

And then if you move to the victimization slide, the next piece, you can see that reflected in the NCVS as well with that long slide. There's a bit

of an anomaly, we shouldn't talk about it today, but a bit of anomaly here between the NCVS and the UCR for what happened in 2022 with the police reports showing a drop in violent crime and the victimization survey showing an increase. And that's something that a number of people, including people at the department are trying to figure out why there is more of a discrepancy that happened in this past year than there has been before.

Now if you switch to the next slide. If you put that, those long-term drops in violence and other types of crime in the context, you see here the work we've been doing at CCJ in the last few years to try to track what's happening in more real time by pulling samples of cities that provide data consistently in real time on their public portals. And the way to read this chart is to see that every one of these bars compares each year to 2019.

So if you look at homicide you see the rise in 2022, it went up in the sample of about three dozen cities, 24 percent. And then in 2021 homicide was 40 percent higher than it was in 2019. And then you see for homicide and gun assaults the peaking and returning, hopefully back to pre-pandemic levels.

You see some property crimes dropping. To

1 put it in context, as stores closed and people stayed 2 at home making it harder to burglarize homes. 3 then this real anomaly here with motor vehicle theft, 4 which is spiking and continues to spike. If you go to the next slide please. 5 6 does this play out in imprisonment disparity. 7 been tracking over the past 20 years. This is broken 8 out by offense, by note that the overall Black-White 9 imprisonment disparity has dropped from about 8.2:1, 10 Blacks to Whites, to 4.9:1. And that's largely 11 mirrored in that trend line for violence, which has 12 dropped from 8.3 to 6.2. 13 Notice the huge slide in the drua 14 imprisonment disparity. It's about a 75 percent 15 reduction in the Black-White imprisonment disparity. 16 Next slide please, will show that the 17 narrowing of that disparity gap in imprisonment for 18 violent crimes is a function of both a drop in the 19 Black rate and an increase in the White rate. 20 things move there. 21 We should hit the next slide please. 22 why don't you pass that one as well so I can get 23 through this. 24 There are two parts, right, to prison

population function of two things. How many people go

in and how long they stay. So we've been unpacking this, and what we're finding is that if you look at the behavior base rate here, in terms of what is coming to the court system, that is, new court commitments to prison per arrest, not a base population rate, you find that in terms of the system playing the hand that it's dealt versus looking at population rates, you see the narrowing almost to one-to-one. And the way to read that chart is, a disparity ratio of one is parity 1:1. And disparity ratio of two is 2:1.

And you see some of these lines starting to get pretty close to one, meaning parity for how the courts are processing the cases that are coming in to them.

Let's hit the next slide please. And when you look at the NCVS and the offending rates by race, and offender counts of who was the assailant in nonfatal violent cases you actually have a situation that occurred in the last few years where there is actually a reverse disparity occurring, where White people are more likely to be imprisoned for these offenses than would be predicted by their rate of offending in the community.

So let me finish up by just concluding

that we're not going to make a huge dent in the disparities in imprisonment until we reduce the rate of violent offending and the disparity in the rate of violent offending between the races, until we reduce the length of stay of prison terms, or until we make changes in the influence of criminal history on sentence length. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Gelb. We're going to now hear from Dr. Mercy.

DR. MERCY: Good morning, members of the Commission. My name is Jim Mercy, I'm Director of the Division of Violence Prevention at the nation's leading public health agency, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak with you about CDC's efforts to better understand and reduce persistent racial and ethnic disparities in violence. The CDC is committed to preventing violence related injuries, deaths and behaviors associated with all forms of violence. Sadly, while homicide, the most severe form violence has been the third leading cause of death among youth in the United States, it has been the leading cause of death among young Black males, 10 to 34 years of age for decades.

My remarks will focus on, first, national

data documenting racial and ethnic disparities in homicide, and non-fatal assault injuries. Second, predominate drivers of these racial and ethnic disparities. And third, evidence-based approaches to reducing racial and ethnic disparities in violence.

The CDC monitors patterns and trends in violence related deaths and non-fatal injuries using a range of data systems. These data systems provide a picture of the magnitude of victimization due to violence in the U.S. and its disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minorities.

In 2022 there were almost 25,000 homicides in the U.S. Homicide rates for Black people were ten times higher; for American Indian and Alaskan Native people, five times higher; and for Hispanic people, twice as high as those for non-Hispanic White people.

Most homicide victims are male and young.

Black, American Indian and Alaskan Native, and

Hispanic males ages 10 to 34 are at greatest risk of

dying from homicide. And their rates far exceed those

for non-Hispanic White males in this age group.

In 2022, 79 percent of all homicides were the result of firearm injuries. The firearm homicide rate increased nearly 35 percent between 2019 and 2020. And it increased eight percent more in 2021

resulting in the highest rate since 1993.

However, the recent increase in firearm homicides was not equally distributed among all populations. Young people, males, Black people, and American Indian, Alaskan Natives experienced the largest increases in 2020. These increases resulted in the widening of long withstanding racial and ethnic disparities in firearm homicide rates.

Many people experience nonfatal injuries associated with violence. Approximately 1.5 million people are treated in U.S. emergency departments each year for injuries resulting from violence inflicted by others.

Data from the National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey for 2019 through 2021 indicate that emergency department visit rate for assault injuries was 4.5 times as high for Black, non-Hispanic people compared to White, non-Hispanics. The same rate was 1.5 times as high for Hispanic people compared to White, non-Hispanics.

There are three features of these disparities worth noting. First, racial and ethnic disparity for violence are greater for the more serious violent outcomes. That is, disparities are greatest for homicide followed by non-fatal injuries.

Second, racial and ethnic disparities are greatest among male adolescent and young adults. And third, when rates of violence increase, racial and ethnic disparities of violence increase as well.

I would like to point to some key factors that drive racial and ethnical disparities in violent victimization. Most central are neighborhood and community conditions such as poverty, access to quality education, employment opportunities and affordable housing. These conditions are disproportionately experienced by racial and ethnical minority communities. And research consistently shows that they drive disparities in the risk for violence.

The influence of these social determinants and violence can also be understood in terms of their impact on the likelihood that children and adolescents who experience trauma associated with adverse experiences, such as child maltreatment or living with a parent who has substance abuse or mental health problems, cumulative exposure to childhood adversity affects health and the probability of being a victim or engaging in violence.

Over the past 40 years much has been learned about preventing violence. A range of evidence-based policies, programs, and practices for

addressing different types of violence can be found in a series of CDC publications called resources for action.

I'd like to share some examples of the evidence for preventing and reducing racial and ethnic disparities in violence from the perspective of, first, what can be done to address individuals at high risk, secondly, the locations where violence is most likely to occur, and thirdly, the social and structural conditions that contribute to violence.

First, evidence-based approaches to addressing the needs of people at greatest risk for experiencing violence include, for example, street outreach programs. These programs help to interrupt conflict in communities and connect populations of highest risk of violence with services.

Evaluations have shown promising results for multiple outcomes, including firearm violence. Also, when people are injured from violence there can be a window of opportunity to provide help. Hospital-based programs can connect them and their families with services. Hospital-based programs have shown reductions in multiple violence related outcomes.

Second, we can improve the physical conditions within the community locations where

violence is mostly likely to occur. For example, multiple cities have had success with revitalizing vacant lots, also referred to as greening programs. This increases opportunities for positive social interactions and reduces the likelihood of violence. And benefits those areas with the highest poverty.

We can also make sure students arrive to, get home safely to and from school. Chicago safe passage provides students with safe routes to and from school by placing community members along these roads to monitor and assist with student safe travel. Studies have shown benefits of school attendance, but also reductions in violent crime.

Third, the evidence supports addressing the underlying conditions that contribute to the risks of violence. We can help strengthen economic and household stability through approaches like housing assistance, childcare subsidies, tax credits and livable wages. These approaches can lift families out of poverty, reduce stress and contribute to reductions in violence.

We need new solutions. We need solutions not just informed by criminal justice but also by public health. Thank you very much.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Dr. Mercy. Chief

Pazen, if you could proceed?

CHIEF PAZEN: Thank you. My name is Paul Pazen. I have the great pleasure of being the former Police Chief in Denver, Colorado. I served the city that I was born and raised for 28 years.

It is an honor to be here to share perspective from on the ground. I've been able to see this firsthand during my entire career.

Very proud of the efforts that we have made in Denver. We have led the country, and beyond, with our alternative response. Like the STAR Program, continuum of crisis care, co-responders, outreach case coordinators to address mental health.

We've also led the country in some of our approaches regarding nonfatal shootings. We have the highest clearance rate anywhere in the country on a nonfatal shooting, which is just as important as a fatal. The difference between a homicide and a nonfatal shooting is luck. And you can't continue the same old type of investigations on those cases or else you're going to have future homicides.

I'm proud of the fact that we have utilized evidence-based approaches from across the country. We had a PhD assigned to my office, and we also hired an academic to consult with us to identify

what approaches work and what approaches don't work.

We utilized Ceasefire Project Safe Neighborhoods, PNI. Hotspot policing. Anything and everything that is out there.

What I can tell you is crime is on the rise. Despite law enforcement's utilization of these effective approaches our homicide rate, particularly the disparities in our communities of color matches that, as you've heard here. Eighty-four percent of the murder victims in Denver are persons of color. And that does not match with the population of our city.

I do want to address, quickly, the '90s crime spike that we had because I've lived through that as a young police officer addressing it. We shouldn't use that benchmark and say that because we're below the '90s that things are fine.

As a matter of fact, crime shouldn't be an issue in the United States at all when you start talking about the advances in technology, in science, in DNA, the proliferation of cameras, Ring cameras, the city cameras that the people have, the license plate readers that we have, the crime gun intelligence being able to identify guns that are involved in cases. The lessons learned over the years on how to

appropriately investigate these cases.

Crimes should not be a topic of conversation. We should have learned from the years and years of experience, as well as the new technology that has helped us.

The criminal justice system is just that, a system. And often times when we're talking about the crime issues we point that finger right at law enforcement and say, why is crime up. Well, I can tell you, as somebody that has held the hand of a 20-year-old who lost his mother to gun violence, as somebody that continues to communicate with a brother who lost his sister to violence, that in too many cases individuals are not being held accountable for violent and repeat offenses.

Of the mother, three of the four perpetrators or offenders in this particular case were out on supervision. They had previous cases pending. So, the police had actually done their job, but the other aspects of the criminal justice system are not keeping pace with that.

Same with the brother who lost his sister. This individual was out on three violent offenses, all three involving a weapon, and was released on a PR bond only to shoot a 32-year-old mother with a AR,

stolen AR-15.

We have to look at what is working and what is not working. And that is all aspects of the criminal justice system. I did a report comparing Denver and Colorado Springs. Both departments have remarkably high clearance rates. Eighty percent and 74 percent respectfully for homicides.

But what happens at that next level? And in the Fourth Judicial District of Colorado Springs, that DA files cases 94.8 percent of the time and holds people accountable for the cases that are solved. In Denver, it's 35 percent of the time.

And you can look similarly, Fresno and Oakland. Kansas City, Kansas, Kansas City, Missouri, that when people are held at the cities that are doing well, there is accountability for violent and repeat offenders.

I live in one of the most beautiful states in the entire country, Colorado. Unfortunately, because of many of the policy challenges that we've made over the last 12 years, we're number one in auto theft, and this is per hundred thousand residents, this was crime rate. Number one in auto theft, number two in property crimes, number four in total crimes. We have the fourth worst recidivism rate anywhere in

the country.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the people that are being harmed are the communities of color in our cities and in our state. Why? Why does it matter?

We talked a lot about some of the drivers of crime. There is continuing research that points to trauma as being the greatest indicator of future violence when young people are exposed to violence, when they're victims of violence or they see violence take place in their neighborhoods. There is a higher propensity or highly likelihood that future violence will occur.

So what is the answer? The answer is We have to have enough police officers, which enough. we don't in Denver, and many places across the country have enough. We have to have enough And you have to have enough support. consequences. And right now, unfortunately I do not believe that we have enough of any one of these areas that can help address crime in a fair and just manner. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Chief Pazen. We will now hear from our last panelist, Mr. Mulroy.

MR. MULROY: Good morning. Thank you.

It's an honor to be here. I have a diverse

perspective on criminal justice racial disparities.

I've been both the DOJ civil rights attorney and a federal prosecutor. I've done prosecution and defense.

I have legislated on criminal justice and civil rights issues, which are the two areas that I published on and taught as a law professor. And now I'm the elected DA in Memphis and Shelby County, which unfortunately has an extremely high crime problem. And also a lot of high profile civil rights violations. Including this year, the tragic killing of Tyre Nichols.

But sadly, Shelby County's situation is not unique. We are a slightly majority Black county in population, but 90 percent Black in homicide victims. And this echoes the national trend. DOJ data shows that despite the fact that our country is about 13 percent Black in population, almost 50 percent of homicide victims are Black.

A recent National Academies press study shows that both Black and Native American residents are by far the most likely to be victimized by violent crime of any kind. And while some data suggests that the nonfatal racial disparity, nonfatal violence racial disparity has been narrowing, the murder

disparity remains stubbornly high.

Also stubbornly high, of course, are racial disparities in the other end of the criminal justice system. So our slightly Black majority county has 80 percent Black defendants in our system.

DOJ a few years back sued our juvenile system for discrimination citing statistics showing that even if you were to control for criminal history and offense level a Black teen was two to three more times likely than a White teen counterpart to be arrested, detained and transferred to adult court. There are of course any number of studies that show that persons of color are more likely to be stopped, searched, arrested and convicted.

Persons of color are disproportionately both victims and defendants. So crime is a civil rights issue.

It's not paradoxical to conclude that minority neighborhoods are both over-policed and under-policed. Racial profiling occurs for non-public-safety-related minor offenses, but at the same time those neighborhoods don't get the kind of intensive investigations and crime prevention strategies that the higher crime rates clearly would call for.

Just as, and that's of course the subject of a current DOJ pattern and practice investigation in Memphis. Just as it's not paradoxical to say we need to do better for victims but also stop profiling, I don't think there is any inherent conflict between criminal justice reform and public safety, despite the claims of some who try to blame recent rises in crime on reform.

In Memphis, our consistent crime solution for more than a decade has been to lock more people up and lock them up longer. It was manifestly a failure. We've had steadily rising violent crime rates throughout that period.

In Tennessee as a whole, between 1991 and 2018 we doubled our prison population. A 68 percent rise in incarceration rate making us 22 percent higher than the national average with an accompanying significant increase in sentence lengths. And during that time, our crime levels skyrocketed to well above the national average and stayed well above the national average, even during periods when the national crime rate dropped.

And America, as a whole, of course mirrors this dynamic. You're familiar with this statistic, we're five percent of the population, 25 percent of

the incarceration population globally. And we have the number one homicide rate among developed countries.

Comparing reform and traditional jurisdictions belies any notion that reform breeds crime. Per capita murder rates are 40 percent higher in red states than blue states. I know there are some that say, well, that really doesn't matter, the real problem is blue cities in red states, but that doesn't work either.

Just last year there was an article in the Economist, hardly a left leaning publication, which said that the recent crime rates were really the same in reform DA jurisdictions and traditional DA jurisdictions. That Economist article cited a 2021 study by the George Mason University Antonin Scalia School of Law. Again, hardly a progressive left leaning biased organization. As well as other studies as well.

A study last year by the University of Toronto studied 65 cities, and each individual county in Florida and California, comparing the reform jurisdictions to the non-reform jurisdictions and came to a similar conclusion.

One final data point I'll just throw out

is that, in the first dozen years of our century, New York and New Jersey saw crime rates fall faster than the national average. Even as they reduced their prison population by a fourth. During a period of time in which the overall national prison incarceration rate rose by ten percent.

Time does not permit me to go through all the different data points that make this same point. And I am not trying to argue that reform jurisdictions are uniformly better performing in crime metrics. But what I am saying is that if you take a look at all of the data, the data does not support the "reform raises crime" narrative.

And I believe there's a plausible intuitive explanation for these reams of data. One which might suggest a course of action on the racial disparities in crime victimization problem that we're talking about today.

Minority communities, I think at least one of the panelists has already noted, minority communities, or perhaps it was the Commissioner, need the most help from law enforcement, but at the same time are understandably the most skeptical of law enforcement fairness and the fairness of the criminal justice system as a whole. I believe that reforms can

restore public confidence in those minority communities, and in the public generally, in the fairness of our criminal justice system and thus incentivize those communities to cooperate more with law enforcement. Providing tips, reporting crimes, serving as witnesses.

In my view this community cooperation is the single most important thing that we can do to bend the curve on crime. The most pressing civil rights issue of our time. Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Mulroy. At this point we're going to open up for questions. We can start with the folks on the phone, if there are any questions there. Okay, hearing none, are there any questions here? Commissioner Nourse?

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Well first of all, I want to thank all of you, that was incredibly informative. And shows the range of really thoughtful, hard work that you've done because this is a wicked problem. It resists simple solutions.

And in my view we have to start embracing what we just heard, which is that there are contradictions here. That going too far in any one direction is going to cause problems. So yes, underpolicing and over-policing can exist simultaneously.

1 So, you know, Chief Pazen, I'm so happy to My daughter went to college in Denver and 2 see you. 3 it's a safe city, but you must be frustrated. 4 get that. I just wanted to ask you, you know, I 5 6 worked on something called an assault weapons ban. 7 And I know people like guns in the west. I have no 8 problem with hunters, but I have never understood the 9 idea that people should have an AR-15. 10 awash in guns. 11 How much of a role do you think that has 12 played in recent crime spikes? If you can just speak 13 to it from your experience. 14 Thank you very much, I CHIEF PAZEN: 15 appreciate historically it. Denver 16 remarkably a safe city. It was the seventh safest 17 city in the country. That was in 2016. And we have 18 fallen from that chart significantly unfortunately 19 last year. So 2022 we were the number one city for 20 auto theft per capita again. So relatively safe, but 21 maybe your car is not that safe in Denver. 22 (Laughter.) 23 CHIEF PAZEN: Guns. I think all of us get 24 in trouble when we start talking about guns and the 25 Second Amendment. What I can tell you is that it is a

wicked problem. And it's a, just like we talked about trauma, right? That's a cycle.

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes.

expected. Somebody that I grew up with, high school, just texted me in the last week wanting to purchase a gun and get training on firearms. And a couple weeks before that my neighbor came to me and, well, where can I buy one and where can I get training on a firearm.

People feel the need to purchase guns. People that never would have or never owned them in the past because they don't feel safe. And if you don't feel safe, that is a failure of our government. That's civil rights as well. Whether the freedom of individuals to be able to live without fear in their community is an aspect of this. And when you have people that have gone their entire lives opposing any type of firearm in the home now reconsidering or thinking about it, you got a problem.

And so when people buy guns, like this, often times they don't properly secure their guns.

And these guns are stolen in burglaries, they're stolen in cars. Or when they steal the whole car and the gun is left inside, now that gun ends up on the

1 So it perpetuates this cycle. street. 2 So really, from my perspective the answer is, addressing crime, reducing that fear of crime and 3 4 then you don't have these extremely high gun sales that often end up on the streets and in the hands of 5 6 people that are willing to do it. 7 I'm so sorry to take up more time, but, 8 you know, what Panelist Hogan was talking about, there 9 is a very small number of individuals who are willing 10 to point a gun at somebody and pull the trigger. 11 Fortunately that number is very small. For us to be 12 effective we have to properly identify, investigate, 13 adjudicate, and hold those individuals accountable. 14 And that's how we can reduce the increases, the spikes 15 that we've seen in murders and gun violence. 16 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Thank you very much. 17 CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones? 18 COMMISSIONER JONES: Thank you, 19 And thanks to all of you for the important 20 testimony you have provided today. Those of you who 21 have served or continue to serve in law enforcement. 22 Special thanks to you for helping to keep us all safe. 23 Ι will just note, before asking 24 question, that Vice Chair Nourse's question was about

AR-15s, assault weapons in particular.

25

And, Chief

Pazen, you didn't address that, you talked about handguns.

So let me ask, Dr. Mercy. In your submitted testimony you said that in 2022, 79 percent of all homicides were the result of firearm injuries, and the firearm homicide rate increased significantly in recent years resulting in the highest rate since 1993. And you know that 1993 is a pretty significant date in modern times, especially because of the assault weapons ban.

From 1994 to 2004 we saw the assault weapons ban considerably reduce the number of mass shootings in this country. And so I'm just curious to hear your thoughts on the importance of an assault weapons ban at combating the scourge of this uniquely American epidemic of mass shootings in America from a public health perspective.

DR. MERCY: Well, as a government employee I can't speak to the policy. I will say 1993, and that time period was also significant. And that was the middle of the crack epidemic as well. And there is some evidence that the assault ban had some influence. But it's difficult to be certain.

One thing about firearms in general we know is that the involvement of a firearm in an act of

violence dramatically increases the likelihood of a 1 severe outcome, of a homicide. So the involvement of 2 3 firearms really exacerbates the health impact of these 4 events. So the more lethal a weapon that's used in an event, the more likely the outcome is to result in 5 6 severe injury or death. 7 You know, there is a lot of research that 8 has been done that supports the idea, speaking to the issue of safety, that having a gun in the home 9 10 actually increases your risk, or household members' 11 risk, of homicide and suicide. And so I think that's 12 another piece of information that people need to 13 understand before they purchase a firearm, that it may 14 not have the effect of protecting them, but may 15 actually increase their risk of very serious outcomes. COMMISSIONER JONES: Mr. Gelb, it seemed 16 17 like you wanted to say something as well in response 18 to my question? 19 I probably shouldn't but I MR. GELB: 20 will. 21 (Laughter.) 22 MR. GELB: I feel like there are two cross 23 currents, speaking of holding two thoughts in your 24 head at the same time. We have a lot of advocacy in

this country right now around getting guns out of

hands of people and trying to make sure that they're not being carried. Especially the assault rifles.

And we also have a lot of advocacy around saying people are unsafe in their communities so of course they're carrying guns and we shouldn't actually arrest them for carrying guns because we should actually understand why they're doing that. And it's a government failure that is causing that gun carrying. So we shouldn't fail them and then arrest them for having failed them for carrying guns.

I don't know the solution, but I did just want to call attention to the fact that we have some fairly strong advocacy on both sides of this equation right now.

CHAIR GARZA: Mr. Mulroy, did you have a comment?

MR. MULROY: I was just going to say, to the extent that we're talking about the need for people to carry guns for self-protection in high crime areas, you know, what everyone thinks about that argument, that doesn't preclude the idea that there should be reasonable regulation of guns. And in our Tennessee, in my state a few years ago we passed permitless carries so we don't even have safety regulations or any kind of precautions.

1 And of course, you don't really need an AR-15 for self-defense in the neighborhood. And the 2 3 whole Second Amendment premise of Justice Scalia in 4 the Heller case was a right of self-defense, which doesn't necessarily extend to AR-15s. I just thought 5 it would be useful to add that for context. 6 7 CHAIR GARZA: Well, I'll ask my question 8 after you, Commissioner Heriot, please. 9 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I'd like to 10 also thank all the panelists here. This has been very 11 interesting. 12 I think my question is probably for Mr. 13 Hogan because I think he probably came closest to what 14 I was thinking of. One of the things that I have been 15 hearing lately, including hearing from people here at 16 the Commission, is that all of this isn't really a 17 civil rights issue, that we're talking about racial 18 disparities and crime victimization but it's not 19 really, really a civil rights issue. You know, much 20 of it is within race. Which seems odd to me. But do 21 you have any comment on that? 22 Do you have any thoughts about this notion 23 of just this not being a civil rights issue? 24 MR. HOGAN: I'm going to say wow. 25 idea of it not being a civil rights issue because it

might be a Black man killing another Black man, it sounds like something that Bull Connor might have said. I mean, that's a horrible sentiment.

So, I mean, Jesse Jackson actually said back in the '90s, this is the number one civil rights issue in the United States. And it's still true today.

So from a personal perspective my response is, every homicide is a tragedy. It doesn't matter what color the victim is, every homicide is a tragedy. That's someone's son, brother, father, uncle. And it's almost always men.

think it's interesting to look at Jill Leovy's book, Ghettoside. Very good book. And it talks about, and this will certainly ring true for the other members of the panel who worked in law enforcement, if you don't control every homicide and nonfatal shooting, you are buying more homicides and shootings because you are going to get into retaliatory violence.

If you don't solve that first homicide, the street keeps score. And if law enforcement can't take care of that homicide or take that nonfatal shooter off the street, the street will. And then that one homicide turns into two, and that two turns

into five, and that five turns into ten.

And we're seeing that right now because we're not taking that five percent of shooters off the street who are really driving violent crime. So that sentiment really bothers me. It really worries me from both a personal and a statistical standpoint.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You've made me feel a little bit guilty. I've got that book Ghettoside on my bedside table and I haven't read it yet. Maybe it's time that I do.

CHAIR GARZA: Well, first of all, thank you all so much for your testimony today. I feel like there might be something underlying a lot of the testimony that we heard this morning. And that has to do with some of the social determinants of health that impact crime and poverty. I think the term was child, adverse childhood experience.

I would like to hear more about, you know, those issues, right? How do we start looking at this issue from the perspective of protecting victims so that they don't become victims again, or commit crimes themselves?

What are the opportunities that we have in order to provide victim services support because I know that that's something that is very lacking for

individuals. So I just wanted to leave that question open to the floor. So whoever would like to begin answering that.

DR. MERCY: I can speak a little bit to that, Commissioner Garza. You know, there is a classic story in public health about people by a riverside and they're enjoying themselves and then they see people floating down the river and they go in and they rescue them and take them out, then more people come and they rescue them and take them out. Finally, somebody says, I'm going to run up and see why they're falling in the river, where it's coming from.

So these issues that we're talking about, like exposure to adversity among children, adolescents have upstream factors that are influencing them. Poverty, racism. And I think if we don't address those factors and really focus upstream, while we're giving the services needed to treat the trauma that they experience, that ultimately we're not going to reduce the supply of victims and perpetrators of violence. That ultimately that's what we have to focus on.

So I'll leave you with that, but I think both are important. Treating, providing those

services that, we have evidence-based services that can help people in trauma, but at the same time moving upstream to address the things that are really driving and causing this.

CHAIR GARZA: Yes, Dr. Piquero.

DR. PIQUERO: Thank you. Thank you, Jim.

I've said in my own work that we can be smart on crime if we're smarter on people and smarter on places.

My dad, who was a Cuban political refugee who came to the United States when he was a teenager, used to change oil in this big old '98 that made nine miles a gallon. And he used to do it with Quaker State. And some people remember Quaker State, but they had this great slogan. And the slogan was, you can pay me now or you can pay me later.

The absolute best thing we can do is invest in people and in communities when those people are small. When they're born. In the first few years of their life. Because you have a kid who is born today who might pick up a gun in 15 years. You have a kid who is 5 today who might pick up a gun in 10 years, and you have a 16 year old kid who might have a gun right now.

You have to do all of those things, not

just one of those things. And too many people think there is just one little thing that's going to solve this problem, it's not. It's hard work, it's investment and it takes leadership from the top of local law enforcement, local politicians all the way up to the federal level. There is no easy solution, but there are solutions. And that's what we can't lose sight of.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. Mr. Mulroy?

MR. MULROY: Just very quickly, on that note. One way of sort of operationalizing this, that we're talking about in Shelby County is, you know, in our juvenile court system we have a dependency and neglect docket. Those are the people that are coming from broken homes and the parents are either abusive or neglectful, they have other types of problems. They're not, this is not a criminal docket.

But about 70 percent of the kids in that docket end up in the delinquency docket. And then a large percentage of those end up in the serious delinquency docket which means they will be transferred to adult court. So we have a pipeline there.

And so, the more that we can focus resources on those kids that are in the dependency and

neglect docket, it's not only a humane thing but it's a cost effective thing because it will mean down the road we'll have less crime.

CHAIR GARZA: Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: Commissioner Garza, thank you. First, we have to start early. By the time that, when I was in law enforcement, I got hold of it, it was too late. We are not social workers when we are police officers, when we are prosecutors. That problem needs to be taken care of much earlier, when those folks are young, and that's when we need to focus on them.

Dr. Piquero is exactly right, we've got to get in earlier and start addressing that issue. But I will give you this note of optimism. I believe in human agency. And out of these, all these people who have enormous trauma and enormous disadvantages that they grew up with, 99.5 percent of them grow up to be great people. Wonderful working people with great lives. So I believe that they can make those choices and succeed even past the problems that they have.

And then we need to identify the folks that need our extra help early on as much as we can because then, the Chief will agree with me here, if we can get rid of crime entirely in the United States

1 that would be what we're all shooting for. But it's going to take work across everybody in this panel and 2 3 all the Commissioners, combining all of our skills at 4 every level to do that. CHAIR GARZA: Well thank you all so much, 5 6 I appreciate your comments. I have done a bit of a 7 criminal defense work, and I have worked with children 8 in the past and it's something that is very important 9 to me, so. 10 I know that we have a question on the 11 phone. Commissioner Gilchrist. Your question is 12 going to be the last question. 13 COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Madam Chair, 14 thank you so much. I think the last panelist actually 15 alluded to my question. 16 What I wanted to dive into, just a little 17 bit, was the relationship between both prosecution and 18 law enforcement. And specifically, since these folks 19 are current government officials, or former government 20 officials, I was curious to know and get their 21 perspective on the checks and balances in that process 22 of seeking justice. So if somebody wants to comment 23 on that, that's perfectly fine. 24 But I really thank them very much for this 25 testimony today. Very enlightening and I certainly

appreciate your willingness to testify.

CHAIR GARZA: Chief Pazen?

CHIEF PAZEN: I'll jump in just real quickly on this. I think the last Commissioner's point is something that we need to take action on moving forward. Right now, you could go to denvergov.org/police and you can see everything that the police department is doing. You can look at the individual record of a police officer, previous use of force. Anything that you want. It gets more opaque, it gets more murky the further up the criminal justice system that you go.

In fact, our courts, if you try to evaluate how a particular courtroom is doing, the survey questions don't even indicate whether or not they are effective in their duties, it is how polite they were to folks coming in. Do they treat their staff with respect, things of that nature.

And it's like, if we want to find out what is working and what is not working, we need a holistic view of the entire criminal justice system, the police. We need fair and just police doing constitutional policing making sure that the people's rights aren't violated. You need prosecutors that are effective, courts, and corrections.

In Colorado a 50 percent failure rate on recidivism for parolees, that's bad for the community, that's bad for the person that is reentering the community. So we have to figure out the entire system. What's working, what's not working, and then work to get these issues fixed for the betterment of all people in our communities.

CHAIR GARZA: Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: This is actually one of my favorite issues, so the question was a great one. If you want to look at the criminal justice outcomes, just once it hits the criminal justice system, the equation that we always use is police times prosecutor times judge gives you your result. And if any of them go to zero then the whole result is zero. So you really have to keep an eye on how they work together. And I'm sure the Chief had seen that.

If we look back through history, when judges were coming close to going to zero, you actually saw a combination of then Senator Joseph Biden and President Ronald Reagan passing the sentencing guidelines federally to make sure that judges would have a more consistent and less racially disparate outcomes. And it worked. It worked across the sentencing system.

1	So we are starting to see some of that
2	now. The less you see consistent work by police,
3	prosecutors and judges, you are going to get racial
4	disparities. And they are increasing once the federal
5	sentencing guidelines stopped being mandatory. So
6	that is something that we need to think about, and
7	something for the federal government to think about.
8	CHAIR GARZA: Okay. Well thank you all so
9	much. I want to say thank you to all of our panelists
10	for your time, your testimony. It's very much
11	appreciated. And we're going to be taking all of that
12	under advisement.
13	III. BREAK
13 14	III. BREAK CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a
14	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a
14 15	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at
14 15 16	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at which time we'll commence with the second panel. So
14 15 16 17	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at which time we'll commence with the second panel. So thank you all so much.
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at which time we'll commence with the second panel. So thank you all so much. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at which time we'll commence with the second panel. So thank you all so much. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:26 a.m. and resumed at 10:41
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at which time we'll commence with the second panel. So thank you all so much. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:26 a.m. and resumed at 10:41 a.m.)
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIR GARZA: So we're going to take a brief break. We're going to break until 10:35, at which time we'll commence with the second panel. So thank you all so much. (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:26 a.m. and resumed at 10:41 a.m.) CHAIR GARZA: Okay, we will now come back

IV. PANEL 2: COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS & ADVOCATES

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you all for being here this morning. During the briefing each panelist will have seven minutes to speak. After each panel presentation Commissioners will have an opportunity to ask questions within the allotted time period. And as before, I'll recognize each Commissioner who wishes to speak.

Of course I am going to strictly enforce the time allotments given to each panelist to present his or her statement. And unless we did not receive your testimony until today, you may assume that we have read it. So you can summarize it, and will appreciate that so you can make the best use of the seven minutes allotted. So please focus your remarks on the topic of our briefing.

Panelists, please note the system of warning lights that we have set up in front of you. When the light turns from green to yellow, that means two minutes remain. When the light turns red panelists should conclude your statements so that you do not risk me cutting you off mid-sentence. I will not do that, I will allow you to finish your thoughts.

My fellow Commissioners and I will do our part and keep our questions and comments concise. So in the order in which they will speak, our panelists

1	this morning are Ruth Abaya, Senior Director, Health
2	Alliance for Violence Intervention.
3	Donald Northcross, Founder and CEO,
4	National OK Program.
5	Nel-Sylvia Guzman, Deputy Director, Safe
6	Sisters Circle.
7	Angela Ferrell-Zabala, Executive Director
8	of Moms Demand Action.
9	Alice Hamblett, Senior Policy Manager,
10	Common Justice.
11	Heather Warnken, Executive Director,
12	Center for Criminal Justice Reform, University of
13	Baltimore School of Law.
14	So I'm going to ask each of you all to
15	raise your hand. Your right hand to be sworn in.
16	Will you swear and confirm that the information that
17	you are about to provide us is true and accurate to
18	the best of your knowledge and belief?
19	(Witnesses sworn.)
20	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much. Dr.
21	Abaya, you can begin.
22	DR. ABAYA: There we go. Thank you. Good
23	morning. It's a privilege to have the opportunity to
24	testify about this important issue. And I'm grateful
25	to the Commission on Civil Rights for choosing to

bring attention to the civil rights implications of how we understand and respond to violent crime and community violence.

So my name is Ruth Abaya. I'm a Pediatric Emergency Medicine Physician in the City of Philadelphia. I'm also the senior director for health systems in CVI integration at HAVI, the Health Alliance for Violence Intervention, which advances hospital-based violence intervention programs, or HVIPs, a leading public health approach to community violence intervention.

In my time as a physician, I have cared for and borne witness to far too many people whose lives have been deeply impacted, or ended, prematurely due to violence. In my time working with my local health department, the city saw some of the highest rates of gun violence ever recorded. And it became clear how the same communities that experienced high levels of violence also experienced lower access to social determinants of health.

Several core rights that were foundational to the origins of this nation were, for these patients, deeply impeded by the near constant threat of violence in their predominately Black and Brown communities. In 2022, 87 percent of firearm injury

victims in the City of Philadelphia were non-Hispanic Black individuals. Concurrently, there were notable disparities in access to important resources such as life-sustaining employment, specifically for Black men and boys.

These all represent layers of disadvantage one upon the other that created an ideal environment for violence to thrive. And these trends are not unique to Philadelphia. Homicide is the leading cause of death, as we've heard already this morning, for Black Americans with non-Hispanic Black individuals ten times more likely to die by homicide than their White counterparts.

In many places throughout the country, community violence is concentrated, it's cyclical, and it's networked, creating cycles of harm and trauma that often impact multiple generations. Firearm injury is now the leading cause of death for children and youth. These cycles have to be disrupted. Community violence intervention that focuses on the tools of public health have the potential to create meaningful change.

A disregard for the rights of communities of color is at the heart of community violence we bear witness to today. Historic disinvestment in

communities of color, such as the discriminatory practice of redlining in the early 20th Century, has been shown to be directly related to current high rates of shooting incidents. And that relationship is mediated by factors such as poverty and educational obtainment.

While we want to believe that these discriminatory practices are a thing of the past, the truth is, modern events demonstrate ongoing discriminatory practices by which minority families are excluded from the opportunities available to others.

As the primary entity tasked with upholding the civil rights of all people within the United States, the federal government can contribute a great deal to addressing civil rights issues as they occur within criminal justice. I'll give one example, which is the laws that govern law enforcement conduct.

As the relationship between communities and public safety officials, or law enforcement, has profound implications for how public safety is achieved as a partnership. And the leadership of the federal government sets the tone for local action. In trauma bays, in resuscitation rooms throughout the country, the rights of patients are challenged when

the line between law enforcement and medical care is crossed, and patients are left unsure of who they can trust.

These encounters erode the trust that enables effective violence intervention. To create true safety, it's crucial to invest in trauma informed and equity-focused interventions that seek to transform, rather than criminalize, to lift up rather than push to the side communities of color. Ensuring that their rights are protected in every setting.

Investing in programs that specifically disproportionately impacts violence that minority communities is an important way to make a difference in these inequities. Models such as hospital-based violence intervention programs, that you heard referenced earlier today, rely on credible messengers, or people with known lived experience from communities affected, who have been violently injured themselves in many instances to support patients who have been violently injured from the hospital or trauma center all the way to the community where informed comprehensive care trauma helps individuals find healing.

HVIPs are a powerful member of the community violence intervention ecosystem, which is a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

term that references a city's violence prevention and intervention infrastructure that connects multiple entities and departments to implement a comprehensive sleet of strategies to address the dynamics of violence. In a well-functioning local CVI ecosystem, there is a shared vision of public safety and the work of securing adequate funding, coordinating efforts and identifying and responding to those at highest risks is shared and efforts to reduce violence become sustainable.

Another key feature of community violence is that its nature can change over time. A critical example of this is the emergence of social media and the recognition that the contagion of violence, once spread through face-to-face interactions, now also occurs in the digital space.

Often violence intervention experts are seeing data that does not reflect current trends on the ground because so much of the available data about violence related trends is not in real time. Effective community violence intervention relies on a of variety factors, of which is one timelv comprehensive data on where violence is occurring, the nature of that violence, who is affected and what responses are being implemented.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This requires data from multiple sectors including hospital systems, health departments, criminal justice, social media, and community members. National numbers on nonfatal shooting incidents and those impacted remain elusive, though initiatives have been launched to advocate for improving the data infrastructure specifically around firearms.

Responding urgently to emerging trends in violence requires timely data that would demonstrate drivers and bring to light inequities. This data then has the potential to actually inform intentional action. The field of community violence intervention needs this type of data integration to be data informed, which is a core tenant of the public health approach.

Health systems that provide care to those who are injured and see the long-term health effects of violence and departments of public health that are tasked with promoting community health also have critical contributions to make to the work of defining the scope of violence and responding to it. These are key members of the community violence ecosystem and they can contribute relevant data, convening power, programmatic support and foster a robust violence intervention infrastructure. This work has incredible

potential to effect change if it's done with a focus on equity and justice.

Other systems that aim to support survivors of violent injury must also consider how equitably resources are allocated. Those who have experienced violent crime have access to victims of crime assistance programs.

However, it's known that survivors of violence who are young male, Black and Brown, are disproportionately underrepresented under victim compensation applicants relative to the proportion of crimes committed against them. This is another source of disparities driven by a range of factors including a lack of knowledge about these benefits, barriers to completions of the application process and hesitations about engaging with law enforcement officials.

At times these forms of compensation are contingent upon a subjective assessment of cooperation. Making this process clear and equitable can improve access for all victims and address these disparities.

A recognition of the history of community violence and how that impacts current trends, a focus on highly quality timely data to inform violence intervention, strong collaboration and sustained

investments in community violence intervention are essential to a public health approach to violence reduction. Thank you so much.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Dr. Abaya. We're going to turn to Mr. Northcross. You can begin.

MR. NORTHCROSS: Thank you so much. I want to thank the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for inviting me here today to participate in this important briefing and to give me the opportunity to share with you how we are addressing this problem with working with the community, police, and other components to address the high incarceration rate, the homicide rate, the violent crime rate, of Black men and boys.

We've heard -- I had the opportunity to sit in the first briefing and I heard, you know, some alarming statistics. And, of course, we are all familiar with those statistics. We know what the problems are.

And so we want to talk a little bit today

-- I want to talk to you about some of the things that
we're doing, and how these problems can be addressed,
other than just depending on law enforcement, other
than depending on just incarceration. We know that
that doesn't solve the problem by itself.

So, my name is Donald Northcross. I'm a retired Sacramento County Sheriff's deputy and founder of the national OK Program. As a young Sheriff's deputy, I started the OK Program in 1990. I'd been on the department for about two years, and I got tired of seeing so many Black men and boys killing each other and going to jail. And I looked around for a solution to the problem and I didn't see one, other than building more prisons.

I used to come home every night from work, and I would complain to my wife about what I had witnessed on my watch. And in the middle of my complaint, at the end of it, I would always say somebody's got to do something about it. And then one night it dawned on me that I was somebody. That's when I realized that nobody can stop Black men and boys from killing each other but Black men and boys. Nobody. We're the solution to the problem.

And so, what we do in the OK Program, we develop a life support system. It's going to take a life support system to solve this problem in our community. We all know that homicide is the number one cause of death of Black men and boys between the ages of one and 44 years old, according to the Centers for Disease Control.

Homicide is -- Black men and boys make up only 6 percent of the nation's population. We account for over 50 percent of the homicides each year. So we know that that's a problem. The question is, how do we address the problem?

And, again, I talk about a life support system where we bring together an interconnected network of Black men. That we recruit them, we train them, and we organize them. These men bring together their resources, their experiences, their wisdom, their knowledge and love for each other, to support the daily lives of our boys.

Black men are the main component of the system, but, of course, parents and the schools and law enforcement is also another part of the system. We're the only program in the nation that has full-time Black male police officers that the program interviews, carefully selects, and trains to work with Black boys, to work with Black men from the community, to help change the course of Black boys.

The police department not only assigns the officers to the program full-time, but they send them to Oakland, at our headquarters, to train for six days. So, we train all of the officers after we carefully select them. We know that it's important to

carefully select the officers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Being a police officer for 20 years, I know that you can get the wrong police officer, even if he's Black, in our community, and he can cause more harm than good. And so, that's why we carefully select them ourselves. We don't allow the police officers just to send us an officer; we carefully select those officers.

And then it requires them to come to train for six days, how to coordinate this life support system. And so, once we train these officers, then they go back to their cities and they are assigned to chapters. A chapter is a middle school, and a high school that that middle school feeds into, so that the officers can follow the same boys from sixth grade through twelfth grade and build that long-term relationship with them. Because it's about relationships.

Unfortunately, our boys are not going to call the police if they have a legitimate threat made on their life. And I'll say that again. Black boys are the only people I know in the country that won't pick up their phone and call the police if they have a legitimate threat made on their life. They'll deal with it themselves. They'll get some friends and

they'll handle it themselves. Or they'll put a gun in their pocket to be able to address that issue when he's confronted by the person who made the threat on their life.

So, what we do, we train those officers and then they go back and they set up a chapter. And then the officer will train how to recruit the boys. We actually go on campus. The officer's on campus all day long and they recruit the boys into the program. We don't just hang a sign on our door and say, we're open for business and wait for the boys to walk through the door. These officers are trained how to connect with these boys. How to approach them. How to let them know that they want them a part of the organization.

Number one, we select officers that love their community. You can't run this program without love. This is about love. And so, we're looking for Black male police officers that love their community and that's willing to make the commitment, because this is not just a 9:00 to 5:00 type of job, of assignment. This is, these officers are called at night. Sometimes our boys need help 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock at night.

That's the only thing that's going to keep

them from putting their gun in their pocket, where they can call a police officer that they know love them and have the authority to mediate conflict between them and other people in the community that could lead to violence.

And so, they call these officers, and these officers respond to it. They have take-home vehicles. They dress down. They wear plain clothes. But they're on the campus with these boys every day. They're validating good behavior; they communicate with the teachers.

The teachers have a list of the boys that are in the program. And the way the boys join the program, their parents have to sign them up for the program, giving the officers permission to get information from the teachers in terms of academic performance, their behavior, and things of that nature.

And so we monitor the boys' progress. And then, so these officers are called. The parents, they make home visits. The parents call these officers if they have a problem even with their own sons. They call the officer because they know these officers love them, and they can trust these officers because of the ones that we — the officers that we select. These

officers, of course, they come in with a certain amount of love and a desire to do this work.

But then they build on those relationships by making home visits to the parents. Getting to know the family members, and letting the parents know that they are available, that you can call me if you have a problem.

The officers use their discretion. They don't just run out on every call, but they use their own discretion. I tell the officers if one of these young men call you at 10:00 o'clock at night and he has a problem, then the way you know if you're going to go or not, you think about if it's your own son. If your own son call you with this same problem, would you go? And if you would go for your own son, you have to go for these young men.

These officers are paid full-time. This is their job. But we know that it's more than a full-time job. So, we're looking for officers who are willing to make that commitment to respond.

This is how we reduce violence in our community when these boys can pick up the phone and call somebody, that's going to be able to respond and address these particular issues. This is how we begin to address it. We use these men that we recruit,

1 train, and organize also. 2 In Oakland, California, for example, we 3 have over 600 Black men that we recruited, trained, 4 and organized. I don't know any other city can boast that they have 600 Black men that's working with the 5 You don't hear Black men and the police 6 7 working together, quite frankly. So, you have these 8 600 men that these, these men come to our Saturday 9 kick it sessions. 10 We meet with the boys every Saturday on 11 the school campus. And so, we have a curriculum, a 12 leadership and critical thinking skills curriculum 13 where we talk about reducing the homicide rate of 14 Black men and boys. 15 We talk about challenges, choices 16 consequences. Appropriate and inappropriate behavior. 17 Healthy and unhealthy relationships. Preventing 18 teenage pregnancy. 19 Passion, love, respect. Strategies to 20 handling conflict. Anger recognition and control. 21 have about 35 topics that we deal with on these boys, 22 with these boys every day. 23 CHAIR GARZA: Mr. Northcross? 24 MR. NORTHCROSS: Yes?

CHAIR GARZA: If you can wrap up.

1 MR. NORTHCROSS: Oh, am I over already? CHAIR GARZA: Yes. 2 3 MR. NORTHCROSS: Oh, I was worried about 4 taking seven minutes. I'll let you finish your 5 CHAIR GARZA: 6 thought. 7 MR. NORTHCROSS: Okay, no, I'm finished. 8 No, I'm sure I'll be able to answer some more 9 questions as we go along. But I just want to wrap it 10 up by saying that law enforcement is not going to be 11 able to do this. Nobody else -- our women can't do 12 Our women have done a tremendous job holding our 13 families together, but Black boys and Black men can 14 only stop Black boys and Black men from killing each 15 other. So let's build that life support system around 16 these young men, and then we can reduce crime in our 17 communities. 18 Thank you very much. CHAIR GARZA: 19 Now we turn to Ms. Guzman, if you can go 20 ahead and get started. 21 Thank you, Madam Chairwoman MS. GUZMAN: 22 and members of the Commission, for the opportunity to 23 speak today. My name is Nel-Sylvia Guzman, and I am 24 the Deputy Director of the Safe Sisters Circle. 25 are a 501(c)(3) non-profit here in Washington, D.C.

1 We provide free, culturally-specific, trauma-informed and holistic services to Black women survivors of 2 domestic and sexual violence in Wards 7 and 8. 3 4 We focus on Wards 7 and 8, collectively as the East of the River Community, 5 6 because they are the community with the largest 7 percentage of violent crime, the largest percentage of 8 Black women, and often the most ignored among D.C.'s 9 prominent neighborhoods and communities. 10 Through partnership and support of 11 culturally specific organizations, the federal 12 government can better support and assist victims of 13 violent crime, especially victims of intimate partner 14 violence. 15 Minority communities, especially lower 16 socioeconomic communities, are disproportionately 17 affected by violent crime. In particular, the risk of 18 serious violence for Black individuals remains one and 19 a half to two times greater than those of White 20 individuals. 21 Given my background, my focus today is 22 more nuanced, and my comments will be focused more on 23 violent crime and challenges faced by Black women, 24 especially those perpetrated by intimate partners.

I sit here today to say the data that we

have, although there are gaps in the data, the data we have show that domestic violence is the number one health concern for Black women in America. Compared to other ethnicities, Black women are reported the highest rates of intimate partner violence in their lifetime.

Although intimate partner violence can vary in how often it happens and how severe it is, violent forms of intimate partner violence, such as physical violence, sexual violence and rape, and intimate partner homicide, disproportionately affect Black women.

Black women are three times more likely to die at the result of intimate partner abuse. 17 percent of Black women in America experience sexual violence by an intimate partner, and nine percent of Black women are raped by an intimate partner.

And these statistics aren't just for cisgender women. Black transgender women account for a disproportionate amount of the victims of fatal violence against transgender, and gender non-conforming people.

Black women are overwhelmingly being subjected to violence, harm and murder. But the resources available to them are often limited, or use

a standard approach for all survivors, regardless of their background.

This is a problem. We have a large percentage of women who are victims of a violent crime, and there is a lack of recovery support.

Generally, fewer than one in three victims of crimes will report receiving the type of assistance that they're requesting. This demonstrates a large gap between the need and the access. Although female victims of serious violence are more likely to ask for assistance when the violence is perpetrated by an intimate partner, about 1 in 10 survivors will have their needs met when requesting services from a domestic violence program.

And this only reflects those that ask. Black women face compounding barriers to safety, to asking for help, and then when they ask for the help, to receiving the help.

There's two specific challenges they face when dealing with intimate partner violence. First is that many of the victim services related to intimate partner violence are tied to the criminal justice system. So, therefore, many survivors are required to have to choose between involving law enforcement, or getting the support that they need. And many

survivors, regardless of race, have a -- choose not to report to the police.

And then the second issue is a lack of culturally-specific organizations and providers who understand and take a multi-layered and intersectional approach to the challenges and obstacles that survivors for each community face when attempting to access services.

At the Safe Sisters Circle, we provide culturally-specific services to our survivors through legal counseling and case management services.

We define culturally-specific as services from an individual from the same community as the service provider; that creates a comfortable environment where trust is established; where the client's culture is taken into context when developing solutions or strategies to address their problems. It's also where we support those who fall through the cracks in the mainstream systems.

I have personally seen firsthand in my time in the field as a attorney providing legal services for Black women, and generally for women survivors in Washington, D.C., the difference between working for a culturally-specific organization and working for other providers.

The Black women survivors are more likely to seek services from organizations that are familiar with their culture, their background, and who they are simply as Black women.

We work on the ground with our community actively engaging them, ensuring that we can be trusted sources in all that we do. And we are providing programs that our community want and need. Unfortunately, even our capacity is limited compared to the true need our community has.

And this is where the federal government can come in. The federal government can address these disparities of intimate partner violence rates, by investing into culturally specific organizations and partnering with them on every level of the government.

Beyond providing direct services, culturally-specific organizations can be that bridge in the gap between government officials and communities that you are looking to engage.

Due to America's long history of systemic racism and over-policing, communities of color often do not trust the government or law enforcement agencies. They are viewed as outsiders and they're just not trusted. Investing more into culturally-specific and community-based organizations, and

assisting with expanding their services because they're often the ones most interacting with victims of violent crime, is imperative.

Federal funding that is often earmarked for culturally specific organizations, is often substantially less than compared to other funding programs. These funding disparities translate to real world harm because less funding means less survivors that are served.

Data for intimate partner violence is among the hardest to gather because most of the times, you're gathering from court records or police departments, and calls. But that data only reflects survivors that have come forward, and that have asked for support. Especially in the Black community, intimate partner violence is under reported.

Working with community based organizations and leaders who are often trusted resources will assist the government in gathering some of this data. And would also allow the organizations to take a not one size fits all approach.

Working with these community based organizations to assess their capacity, will often be the best way to see if these needs are being met because of their, if the demand is too high compared

to the resources available, we can specifically see 1 where communities need more investment. 2 3 We at the Safe Sisters Circle are happy to 4 be a resource for anyone looking to begin this task of collecting data, communicating with, or generally 5 6 better engaging with the Ward 7 and 8 community of 7 Washington, D.C. 8 Thank you. 9 Thank you, Ms. Guzman. CHAIR GARZA: 10 We're going to now hear from Ms. Ferrell-11 Zabala. 12 MS. FERRELL-ZABALA: Thank you so much. 13 Good morning, my name is Angela Ferrell-Zabala, and I 14 am the Executive Director of Moms Demand Action. Moms 15 Demand Action is the nation's largest grassroots 16 volunteer network and movement to end gun violence. 17 And Moms Demand Action is also part of Everytown for 18 Gun Safety, which is the nation's largest gun violence 19 prevention organization. 20 I'd like to thank the U.S. Commission on 21 Civil Rights for holding this briefing, and for 22 inviting me to share our perspective on this very 23 important issue. 24 I'm a mother of four, and when I had my 25 twins when they were small, I would always tell them if you get lost, find a mom, she'll help you. That's why I do what I do. I do this to build a country where my kids, and all children, are safe from gun violence.

Gun violence, which is currently the number one killer of children, teens, and young adults, in this country. That's especially true if you're Black. Every seven hours, seven hours, a Black boy or teenager dies by gun homicide in the United States.

The headlines often paint a disturbing picture that crime, and specifically violent crime, is on the rise. But those are just the headlines. There are other incidents of violence that never make the news, or are never reported to law enforcement. These stories are just as important to tell.

Recent crime data, or at least the incomplete data that we have, paints a slightly different picture that violent crime rates are down. But we know that the numbers on their own can't change how individuals, especially those from the most impacted Black and Brown communities, feel when it comes to crime, which is often unsafe, unheard, and unseen.

We also know that violent crime does not

happen in a vacuum. There are longstanding structural and systemic inequities in healthcare, education, housing, workforce development, and criminal justice that can drive violent crime.

The same is true for interpersonal violence, historical violence, and intergenerational violence. And then, there are the guns. Guns that make violent crime all the more violent, and all the more deadly. On an average day, 120 Americans are shot and killed in this country. And 200 more are wounded, shot and wounded. That amounts to more than 43,000 gun deaths each year, 40 percent of which are gun homicides.

In 2022 alone, 70 percent of all homicides reported to the FBI involved a firearm. Often, the guns are used in crimes and end up in the hands of individuals with dangerous histories due to loopholes in the background check system, or rogue dealers who sell guns to straw purchasers, and firearms traffickers.

As I said, gun violence and specifically gun homicide, has an outsized impact on communities of color. Recent data from the CDC reveals that Black Americans are nearly 12 times more likely to die from gun homicide, than White Americans.

Native Americans are nearly eight times more likely, and Latinx people are over two times more likely with disparities likely being even worse among the latter two groups, because of data collection issues.

The same disparities exist among individuals who are shot and wounded. And these disparities worsen if you're also in the LGBTQ+ community. While just an estimated 13 percent of the trans population in the United States is Black, 67 percent of known trans homicide victims killed with a gun, are Black women.

These communities not only bear a disproportionate burden when it comes to the gun violence, but also endure more of the resulting trauma.

This trauma is both individual and collective. It's immediate for the people directly it ripples through entire impacted. And then communities. In fact, 59 percent of Americans, or someone that they care about, have experienced gun violence in their lifetime.

We are a nation of survivors as generation after generation feels the impact and trauma from gun violence. Survivors and their communities need

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

services and support on their journey towards healing.

Because following an incident of gun violence, one in three survivors report living in fear and feeling unsafe.

Gun violence can upend the world in which survivors find themselves, disrupting how they navigate their environments, and relationships.

With each incident of gun violence, there is a moment that changes everything. Whether it's homicide or suicide, intimate partner shooting, or hate-motivated shooting, a mass shooting that captures the attention of this nation, or an unsolved shooting that never even makes a headline, the survivors that we work with tell us that their lives are never the same.

They also tell us that without the services and support, the trauma of gun violence can result in behaviors that contribute to cycles of violence.

So, the work to address the trauma is not only healing work, but it's also prevention work. We know this from the data that we have, but our datasets are incomplete and under-inclusive. And that must change so that we can better understand and solve the crisis effectively, and equitably.

1 That means strengthening the proven tools 2 and resources we have to prevent gun violence, and help survivors heal, like evidence-based community 3 4 violence intervention programs. It also means developing new ones, like 5 how to build trust with law enforcement; how to 6 7 strengthen culturally responsive mental health 8 services for survivors and their communities; and, how 9 to keep firearms out of the hands of those who should 10 never have them in the first place. 11 The headlines can only tell us so much 12 about violent crime and gun violence. That's why the 13 untold stories matter. 14 This Commission will hear а lot of 15 different statistics today, but I want to remind you 16 that behind each number is a real person. A person 17 with a family and friends, and an entire community 18 that was changed forever because of gun violence. 19 we're thinking So when about 20 solutions, we can't lose sight of the heart of why 21 this work is so important. 22 That's how we make sure that our actions 23 have the most impact. Because whether we 24 community members or advocates, or lawmakers, we need

to hear it all in order to be able to make informed

1 changes to break the cycle of violence, heal trauma, and keep communities safe. 2 3 Thank you again for the opportunity to be here and share our views. I look forward to the 4 Commission's questions. 5 6 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, 7 Ferrell-Zabala. 8 Ms. Hamblett, you can proceed. 9 MS. HAMBLETT: Good morning. My name is 10 Alice Hamblett, and I'm a Senior Policy Manager at 11 Common Justice. Thank you for inviting us to testify 12 today. 13 As the first alternative to incarceration 14 and victim service program in the country that 15 addresses violent felonies in adult courts, we have 16 seen firsthand how Black and Brown communities are 17 both deeply impacted by violence, and dismissed by 18 institutions that purport to serve them. 19 In New York City, we have worked with 20 victims of violence, and individuals who have caused 21 harm, via our restorative justice model for nearly 15 22 years. 23 Approximately 90 percent of the victims we 24 people of color. Nearly all of are 25 participants live in low-income communities.

are first or second generation immigrants.

We believe that to successfully address racial and ethnic disparities and violent victimization, we must first recognize and dismantle false but pervasive narratives.

In the United States, there is a dominant perception that victims of violence who are worthy of support, of sympathy, of services, are White.

The image of an innocent White woman is upheld as the prototypical victim. Meanwhile, Black and Brown people who are violently victimized, are criminalized, ignored, and even blamed for their own harm.

Our collective tendency to buck reality, to erase the experiences of Black and Brown survivors, is deeply rooted in racist histories that render people of color as deserving of harm, and as undeserving of assistance. But people of color suffer from violence at disproportionately high rates. And we have known this for some time.

According to a 2019 analysis of NCVS survey by Heather Warnken, who is here today, the people most likely to experience violent victimization are Black boys and men, younger than 35, living in metropolitan areas, with household incomes of less

1 than \$25,000.00 a year. 2 These disparities also map on to specific 3 types of violence, such as intimate partner violence, 4 gun violence, and police violence, all of which affect people of color at rates higher than they do White 5 6 people. 7 When it comes to meeting survivors' needs, 8 another myth prevails. That the criminal justice 9 especially incarceration, is a 10 centered way to facilitate healing. 11 But most survivors do not seek support via 12 the criminal justice system. In fact, according to 13 the Bureau of Justice statistics, roughly only 40 14 percent of victims of violence report their harm to 15 police. And those who do report their harm to police, 16 too often find their voices drowned out by the 17 mechanics of the system. 18 Instead of being asked what they want, 19 what they need, their primary options to achieve 20 justice are a victim impact statement, and 21 incarceration of the person who hurt them. 22 At Common Justice, our restorative justice 23 program offers another choice. Accountability and

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

Again, the vast majority of the people we

healing, without incarceration.

24

1 serve come from communities of color. Communities that have been over-surveilled, over-policed, and 2 over-incarcerated all in the name of public safety. 3 4 Yet they still have suffered from violence. the survivors 5 Ninety percent of we 6 approach with the option to use our restorative 7 justice model to resolve their case, choose it. 8 Because they want safety. Why? For 9 themselves, and for others. And if incarceration 10 worked to secure their safety, they would know by now. 11 When we subscribe to and promote these false 12 narratives, we erase and we criminalize victims of 13 color. 14 So how do we move forward? Beyond our 15 restorative justice model, we at Common Justice are 16 crafting policy changes to address racial and ethnic 17 disparities in victim services. 18 Part of this work is decoupling 19 enforcement and victim services. Because we know that 20 we cannot continue to force survivors of color to rely 21 upon the systems that oppress them to seek safety. 22 For example, state victim compensation 23 programs can help survivors recoup costs associated 24 with harm. Like medical bills, mental health bills,

and burial expenses.

1 These programs are largely supported by federal dollars via the Crime Victims Fund, which are 2 3 administered by the Office for Victims of Crime, or 4 OVC. In most states, to be eligible to receive 5 victim compensation, survivors must report their harm 6 7 to law enforcement. 8 In a country where Black people are three 9 and a half times more likely than White people to be 10 murdered by police, programs that bar survivors from 11 receiving support based on their comfortability with 12 law enforcement, are profoundly racially inequitable. 13 Following the lead of states like Iowa and 14 New Mexico, Common Justice and our partners are 15 forward legislation that would allow working to 16 survivors in New York, to apply for victim 17 compensation without having to through go law 18 enforcement. 19 Reforming these programs is just 20 example of how to reduce disparities, and how to meet 21 the needs of survivors of color. The federal 22 government also has a responsibility to rigorously 23 analyze victim compensation data. 24 Each state provides demographic data to

OVC via annual performance measure reports. This data

must be analyzed in conjunction with state level 1 demographic data on violent victimization. 2 3 In addition, OVC needs to collect, 4 analyze, and disseminate demographic data pertaining to victim compensation awards and denials. 5 Such 6 analysis can inform policy changes that 7 survivors' access to these lifesaving funds. 8 And as we move through these efforts and 9 others, we must center the voices of Black and Brown 10 survivors. And we must provide opportunities for them 11 to lead research and policy solutions with direct 12 involvement, because those who are closest to the 13 problems are indeed, closest to the solutions. 14 Dominant narratives tell us that Black and 15 Brown survivors are unworthy of support, and that our 16 justice system invariably criminal serves the 17 interests of those who have endured harm. 18 Unless we contend with and disrupt these 19 myths, racial and ethnic disparities and violent 20 victimization, and victim services will continue and 21 even grow. 22 We at Common Justice implore the federal 23 government to use its power to eliminate and to 24 illuminate these disparities, to craft creative

solutions to stop cycles of violence, and above all,

1 to uplift the voices of Black and Brown survivors. 2 Survivors of color deserve to be seen, and 3 survivors of color deserve to heal. 4 Thank you. 5 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, ${\tt Ms.}$ Hamblett. 6 7 Ms. Warnken, you can proceed. 8 MS. WARNKEN: My name is Heather Warnken 9 and I am the Executive Director at the Center for 10 Criminal Justice Reform, at the University 11 Baltimore School of Law. I am grateful for the 12 opportunity to participate in this very important 13 briefing today. 14 Prior to my current role, I served as a 15 visiting fellow at the U.S. Department of Justice, 16 Office of Justice Programs, in the first ever position 17 dedicated to bridging the gap between research, 18 policy, and practice, to improve the response to crime 19 victims. 20 Through this role, Ι facilitated 21 collaboration across federal, state, and 22 government partners, practitioners, researchers, and 23 directly impacted communities in the design 24 implementation of equitable data driven programs and 25 policies nationwide.

1 Through written testimony, I've detailed numerous sub-topics I will not have time to address 2 3 But I have chosen a few key points 4 highlight, starting with racial disparities in crime victim compensation. 5 Victim compensation, as we've heard, is 6 7 one of the nation's dedicated resources for helping 8 victims, providing financial assistance for expenses 9 incurred as the result of being a victim of crime. 10 These expenses, such as medical and mental health 11 needs, funeral and burial, and lost wages, are not 12 borne equally. 13 A large body of evidence demonstrates 14 profound racial disparities in risk for violent 15 victimization and its impacts, with low 16 communities of color bearing the brunt of these costs. 17 Τn communities where violence is 18 concentrated, the impact of this trauma combines with 19 chronic disinvestments, lack of support services, and 20 an over reliance on policing, prisons, and jails. 21 These conditions often break down social trust and 22 breed cynicism towards government. 23 Compensation programs give government

agencies a different way to respond to victimization

outside of the criminal-legal framework of arrest,

24

prosecution, and incarceration. And in doing so, they provide the opportunity for government agencies and community-based organizations to build trusting relationships that are needed to interrupt cycles of violence and solve crime.

So, in other words, this is not just about

the healing and dignity of victims. This is about public safety. By assisting with these destabilizing expenses, compensation helps reduce the risk of future victimization, and the long-term costs of violence to the state.

Across the country, as we've heard, notwithstanding the potential of these programs to meet the needs of survivors and promote systemic legitimacy, compensation has been inaccessible to the majority of victims.

A growing body of research demonstrates that Black and Brown victims, in particular those living in low income communities, are least likely to be seen and served as victims of crime.

Despite these higher rates of violent victimization, compensation programs disproportionately deny and/or alienate applicants of color, especially Black men and youth impacted by gun and other forms of community violence.

1 There are a range of problems undermining 2 effectiveness, including а paradoxical program 3 reliance on reimbursement, requiring victims to pay up 4 front the cost of compensable expenses even though the intended for people who 5 program is lack such 6 resources. 7 Unreasonable attempts to promote victim 8 cooperation and reporting to law enforcement, as we've 9 This is especially unjust for victims who may 10 fear or distrust police. 11 Blaming the victim by operating on a 12 flawed model of only supporting, quote, innocent 13 victims, leading to determinations of worthiness that 14 influenced by are too often race and other 15 discriminatory factors, and a harmful reliance on 16 criminal justice system fines and fees to fund these 17 benefits. 18 A proliferation of states have recently 19 introduced or passed legislation designed to improve 20 compensation, and the Department of Justice Office for 21 Victims of Crime will soon release updated guidance 22 from the federal level for the first time in a

This is hopeful, needed work. However, compensation reform or any number of other programs

generation.

23

24

will mean very little without the courage to do the more difficult, longer-term work of changing the culture in which these programs must be implemented.

This includes confronting the role of racism in determining whose harm matters, and moving beyond not just talking points that we can't police and prosecute our way out of violence, to actions and investments that repair and rebuild relationships rooted in dignity and a more holistic set of public safety goals.

Another area I'd like to highlight is the false dichotomy between who we view as victims, and perpetrators of harm. In addition to stark racial disparities in rates of incarceration that have made the U.S. an outlier across the world, a large body of research has confirmed the prevalence and severity of victimization before, during, and after incarceration.

But lesser discussed are the explicit and implicit barriers created to being seen and served as victims after someone has touched the criminal or juvenile justice system, the extent to which we criminalize rather than heal victimization and trauma, and how much more expensive this is.

In 2021, while still at DOJ, I had the honor of leading an assessment for the city of

1 Baltimore on victim services, focused on the response to Black and Brown victims of gun violence. 2 3 The findings of this report, similar to 4 those I've encountered in my work in numerous other cities, were again laid bare when I participated this 5 6 summer in the response to victims of the devastating 7 mass shooting in Brooklyn Homes. 8 Too often, residents impacted by violence, 9 especially those who are poor or have ever touched the 10 system previously, are more likely to be criminalized 11 rather than seen as human beings deserving of dignity 12 and support. 13 Even surviving loved ones of homicide 14 victims, witnesses at crime scenes, people fighting 15 for their lives in hospital beds, all experience 16 rights violations, additional trauma, coercion, 17 misinformation, barriers to existing services, in the 18 course of investigations and beyond. 19 Now these dynamics don't just fail victims 20 in their most difficult moments. They profoundly 21 worsen the relationship between the community and 22 police, and the system as a whole. They undermine law 23 enforcement's own investigative goals. They miss

want to close with a quote

opportunities to interrupt cycles of harm.

24

25

from

1	Criminologist Elliott Currie's breathtaking book, A
2	Peculiar Indifference: The Neglected Toll of Violence
3	on Black America. Quote, "America continues to
4	tolerate one of the most fundamental inequalities
5	imaginable, a radical disparity in the very prospect
6	of survival itself. Wealthy countries also have racial
7	and ethnic differences in the risks of violent death
8	and injury, but none even come close to the excess
9	mortality, disability, and suffering that we have come
10	to tacitly accept. And those stark gaps in the risks
11	of violence do not stand alone. They are only one
12	particularly glaring example of a much broader pattern
13	of systemic racial inequalities in health and well-
14	being, that set the United States off sharply from
15	every other advanced nation in the world." End quote.
16	We know a lot about this problem and what
17	it would take to solve it. The question is, do we
18	want to change?
19	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Ms. Warnken.
20	Thank you to all of our panelists for your comments.
21	I'm going to, at this point I'm going to open up the
22	questions to the Commissioners.
23	We can start with folks on the phone. I
24	want to give them an opportunity to participate.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair,

1	Kirsanow here.
2	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow,
3	please proceed.
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. I
5	would like to thank the panelists for their testimony.
6	It was very enlightening.
7	I have a question for I believe it's Mr.
8	Northcross. Mr. Northcross, what are the three most
9	important things you think would reduce violence in
10	the Black community?
11	MR. NORTHCROSS: That's a good question.
12	The three most important things I think, is when we're
13	talking about violence in the Black community, we also
14	understand that we're talking about Black men and boys
15	committing most of the violence, by far in the Black
16	community.
17	And, of course, the only way that's going
18	to stop, I think the main thing is organizing Black
19	men. Getting Black men to step up and take on the
20	responsibility of guiding young Black boys in the
21	right direction.
22	Seventy-two percent of our households are
23	headed by single mothers. There is a void in Black
24	boys' lives, the ones who cause a lot of the crime in
25	our community.

our community.

1 So, the number one thing is to get Black 2 take that responsibility, to organize men to 3 Nobody else is stopping us from doing 4 I don't understand why we're not organizing together 5 ourselves, and come to address this 6 particular issue. 7 So that's the number one thing. 8 number two thing is to make sure that our boys get 9 educated, that they're in school, that they're 10 performing in school. 11 And I think the other thing is to prepare 12 be able to work, to get, we need 13 opportunities, but also we need to prepare them to 14 work. 15 We have a generation of young men now who 16 are not even prepared to work. They don't understand 17 the importance of going to work on time, doing a day's 18 work for a day's pay. And just taking pride in being 19 able to contribute to society. 20 So I think that organizing Black men to 21 take on that responsibility, making sure our boys 22 understand the value of education, and supporting them 23 through their educational process. And creating 24 opportunities for them to be able to work.

And I think that will reduce crime in our

1	communities.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.
3	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones?
4	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Madam Chair?
5	CHAIR GARZA: Oh, okay, Commissioner
6	Gilchrist
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Thank you so
9	much, Madam Chair.
10	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
11	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Yes, Madam Chair.
12	CHAIR GARZA: You can proceed with your
13	question.
14	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: I just want,
15	okay, thank you. I just wanted to thank this panel
16	for the information that they shared with us today.
17	It was certainly enlightening, and it certainly helps
18	to inform some of our perspectives about this issue.
19	So, I just wanted to briefly thank them
20	for their testimony today. Thank you, Madam Chair.
21	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Commissioner
22	Gilchrist.
23	Commissioner Jones has a question.
24	COMMISSIONER JONES: I, too, want to start
25	by thanking all the panelists for your important

testimony today. And for all that you are doing in your respective areas to solve these problems, these really important problems.

I'll go to Mr. Northcross. Based on your testimony, you are doing extraordinary work, work that I am personally very grateful to you for.

It also seems to me that it should not fall on people of goodwill, such as yourself, to solve these problems. You ticked off a list of approximately three things you think would be most important at solving for this issue of so-called Black on Black crime.

But let's also talk about the social determinants of criminality. You mentioned for example, that only Black men can solve this problem. I want to push back on that, because we do have a federal government. We have governments in all of the states and territories in the United States. And there is, it seems to me, a foundational role to help solve for the issue of crime generally. And, to solve for even the disparities that we are seeing along lines of race and ethnicity.

Wouldn't it be helpful to you if the federal government were fully committed to solving for the issue of poverty? Wouldn't it be helpful to you

1 if the federal government and at the state level, governments were committed to solving for the issue of 2 3 housing segregation? 4 You did mention workforce opportunities, and so I imagine the answer is yes to the question of: 5 6 shouldn't government be fully committed to 7 training, especially in inner city communities, and in 8 the Black and Brown communities? 9 And while we're on the subject, let's also 10 talk about the fact that we've got just radically 11 unequal educational opportunities, especially along 12 racial lines in this country. 13 Shouldn't we also solve for that, instead 14 of it falling on people of good conscience such as 15 yourself to try to do? Just yeoman's work. 16 NORTHCROSS: Yes, those are good 17 questions, you know. And I'll be 65 years old in 18 And I've never seen the government take February. 19 this seriously and come up with solutions for this 20 problem. And so, I got tired of wringing my hands and 21 wondering what's going to happen, and when is somebody 22 going to do something about it. There's a lot of 23 different approaches that can be taken, but I'm 24 talking about an approach that's in our hands.

I often say that Black men have the means

collectively, to address the issue of homicides in our own community. But we just don't have the mindset to do it. When I say the mindset, I mean the mindset of bringing our resources together that we have.

The great comedian Chris Rock said one time, he said that before he became the big Chris Rock, his car stopped on the side of the road and he got out trying to stop people flagging them down. He said the more he waved, the faster they went. He said finally he started pushing his car and when he started pushing his car, everybody started stopping.

So I'm saying to Black men in this country, we can't wait until everybody stop to help us. We're dying every day. And if Black men come together and pool our resources together, we have more purchasing power now than we've ever had in the history of this country as Black men.

And this takes love to get out with our boys. We've got to get out in our community, let our boys know we love them; create opportunities where they want to be around us; fun activities. Spend our money on things and rewarding them for doing well in school.

The government can do that. They can do it, too, but we shouldn't have to wait on them to do

1 And we're going to keep dying as long as we wait on them to do it. I don't believe in asking folks to 2 3 do something for me that I can do for myself. 4 We can do this, and it's empowering Black And when we do that, the nation is going to, and 5 men. 6 the world is going to stand up and pay attention to 7 Black men who love themselves enough, and love their 8 families and their communities enough to bring our 9 resources together, and address this particular issue. 10 And I stand on it. Again I will say, 11 nobody can stop Black men and boys from killing each 12 other but Black men and boys. That's a state of mind. 13 We have problems in our society as far as 14 inequities. I'll be the first one to admit that. But 15 they've always been there. And we were never killing 16 each other at the rate that we killing each other now. 17 We've been poor in this country for a long time. 18 We've been without resources for a long time. But we 19 didn't turn to killing each other the way we're 20 killing each other now. That's another problem. 21 that problem lies in the Black community teaching us 22 how to love ourselves, respect ourselves. 23 women. 24 Don't stand by and watch us kill each 25 other. We can stop it. We have to change our

1	mindset, brother.
2	COMMISSIONER JONES: I appreciate your
3	important work and your passion. It's important, I
4	think especially in jobs like this. There are a lot
5	of White men who grow up in single parent households
6	in America and you don't see the same rate of violence
7	that you've been describing.
8	And I think that has less to do with the
9	state of mind than it does the concentrations of
10	poverty and marginalization and a feeling of
11	hopelessness and helplessness that only the government
12	can solve at that scale.
13	MR. NORTHCROSS: And I'm not disagreeing
14	with you.
15	COMMISSIONER JONES: And it can also be
16	true at the same time, that there is a role for
17	personal responsibility, absolutely.
18	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Vice Chair
19	Nourse?
20	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Well, I want to thank
21	all of you, you're all doing what I'd say is God's
22	work.
23	I mean, a lot of people think the
24	government can solve everything but you all are doing
25	this on your own with very little, I'm sure. And one

1 of the things that I'm hearing is how this, you are stepping up to do what a lot of people think the 2 3 government already does, right? 4 So I just want to thank you for your work, and your patience, and your tirelessness about this. 5 We are a nation of doers and volunteers, and that's a 6 7 great thing about us. 8 But I really like the fact that we have 9 other perspectives on this panel. Because the one 10 size fits all just doesn't work, and we all know that. 11 I'm happy to see we have a doctor here who 12 amazing work because hospitals is 13 experience working on violence against women and 14 gender, they were the first to help. They were the 15 first to give credibility that this violence existed 16 when I started working on it in 1990. 17 I'd just like to, and Ms. Guzman, thank 18 you again for your work. I guess I'd want to ask just 19 a couple of quick questions. Someone mentioned 20 restorative justice and I'd just like you to explain 21 for people what that, what that is. 22 MS. HAMBLETT: Sure. So, restorative 23 justice can look like a lot of different things. 24 see schools, right, choosing 25 parent/teacher conferences and counselors intervene

1 instead of you know, heavily disciplining youth. 2 In our model at Common Justice, it looks 3 like addressing violent felony charges in adult courts 4 without relying on incarceration. And, practically, I can explain to you sort of how that, that gets 5 6 operationalized on sort of a daily, weekly, monthly 7 basis in New York City where we work. 8 So, we work with DAs offices in Brooklyn, 9 Manhattan, and the Bronx, and we get cases again, 10 serious violent felonies. We approach victims of 11 these cases and we ask them two questions. The first 12 question we ask them is if they want victim services. 13 If so, we provide that to them for life. 14 And the second question we ask them is if 15 they want to use our restorative justice model to 16 resolve their case. And, again, as I said, 90 percent 17 of people say yes. 18 Once all parties agree to this, 19 defendant in the case, who we call a responsible 20 party, gets entered into our alternative 21 incarceration program. 22 First thing we do is meet their needs 23 because we can't expect to hold people accountable if 24 they can't put food on their table, if they don't have

a place to sleep.

They also get entered into violence intervention programming to start to dismantle some common beliefs, right. Some pervasive beliefs. Just like myths that I was talking about today, myths that are unjustified about violence and safety, and what it means to be part of a community.

Three to four months in, they enter into a restorative justice circle with the person who harmed them, or a proxy. We don't force victims to be in spaces with the person who harmed them, if they don't want to be. As well as their support people, and our support people, right. People who work at Common Justice.

And they get to have a serious conversation about the harm that was done. Victims get to ask, you know, why me, why this day, why this time. And they also get to set a series of community agreements that the responsible party has to follow, to make things as right as possible. Knowing they can't change what happened. And we call that, doing sorry.

A community agreement could look like, you know, I want you to write a letter of apology to my kids. Or I want you to pay financial restitution. Or I want you to get a job, right.

1 If the responsible party follows these 2 community agreements, and if they successfully 3 complete the alternative to incarceration program, 4 their case gets dropped down to a misdemeanor 5 violation and they don't go to jail. 6 And I'll just share that we just had 7 recently the Division of Criminal Justice Services in 8 New York, analyze data from our program from 2012 to 9 2022. Only one of our graduates has been reconvicted 10 of a violent felony. 11 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: That's an incredible 12 record. 13 CHAIR GARZA: Ι just have a general 14 question on support, right, for the work that needs to 15 I think what I have heard through all of the 16 testimony here is that there is a need for support in 17 the work that we're doing. 18 Support for crime victims' funds, 19 maybe some revamping of those programs. Support for 20 victims of domestic violence as I read in your 21 testimony, Ms. Guzman. 22 And so, I just want to ask as a general 23 matter, you know, what does support look like from the 24 federal government in aiding the work that you are 25 trying to accomplish?

1 MS. FERRELL-ZABALA: I will speak to that. I think it's many things, and I want to kind of pan 2 3 out just slightly and say when I was hearing the 4 conversation earlier between is it, you know, on the community, is it government. 5 6 I think multiple things can be true. 7 have to see this as an ecosystem. The problem is so 8 pervasive, this is a public health crisis. 9 So, yes, we need government, and yes, we 10 need people on the ground that are doing what they 11 need to do for the immediate, and tangible things that 12 people need in their day-to-day lives. 13 We really, as I said earlier, we want to 14 make sure that we're doing things about having more 15 complete datasets so that we can actually address the 16 problem as we need to address the problem. 17 And that brings in what I heard a lot of 18 panelists say, that the solution often lies right in 19 And so, if we get more complete the community. 20 datasets, then that's going to help us. 21 We want to continue to figure out how we 22 build stronger relationships with law enforcement in a 23 lot of these communities. There's trust that's been 24 broken and we know all the reasons why.

touched on it today, but I think that's important.

We want to make sure that we culturally responsive interventions, especially when we think about mental health services. And, frankly, not just serving, servicing the person that was When I think about gun violence, we often impacted. think about the person that was immediately and directly impacted. But it also goes beyond that person into family, into community, and even generationally. So we have to start to peel that away. And then, you know, I'm Moms Demand so I'm going to say it. We've got strengthen our gun laws in this country. Period. of story. We have a crisis in this country that no other country has. And these other countries have mental health issues. They have all kinds of things that we brought up today. But they don't have this pervasive gun problem in this country. So that's what we're looking to do, and we're going to continue to work. And, we'll partner with anyone that will be willing to partner with us to, to solve this. CHAIR GARZA: Dr. Abaya? DR. ABAYA: Thank you for that question. Happy to speak to that, as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 I definitely second the need complete but also timely data. But at the local and 2 3 also at the federal level to understand the nature of 4 the problem. Because a tenet, as I said, of the public health approach is that it's dated-informed. 5 6 And so if you don't have real-time data, you can be 7 solving for a problem that's changing in real-time. 8 I also think that sustained kind of 9 funding for an integration of hospital-based funds, so 10 an intervention-type model, so violence intervention 11 programs, recognizing that these are professionals. 12 These fields need to be professionalized. 13 Speaking for the medical setting, these 14 need to be reimbursable medical services that we can 15 use to create sustainability of that model. 16 that's a really important thing that can be solved 17 for, and can prevent the phenomenon by which programs 18 are built and disappear, and built and disappear, as 19 they rely on variable grant funding over time. 20 And then I just want to also say, you 21 for know. standards law enforcement patient 22 interactions in hospital settings. 23 It really speaks to this bigger umbrella 24 issue of trust. And so, I think that having some

standards for how law enforcement enters into medical

1	settings, and how that is negotiated so that patient
2	trust and confidentiality is prioritized, is really
3	critical as well.
4	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for that.
5	Ms. Guzman, and then I'll go to Ms.
6	Warnken.
7	MS. GUZMAN: Thank you. So I think the
8	most important part is going to be funding. Funding a
9	lot of these organizations that are doing the work on
10	the ground.
11	And part of that is also echoing what my
12	co-panelists said earlier about finding ways to
13	disconnect the law enforcement aspects for survivors,
14	and for victims. Because not every survivor wants to
15	involve the law enforcement, or the legal system in
16	the criminal justice system at least.
17	That's why civil protection order cases
18	end up being some of the most prevalent over actually
19	pressing charges, at least in my work that I've done.
20	Because our survivors don't want to
21	involve the police. Oftentimes they create a larger
22	situation. Survivors end up getting arrested for
23	actions that were nothing for them.
24	So, I think it's finding ways to fund
25	these alternative methods, and starting those on the

1 ground with these grassroot organizations that are led 2 by the communities that are the most affected by these 3 issues. 4 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for that. Ms. Warnken? 5 6 MS. WARNKEN: Thank you. There's so many 7 important answers to your question. Ι 8 definitely underscore, in a big way, this point about 9 untethering support from the criminal legal system. 10 And we've talked today about some really 11 tangible ways to do that, including like the law 12 change in New York, one we're working on in Maryland, 13 to redefine the victim compensation program to be more 14 of a health and healing-oriented approach. 15 Another thing I wanted to emphasize about 16 this is because again, I couldn't agree more about 17 getting the federal resources, getting those dollars 18 hands of the grassroots community-based in the 19 organizations that are closest to the challenges. 20 But there are a ton of reasons why it is 21 very difficult for those organizations to apply for, 22 to maintain, and keep those grants. There are many, in addition to 23 the 24 Herculean lift often of applying for a program and 25 needing supports that, programs that are for very good

1 reason, focused on the crisis-driven needs of those 2 that they're serving, don't have the capacity to do 3 that. But even with removing some of that red 4 tape, even with training and technical assistance for 5 6 the, from the federal government that 7 organizations get the grant, there are very arduous 8 reporting requirements and data hurdles that, 9 oftentimes, not only compromise organization's ability 10 to keep the grants, but actually backfire when it 11 comes to sustaining programs, or, or not being in good 12 standing to receive those grants in the future if they 13 fall short. 14 And the last thing I'll say quickly. We 15 talked about the VOCA rule change on compensation 16 that's forthcoming. 17 There was a really significant rule change 18 in VOCA in 2016, that pretty radically reinterpreted 19 allowable uses for those programs. And was intended 20 to expand access. 21 It did a number of really important 22 things, including removing a decades long prohibition 23 of using VOCA funds to serve survivors who are 24 incarcerated.

Many things that were not just tools for

1 expanding access and funding the programs that we need the most, but for changing narratives around these 2 3 issues that I think all of us have highlighted today. 4 Thank you. 5 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much. 6 Commissioner Magpantay? 7 COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Sure. Ms. 8 Hamblett, that was great. And, I appreciated the 9 explanation and how the restorative justice approach, 10 could you just -- not now in this testimony, but could 11 you provide the staff more details on how your 12 restorative justice approach works? And also, how we 13 can scale that up. 14 The COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act actually has 15 an authorization for alternatives to incarceration 16 once there is victimization, and a finding of guilt. 17 So it's maybe a little later on in the process, but 18 I'm still very interested in hearing how your model 19 works. 20 I heard the victim compensation part, but 21 when I was reading the testimony I wanted to see more 22 of what happened with the offender. And what we can 23 try to reestablish you just know, more 24 restorative justice in that process.

So, if you could just provide us, later

1	on, more details, I'm sure the staff, Marik, would be
2	very interested in hearing that as I would, so that we
3	can see how we can scale this up, you know, at the
4	federal level. And if you could also detail out like
5	the different crimes. Like, guns, murder, homicide
6	rate, burglary, to the extent that you have that, it
7	would be remarkably helpful in our study and our
8	research.
9	MS. HAMBLETT: I'm happy to provide that
10	to you.
11	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Thank you.
12	CHAIR GARZA: He sent you with homework.
13	(Laughter.)
14	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Sorry.
15	CHAIR GARZA: I think those are all the
16	questions that we have. I just want to thank you all
17	very, very much for being here today, and for
18	contributing to this conversation.
19	You've given us a lot to think about. I
20	hear you. Data and funding, and some fixes in the
21	programs, and I appreciate that very much. So thank
22	you for being here.
23	We're going to go ahead and break for
24	lunch for an hour, and then we're going to reconvene
25	at, I believe, at 12:52 p.m. All right, thank you.

1 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:52 a.m. and resumed at 12:54 2 3 p.m.) 4 CHAIR GARZA: Welcome back everyone, and for your continued attention to 5 this you 6 important topic. For those of the panelists that 7 haven't been here since this morning, my name is 8 Rochelle Garza. I'm the chair of the Commission. 9 I want to remind everyone that we have a 10 licensed mental health professional available if you 11 need assistance, so please let a staff member know. 12 You can flag them down and we can find a space for 13 folks to speak with the counselor. 14 Just some housekeeping matters. 15 the briefing panel each panelist will have seven 16 minutes to speak. After each panel presentation, 17 Commissioners will have the opportunity to ask 18 questions within the allotted period of time and I 19 will recognize Commissioners who wish to speak. 20 Ι will strictly enforce the time 21 allotments given to each panelist to present his or 22 her statement. And unless we did not receive your 23 testimony until today, you may assume that we have 24 read your testimony, so feel free to summarize it and

we will appreciate that so that you can make the best

use of the seven minutes allotted. So please focus your remarks on our briefing.

Panelists, just want to draw your attention to the warning lights that have been set up in front of you. When the light turns from green to yellow that means you have two minutes remaining. When the light turns red, panelists should conclude your statements so that you don't risk me cutting you off. I will let you finish your statement and your thought, but just try to wrap it up as quickly as you can.

My fellow Commissioners and I will do our part to keep our questions and comments concise.

PANEL 3: IMPACTED PERSONS

And we will now proceed with the third panel, Individuals Impacted by Crime. In the order in which they will speak, our panelists are Nicole Nabors, founder of Grace & Peace Counseling; Demetrius Molina, survivor of neighborhood violence; Lawanda Hawkins, founder of Justice for Murdered Children; Audacia Ray, Director of Community Organizing and Advocacy Anti-Violence Project; Tashica Hilliard, the widow of Deputy Glenn Hilliard; Christina Love, survivor and Executive Director, Rural Alaska Integrated Services.

So I want to thank you all for being here today and being willing to share your experience. Your willingness to speak to us today is going to play a critical role in taking steps to address crime in our country. So I want to say thank you very much. I know this is sensitive and we are all eager to hear from you.

So with that, I'm going to ask each of you to raise your right hand. I'm going to give you an oath.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much. So we'll go ahead and begin with Ms. Nabors.

MS. NABORS: Thank you. My name is Nicole Nabors. I was born in Niagara Falls, New York, and I'm the eldest child of three. I grew up in Rochester, New York and I attended School of the Arts for creative writing and drama. I was an all-city basketball player for three consecutive years. After high school I joined the U.S. Navy. I served on board the USS Theodore Roosevelt and I was an aviation boatswain's mate in crash and salvage. I served in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi --- Enduring Iraqi Freedom.

After my service, I entered into community

college for a year and then I transitioned to seminary, but I was unable to complete my seminary course because in 2006 I was shot and left for dead after witnessing a gunman kill my cousin Lanerra Streeter. I called 911 and directed the authorities to my location. I did not know the physical address, so I used landmarks to navigate the authorities to me. It took over 20 minutes for them to get to me.

Upon waking up in the hospital I was told that I would never walk again. Doctors confirmed that I was shot in my neck, my torso, and my left leg. bullet entered my torso, ricocheted off my internal organs and lodged in the right side of my spine. same bullet also collapsed my left lung. The doctors did not want to remove the bullet because they said it would cause more damage. The other shots are what they call through-and-through. The bullet went straight through my neck; the other one went through The bullet that went through my neck damaged my leq. my upper brachial plexus, which just means that it affects the range of motion in my left arm.

After being shot I experienced quite a bit of rejection. My 25th birthday was exactly one month later and both friends and family walked away. I stopped getting visits. Phone calls went unanswered

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and were not returned. I was also rejected by the health care system.

But before I get into the details of that I want to begin by saying that the surgical team saved my life. I was transported from Niagara Falls to Buffalo by Mercy Flight and rushed into surgery and I was revived twice. And so I will always be grateful to the staff who played a role in treating me.

However, their bedside manners significantly differ from their medical skills. I experienced prejudice and bias almost daily. Being a Black woman who suffered gunshot wounds meant I lived a particular lifestyle. Medical doctors would speak obscenities to me saying things such as no more chilling with the homies, or it's time for a lifestyle change. You've been gifted with your life despite your past decisions; now what are you going to do with it? I would also hear nurses from the hallway say thugs get helped last, ignoring my call light.

Two things were evident: The staff did not watch the news and they believed they believed that I had did something to deserve my circumstance. One by one I educated them all. Most of the staff profusely apologized, but the problem is that they felt it was okay to behave in this manner in the first

place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The biggest question that I have is what if I was a thug? Would it mean that I deserved to hear slander from people who had dedicated their life to helping others heal. Can you imagine having these conversations being in extreme pain and difficulty breathing? Moreover, the impression of such remarks last much longer than the apologies. Mustering up the strength in my most broken state put me in a constant state of alert in a place where I should have been able to rest.

I was in the hospital for 4 months and 14 days and then I was discharged to my father house. When Ι was discharged, Ι was not completely I required help for everything: getting rolling over in the bed, showering, out of bed, getting dressed, food preparation, and more. I had a aide seven days a week for four hours: two hours in the morning and two in the evening, which was not enough. No one explained to me how the extent of my injuries required such a different level of care and I was not -- I was unaware of the different doctors that I needed and I was left to figure those things out on my own.

My medical equipment was flimsy and it was

not sustainable. Even with a personal care aide the devices still weren't sturdy, so I resorted to using sponge baths and disposable pads for bathroom use. I was not given information on how to care for my urological health and after I few months I got a urinary tract infection which led to hospitalization.

I then, after being hospitalized for a month, I went into a nursing home where I learned how to be independent. I experienced prejudice there as well, but by that time I had become immune to it, sadly. But I learned that it wasn't my job to educate ignorance.

A little while after that I was able to get my own apartment where I was on Social Security. I qualified for subsidized housing, and so I moved into a high rise and I began college where my funds were monitored, and college loans, which I'm currently paying back now, were considered income. So that completely changed my cost of living.

Thank you. That completely changed my cost of living. But I did receive a bachelor's in psychology and philosophy and world religion and I also have a master's degree in social work. And just last year I completed my master's in theology.

Currently I continue to face challenges in

the medical field: neglect, doctors not listening, and bias. And I continue to receive aide services to assist with daily tasks and range of motion, but despite those things I currently own my own business.

I'm a mental health therapist. I specialize in grief, loss, and trauma. And I believe that I'm gifted in those areas, not just because I'm astute, but because I am one who is acquainted with the night. I serve on the board of Rochester's Spinal Cord Association. I'm the author of Dance Again: A Journey of Inner Healing.

And I started by introducing myself with my name. I'd like to tell you what my name means. Nicole means victor of the people. Nabors means prophet of light. The Greek associated light with knowledge and the Romans believed that light was referred to as power. The Hebrews associated light with divinity. And so I stand here today not as a victim, but a victor, a woman who was victimized but has been -- but I did not stay there.

I was chosen to come before you today to shed knowledge and hopefully provide insight and understanding about a demographic who are often overlooked. I believe we cannot control what happens to us, but we can help one another make things easier

1 and more pleasant in this life. And so I hope that the power of these stories motivate you to do so. 2 3 Thank you so much for listening. 4 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, Ms. Nabors. 5 6 Now we're going to turn to Mr. Molina. 7 You can begin. 8 MR. MOLINA: Thank you. First, I want to 9 thank the Commissioners for inviting me here. 10 Hello. My name is Demetrius Molina. I want to 11 first introduce myself by telling you all a little 12 about who I am, where I come from, and why I was 13 invited here today. 14 I was born in a small city in upstate New 15 York, a place best known for its maximum security 16 prison and its high crime rate. The small city has 17 had a terrible drug problem since the early '80s. 18 reputation as a money town attracts big city drug 19 dealers looking to make a larger profit. As a result, 20 substance abuse and qun violence became a serious 21 threat to the safety and welfare of the community. 22 When I was born my dad was a 16-year-old 23 who had already been arrested and was well on his way 24 to his first of many prison stints despite the fact

that he was legally a child. My mother was also a

teen mom and became a 16-year-old single mother forced to drop out of high school. My father fell victim to drug abuse and stayed out of prison -- excuse me, stayed out of the picture most of my life. After my father went away to prison my mother shortly fell in love with another man. He was in the picture briefly before being arrested and sentenced to an eight-year prison sentence leaving my mother yet pregnant and single again.

When I was eight years old, I experienced early childhood abuse at the hands of my mother's younger brother. My uncle regularly took me to the park under the guise of spending time with me and forced me to fight other kids my age. He pitted me against some of my friends' younger brothers. They bet and wagered many of the fights. Due to the high stakes my uncle placed extreme pressure on me to win these playground scuffles. When I lost, I became the target of his anger and ridicule. If I won, he rewarded me with Burger King.

Of course this was a big secret to my mom.

He made me lie about everything we did, even the cuts
and bruises had a premeditated story to be told if my
mom questioned me. This went on for quite some time.

Looking back on that experience today it's clear that

this has had a detrimental impact on my development as a child. I was not only taught to lie and be violent, but hurting other people was a good thing.

I've been arrested five times in my life. The first time I was arrested I was 12 years old, a child. One day after school I punched another child for stealing my bike the previous day. The next day when I reported back to school I was pulled out of class and taken to the principal's office where I was arrested in front of my mom.

When I told them that Brian stole my bike, the cops said you should have called the police. But why would I call the police when they took my father away? Why would I call the police when I never considered them people who protected me? Why would I call them when I was taught not to trust the police because they tended to bring more trouble into my neighborhood than solve?

The officers didn't care what was taken from me. No one spoke to me or tried to teach me about a better solution. The police only seemed concerned with giving me a criminal record, and this was well before I heard of the school to prison pipeline and it shaped my undeveloped mind to never place trust in this justice system.

By the time I was 15 most of my friends either bought or sold drugs. With no father figure or any positive male role models to look up to for guidance I became easily influenced by the wrong crowd. My environment had a negative effect on my decision making abilities. Constant exposure to illegal activities desensitized me to crime and violence which contributed to me idolizing drug dealers from my neighborhood. In hindsight it was never a question of if I would sell drugs, but more of a question of when I would.

My fourth arrest was for retaliating against someone who came shooting at my house. This arrest was my first that involved the use of a weapon. The initiator was not arrested because I would not cooperate with the police by identifying the shooter.

Now most of you may question why I chose not to cooperate with the authorities when someone tried to kill me. Well, the answer is simple and has everything to do with the strained relationship between law enforcement and people from inner city communities. People from these communities do not look at police officers as people who are really there to protect and serve. With over-policing, police discrimination, and police brutality being real

threats to minorities, the police are feared and perceived as the enemy. Furthermore, there is culturally a negative stigma associated with cooperating with law enforcement. To be labeled a rat or a snitch in poor communities can be dangerous and sometimes even deadly.

This reluctance to cooperate with law enforcement only perpetuates the strained relationship between them and members of minority communities. Though I was clearly heading down the wrong path the only solution that was ever presented to me was the criminal justice system, not counseling or mentoring or any other community resources.

My last arrest resulted from the shooting death of an innocent bystander who was safely sleeping in the comfort of his home when a stray bullet came through his bedroom killing him while he was asleep. He was a pastor, a father, and a husband; his wife was seven months pregnant at the time. My punishment was a 17 to life-year prison sentence and a lifetime of quilt.

At the lowest point of my life, I was forced to look in the mirror and did not like my reflection. When did I become a violent criminal? There I was repeating history. Twenty-three years

old, abandoning my son, and forcing his mother into a role of a single mother, a product of my own environment inevitably providing the same disadvantages for my son to continue the cycle.

While I was incarcerated, I saw that so many other incarcerated people was like me. They came from child environments where it seems like their destinies were already determined. Recently I read somewhere that trauma explains behavior, but it doesn't excuse it. I agree. And therefore, I do not intend to diminish the gravity of my irresponsible actions by highlighting my hardships. I'm fully aware the negative impact crime and violence had have on society as well as the tremendous pain and suffering I have caused through my extremely poor choices. I only want you to know that I had very few choices in front of me, not that I chose wrong from all possibilities that children from rich households had.

The isolation and separation of prison allowed me to feel once again victimized by a punitive system, however as the years passed any outward impact of my role in this crime took hold of my conscience. I could no longer feel sorry for myself. Slowly but surely my sentiments shifted towards those that my actions affected most: my victim and his family.

I used my prison time to recognize where my poor choices started and focus on making the necessary changes to have a positive impact on my son. My first step in bettering myself was taking full responsibility for my actions. Avoiding conflict in an extremely violent and volatile place is nearly impossible. Violence is the only form of respect in a place that has daily fightings and stabbings. I witnessed gang wars, riots, violence against -- from guards against incarcerated people. I was exposed to pepper spray, tear gas, and even live rounds being shot in the recreation yard.

Incarceration is not the solution.

Consider this: Most incarcerated people will be returning to the same communities they were arrested in, now more prone to violence and facing many challenges of a person with a criminal background.

What is the answer? Unfortunately, it's very rarely the prison system itself. The prison system only provides violence, intimidation, fear, and dehumanization. Community groups have to come in and offer restorative approaches because prison doesn't offer them. I participated in a prison college program and also a prison theater program and I truly believe that these programs are the reason I made it

out of prison as the man I am today, but it's important to distinguish that I made it through prison not because of programs created by the prison, but in spite of the lack of programs provided to incarcerated people by the prison.

Prison staff routinely worked to obstruct volunteer programs. Prison staff openly mocked, punished, and made it harder for people to access and be successful in education programs from outside community groups. Threats ranging from planting drugs or weapons in your cell to leaving your name off of the class roster were often used to deter incarcerated people from participating in programs that could positively impact our lives. Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Molina.

Ms. Hawkins, you can proceed.

MS. HAWKINS: Today I stand before you to share a deeply personal and life-altering experience. It was December the 6th, 1995, a day forever etched in my memory, the day my life changed forever. On that day -- fateful day my only child Reginald was murdered and my world was turned upside down. From that moment my life took a tragic turn. Reggie, the love of my life, my only child, had been taken from me in the most horrific manner imaginable.

My world crumbled around me and I was left with profound emptiness in my heart. The pain of losing a child to such a senseless violence is indescribable. The journey of grief has been long. And even after all these years it's continued. But I share my story not just to recount my own tragedy but to remind us that all -- the impact of murder reaches far beyond the immediate family. It touches family, friends, and entire communities leaving us scarred forever.

In memory of Reggie I strive to find strength in his spirit, remembering the joy and laughter he brought into our lives. And I also seek to honor his memory by raising awareness about the need for support for Black and Brown families. Also in the face of losing Reginald my life -- I had to make a critical life decision. Would I wilt as a flower choked in a garden weeds or will I fight with every fiber in my soul? So I decided to dedicate my life to try to help those who are unable to help themselves.

The reason I'm here today is that I chose to fight back, not for vengeance because that belongs to the Lord, but as a voice for justice, not only for my son Reginald, my sister Linda who unfortunately was

murdered March the 14th, 2011, but also for every victim that prey -- that falls preys to violence and their families -- their friends and families they leave behind.

First, in 1995 we had over 800 homicides in L.A. The lack of trust I felt in December 1995 after the murder of my son in the criminal justice system was deeply rooted in historical and contemporary facts. There were two things that were a problem:

First, there was a guy named Rodney King who was killed in 1992 in L.A. At that time it was called police brutality. Racial tension led to a perception of systematic racism.

Second, the O.J. Simpson case in 1995. My son was murdered in December. O.J. Simpson was sentenced in September or October. It highlighted the racial dynamics in the criminal justice system. It also intensified skepticism about the fairness of the justice system because what we were seeing.

To me the effect of these two events had a lot do with my son's investigation. There was deep-rooted mistrust within the criminal justice system and the community making it more difficult for law enforcement to solve Black and Brown murders in the

'90s. The majority of the Black and Brown murders dating back to the '90s in Los Angeles County remain unsolved. Per a former LAPD chief of police, Chief Willie Williams, a murderer kills in L.A. County two to three times before being arrested if you're Black of Brown. That was in the '90s.

Let's talk about 2023. Now I have a dynamic relationship with the criminal justice system.

Our story is used to collaborate a model in Los Angeles for building trust and addressing the issues faced by Black and Brown. But we still face challenges. To me Black and Brown communities in L.A.

County, like in many other minority communities, often face unique and dis-appropriate challenges when dealing with murder and its aftermath.

First, in a Black and Brown community murder is justified by the criminal justice system, by blaming the victim. Second, in telling us to give those who murder our loved ones a second chance. What about our children? What about us?

Also, we face challenges. Lack of attention is not given. Majority of our cases go unsolved. We have lack of resources in the Black community, economic disparity, distrust of the criminal justice system. And it's a biased

investigation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

stereotyped. For We are instance, derogatory name calling are given to witnesses in our community: snitches and thugs and whistle-blowing from the criminal justice system. Labeling young Black and Brown murder victims as gang bangers, drug daddies, drug dealers based on the ZIP code and association as though it's justifying them being murdered. These labels not only perpetuate stereotypes, but also affects how murder victims' families from these communities are perceived and treated in the criminal justice system.

Negative terminology. The use of negative terminology, calling these murder victim gang bangers and drug dealers, to describe murder victims not only dehumanizes our murder victims, but also perpetuates a cycle of victim blaming. It is crucial to treat all victims with dignity and respect regardless of their background. To me personally these issues undermine the pursuit of justice and further erode trust in the criminal justice system for Black and Brown.

Victim blaming. To be labeling, calling them gang bangers, drug dealers, or witnesses with derogatory terms not only adds to their suffering but also perpetuates a cycle of stigmatization and

discrimination. It is crucial to focus on supporting and understanding the experience of those who have been affected by murder, whether they are victims, witnesses, or their families. Also, it's important for communities, law enforcement, society as a whole to reframe from victim blaming and to stay and work together to support those who have been affected.

We have noticed as Black and Brown murder victims' families in L.A., animals are given more support and attention than our Black and Brown murder victims. How can we believe in a system that is calling us derogatory names and we still paying taxes?

How does murder impact trusted relationship in the community and law enforcement? impacts it greatly. Because if we have the derogatory name calling coming from law enforcement when they're doing investigations, it's hard for us to believe they're doing a great investigation. If you've got your foot on my neck and you're calling my child derogatory names, how can we believe in the criminal justice system? We're hearing it from everywhere. And somebody got to stand up and say stop victimizing victims. We've had it with this craziness. It's only right.

Stop blaming the victims, stop blaming the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Community. And we expect investigations like it's
2	your child being murdered. Yes, we shouldn't have to
3	ask this, but we do. We want public service
4	announcements regarding Black and Brown murder victims
5	like you treat other crime victims. We don't see it.
6	We expect to see it. We want them on the bus stops.
7	We want them in the restrooms. Because we believe
8	people know who murdered our loved ones besides the
9	perpetrator and our kids. We want to be treated just
10	like other crime victims are treated in this country.
11	And why are we being discriminated because we're
12	Black and Brown? This is unfair for Black and Brown
13	murder victims' families to be treated in this fashion
14	in 2023. That's it for me.
15	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Ms. Hawkins.
16	Thank you for that.
17	We're going to turn to Mx. Ray. If you
18	would proceed, please?
19	MX. RAY: My name is Audacia Ray and I'm
20	the Director of Community Organizing and Public
21	Advocacy at the New York City Anti-Violence Project.
22	I'm a bisexual non-binary former sex worker and I'm a
23	survivor of intimate partner and sexual violence and
24	my pronouns are they and she.
25	Today I'm going to be sharing about some

of the cases that the Anti-Violence Project has worked on and some of the families that we've closely with, but first I'll talk a little bit about how AVP works.

The Anti-Violence Project, which was founded in 1980, is the only LGBT-specific victim services agency in New York City and it's the largest organization in the country that's dedicated exclusively to working with LGBTQ and HIV-affected survivors of all forms of violence. And we take a special focus on intimate partner violence, sexual violence, and hate violence.

AVP coordinates the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, or NCAVP, the New York State LGBTQ Intimate Partner Violence Network, and we are partner in the FVPSA-funded National LGBTQ Intimate Partner Violence Institute. We operate a 24/7 English-Spanish hotline for survivors and we provide free legal counseling and advocacy services.

In NCAVP's 2018 report on LGBTQ violence we documented that people of color and transgender or gender non-conforming people were most often victims of hate violence/homicides with 71 percent of the victims being people of color, 52 percent were trans and gender non-conforming people, and 40 percent were specifically transgender women of color.

To get a more complete picture of the disproportionate impacts on violent crime on Black, indigenous, and people of color, data must be collected to reflect multiple marginalization around race and sex and UCCHR's categories must be expanded to include sexual orientation as well as gender identity and presentation.

The FBI has this extremely under-utilized category of multiple bias for hate crimes, but their assessment tools have to be sharpened to recognize the crimes closer to the frequency that they're actually happening. In the 2022 crime data that the FBI recently released nationwide, it determined that there had been more than 11,000 single bias hate crimes, but only 346 multiple bias hate crime incidents.

multiply Considering marginalized identities is really key to understanding responding to what's going on along the lines of race and sex and when hate crimes are documented as anti-Black violence by the FBI the sex of the victim is also documented. And when hate crimes are documented anti-sexual orientation, the sex and race of the victim documented. this demographic are But information is not considered holistically intersectionally, and it has to be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I want to share the story of Deandre Matthews, a 19-year-old Black cisgender gay man from Brooklyn who borrowed his mom's Jeep one night this past February and he didn't come home. Deandre's body was found the next day on train tracks near Brooklyn College. He had a gunshot wound in his head and his body had significant burn wounds. His mother's Jeep was found burnt out nearby and later a medical examiner found that he had suffered from smoke inhalation prior to his death.

In collaboration with the Matthews family,

AVP organized a vigil for Deandre on February 16th,

which was nine days after his body was found. The

event at the Brooklyn Community Pride Center was

standing-room only and alongside Deandre's mother,

Danielle, we made a plea for the horrific crime to be

investigated as a hate crime.

In the following weeks and months, it became clear that Deandre knew his attacker. They had been in communication for more than a year on Deandre's phone there were multiple pictures of them together. And the 19-year-old man who was arrested in May was charged with murder, weapons possession, and evidence tampering. Deandre's murder was not charged as a hate crime because it didn't meet the

standard of hateful intent, nor explicit expression of anti-Black or anti-gay hate during the crime itself.

New York, racist anti-sexual Ιn orientation and anti-gender identity violence are hate crimes and they are documented in the annual FBI For the purpose of this briefing, I want to underscore that there are gaps among how the FBI categorizes these incidents, state laws around inclusivity and discrimination categories, and the limited discrimination categories of sex and race that the Commission uses.

As we've learned more about the circumstances of Deandre's homicide, AVP has been highlighting the complex intersections of hate violence, intimate partner violence, and hookup violence that were present in this crime. That analysis, however, is not at all present in the data or in the charges around the case.

The second example I want to share with you today is a pattern of five homicides in Jacksonville, Florida during 2018. All of the victims were women who were both Black and trans and all of them were victims of gun violence. It's important to say their names. Antash'a English, Cathalina Christina James, Celine Walker, Jessie Sumlar, Sasha

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Garden.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Although five murders is a significant pattern and the local community expressed concern about the possibility of a serial killer, the Jacksonville Sheriff's Department was very lax in their investigations and in communicating publicly about the cases. Several of the homicide victims were misgendered and deadnamed in the press, which delayed the process of identifying them and connecting with loved ones.

Trans people don't often share their legal or deadnames even with close friends, so when they're reported as missing under their known name but documented by police or coroners under their deadnames, their loved ones don't know what happened to them.

Because law enforcement officials were not trans-competent the investigations slowed and the community became even more distrustful of the police. And while it's necessary for police to be transcompetent and affirming, it's even more important for there to be substantial support for community reporting mechanisms that do involve law not enforcement.

As reported in Lambda Legal's 2023

publication Protected and Served, Black participants had contact with the police in the previous five years at rates 18 percent higher than non-Black respondents, and 36 percent of Black participants do not trust the police at all. And this is specifically folks who are Black and LGBTQ.

To get a more complete picture of the disproportionate impacts of violent crime on Black people, data must be collected in a way that reflects the multiple marginalization around race and sex and the categories have to be expanded to include sexual gender identity orientation as well presentation. Because of the mistrust and the fear that many Black and multiply marginalized people have towards law enforcement, community-based reporting can assist in collecting more accurate data that reflects feels comfortable reporting to just who police, but more expansively who's experiencing violence.

Black people have consistently represented over 82 percent of non-White victims of all reported violence from 2017 to 2022, and over these five years, anti-Black hate violence increased 66 percent while hate violence increased by 58 percent. The only population experiencing harm at a faster pace are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 people of LGBTQ identities, and there's a significant crossover between those communities. 2 3 For sexual orientation and gender 4 identity-based violence the increase from 2017 to 2022 was over 90 percent. Year to year, hate violence 5 6 continues to climb with disproportionate 7 targeting race and ethnicity and also demographics 8 correlating with sexual orientation and gender 9 identity. 10 Without a concerted effort to reduce hate 11 violence and to document the multiple bias incidents, 12 individuals who are at the intersection of race, 13 sexual orientation and gender identity will continue 14 to be over-represented in violent victimization 15 reporting and with significant risks of these surges 16 continuing to trend. Thank you. 17 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Mx. Ray. 18 Now we're going to turn to Ms. Hilliard. 19 You can proceed. 20 MS. HILLIARD: Good afternoon. My name is 21 Tashica Hilliard. I'm a newly-licensed nurse, mother 22 and three, and sadly the widow of Glenn Hilliard who 23 was murdered. 24 Today I'm here to speak about my husband, 25 Wicomico County Deputy Sheriff Glenn Hilliard, who was brutally murdered while on duty on June 12th, 2022. Had Former Baltimore City State's Attorney Marilyn Mosby held violent criminals accountable, my husband may still be alive today.

Glenn was adopted at the age of four years old and raised in Newark, New Jersey. As a child Glenn was fascinated by and often drawn to anything law enforcement related. During his senior year of high school Glenn visited and toured the campus of the University of Maryland Eastern Shore, a historically Black university. Glenn told me that when he first saw the campus he fell in love with the quiet area as it was a far cry from the hustle and bustle and high crime rates associated with Newark.

Before becoming a deputy sheriff Glenn worked as a seasonal police officer in Ocean City, Maryland during the summer of his first year of college. Glenn told me that when he worked in the seasonal position, he knew for sure that law enforcement was his number one career choice. Glenn changed his major from computer science and graduated with a bachelor's degree in criminal justice in the winter of 2003.

During college Glenn also worked in student security and had the opportunity to meet with

and form relationships with local law enforcement officers. Because of those relationships and his character, Glenn was offered a position at the local police department, which he accepted. Glenn then enrolled and completed his formal police training at a local community college.

Glenn worked as a police officer at a couple of different small agencies before he was sworn in as deputy sheriff at Wicomico County Sheriff's Office in 2012. Glenn was never shy about his many accomplishments and certifications throughout his career with advancing to the SWAT Team being at the top of his list. Anyone who ever met or worked with Glenn knew that he was born to be a law enforcement officer. He was excellent at his job and he loved every minute of it.

June 12th, 2022, was a Sunday. As Glenn got ready for work I — to leave for work I gave him a kiss and told him to come back safely, as I always did. He replied, "I shoot first," as he always did, as he walked out the door. A few hours later I texted Glenn and he responded with, "I will call you when I clear this call." Nothing unusual about that except that night he never did get the chance to call me back.

As I mentioned before, Glenn was extremely great at his job and he was most proud when he was able to serve a warrant, especially on someone who may be a danger to the community. So, on the evening of June 12th, 2022, Glenn -- when Glenn heard the call that a convicted felon with an active fugitive warrant who may also be armed was nearby his location, he immediately began searching. Because Glenn was so good at what he did it did not take him long to spot and begin pursuit of the suspect.

Glenn spotted the suspect peeking out from under the stairwell at the apartment complex. Glenn got out of his car and yelled for the suspect to stop. Unbeknownst to Glenn the suspect had spotted him first and was lying in wait fully armed, ready and disgustingly excited to take a life. Glenn announced himself and the suspect started running and my husband took chase.

During the very short chase Glenn announced that his taser was drawn and would be deployed if the suspect did not surrender. Then the suspect, who had a backpack over his shoulder, only took a few more steps before reaching into his backpack and produced a 9mm handgun equipped with laser site with 30 rounds magazine -- a fully loaded

magazine and shot my husband three times. One round hit Glenn's shoulder. The other hit Glenn in the forehead. As I recall the medical examiner described it as an instantly fatal shot.

The suspect, a 20-year-old White male, had been arrested 20 times as a juvenile and now 10 times as an adult. Within his short time of being an adult, the suspect had already had multiple incidences of robbery, second-degree assault, malicious destruction of property, and the list goes on. In 2019 he was facing up to a 25-year prison sentence due to the use of a handgun during an armed robbery.

The Baltimore City state's attorney authorized for the suspect to receive probation before judgment and not the minimum sentence. After pleading guilty to one count of armed robbery, the suspect continued to be arrested throughout different counties in Maryland, but his probation was never violated until sometime in May or early June.

The suspect was prohibited from having a firearm, possessing a firearm due to his prior felony convictions, but as Glenn always told me, gun laws are for law-abiding citizens, not criminals. The only thing that could have saved my husband's life that night would have been if the suspect were in prison

where he belonged.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I was raised in a household that saw no color and I was taught to believe we are all just people, children of God. So it was not until I began at our local courthouse working with career criminals, not unlike the suspect, that I started to become aware that sometimes preconceptions preceded The suspect fit the demographic of clients sentences. that I often work with in a jail diversion program: White, early 20s, not the best childhood, seemingly needing direction. Unfortunately throughout my career I noticed that young Black males with the same circumstances were often labeled as violent, or drug dealers.

It's unfortunate to say, but after finding out about the suspect's identity and history, I had to wonder if the state's attorney in Baltimore decided that this was a poor young White kid who clearly did violent actions but somehow deserved multiple chances to actually prove he was violent. I thought that if this had been a young Black male would the sentence have been the same or would the kid have still been sitting in prison and my husband may still be alive today? If it was that the state's attorney was giving him opportunity himself, an to prove then

1 unfortunately he did just that and proved himself to be a violent heartless murderer of whom the court 2 3 should be protecting us from and not letting out on 4 the streets. The murderer was eventually captured, 5 6 tried, and convicted this past June and sentenced to 7 life plus 66 years. I feel that the state's attorney 8 had been -- if the state's attorney had been more 9 proactive and allowed prosecutors to violate the 10 suspect's probation and put him in jail, my husband 11 may still be alive today. 12 husband, love of my life, 13 children's father is gone, but he died doing what he 14 loved and he died a hero. Although my children will 15 be facing endless life events without their father, 16 they are comforted in knowing that he did everything 17 right on the night of his murder and he lost his life 18 saving the lives of countless others. Thank you for 19 the opportunity to talk today. 20 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much for your 21 testimony, Ms. Hilliard. 22 We're going to turn to our final panelist, 23 Christina Love. Whenever you're ready. We can take a 24 moment.

MS. LOVE: It's a lot.

25

(Native language

spoken.) My name is Christina Love. I'm an Egegik Village tribal member. I've traveled very, very far to be here today.

My family's from Egegik Village where we have been for 10,000-plus years. I was raised in the village of Chitina in the interior on Ahtna land and today I live on Lingít Aaní, home to the Áak'w and T'aakú Kwáan people of the Tlingit Nation, also known as Juneau, Alaska.

I'm very, very grateful to be here. It's a miracle that I'm here. I know that you're all aware of the statistics of violence, that Native people are more likely to be murdered, to be physically abused or sexually abused than we are to own land, to graduate from college, or to be here today.

I'm a senior specialist on intersectionality. And that just means that we can't talk about domestic violence and sexual assault without talking about incarceration and homelessness and substance use. A big part of my job is to normalize the ways that people survive and to place the blame where it belongs. Mental health and substance use are natural reactions to violence; it's the violence that is not the natural thing.

I want to tell a couple of stories, and I

know that there's the stories that I provided for you, but I want to highlight a couple of other things that are not in the brief.

Fifteen years ago, my body was left in a ditch for dead. And I draw on this experience often when I think about what it took to climb out of that ditch covered in my own blood and bruised and flagging down a person to receive medical care. And that of itself is trauma, but the trauma that I want to highlight is what happened after, that while I was in medical services and interacting with law enforcement and advocates there continued to be a profound misunderstanding and misconception about who survivors are.

People said things like if I hadn't been addicted then I wouldn't have been abused, or if I hadn't been in that flophouse then those things would have never happened. And I believed them for a really long time. I believed that I was to blame for the harm that had happened to me, and I believed that it was my fault that I was addicted. But if we rewind back to when I was 12 years old when my father went to prison for sexually abusing his children, there were no supports then there either and we were blamed for that harm.

And if we rewind back even further to my mother and the harm that she experienced while in BIA school, the Bureau of Indian Affairs -- my mother is a boarding school survivor. And that was a very hard decision that our family made because during the 1970s it was illegal to have a mental health issue and my mother was born with developmental disabilities. And we could go into -- about the why of that. Because she didn't have the adequate medical care that she needed that could have prevented those things from early on. She has Graves' disease. But her family chose to place her in BIA school so that she wouldn't be taken to Morningside Hospital, because at the time mental health was criminalized.

And I'm telling you this because -- and that wasn't that long ago. We have survivors that went to -- I've interviewed survivors of internment camps that are still alive, which is just another word for concentration camps, in Alaska. Our villages were removed during war to the land of the Tlingit people where they survived grave physical and sexual abuse. So when they were hungry, they were given alcohol. When they were thirsty, they were given alcohol. When they were cold because they didn't have shelter, they were given alcohol.

This is the story of how we got here to today, that we have the systems that we pay for, that this subject is not complicated. What we're talking about is things that were taken from our communities. And the solution is that those things would be brought back. Thousands of years of parenting skills. Once they're removed they don't magically reappear. Violence is a learned behavior. And people who brought people here against their will were the first abusers and people who violently stole land and violently stole culture were the first abusers. And what we end up with is what we have here today.

And so the shorter story is that these are the institutions that we have inherited. These policies and practices we did not write. They were not made for us and they were not made by us. And so we have -- we are all here today. And in preparation I thought about the thousands of people who have sat in this seat before me, the brilliant scholars of law and survivors and activists who have made the same plea to all of you, too, to do something differently, that this is all of our country.

And I believe that we got here because of a dream that wasn't ours. And it will take all of us to have the courage and the determination. I have to

believe that even though right now earlier this week I was in trial for my own sexual assault. On March 3rd of this year, I celebrated 10 years of recovery from heroin, 10 years of recovery from incarceration, that I learned how to grow back into the community. And I get to be here today because people believed in my worth, because they looked me in the eye and they told me that they didn't think that I was a bad person, but just somebody who had experienced a lot of trauma. And we have the opportunity to tell that story about who people are.

And so there's a couple of major solutions that I want to focus on. One of them is what we call equity audits. And that's an opportunity to re-center our services. Law enforcement -- everything that law enforcement needs, that medical providers need, advocates need, all survivors need, all of us need. When I go into a sexual assault and I'm working with somebody, there's so often that I'm encountering law enforcement officers and medical officers who have no heart response. And I know that the victim that I'm working with, her and I, we're going to be just fine. But the people that we're encountering who don't have this heart response, who don't have access to medical care, who don't have access to these things, yes,

housing would be very, very beneficial as well as the full continuum of care.

Cost-free initiatives include changing the language of — that we tell the whole story about how we got here, and we get very clear about what those solutions are, that I was not sexually assaulted, but he sexually assaulted me and that we be very clear about the people who are being harmed because there is a false dichotomy of us and them and perpetrators. It's not political that we are not vulnerable people, that we're targeted people. And that's what makes us vulnerable. That on the front page serial killers say that they are going after people that no one looks for, that nobody listens to. And they're right.

We have -- in our communities one out of three communities has no response at all. In the report you'll see that there are several communities when we call for 9-1-1 no one comes. And so we have these entire systems that deem certain groups of people -- it's not a coincidence that women are harmed more than men. It's not a coincidence that Black and Brown and indigenous people are harmed more that our LGBTQ two-spirit relatives are harmed more. We have to ask these questions about who's being harmed as

well as the solutions. Thank you so much. 1 2 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. 3 Love. 4 And thank you to all of our panelists for your testimony and your bravery in sharing your 5 6 stories with us today. I know I can speak on behalf 7 of my fellow Commissioners that we're very touched by 8 your words. 9 At this point I'm going to open us up to 10 questions. And I believe we still have a 11 Commissioners on the phone, so I'd like to open it up 12 to them first. Is there anyone on the phone that has 13 a question? 14 (Simultaneous speaking.) 15 CHAIR GARZA: We'll go with Commissioner 16 Gilchrist and then Commissioner Kirsanow. 17 COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Madam Chair, 18 Commissioner Gilchrist here. I don't 19 questions, but I certainly just want to thank the 20 panelists for those heartfelt remarks. This testimony 21 certainly again informs us about the work that we not 22 only are doing with this particular issue, but how we 23 continue to look at the implications of this work 24 going forward. And so I just thank them for coming

and sharing with us today during our briefing.

1 I CHAIR GARZA: appreciate that, Commissioner Gilchrist. 2 Commissioner Kirsanow? 3 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No questions. 5 Thank you. CHAIR GARZA: Vice Chair Nourse? 6 7 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: I just want to share 8 my sentiment with you, that you all touched me very 9 And I've been working on these issues for 30 10 years and I've never seen such brave people. So thank 11 Thank you for sharing your struggles and your you. 12 pain with us. 13 COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Ι echo the 14 sentiments. 15 CHAIR GARZA: Yes, I echo it as well. 16 know that a few of you weren't here earlier this 17 morning, but I just want to point out that we heard 18 from experts this morning about different issues that 19 have contributed, different highlights in terms of 20 care after victimization including victim services, 21 issues with even having access. I was surprised to 22 learn -- I'm from Texas and I was very surprised to 23 learn that our Victims' Compensation Program 24 although women more likely to apply are

compensation, are less likely to receive it.

1 So I just want to point out that we've heard from these panelists that are -- that identified 2 3 all of the things that you all spoke about. And so I 4 just wanted to pose a general question of what you feel -- I mean what you feel is the most needed in 5 6 terms of addressing the issues that each of you faced. 7 I mean, we could start with Ms. Nabors, if 8 you have any thoughts there. 9 MS. NABORS: Thank you so much. 10 big question. I think an education I think 11 important, really getting some cultural sensitivity 12 courses for the medical field I think that would be 13 really important. Education about crimes victim 14 services. 15 I was really blessed. Like I said, 16 injury happened 17 years ago, so I was able to stay in 17 the hospital for four-and-a-half months. Now people 18 are shot and they're sent home in two weeks. 19 couldn't imagine what that would be like. And they're 20 sent back to the same environment. So it's not 21 accessible. They can't use the bathroom, anything 22 like that, and they're not told about crime victims, 23 which is a federally-funded service. 24 And every state doesn't have it, but in

New York State that will pay for anything dealing with

your injury. A lot of people don't have that knowledge or they're not provided with a social worker to help fill out that information. So I would say crime victims and cultural sensitivity.

I actually work on that on a small scale in Rochester, New York with Rochester Spinal Association. We have clinics for the residents and the doctors to come in. And we share our experience and we talk about statistics of what's going on to hopefully bring about change. But that's on a very small scale in comparison to the nation. So that would be my thoughts. Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: If anyone else would like to share something?

MR. MOLINA: Yes, I believe that the biggest issue is the strained relationship between law enforcement and members of inner city communities. And the reason that is, is because from my experience not having trust in law enforcement and not really believing that they were there to help and protect caused me to do things that led to the path that I took.

And also like the police officers and things not really having much experience or knowledge with dealing with people in the inner city

communities. Most of their presence always resulted in they're responding to a crime or something that happened and someone's being arrested. So if there was some sort of programs that can kind of bridge the gap between the inner city communities and law enforcement, I believe that the strained relationship could be strengthened and create trust. This lack of trust is what's led to a lot of issues.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for that.

Ms. Love?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LOVE: Thank you so much for asking the question. What I've learned with looking at other solutions is that we can't change public policy without public opinion. We've written beautiful omnibus crime bills that people didn't understand. They didn't understand the science of addition, they didn't understand the science of trauma, they don't understand -- I think that often when we look at the full continuum of what communities need and the very limited options, then we end up in this cycle of overcriminalization. There are entire states that would collapse without the economic benefits of what is slave labor and how that contributes to increased violence within those communities.

So first I would ask for an equity audit

that centers people who have been directly impacted.

I heard somebody quote Glenn Martin. And the other part of that quote was really important. So the quote is the people closest to the problem are closest to the solution, but furthest from resources and power. Myself and other people here, we have all the solutions, but we've never had access to the social capital, we've never had access to the power, the resources to make those changes.

We can tell you that economic instability and that housing and employment -- that all of those things that people need, those basic needs. When we look at the hierarchy of need, formally known as Maslow's -- was stolen from the Blackfeet Nation. The other part of that that's missing is the community context. And what -- that there isn't anything wrong with people or communities. There are only things that are missing.

And for some people and for some communities those are big things. And for some people and for some communities those are things that have been missing -- or sorry. Let me rephrase that. The other part of this is language. Things that were taken. I didn't lose my language or my culture. They were taken from us.

it's a paradigm shift that would restore power to communities and people who have been directly impacted at every single level. So hiring people with lived experience, bringing people in with lived experience to do these equity audits that includes language, using the right language, people who perpetrate harm, right? So then we get rid of that false dichotomy of who is committing crime.

And we name them as people first and we tell the whole story about what addiction really is and what's happening to this community. That's real liberation when you know that you've been living life in a certain way because you didn't have access to other -- Maya Angelou is another -- we do the best we can until we know another way. And so it takes all of us to tell the whole story and ensure that people have what they need. Because when we do -- myself and others are the example of that. When we're given the resources that we choose something differently. Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you.

Ms. Hawkins, were you wanting to --

MS. HAWKINS: I think it should start with education and with the criminal justice system, it

needs to be educated on culture sensitivity when it comes to Black and Brown murdered victims, because there is no training on that. And by it not being trained in 2023 it puts us further and further back. It has to start at the top. We hear on TV even from Congress and Senate -- they call them victims whistleblowers and these derogatory names. It has to stop. It has to stop from the top.

And demand that law enforcement, the judges, the DA, the public defenders do not use these derogatory name calling when it comes to murdered victims. We did it when it came to rape with women who walk the street. It became a law that you -- because if I were a prostitute you couldn't call me a prostitute when I came to a rape case in to the courtroom.

We need that to happen for murder victims. The derogatory name calling of murder victims and witnesses. And that's a problem in our community because if you come forward, like you said, you'd be calling a snitch, a sell-out. And then they got these things: snitches get stitches. And so we have to change that whole -- you got to change it. And you all have the power and the resources that we don't have in our community, as she indicated. We don't

have it. And for us to be in 2023, there's not one public service announcement in this country regarding murder. That's unacceptable.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you.

MX. RAY: I'm thinking a little bit about a question actually that Commissioner Jones asked in an earlier panel about the gap between communities doing things for themselves and what we require from the federal government. And I think what's coming up really strongly in this panel is that we need both. We need the investment of federal government and we also need support for our communities. Because our communities know what we need and we know how to get there and we must be treated as experts, not just on our own lives.

I always love panels of survivors. It's always the best part of any hearing. And also we are all folks who have solutions that are not just here to tell a painful personal story. We have — through our lives have understood like what needs to shift in order for that to work. And part of that also requires folks from our communities being included in those policy conversations.

Policy conversations are not over our heads. And if they are, it's because they're being

1	put together in a very obtuse way. So we can engage
2	in those conversations and we should be at those
3	tables, not just to tell sad stories, but also to
4	really be invested in ourselves and invest in how do
5	we shift this together?
6	CHAIR GARZA: Would anyone else like to
7	make a comment?
8	No, you're okay. You don't have to. I'm
9	not going to call on anyone. I just want to make sure
10	I give everyone the opportunity to say what they want
11	to say.
12	Well, I'm hearing no more questions at
13	this point and I just from the bottom of my heart
14	I'm so grateful and thankful for your presence here
15	today.
16	I know you traveled very far, Ms. Love,
17	Ms. Hilliard. I know a lot of folks Mr. Molina.
18	I appreciate you coming here today sharing
19	your stories and participating in this important
20	panel. We're going to incorporate a lot of what we've
21	heard today into the ultimate report that we'll
22	produce. So thank you again very much.
23	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Exactly that.
24	Thank you. And I give you my personal assurance that
25	everything that you have said, I have been listening

1 and taking notes constantly and hearing your stories. And as I'm on this Commission, we will work very hard 2 3 to figure out the issues that we can do with this 4 government to bring healing and justice for these issues that you all have raised. Thank you. 5 6 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. We're going to 7 go ahead and take a break, a 10-minute break. 8 reconvene at 2:06 p.m. for our fourth and final panel. 9 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went 10 off the record at 1:56 p.m. and resumed at 2:14 p.m.) 11 VIII. PANEL 4: RESEARCHER & POLICY EXPERTS 12 CHAIR GARZA: Good afternoon. We will now 13 proceed with our fourth panel, researchers and policy 14 experts. Thank you all for being here this afternoon. 15 I'm going to give you some details about how this is 16 going to run. 17 Each panelist is going to have seven 18 After each panel presentation, minutes to speak. have the opportunity to 19 Commissioners will 20 questions within the allotted time period. And I will 21 recognize Commissioners who wish to speak. 22 Ι will strictly enforce the time 23 allotments given to each panelist to present his or 24 her statement. And unless we did not receive your 25 testimony until today, you may assume that we have

read it so feel free to summarize it. And we will appreciate that so you can make use of the seven minutes you've been allotted. Please focus your remarks on the topic of our briefing.

I want to draw your attention to the system of warning lights that we have set up. They are in front of you. When the light turns from green to yellow, that means you have two minutes remaining. And when the light turns red, panelists should conclude their statements. So just wrap up what you're going to say. I don't want to interrupt you. That would be my preference. But we do have to be mindful of time.

My fellow Commissioners and I will do our part to keep our questions and comments concise. the order in which our panelists are speaking, we have with us today, Patrick Sharkey, The William S. Tod Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs, Princeton University. We have John Lott, President of Crime Prevention Research Center, John Paul Wright, Professor at the University of Cincinnati, Mallory O'Brien, Associate Scientist at the Johns Hopkins University, Rafael Manqual, Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Mona Sahaf, Reshaping Prosecution Director at the Vera Institute of Justice.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 So I'm going to ask each of you to raise 2 your right hand to take an oath. Will you swear and 3 confirm that the information that you are about to 4 provide us is true and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief? 5 6 (Witnesses sworn.) 7 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much. Dr. 8 Sharkey, we can begin with you. 9 DR. SHARKEY: Great. Thank you. 10 a long day for all of you. Thanks for sticking with 11 And also thanks to Bridget Brew and Latrice us. 12 Foshee for -- I hope I pronounced that right -- for 13 setting this up, putting it all together. 14 So I will use this opportunity to make 15 three points about the lessons from research conducted 16 on trends in violence from the 1990s to the present. 17 And the first point I want to make is that the decline 18 of violence that took place from the 1990s to the 19 through the mid-2010s had its greatest impact on the 20 most disadvantaged segments of the population. 21 So from '91 to 2014, the U.S. murder rate 22 fell by half, by more than half, and violence fell to 23 some degree; in almost every major city it fell by 75 24 percent or more in cities like Los Angeles, Dallas,

San Diego here in DC and elsewhere.

25

It completely

1 transformed cities where violence fell to this degree. 2 Equally important, the greatest impact of 3 the crime decline was experienced by the 4 disadvantaged segments of the population and in the most disadvantaged communities. 5 The simplest way to make this point is to 6 7 look at lives lost. Dr. Michael Friedson and I 8 conducted a study in which we estimated the effect of 9 the national decline in murder on life expectancy and 10 found that the crime drop should be seen as perhaps 11 the most important public health advancement for Black 12 men of the past several decades. 13 But the drop in violence in the 1990s 14 didn't just save lives. It also improved academic 15 It narrowed racial gaps in achievement. 16 children's cognitive affected development. 17 Separate research with Dr. Gerard Torrats-Espinosa 18 showed that declining violence in young people's 19 communities has a causal impact on their probability 20 of experiencing upward mobility, moving out of poverty 21 as they reach adulthood. 22 So the lesson here is that when violence 23 falls, the most disadvantaged communities benefit the 24 most.

Point number two: American cities remain

vulnerable to rising violence because our nation's approach has relied primarily on aggressive policing, mass incarceration and has not dealt with the prevalence of guns.

I wrote a book on the decline of violence that was published in 2018 in which I argued that the fall of violence should be seen as a victory for urban America. And yet I titled the book, Uneasy Peace. Why? Well, as I wrote in the preface, the decline in violence that changed urban America is fragile.

So let me say this clearly. It is not possible to build a lasting sustained peace through mass incarceration, through aggressive policing, through intensive surveillance targeted toward low income communities of color. It is not possible to build a lasting peace when an unregulated supply of guns circulates through communities.

It is not possible to build a lasting peace without investment designed to strengthen the local institutions that keep communities safe while also building stronger neighborhoods.

In the years since that book came out in 2018, my concerns about the fragility of the drop in violence have been borne out. From 2014 to 2022, the national murder rate has risen by 43 percent. A study

I conducted with Alisabeth Marsteller showed that the rise of gun violence had been most pronounced in predominantly Black neighborhoods and in low income neighborhoods.

And I just want to emphasize, this is not a broad rise in crime. This is purely a rise in gun violence. Gun crime is the only form of crime that risen 2019. has since So just the as most disadvantaged communities benefitted the most when violence fell, those communities have experienced the greatest impact of the recent rise of violence.

Point Number 3: A strong body of evidence points toward a new model to confront violence while building stronger communities. This latest rise of violence leaves us with a challenging question. How can we move forward with a new model that not only reduces violence, but also builds stronger neighborhoods, rebuilds trust between residents and law enforcement and continues to reduce the massive scale of federal, state, and local systems of prisons and jails?

And I will conclude with three complementary approaches. The first is to invest in policies that allow law enforcement agencies to rebuild trust with the communities they serve.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Federal and state funding can be used to support local law enforcement agencies through hiring more officers in cities and towns with insufficient resources to deal with the challenge of gun violence and tying that funding to approaches explicitly design to build trust and legitimacy.

The second approach is to implement the most basic regulations of firearms in order to better track the circulation of guns and ensure that they are kept out of the hands of individuals with a history of mental illness, domestic violence or serious crime.

A study I published just a couple weeks ago with Megan Kang, a doctoral student at Princeton, found that accumulation of basic state level gun regulations passed in 40 states from 1991 to 2016 had a causal impact on reducing all forms of gun mortality, saving 4,000 lives annually. That's about 10 percent of gun deaths in the U.S.

State regulations, many of which have broad public support across the political spectrum, including gun owners, have provided a clear template for how to reduce gun deaths nationally.

The third and most important approach is to turn toward community residents and local organizations to play central roles in the effort to

1 build safe, strong neighborhoods and cities. 2 By this point, we have a large body of 3 rigorous research, including experimental evaluations, 4 making clear that local community organizations played 5 a central role in contributing to the crime drop of the 1990s and can be remarkably effective in reducing 6 7 violence. We as a nation have simply never given 8 community organizations the resources they need to 9 become central actors the efforts in 10 communities safe. 11 So, to summarize those three 12 recommendations: support local law enforcement in the 13 effort to rebuild trust, enact basic regulations on 14 the sale or and access to guns, and turn toward 15 community organizations to reduce violence. 16 you. 17 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Dr. Sharkey. 18 will now hear from Dr. Lott if you would please 19 proceed. 20 DR. LOTT: Thank you. Ι greatly 21 appreciate being invited here today. As we have heard 22 many times today, Blacks disproportionately 23 higher murder rates. People commit crimes primarily 24 against people who are like themselves, both in terms

of race and social/economic status.

In my written testimony, I discuss how the costs of crime are much broader than just the direct victims of crime. And so I'm not going to go really through that right now.

There are several points I want to make.

One is single parent families are a major contributing problem to all sorts of social problems, including crime. But unfortunately, the government has played a major role in the breakdown of families.

Another point is if you make it riskier for criminals to commit crime, you will have less crime. You can stop crime with higher arrest rates, higher conviction rates, longer prison sentences, but you can also do it by letting victims be able to go and protect themselves with guns.

either all guns or all handguns that we have crime data for has shown murder rates and homicide rates go up, every single time. If guns on net are that bad, as some have argued, you would think it would be easy to find lots of places that have banned guns where you see murder rates go down or at least stay the same. And yet every time they go up.

If by randomness, you would think once or twice you could go and see that murder rates would go

down, but yet they go up every single time. And the question is why? And the basic point is that when you ban guns, it's the most law-abiding, good citizens who turn in their guns, not the criminals. And to the extent that you disarm law-abiding citizens relative to criminals, you may take a few guns away from criminals, you actually make it easier for criminals to go and commit crimes.

And this point applies to gun control laws generally, not just bans. You have to be careful that the gun control laws that you are passing primarily disarm the victims that are there.

I just want to make a couple quick points from earlier panels. With all the discussion about guns, it is important to recognize that 92 percent of violent crime has nothing to do with guns. Firearms are not the leading cause of death of children, despite being referenced several times today.

A number of references have been made to AR-15s, just so people know, AR-15s are small caliber, semi-automatic hunting rifles. They just look different, but they function identically to any semi-automatic gun. About 85 percent of the guns in the United State are semi-automatic.

Assault weapons have not reduced the mass

public shootings, the ban that we had from '94 to 2004. There is one academic, Louis Klarevas has his own unique definition of mass shootings that he collects there, and that's the one that President Biden and others refer to constantly.

But the problem that you have with that is that if you look at the percent of mass shootings, mass public shootings that involve assault weapons, even using his unique measure, it actually went up during that period of time. The only way that it could drive a decline was if the share fell over the period.

As far as mass public shootings being a uniquely an American problem, it was mentioned by several of the people today if you look over the last 20 years, the United States accounts for 4.6 percent of the world population, but 1 percent of the world's mass public shootings. There are many countries in Europe that set a higher per capita rates of mass public shootings than the United States has.

Guns in the home do not increase the risk of homicides and suicides. I can talk about that. I was chief economist for the U.S. Sentencing Commission, and I can tell you the sentencing quidelines increased disparity rather than decreasing

it. And academic research shows that poverty rates changes only explain one to two percent of the variation in crime rates.

Onto other things. If my research convinces me of anything, it is the most vulnerable people in our society who benefit the most from having guns and are harmed the most by gun control. The people who benefit the most have two groups. The people who are most likely victims of violent crime and that overwhelmingly tends to be poor Blacks who live in high crime urban areas and people who are relatively weaker physically, women and the elderly. And, unfortunately, gun control laws discriminate against the poor and minorities.

Let me just talk about background checks as an example. We frequently hear that there are 4 million dangerous prohibited people that have been prevented from buying guns because of background checks. That is simply false. What they should say is there have been 4 million initial denials. And virtually all of those, about 99 percent of those, are mistakes, false positives.

The thing is, when you go and you buy a gun, you are providing all this information. What they do in the next background check is look at

1 roughly phonetically similar names and similar birthdays. The problem is that people tend to have 2 3 names similar to others in their racial groups. 4 Hispanics have names similar to other Blacks tend to have names similar to other 5 Hispanics. 6 Blacks. Thirty-three percent of Black males are 7 Eighteen percent of Hispanic males felons. 8 Six percent of white males are felons. felons. Three 9 percent of Asian males are felons. 10 Where are you most likely going to see the 11 mistakes being made then when you have looking at 12 things like roughly phonetically similar names? 13 are going to be discriminating against law abiding 14 good Black and Hispanic males simply because they have 15 a roughly phonetically similar name to somebody who is 16 a felon, who is prohibited. 17 If private companies did background checks 18 in the same way that the federal government does, 19 under federal law they would be sued out of business. 20 Why can't we require that the federal government have 21 to meet the same standards for doing background checks 22 that private companies have to meet?

You look at the fees. If I were to go and give John or somebody else here a gun, here in DC, we would have to go through a background check. It costs

23

24

\$125 to do a background check on a private transfer of a gun.

I will give you an example. Let's say I'm going to give one other person four guns. One person giving one other person four guns, you'd think it is just one background check because the same person is getting all guns. In DC, and most of the other states that have these background checks, these universal background checks, they require a separate background check on each gun. So rather than \$125, it would cost \$500 for me to transfer the guns from one person to another.

Give me a benign explanation for why that's set up that way other than just to make it costly for law-abiding people who are trying to go out of their way to go and obey the law to be able to go and protect themselves and their families. There is no other benign explanation other than making it costly.

Who do you think you're stopping? You're stopping poor people. And the same thing with the errors in the background check system. You have a situation where the middle income -- you let people go over a minute earlier today. I'm almost done.

CHAIR GARZA: Just go ahead and finish.

1 DR. LOTT: You have a system here where it's middle income and poor people who they can go and 2 3 hire a lawyer to go and fix the mistakes in the 4 background check system. But who wants to pay \$3,000, 5 even if they want to have a gun, even if they can 6 afford to do it, just to fix a mistake that the 7 government made and not the individuals? Thank you 8 very much for your time. 9 CHAIR GARZA: Okay. Thank you. Now we'll 10 turn to Dr. Wright. 11 DR. WRIGHT: Thank very much. you 12 uncharted Criminologically speaking, we are in 13 territory. In years prior when asked about levels and 14 rates of crime, we had reasonably accurate statistics 15 generated from well-known processes. In recent years 16 that has changed. That has changed dramatically, much 17 of it stemming from COVID and related social protests. 18 As part of the pandemic response, for 19 example, large parts of our economy, educational 20 system and more relevant to this panel criminal 21 justice system were drawn down. 22 The drawdown of the justice system was 23 widespread and clearly impacted the data generating 24 processes used to estimate the volume and distribution

example,

For

crime.

of

25

many police agencies

instructed the public to avoid calling them unless the situation was dire. Meaning many crimes were not reported, not counted.

Many courts suspended or scaled back operations, which reduced the flow of alleged offenders through the system. Probation offices stopped home and work verifications — were all but shuttered — all but eliminating revocations due to technical violations and additional crimes. Many jails stopped admitting inmates or admitted only those accused of the most serious of crimes.

This altered the arrest probabilities of police as they understood people would not be processed. I want to also note that in 2020 jail admissions fell 16 percent, daily jail populations dropped a remarkable 25 percent and state and federal prison systems were reduced 8 percent within months with more than 100,000 inmates released back into their communities, almost of them without any meaningful supervision.

As if COVID wasn't enough, the political reaction the George Floyd protests had to police consequential effects on the and the administration of justice. De-policing, especially in minority neighbors became widespread. Proactive

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

policing already at very low levels owing to COVID all but ceased.

The effect of the defund movement coupled with the rise in protests was nothing short of remarkable. Police across the country retired or resigned in numbers never before witnessed. Several jurisdictions to this day triage calls for service thus downwardly biasing estimates of crime.

To reiterate, we're in unchartered territory when it comes to the measurement of crime. While there is reason to believe that some crime categories have declined such as burglary, there is every reason to believe that crime generally or overall, and especially violent crime, which I'm most concerned about, has increased.

The current picture of crime in America is complicated. And we have to be careful about extending too much credibility to crime estimates until we know more about the data generating process. That said, data show a clear substantial increase in homicides and shootings, beginning around 2012, 2013. However, homicides escalated an amazing 35 percent in 2020 over 2019 levels. None of this was predicted by the way.

Of course, aggregate trends in homicide

mask very large trends between subgroups. Males and African Americans have always had significantly higher rates of homicide. African American homicide rates in February of 2019, just one year prior to COVID was 18 per 100,000. One year later it was 35 to 100,000. Since COVID and the social unrest, Black/White differences in homicide rates have ranked between 25 to 35 to 1.

To appreciate the dramatic increase in homicides from 2019 to 2022, consider that an additional 16,737 people were killed by criminal homicide between that period.

Of these, an astonishing 10,800 were Black victims. Making matters worse, much of the increase in Black homicides and firearms injuries are disproportionately of the young, Black, and male, with precipitous increases in juvenile violence.

I will add on top of that something less often considered that two to three times as many people are shot who survive that shooting. Considering this fact, a minimum low estimate of about 91,000 additional African Americans were shot over this time period. Clearly, increases in violence, even small increases in violence, disproportionately impact the Black community.

Fortunately, we know today how better to manage crime and how to reduce it. The same social science that has documented the broad scale deleterious effects of crime also tells us that the justice system reduces crime. For example, several studies show that increasing police levels reduces crime, largely through the effect of arrest.

Hiring more police has been linked to

Hiring more police has been linked to reductions in auto thefts, burglaries, robberies, aggravated assaults, larceny and homicide.

Chalfin and McCrary, for example, found that for every \$1 spent on policing, it generated \$1.63 for social benefits. More recently Chalfin also found that the addition of each additional officer on a police force prevented .1 homicides, and the effect was twice as large in Black communities.

Numerous studies have also documented substantial reductions in violent crime associated with the use of focused deterrent strategies.

Overall, focused deterrence has been tried in cities across the U.S., and research finds the net crime reduction around 64 percent when employed with integrity.

What we do to those who are arrested also matters. Not prosecuting offenders and placing them

immediately back on the street unsupervised is a recipe for more crime.

Hogan's analysis of data from Philadelphia, for example, found that while the office reduced criminal sentences by 70 percent, it resulted in about 75 additional homicides per year from 2015 to 2019. Most of those homicides were of African Americans.

And finally, while there are costs to incarceration, it is now obvious that there are also costs to not incarcerating. The difference has been pointed out in the literature as in who pays the price? The individual who commits the crime or the community in which they offend in.

To conclude, government action should reduce harm to innocent law-abiding people. It should not increase the risk by withdrawing critical public safety resources, especially in minority communities where crime is high and the consequences of victimization are most severe.

Available data show that members of these communities desire more police not less and more policing. They want offenders prosecuted and off the streets, just like anyone else would if crime were prevalent in their neighborhood.

1	Depriving these communities of necessary
2	public safety resources, either intentionally through
3	policy or by circumstance should be thought of as a
4	violation of their own civil rights and civil
5	liberties. I can think of few things more cruel than
6	to deny safety to those most in need, especially when
7	we have the knowledge and skill sets to improve their
8	lives.
9	Finally, we need to abandon, abandon the
10	anti-justice system narrative and reaffirm
11	government's first priority of government, and that is
12	the safety of all of our citizens.
13	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Dr. Wright. Now
14	we're going to hear from Dr. O'Brien if you could
15	please proceed.
16	DR. O'BRIEN: Thank you. Good afternoon,
17	everyone. Nice to be here. I appreciate the
18	opportunity.
19	My testimony is going to focus on local
20	data and hopefully provide some solutions to reduce
21	the racial disparities that we are seeing in violent
22	criminal victimization.
23	I am trained as an epidemiologist and have
24	been working in this area of violence and overdose
25	prevention for nearly 30 years. And I really worked

at the intersection of public health and public safety and had the opportunity to work at the local level, at the state level and the federal level in public health and with criminal justice agencies.

And I've learned what through that experience is that when we are talking about violence, we can't just focus on homicides. We really need to be able to look at non-fatal shootings because nonshootings occur four times as often homicides. So if we really want to understand what's going on, we need to be able to look at the complete And that information is so important to local communities to identify those prevention and intervention strategies that can reduce the violence that we're seeing.

Unfortunately non-fatal shooting data is not often collected. Law enforcement agencies collect information on homicides, aggravated assaults with armed robberies, but actually indicating if the person was injured by a firearm is not captured currently.

And so what I'd like to do is spend a little bit of time sharing with you what do we know at the local level. I was fortunate in 2005 to begin working with the City of Milwaukee and helped developed with them a way to collect information and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

develop and infrastructure to really reduce violence in the city.

And the data system that we created allowed us to look at not only homicides but non-fatal shootings. And so we've heard today about national data. And I just want to bring it home to the local level. So we heard this morning that the U.S. leads the world in rates of homicide.

The rate actually in 2022 was 6.1. If we look at the State of Wisconsin, which is where I'm from, that number is 5.4 per 100,000. If we look at the City of Milwaukee, that number is 35.1. And when we look at Black males, that number goes up to 118 per 100,000.

of 15 and 34, that number escalates to 252 per 100,000. And that compares to 14.2 for white males in the same age group. So I can talk about national data. I can talk about state data and local data on homicides but I can't for non-fatal shootings. And when we look at non-fatal shootings, we don't have national data. We don't have state data.

For the city, I can tell you that in 2022 the rate for non-fatal shootings was 132 per 100,000. The rate for Black males was 554. The rate for Black

males between the ages of 15 and 34 was 1,235 compared to 38 for their white male counterpoints.

That's staggering. Those numbers are staggering. So what do we do? I'm not only coming with data, but I'm also coming with solutions.

So my colleagues and I at the Center for Gun Violence Solutions have been working on a new model for reducing violence in our communities, and that model is called Violence Reduction Councils. And Violence Reduction Councils take a public health approach to what has traditionally been a law enforcement problem.

And it starts with a different set of tools for our communities to tackle violence, both homicide and non-fatal shooting and violence in general. And data is the essential element of good decision-making. And data from different front line practitioners as well as people with lived experience can give us a much a deeper picture of what's really going on that really helps us create those strategies to reduce violence.

We need to create an environment for trust and collaboration and Violence Reduction Councils create a big tent allowing all of us to work together.

These councils are led by a neutral convener,

somebody who has a background in public health, and they manage the pillars of a Violence Reduction Council, which includes a governance structure, convening criminal justice partners, public health and community and its underpinned with the data infrastructure that really allows communities to move forward on reducing violence and ultimately the disparities that we're seeing in victimization.

This new framework for data modeling weighs relevant situational factors to give us that deeper perspective. Homicides and shootings are preventable. We hear time and again when we meet with individuals that we knew this was coming. So if we know it's coming, it's preventable.

So how do we intervene in that cycle? How do we stop a shooting before it occurs, and more importantly, provide alternatives and support to people to keep them from resorting to violence in the first place?

In one city that we worked, having that non-fatal shooting data led to the reduction in follow-on shootings and homicides.

In another community that we worked, the community was able to develop a witness protection program customized specifically for their community.

In Milwaukee, where this was pioneered, we were able to achieve nearly 50 percent decline in homicides using this approach. The whole premise here is on prevention, of being proactive before the homicide occurs or the non-fatal shooting occurs rather than reactive after the fact.

We at the center have been funded by the Bloomberg American Health Initiative to develop a comprehensive toolkit data system and trainings to share with communities to establish Violence Reduction Councils of their own. This data system that I mentioned allows communities to capture rich information on homicides and non-fatal shootings. And today there is a new public health approach to violence prevention.

I just want to say lastly I have talked about data. And we heard from Dr. Mercy this morning, CDC just celebrated that National Violent Death Reporting System at CDC celebrated its 20 year anniversary. And they now cover 50 states and U.S. territories on collecting detailed violent death data. It's time that we start capturing that same level of data with non-fatal shootings.

The NIBRS system has approved changes to improve collection of shooting information. We need

1 to make sure that we're defining non-fatal shootings 2 as ensuring the participation of well 3 enforcement agencies in the NIBRS system. 4 So I will leave you with the final 5 statement. Collecting, analyzing and translating local and national data on violent crime victimization 6 7 in collaboration with police, public safety and 8 community at every level of government to develop and 9 implement strategies, policy and practice can reduce 10 racial and ethnic disparities and victimization. 11 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, Dr. 12 We're going to go ahead and proceed with Mr. 13 Mangual, if you would like to start? 14 MR. MANGUAL: Sure. Thank you so much for 15 the invitation today. In my limited time, I want to make three points. 16 17 First is that serious violence is up. 18 Second is that that increase has disproportionately 19 impacted Black and Latino residents of this country 20 who have long dealt with the brunt of the problems of 21 homicides and gun violence. 22 And third is that there is good reason to 23 suspect that this loss in safety is at least partly 24 driven by a shift in policing and criminal justice 25 policy that can best be characterized as generally

1 lowering the transaction cost of committing a crime and raising the transaction cost of enforcing the law. 2 3 On the first point, very quickly, 4 nationally in 2015 and '16, we started to see a decrease in public safety. Murders rose nearly 11 and 5 6 8 percent respectively in those years. The national 7 homicide rate declined slightly in 2017 and '18 before 8 ticking back upward in 2019. And then, of course, in 9 2020 the nation saw its largest single year spike in 10 homicides in at least 100 years, which was followed by 11 another increase in murders in 2021. 12 the second point, that this 13 disproportionately impacted Black and Latino 14 communities. The 2020 spike in homicide resulted in 15 an additional eight deaths per 100,000 Black residents 16 in the U.S. while the white homicide rate increase 17 resulted in an additional 0.5 deaths per 100,000 white 18 residents. 19 t.he Black homicide pushed 20 victimization rate in the United States up to 25.3 per 21 100,000 in 2020 from 19.5 per 100,000 in 2019, making 22 the Black homicide victimization rate that year nearly 23 10 times higher than the white homicide victimization 24 rate.

When one zeroes in on gun homicides, this

pattern of racial disparities and victimization grows even starker as is illustrated by the fact that the firearm homicide rate for Black men in the U.S. hit in 2021 its early 1990s peak of approximately 55 per 100,000.

This represents a total erasure of the progress made on that measure between 1991 and the mid-2010s which saw the Black male firearm homicide rate fall below 30 per 100,000 from 50 per 100,000.

And you can also see these same racial disparities play out at the more local level when one zeroes in at the city and neighborhoods. In New York City, for example, homicides increased by approximately 97 percent and 50 percent in 2020 and both measures remained elevated compared to their prepandemic lows, a minimum, a minimum of 95 percent of all shooting victims and 85 percent of all homicide victims have been Black or Hispanic every single year going back to at least 2008.

In the City of Chicago, where 57.9 percent of the population is Black or Hispanic, those groups constituted 95 percent of homicide victims in 2019, 96 percent in 2020, 96 percent in 2021 and 95 percent in 2022.

A recent cross-sectional study of 129,826

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

adult men living in the City of Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and Los Angeles in 2020 and '21, which was published in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that, and I'm going to quote here, "young males from ZIP Codes with the most violence in Chicago and Philadelphia had a notably higher risk of firearm related death than U.S. military personnel who served during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan."

Now, if you think about that for a moment and put yourself in the position of a mother sending her child off to the Marines at the age of 19 in 2003 and you think about the fear that that mom would naturally feel at that moment, that her son might not make it home, consider the fact that every single day in this country there are mothers who take the same chance with their son's lives simply by sending them to school in their own neighborhoods.

On to the third point, the suspicion that this decrease in safety, which has disproportionately impacted Blacks and Latinos is due to a shift in criminal justice policy.

As my co-panelist Patrick Sharkey has noted in the past, "Even the staunchest critics of mass incarceration acknowledge that the expansion of the imprisoned population contributed to the decline

in violence." And the best evidence that we have makes clear that police are effective in reducing violence such that "one of the most robust and most uncomfortable findings in criminology is that putting more officers on the streets leads to less violent crime."

Now he's right on both counts. And I cite these acknowledgments because over the last decade plus both policing and incarceration have taken hits. Between 2010 and 2016, police departments across the country have seen increases in oversight actions. Over the last 10 to 20 years, the country has seen federal and state sentencing reforms, bail reforms, discovery reforms, de-criminalization efforts aimed at and theft offenses, successful litigation efforts targeting police practices or incarceration and the slew of often hasty state and local police aimed at restricting police powers reforms discretion.

We've also seen the explosion of the prosecutor movement such that now some 70 million Americans live in jurisdictions with prosecutors who have used their discretion to limit the ability of line prosecutors with respect to seeking pre-trial detention, opposing parole and pursuing sentencing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

enhancements.

Now these shifts individually and collectively seemed to have reduced the likelihood of arrests or prosecution and/or incarceration for many offenders, which is a problem. And the reason that is a problem is because the serious problem of violent crime, particularly gun violence, has long been driven by repeat offenders.

A study done in the City of Chicago found that the typical homicide or shooting suspect in 2015 and '16 had 12 prior arrests, nearly 1 in 5 had more than 20 prior arrests, a measure that's in line with one that was cited by former Metro Police Chief Robert Conti here in the City of DC who said that the average homicide suspect has been arrested 11 times prior to them committing a homicide.

In the City of Baltimore, various studies of homicides in 2017 and '18 found that homicide suspects that have been identified had nine prior arrests and then more than a third of them were on parole or probation. And then nationally between 1990 and 2002, more than a third of those convicted of violent felonies in America's 75 largest urban counties were on parole, probation or pre-trial release at the time of their offense and 75 percent of

them had a prior arrest history.

The reality is that serious violent crime, particularly gun violence, is and has long been driven by repeat offenders who have been given multiple bites of the apple and they used those bites of the apple to victimize people living in the communities in which they would otherwise spend their time. That has led to a loss of life one that we should do something about by treating that issue as a civil rights concern.

When the government takes affirmative steps to change policy and that policy has disproportionate impacts on low income minority communities, this body has in the past shown interest in examining that as the civil rights issues that they are. It should do the same here.

We have heard a lot about preventing violence. And that is something that I dedicate my work to. But the single best way to prevent a shooting is by keeping shooters off the street. And our policy throughout this country over the last several years has been calculated to minimize that effect, to keep shooters on the street and that's what needs to change. Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you Mr. Mangual. Ms.

Sahaf?

MS. SAHAF: Thank you. Is that on? Yes. Good afternoon. I'm Mona Sahaf, and I work at the Vera Institute of Justice where I'm the director of our Reshaping Prosecution Program.

My team uses research and evidence to help prosecutors increase public safety by shrinking the front end of the criminal system, addressing racial disparities in prosecution that make us less safe, and increasing collaboration of communities that are most impacted by the DA's decisions.

Before joining the Vera Institute, I was a prosecutor for 12 years at the federal level here in Washington, D.C. where I prosecuted general violent crime, domestic violence, national security matters, fraud. I then worked at DOJ headquarters in the human rights special prosecution section where I investigated and prosecuted cases around the country, including crime that occurred at U.S. military bases and embassies abroad.

Having worked in criminal courts for 15 years, I've met with hundreds of victims and their families. I've seen firsthand how the criminal legal system fails to meet the needs of crime survivors, makes us less safe, and discounts the safety of people

of color, lower income people, and LGBTQ people.

Ample research that we've heard about all day backs these observations. A 2022 National Survey of Crime Victims shows that crime continues to impact most Americans. Indeed 6 of every 10 people were a victim of crime in the past 10 years and about half of them were victims of violent crime.

However, according to DOJ findings, the majority of victims of violent crime in the last census tells us that 58 percent continue not to report their crimes to police, and this reluctance greatly hinders our government's ability to deliver public safety because we don't know where the crimes are occurring.

Data also tells us that crime does not impact communities equally. And we've heard a lot about that today, but let me just refresh a couple of statistics. Victims are more likely to be young people, people of color from low income communities, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities, and people with criminal records.

For example, according to DOJ, young people aged 18 to 29 are 18 percent of our population but are nearly 30 percent of the victims of violent crime. DOJ data also tells us that gay people face

violent victimization at twice the rate of heterosexual people and that transgender people experience violence at 2-1/2 times the rate of non-transgender communities.

We've also heard ample data around the disproportionate impact of crime on Black communities. Black children and adults aged 15 to 34 are victims of gun homicides 20 times the rate of White children and adults for example. So from this disheartening data, we know which communities are at the greatest risk of victimization and to address disparities, we have to target more resources and interventions to them to help them heal from past trauma that causes future trauma and to protect them from future victimization.

Also, government actors need to adopt evidence-based reforms that reduce reliance on tools that have not made us safe. We've heard earlier today, you know, it's come down a little bit, but we incarcerate 25 percent of the world's population. That's not making us safer. If it was, we would be the safest.

These tools are not working for us. And research has shown that increased incarceration has only minimal impacts on crime rates and that those impacts are primarily on property crime, not violent

crime.

Additionally, the criminogenic impacts of incarceration are very well documented. In other words, incarceration is associated with increasing rates of crime. For example, for people charged with felony offenses, each additional year of incarceration can increase the likelihood of their future contact with the system by four to seven percentage points and reduce their chances of employment, which we know creates stability and helps reduce crime by 3.6 percentage points.

Unfortunately, many policymakers continue to call for charging more, detaining more and incarcerating people for longer periods, despite the lack of evidence that doing so would make us safer.

But fortunately, there are alternatives that have been shown to increasingly -- excuse me, significantly increase safety without levying the heavy social costs of policing and incarceration on communities.

One are diversion policies. So more police and prosecutors are using diversion programs to address the underlying drivers of crime, be them substance abuse issues, mental health issues, poverty, joblessness, lack of recreation for youth. And these

diversion programs have far better outcomes than the traditional system.

Our status quo system is failing by any kind of grade. If my kids brought me back a grade of our criminal that shows 8 years out, 80 percent of people have been rearrested or reconvicted, you know, I would kick them out.

So diversion programs, on the other hand, their outcomes are much better. For example a study of diversion programs in Texas found that diversions intentionally addressing the crime apart from the criminal system, outside of the system, decreased a person's future convictions by 48 percent over a 10 year period and improved their employment outcomes by 53 percent over the same period.

Another thing we can employ declination policies, so choosing to decline certain charges in absolution. So, you know, apart from programming. This is what the research shows us. Suffolk County, Massachusetts in 2019 the DA instituted a policy presumption, so not categorically but a presumption not to charge certain low level nonviolent offenses.

A rigorous study of this policy showed that not charging people actually decreased their

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

chances of future involvements substantially. Researchers also found no increase of non-violent misdemeanors reported to police. So no apparent public safety impacts from charging people less. Just simply charging people less and keeping them out of the system makes communities safer.

In another example in Minnesota, DA John Choi there has implemented a policy with several police chiefs to decline to charge cases and to conduct fewer low level traffic stops, traffic stops particularly based on equipment and paperwork violations.

The harms associated with traffic stops are well documented and were acutely felt there in Ramsey County, Minnesota, where Philando Castile was killed during his 49th traffic stop over a 13 year period. Law enforcement there knew these traffic stops drove racial disparities, were destroying trust with communities that they need to deliver safety to and whose cooperation they needed to deliver safety throughout the county.

And two years later, we have analysis of these policies, so again police chiefs with the district attorney doing less, and they found massive drops in racial disparities and no apparent public

safety impacts based on 911 call volumes or the number of guns taken off the streets. So a full success.

And I've been at community meetings there, and the amount of trust that's been rebuilt with communities of color who are so proud of their DA and so proud of their police chiefs who were doing things to make them safer was palpable in the room. And I heard from many community members about this.

And finally, we also have good evidence around community violence intervention programs, focus deterrent strategies that target those at greatest risk of committing or being victimized by gun crime. They've had great results in cities like Baltimore, Chicago, New York City.

And in contrast to our system, they are looking to prevent crime before it occurs and not after it occurs. The Commission is uniquely situated to support communities that are disparately impacted by helping target resources to these communities that we know bear the brunt of the harms. Supporting the use and funding of evidence-based interventions, and perhaps now more than ever, speaking up against those calling for more prosecution, greater penalties and more incarceration. Thank you so much.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, Ms.

1	Sahaf. And thank you to all of our panelists for your
2	testimony. I appreciate it very much.
3	I am going to open up the floor to
4	Commissioners for questions. If there are none
5	initially here on the floor, I will turn it over to
6	the folks on the phone and give them an opportunity.
7	Please speak up and I will recognize you.
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair,
9	Kirsanow here.
10	CHAIR GARZA: Yes, Commissioner Kirsanow,
11	please proceed.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you very
13	much. My question I suppose would be for Professor
14	Wright. Despite the fact that I have been on the
15	Commission for quite some time, this is the first time
16	that I've regularly heard the term over-policing.
17	Now, I happen to live in the same inner-
18	city Cleveland neighborhood, high-crime neighborhood
19	for the last 40 years, and that's the term that none
20	of my neighbors have ever utilized. They have always
21	said, where are the police? We want more police.
22	Does over-policing artificially inflate
23	crime numbers and result in greater victimization of
24	Blacks?
25	DR. WRIGHT: I think over the argument

communities are that certain over-policed Most police, we look at the way they spent misplaced. their time is highly reactive, 911 calls, a certain fraction of those, outside of 911 calls are driven by victims stopping them or people requesting their assistance and then the smallest fraction being that they initiate contact and conduct investigation out of that.

And with that said, you go to where the problem is. And police allocation of resources, and this is what of the some focus deterrence literature tells us, that you don't have to flood an area with blue, right, that you can be highly selective, that you can use various types of crime analytics and street level and operational level intelligence to selectively arrest and hopefully incapacitate people that are driving crime in those areas.

I think, as was mentioned earlier, most of the shootings, and I work in Cincinnati with the Gun Crime Intelligence Center with the CPD and ATF, most of the shooting are by recidivists, people that have extensive criminal histories. It is not at all surprising. And they use remarkable levels of effort and intelligence so they no longer have to flood an area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

To give you contrast, real quick, there used to be a unit called the Vortex. And it was like a strike team. And it was effective, but it also generated a lot of community backlash.

Thus far, the Gun Crime Intelligence Center, as we receive widespread support in large part also because it brings in community members. And we have social workers on staff, and we work with violence interrupters. So a long-winded way of saying that I believe that you don't have to flood an area with police or have what would be called overpolicing, but you can do so much more intelligently.

CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I think probably Dr. Wright is the first person to at least start with on my question, too, but anybody who wants to comment, I would appreciate.

I feel awash in statistics. And I understand that things can be, you know -- we can probably improve what we have. But I'm sort of looking for what is the most reliable, you know, numbers out there. And I understand the notion that murder is probably better measured than things like, at the opposite end might be simple assault. But there is a lot in between. You know, which numbers

1	strike you as the most reliable?
2	DR. WRIGHT: We're pretty good at counting
3	dead bodies. And after that, auto theft.
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Auto theft?
5	DR. WRIGHT: Auto theft numbers are fairly
6	accurate, yes. Someone steals your car, you have to
7	turn it in for insurance.
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Oh, yes. I get it.
9	DR. WRIGHT: So, you know, where we see
10	typically the most serious types of crimes, you have
11	higher reporting. Generally speaking, when you start
12	to move down that chain in the property crime, you see
13	less reporting. And oftentimes NCVS has shown this,
14	you know, for many, many years.
15	MR. MANGUAL: If I could add to that, I
16	think Dr. Wright is exactly right, that homicide and
17	auto theft are probably our two most reliable measures
18	because those are the things that are hardest to fudge
19	and where people have the greatest incentive to
20	actually report the offenses.
21	But I do think it's important for us to
22	consider, particularly with respect to the last few
23	years, that we have to really do more work to
24	understand other kinds of crime statistics. I will
2.5	

take, you know, robbery and assault for example. Now

those numbers have gone up in a lot of places, although not everywhere, but they certainly haven't gone up nearly as much as homicides and shootings have gone up.

Now one of the things that we have to understand is that since the pandemic in 2020, there has been a real change in what criminologists call routine activities. People are spending significantly less time on the street. They are spending less time in commercial settings.

If you look at all kinds of data measures, so there was a study done by the University of Toronto looking at cell phone data that found that foot traffic in New York City was down 33 percent in the business districts.

JPMorgan put out a report in 2022 showing that the majority of the consumer spending recovery in 2021 was driven by online spending as opposed to inperson spending. The MTA puts out regular surveys of ridership, still showing that three years after the pandemic subway ridership is only 70 percent of what it was prior to the pandemic. All of this means, is that people are spending significantly less time in the places where they might be victimized.

So when we look at the raw numbers of

1 these offenses, we have to use our ability to analyze 2 and understand that the risk has actually gone up 3 significantly more once you control for the amount of 4 time that people are actually spending in public 5 spaces. CHAIR GARZA: Vice Chair Nourse? 6 7 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes. I am awash in 8 So Professor Sharkey, I wonder if you data, too. 9 could -- I'm going to raise three different sets of 10 data and maybe you can help me. We've been told in 11 various panels that crime is up. That's a very 12 general term. I mean, all of you people have spent 13 your life studying crime, right? You know all the 14 sources of data, right? 15 So if you look on the website at the FBI, 16 they say that murder and non-negligent manslaughter 17 recorded in 2022 estimated a national decrease of 6.1 18 percent compared to the previous year and that violent 19 crime overall in the nation has decreased an estimated 20 1.7 percent. 21 understand the National Crime NowТ 22 Victimization Survey may differ from that. But do you 23 have any reason to doubt this set of numbers? 24 DR. SHARKEY: No, I think -- so what we 25 know is that in 2020 there was a huge increase in gun

violence. And that was just gun violence exclusively. Since then in 2021 it was high again. Last year we had a very sharp decline, one of the largest declines ever, year-to-year declines. And this year, we're having an even larger decline.

So the increase since 2020 is very real, and we should not downplay that. We should also celebrate the progress. And thousands of lives are going to be saved this year compared to last year and compared to 2020.

So we shouldn't doubt those numbers. Those numbers are solid. As Dr. Wright said, we should be focusing on murder. I think shootings are also measured pretty well at this point. And those figures tell us that last year and this year we're seeing sharp declines.

another thing. You know, I said at the beginning of my statement that there are a lot of slogans, you know, progressive prosecution, defund the police and that gives people misleading impressions. So, for example, the U.S. prison population appears to have gone up 2 percent in 2021. Would that seem unusual to you?

DR. SHARKEY: That the prison population

1	went up?
2	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Prison population went
3	up 2 percent in 2021.
4	DR. SHARKEY: I don't track that as
5	closely as violence. The prison population has been
6	falling
7	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes, yup.
8	DR. SHARKEY: pretty steadily since
9	2008 or so.
10	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yeah.
11	DR. SHARKEY: Yeah.
12	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: But it's recently gone
13	up. And then funding for police went up for 83
14	percent of 100 cities. And I really don't like to
15	rely on news sources for data. This is from ABC News
16	recently. Because a lot of people hear these slogans,
17	and they think, oh, we don't have police anymore. I
18	mean, I understand they took a huge hit during COVID,
19	and Professor Wright is absolutely correct on that.
20	But I don't local communities aren't stopping to
21	spend are they?
22	DR. SHARKEY: No, there's been no
23	defunding of the police. The only suggestion to
24	defund is coming from the right, defund DOJ, and the

FBI. It's a bad idea. I think, you know, I try to

1	kind of toe the line that we cannot take away
2	responsibility from law enforcement until we have
3	built other institutions and funded other institutions
4	to step up and play a larger role.
5	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: And I think that's
6	what lot of people are saying. And finally, let me
7	ask one question of Dr. O'Brien while I have the mic
8	on.
9	I have a slide up here. We have been told
10	that the CDC data on firearm related injuries may be
11	wrong. But according to this, it says from 2019 to
12	the present day, there has been a 33.4 increase in
13	firearm homicides from 2019 to 2020. Is that
14	consistent with your understanding?
15	DR. O'BRIEN: And that data is based on
16	information that's captured at the state level from
17	medical examiners at the local level. So that data is
18	solid data. They have people that are abstracting it
19	on a daily basis.
20	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Thank you.
21	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones?
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I think that some of
23	the panelists wanted to respond to some of these
24	questions, Dr. Lott and Mr. Mangual.
25	COMMISSIONER JONES: I think the Chair is

1 the one who is governing that, and everyone else should kind of mute themselves in the meantime. 2 3 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, just to point 4 out that they are permitted to speak then. CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones? 5 6 COMMISSIONER JONES: Thank you, Madam 7 Chair, for recognizing me. You know, earlier on in 8 this panel, Ι heard probably the greatest 9 concentration of disinformation that I've seen in such 10 a short time span. I served on the House Judiciary 11 Committee with Jim Jordan and Matt Gaetz. 12 The wackiest probably thing to emerge from 13 this panel is somehow the idea that because of the 14 commonality of Black names that universal background 15 checks would not be effective at stemming the uniquely 16 American problem of gun violence. And then, of 17 course, there was also disinformation about what an 18 assault weapons ban would actually accomplish. 19 And so Professor Sharkey, you are someone 20 who has brought a lot of analytical rigor to your 21 scholarship. Is there anything you would like to 22 respond to that was stated by Mr. Lott, for example, 23 earlier on today's panel? 24 DR. SHARKEY: Well, A, this is a really 25 hard topic to study. And I do think, you know, there

needs to be improvements in research. And over time there have been steady improvements. The virtual consensus, so Dr. Lott has published a lot of research on gun laws. I think it's safe to say that most of that research has been debunked at this point.

I don't mean to be disrespectful, but the consensus that has emerged is that the argument that more guns leads to less crime is wrong.

What we know is that there are a set of policies, most of them enacted at the state level. That's where we get the variation that we need to come close to identifying causal effects.

Some of those policies, the most common ones that have been shown time and again to be causal and effective at reducing gun deaths. I'm going to say gun deaths because it's not just homicides. It's suicides and gun accidents as well. Are universal background checks waiting periods, prohibited possessor laws, which do not allow people with domestic violence history or records to have access to guns.

Now other policies have much more mixed evidence. I think concealed carry laws, which Dr. Lott has studied, have mixed evidence. I'm not going to come out and say that there is slam dunk evidence

that violence is going to fall next year if we get rid of concealed carry laws.

So the body of evidence needs to improve. That said, what we know is that the accumulation of regulations that make it more difficult for people who shouldn't have a gun to access guns, that make it more difficult for dealers who will sell to anyone who walks in the door to stay in business, that makes it more difficult for children to access guns, these kinds of policies, when they accumulate, save thousands and thousands of lives, and that's causal.

So it's not an accident that the states with the most restrictive gun regulations have the lowest rates of gun deaths. It's not an accident that the nations with the most guns have the most gun deaths. You know, this evidence has accumulated and virtually every scientist who studies this reaches this conclusion.

And the ones who reached out to the conclusion are the ones that get called on over and over. But it's like the climate change deniers. You know, you can find one or two who are going to dispute the evidence. Virtually, everyone else is on the same page.

COMMISSIONER JONES: Thank you, Professor.

1 CHAIR GARZA: Go ahead, Dr. Lott. 2 DR. LOTT: Well, first of all --3 CHAIR GARZA: Your microphone. 4 DR. LOTT: Professor Sharkey didn't deal 5 with what I thought was the most basic part of the 6 Are there mistakes in the background check 7 system? 8 And, you know, just to give you an idea 9 here, one of the big criticisms have been made, when 10 you have a Democratic President and the Republicans 11 say Democrats aren't enforcing the gun control laws. 12 When there is a Republican President, the Democrats say that. 13 14 What's Exhibit A? It is the denials in 15 the background check system. You almost never see 16 prosecutions. You may say 200,000 times that people 17 have been stopped because of the background check 18 system, you see 20 prosecutions and 12 convictions. 19 Why do you see so many? If you actually 20 go and talk to the people who are involved in the 21 prosecutions, they would say these are like 22 easiest things to go and prosecute people for. The 23 reason they are not prosecuting people is because they 24 are not real cases.

It's one thing to go and stop a felon from

buying a gun. It's another thing to stop somebody simply because they have a roughly phonetically similar name and similar birthdate to the person who you want to stop.

And so I have no problem with background checks. Okay? My problem was that the current background system discriminates against the very people who need guns the most for protection. Lawabiding poor Black people who live in high crime urban areas.

And there's no reason -- if you were to go to a private company and say should you do background checks on people that look at roughly phonetically similar names and similar birthdays, they would look at you like you're from Mars because they are going to say you're going to be discriminating against minorities. You're going to create lots of false positives.

If it's nuts for private companies to go and do background checks like that, why is it okay for the federal government in the NICCS system to go and do that? If you have 4 million people where almost all of those are mistakes, how is that justifiable? You know, there is a reason why you don't have prosecutions for these cases, whether it's across

Democratic or Republican administrations.

Now with regard to the claims that my research has been debunked, I can give you dozens of peer reviewed studies. In fact there are many more that have found my research has stood up to all of these different types of tests that are there. And I looked at more the concealed carry. I have looked at many different types of gun control laws that are there. And as far as background checks, I wish it had the impact. Waiting periods actually have been associated with increases in violent crime rates for rape rates.

You know, you may have a cooling off period, but you also make it difficult for victims, let's say a woman who is being talked or threatened, to be able to quickly be able to go and get a gun for self-defense. And so you have to go and look at the net effect that's there.

As far as the assault weapons ban goes, I will just give you again just a simple statistic. And that is if the assault weapons ban actually worked, you should have seen the share of attacks involving assault weapons fall during the period when the ban was in effect.

In fact, what you see is that the share of

attacks went up when you saw a weapons ban went into effect, and it fell when it went after. But why one would think that a ban on guns based on how they look rather than how they function is going to make any difference.

You know, when Senator Feinstein's staff went through catalogs to go and look at guns based on how they look rather than how they function when there are functionally identical guns that were still available there makes no sense to me. But I'm sure other people on the panel may have thoughts about that. But I am more than happy to give dozens of papers that have found my work -- even stronger effects than I have.

And the thing is, if you look at the studies that tend to argue against me, look at later periods of time. And what happens is if you look at the period, let's say from 2000 on, in these studies, you are comparing how the crime rates are changing in the states that change those laws during those later periods versus all the states that adopted right to carry laws before that.

In fact, the later states were much more restrictive. They had higher fees, longer training periods. They actually saw smaller increases in

1 concealed carry permits than the earlier states. 2 the positive effect that they have there is actually 3 the opposite of what they think it is because what you 4 really want to look at is the percent of the population with the permits. 5 And there are other 6 issues that I could go into. 7 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Dr. Lott. 8 going to be mindful of time here so if we could keep 9 our comments a little bit shorter. We'll go to 10 Commissioner Jones. I don't know if you had another 11 questions. 12 COMMISSIONER JONES: Madam Chair, that's a 13 lot to respond to that we just heard. A lot more 14 disinformation frankly. 15 DR. LOTT: What did I say that was wrong? 16 COMMISSIONER JONES: Almost everything, 17 sir. And by the way, I'm looking at a two page 18 document just probably 20 different examples of how 19 you've been called out for erroneous statements, much 20 of which looks to be deliberate. 21 But one of the things you added today, you 22 suggested -- in fact you state explicitly that -- you 23 know, you mentioned 4 million names, and you said that 24 almost all of those background searches have been

inaccurate. Do you want to clarify that statement?

1 DR. LOTT: No, I don't want to clarify. 2 COMMISSIONER JONES: Oh, my goodness. 3 Okay. 4 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Could you respond to the Inspector General's report that revealed that 5 6 these background check denials are accurate in 99.8 7 percent of the cases? 8 DR. LOTT: Okay. What they did was they 9 looked at 400 "judiciously sampled observations" here. 10 I don't why -- you want to look at a random sample if 11 you're going to look at that small of a group. 12 there is no reason to look at that small of a sample. 13 We have the entire thing there. 14 We know, for example, you can go and look 15 through -- there are basically five stages of review 16 that occur when a NICCS background check occurs. 17 first stage of review is the National BATF Office will 18 look at them --19 VICE CHAIR NOURSE: I just wanted you to 20 respond to the question. 21 CHAIR GARZA: I apologize. I just kind of 22 want to move us along if we can because I feel like 23 there are some other -- I have not had the opportunity 24 to ask a question. I am really grateful to have heard 25 specifically from Dr. O'Brien and Ms. Sahaf about some

of the things that have been echoed this morning about what we talked about.

And to me what I keep hearing is that there is a lack of data, of reliable data. I know we talked about homicide as being the most reliable because you have a body unfortunately. But, you know, shootings, as you have mentioned, non-fatal shootings, the fact that that's not being tracked, I mean, that is a big problem, is it not?

DR. O'BRIEN: So there is hospital data, and there is hospital data from emergency department visits that track non-fatal shootings. But it doesn't give us the detail that we need like where, why, how can we prevent? And until we start getting that level of data on non-fatal shootings, like we have on homicides, communities are at a loss because if you are looking at gun violence, you really need to look at the totality of non-fatal shootings and homicides.

And I started only looking at homicides.

And I'm, like, what is going on here, and where are the non-fatal shootings? I thought there was a fraction of the non-fatal shootings until I actually started pulling up data.

And when you start pulling all of it and understand the bigger picture, it really helps

1 communities at the local level. And that data then 2 flows up to the national level. We have a much better 3 understanding of what's going on and how we can 4 prevent and how we can intervene. 5 CHAIR GARZA: Go ahead, Mr. Mangual. 6 MR. MANGUAL: If I could just quickly add 7 I mean, in addition to the non-fatal to that. 8 shootings in which people are wounded, we should also 9 be doing more to track non-fatal shootings in which no 10 one is wounded. And one of the best ways to do that 11 is to see jurisdictions more broadly adopt technology 12 like ShotSpotter using acoustic technology to identify 13 the firing of gunshots. 14 Now a huge portion of ShotSpotter alerts 15 do not see accompanying 911 calls, which tell us that 16 non-fatal gun violence is actually more common than 17 even the data that we do have is. 18 But I would note that there has been a lot of opposition on the left in this country to the 19 20 adoption of ShotSpotter on the claim that it sends 21 police resources into minority neighborhoods which 22 we've heard time and again see the brunt of this 23 problem. I just wanted to note that. 24 CHAIR GARZA: And I wanted to bring in Ms. 25 Sahaf into this if I can. You know, I think that your

comment made me think a lot about investment in communities, right, because that's what we need to do, or at least that's what we've heard all morning. It's data and it's investment in the communities.

And I'm a Texan. So I was particularly struck by that diversion program having that much of a success. I also practice criminal defense and have represented children. And my dad was a district court judge in the 80s and 90s. So I come from a family folks that understand law enforcement and the criminal justice system as a whole.

But I wanted to bring you in if you wanted to add anything.

MS. SAHAF: Sure. I appreciate it. You know, I have a lot of different -- so my team is public defenders, former public defenders and prosecutors and some really incredible scientists with similar bona fides to folks here. And I sometimes had like tech folks come and say, what is the solution? You know, is it ShotSpotter? What is it?

And I have incredible data scientists who say, no, you know, who understand tech and use it. And they don't think tech is the solution. And I wish it was. I understand the attraction for that. But the solution is, you know, more money to communities

at the local level.

I also echo what an earlier panel said, we already know what the solutions are. People who have lived experience who are doing the work, they know what the solutions are already. And we need to collect more data to back up those stories. But we have a lot of evidence already about what works. But they need more funding and money.

You know, my organization sometimes gives subgrants to help people build diversion programs. But the question is when we leave what's going to happen? They are desperate for funding.

So we have a lot of solutions that work, but the money is not getting to the folks to make sure things are sustainable and can be built.

I have people doing restorative justice programs who are, like, we want to scale it, but they need the money. So I think it's good to know that we already -- there is some data collection. You know, it's imperfect, but we already have really good guidance from the data and from people who are doing the work. And we really just need to give them whatever they ask for, they know.

VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Could just explain what a diversion program is for our audience?

MS. SAHAF: Absolutely. So a diversion doesn't have a perfectly even definition across. But really I think of it as ways to solve. So when criminalized behavior occurs, when a crime occurs and even that's fraught as we know, you know, when we talk through how we measure crime rates, et cetera.

But it's finding a way to address crime and harm outside of the criminal system -- so in a way that would not end up with somebody getting a conviction because we know those carry so many collateral consequences -- that make a safer and help make those citizens, you know, deal with major uphill battles to becoming productive, thriving members of society and tend to drive -- they drive programs and resources to wherever the underlying drivers are of people's conduct.

I tell people all the time, my kids are in camp in the summer. And so they are occupied. They have something to do. If you are not occupied, if you don't have recreation, if you're not in good schools, if you don't have health care, if you don't have safe child care, you know, these are all the things that cause people to get caught up in criminal activity. And it does include absolutely over-policing. It does.

You know, if you live in a detached house and you are arguing with your spouse, no one is calling the cops. And if you live in a narrow apartment building and there are thin walls and noise, absolutely policing does not reflect where all the crime is occurring. Crime is occurring all over the place, but who is being policed is very much driven by other factors.

So diversion programs find ways to address services to whatever is the underlying driver of the crime, maybe it's mental health, there is substance abuse, joblessness, mentoring outside of the criminal system.

So, for example, you will often see in the criminal system you need to, you know, serve this much time and this fine and maybe community service. But if you have a mental health issue that's driving your criminal conduct, the community service is never really going to get you where you need to go.

So our recommendation is always services provided in community-based organizations that are tied to those communities that know what the needs are that have, you know, access to mentors, to jobs, you know, resumes, substance abuse apart from the system because we've also heard a lot today around the many,

1 many reasons many people don't want to interact with They're not there. And we know that 2 the system. 3 there is a lot of harm that's been inflicted. 4 finding ways to address crime outside of the criminal legal system. 5 6 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. We have time for 7 question. really appreciate the robust Ι 8 Thank you. Commissioner Magpantay. conversation. 9 COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: I've got question, a moment of gratitude, thanks. Ms. Sahaf, I 10 11 wanted more of those details so that was great. 12 I just wanted to thank Rafael who actually 13 serves on the New York Advisory Committee to the U.S. 14 Commission on Civil Rights. We served on the 15 committee a number of years -- I think you're still on 16 I wanted to thank you for your service to the New 17 York Advisory Committee and for this testimony. 18 course, all of you, thank you for sharing and taking 19 your time. 20 CHAIR GARZA: Wonderful. Well, thank you 21 all very much again for the robust conversation. You 22 have given us a lot to consider. Thank you for your 23 testimony. We will be looking at that as we develop 24 our report.

So I'm going to ask all the attendees to

continue any conversations you want to have outside of 1 the hearing room so our staff can prepare the room for 2 3 -- okay. We're recessing. 4 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:29 p.m. and resumed at 4:04 p.m.) 5 6 CHAIR GARZA: Welcome back, everyone, for 7 our public comment period. We're going to proceed 8 with the public comment session. 9 Just a few opening instructions we've 10 provided to each participant. Please tailor your 11 remarks to the topic of today's briefing: the racial, 12 gender, and ethnic disparities among victims 13 crimes, violent crimes. Please state your name for 14 the record so that we can make sure it's included. Please note that the U.S. Commission on 15 16 Civil Rights has a policy not to defame, degrade, or 17 incriminate any person. Also, this comment period is 18 a time for Commissioners to listen, not to engage in 19 discussion with auestions or presenters. We 20 appreciate your testimony and we're eager to hear it. 21 You will have five minutes to speak, which 22 will be measured by a timer. So please notice the box 23 in front of you. It has three lights. When the light 24 turns from green to yellow, that means one minute

And when the light turns red, you should

remains.

1 conclude your statement. If you do not conclude, I will cut you off 2 3 in order to allow other folks to speak. So just wrap 4 up, when you see that light, wrap up your thought. If you have not finished or would like to 5 6 submit additional information, we encourage you to do 7 so by mailing or emailing your written submissions to 8 us at the address provided on your information sheet 9 by Friday, December 15 of this year. 10 And while awaiting your turn, please sit 11 in the numbered chair that corresponds to your ticket. 12 In order to reduce time between speakers, we ask you 13 to move forward to, well, to turn on your microphone 14 before and go ahead and start after the last person 15 has finished. 16 If you need to step out briefly for any 17 reason, just to use the restroom or otherwise, please 18 let a staff person know, and then you can be reseated. 19 And a quick reminder, we have a licensed 20 mental health professional available if you do need 21 assistance, so please let a staff member know that you 22 would like to speak with them, and our staff will 23 direct you to the appropriate place. 24 So we'll go ahead and begin, starting with

the person on my left.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

2 MS. JOHNSON: Can you hear me? All right. Thank you to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for holding this incredibly important briefing. My name is Kierra Johnson, and I'm the Executive Director of the National LGBTQ Task Force, the oldest 6 7 rights and advocacy organization in the country. Here at the task force we know that our 8

history tells our story, but it also shapes future. Unfortunately, history has shown us that across this country, LGBTQ+ people, particularly Black transgender women, continue to be disproportionately impacted by acts of violence.

Reports show that transgender people in United States face persistent and pervasive the In 2022 alone, people of color discrimination. account for 81% of violence against known victims in the transgender community, and 59% of them are Black.

Transwomen are also disproportionately represented, as they have been in years past, also comprising 81% of the deaths recorded.

It is undeniable that trans and gender non-conforming people in the U.S., and Latina and Black transgender women in particularly, disproportionately impacted. And this pattern shows

1

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

no sign of stopping in 2023.

The FBI started tracking hate crimes against transgender people in 2015 -- in 2013. Since then, there have been 302 fatalities accounted for, with a large percentage being overwhelmingly Black, under 35, and killed with a firearm.

Despite this high number of fatalities, we also know that a large percentage of these deaths are reported with inaccurate information relating to the victim's gender identity. This raises alarms about the extreme violence that folks are faced with and illustrates even more that stronger protections are essential.

Transgender African Americans, according to research, are disproportionately impacted by violence among LGBT people. Among respondents to the 2015 U.S. transgender study, 44% of Black respondents reported being verbally harassed, more than half were sexually assaulted in their life.

Another study of anti-LGBTQ violence found that 71% reported -- of homicides reported were people of color, 52% were transgender or gender non-conforming, and 40% were transgender women of color.

This violence comes as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people are being targeted in

the media, in events, and across state legislatures. States across the country have been advancing anti-LGBTQ legislation while simultaneously dismantling their gun protection laws.

The result is a deadly environment where LGBTQ+ people must live in constant fear for their lives. The Williams Institute reports that gun violence, racism, and violence against trans and gender non-conforming individuals is closely intertwined.

Guns are the most frequently used weapon in the murder of transgender people, especially at the hands of law enforcement. Nearly three-quarters of trans people killed in America from 2017 to 2022 were killed by a gun.

Violence in law enforcement interactions unfortunately have been deadly. The Williams Institute also found that LGBTO individuals and continue communities to face profiling, discrimination, and harassment at the hands of law enforcement officers. Notably, police abuse misconduct reported higher were at rates by respondents of color and transgender and gender nonconforming respondents.

This experience is echoed in data from the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

U.S. transgender survey, in which 61% of Black respondents experienced some form of mistreatment by the police, including being verbally harassed, physically or sexually assaulted.

I'm here to say out loud to you that Black lives matter. Black trans lives matter, or at least they should.

To keep families, our communities safe, lawmakers at every level must take action to prioritize legislation that protects communities from hate-fueled violence. And the first step is ensuring federal non-discrimination protections and policies extend to LGBTQ people and are updated to protect women, people of color, and LGBTQ folks in public accommodations.

Transphobia is an aggravating factor of these violent crimes, and it must be taken seriously. In fact, it is quite literally life or death. As the Commission investigates violent crimes in America, the violence that queer and trans people endure daily should be included.

And the Commission needs to look at race and gender and take them under its civil rights purview. Additionally, we urge the Commission to recommend LGBTQ sensitivity training for law

1 enforcement and victim services to support victims and their loved ones appropriately and compassionately. 2 3 This world will not be safe for any of us 4 if we are unable to live our authentic lives free from violence and harassment. Thank you so much for your 5 6 consideration. 7 CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for your 8 We'll go ahead and move on to the second testimony. 9 speaker. 10 MS. ETCUBANEZ: Thank you. First, thank 11 you for holding this hearing and for the opportunity 12 My name is Marita Etcubanez, and I am Vice 13 President for Strategic Initiatives with 14 Americans Advancing Justice, AAJC. We're a nonprofit 15 organization focused on federal policy advocacy to 16 advance civil and human rights for the Asian-American 17 community. 18 So I very much appreciate the Commission 19 holding a hearing this spring focused on anti-Asian 20 racism and the federal government response. We 21 appreciate the spotlight presented by that hearing, 22 where we and other community advocates were able to 23 on the discrimination that Asian-American 24 communities have faced over time, but in particular in

recent years connected to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Our testimony for that hearing was focused on hate crimes and hate incidents. While we provided a great deal of information on the available data, we also spoke about the need for improvements to data collection. I would like to offer additional information that has become available since that hearing.

While hate crimes motivated by anti-Asian bias are down in 2022 from the all-time high recorded by the FBI in 2021, overall hate crimes are still at alarmingly high levels, with a total of nearly 11,650 hate crimes reported to the FBI in 2022.

And while the hate crimes motivated by anti-Asian bias have gone down to four percent of the total from seven percent of the total in 2021, these levels are still many times higher than what we had been seeing prior to the Covid-19 pandemic.

We continue to urge greater effort to speed the transition to NIBRS and to improve hate crime reporting in general. As we noted previously, community reporting sites are still needed to give us a better sense of the scope of what Asian-Americans are facing, particularly since we know that many Asian-Americans still do not feel comfortable looking to law enforcement and the criminal justice system for

recourse.

So this brings me to the two points I wish to highlight for the Commission: the need for greater data disaggregation, and for improved language access.

Contrary to popular perception, while many Asian-Americans are doing well -- many are high-earning, well-educated -- our community also has the greatest income gap of any racial group, which means that there are also significant segments of the community that continue to struggle.

Certain Asian-Americans, whether due to poverty, residential segregation, or other factors, are move vulnerable to violent crime. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics' most recent data, 252 and 60 Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders were the victims of violent crime in 2022, amounting to four percent of all violent crimes. This is an increase both in terms of the number and percentage from the year before.

Data on violent crime victimization is currently only available by broad racial categories, which we fear may obscure the higher risk of victimization of the more disadvantaged in our community.

Asian Americans Advancing Justice, AAJC,

urges the government to collect more detailed data on the victim of violent crime, disaggregated to reflect the diverse experiences of the various subgroups within the Asian-American population, which will help ensure that resources can be allocated to those most in need.

Asian Americans Advancing Justice applauds the Commission for including language access among its top recommendations in its report on the federal response to anti-Asian racism. We stand ready to support the Commission in its efforts to make the government and government-funded programs and services more accessible to all, especially those who have difficulty communicating in English.

The majority of Asian-American immigrants, 52%, have limited proficiency in English, and when we look at the disaggregated data, we see that LEP rates are much higher for certain segments of our community. Seventy-nine percent of Burmese immigrants, 72% of Vietnamese immigrants, 67% of Cambodian immigrants, and 66% of Chinese immigrants have limited proficiency in English.

So while not everyone will feel comfortable turning to law enforcement, when people from our community do, it is vital that they are able

to access help in their language. Civil rights are not limited only to those who can communicate effectively in English.

Federal agencies and entities receiving federal funding have a legal obligation to provide language access, and this obligation should not turn on whether one speaks one of the more commonly spoken languages in the U.S. When one of our elders, for example, is the victim of violent crime, they should be able to access help, even if they don't speak English.

And when our communities are impacted by mass shootings, as we saw in Atlanta in 2021 and in Monterey Park in Half Moon Bay, California, during the Lunar New Year celebrations earlier this year, the response by law enforcement and government agencies must be in the languages spoken by the impacted population.

So with that, again, we urge your assistance and we stand ready to help when it comes to improving data disaggregation and language access. I want to thank you for organizing this hearing and for your continued focus on understanding how different communities are impacted by crime.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much for your

1 comments. We're going to move on to the next speaker. 2 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon. My name is 3 Zack Smith, and I'm with the Heritage Foundation. 4 Much of the discussion surrounding today's criminal justice policies unfortunately revolve around 5 6 two myths. One, that our criminal justice system is 7 systemically racist, and two, that we have a mass 8 incarceration problem. Neither of these are true. 9 Yet, if we look at what has happened in 10 cities around the country, politicians have pushed out 11 policies based on both of these myths. Take, for 12 example, what has happened here in our nation's 13 capital, Washington, DC. 14 In July of 2020, in the wake of the riots 15 following George Floyd's death, the local city council 16 cut \$15 million from the local police force's budget 17 as part of "grappling with the undoing of centuries of 18 systemic layered racism and its permutations 19 throughout our society." 20 Charles Allen, the local councilmember who 21 spearheaded this effort, proudly proclaimed that this 22 budget cut would result in the biggest reduction to 23 MPD, DC's local police force, that he had ever seen. 24 Allen anticipated that MPD would lose at least 200 25 officers as a result of this cut, and he pledged to

continue to take similar actions because he knew that "racial justice wouldn't be achieved in a single budget."

So how are these efforts going? Well, I think anyone who has watched the news or talked to DC residents will tell you that things are not going well. In April of this year, then-DC Police Chief Robert Conti said that his department had a net loss of about 450 police officers over the past three years, putting his department staffing level at the lowest it's been in half a century.

The number of sworn officers has continued to fall and is expected to continue to fall short for the foreseeable future. This at the same time that the District is experiencing a rash of violent crimes. Homicides are up 34% compared to this same time last year, robberies are up 67%. Motor vehicle thefts are up 97%, carjackings are up an astounding 105%.

The District ended last year, 2022, with 203 murders. So far this year, the District has experienced 243 murders.

Compare this number to a little over ten years ago, when the District experienced the relatively low number of 88 murders in 2012. It's clear that something has changed, and that something

has to change again. That's especially true when we consider who is predominantly being victimized by the increases in violent crime.

In December 2021, the National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform released a report on the gun violence problem in the Washington, DC. It examined all 341 homicides that occurred in the District in 2019 and 20202, and all 522 non-fatal injury shootings that occurred in 2020.

It found that the victims and suspects of homicides and non-fatal shootings in DC are predominantly male, Black, and between the ages of 18 and 43. It further found that about 96% of victims and suspects in both homicides and non-fatal shootings were Black, despite Black residents comprising only 46% of the District's population.

As the number of shootings and homicides have climbed, so too tragically have the number of young Black men who have been victimized by these crimes. Yet as we look elsewhere to cities around the country, including those that have been the focus of today's hearings, places like Denver, Houston, Memphis, Milwaukee, and Seattle, just to name a few, these same types of trends can be seen there too.

Moreover, prosecutors in many of these

cities have pledged not to prosecute certain crimes, not to seek bail in many cases pending trial, and not to seek sentences of incarceration wherever they can avoid it. Yet by failing to do their duty, these prosecutors are creating more victims in their communities.

It's also important to push back against the notion that there's certain so-called quality-of-life crimes, things like shoplifting, prostitution, and drug possession, that cannot be prosecuted with no adverse consequences. Allowing these crimes to go unchecked harms their communities where they take place and makes businesses untenable in those communities.

This often means that the only grocery store or the only pharmacy in certain low-income neighborhoods close, making it that much more difficult for residents of those neighborhoods to live on a day-to-day basis.

Contrary to what some have said, data and science do not support these soft-on-crime approaches. At the end of the day, we know what works to combat crime and to lower the number of young Black men who are shooting and homicide victims.

Put more police on the street, empower

them to responsibly do their jobs, and have prosecutors who will prosecute crimes, hold criminals accountable, and seek justice for all victims. This is what our communities deserve, and we all should expect no less.

Thank you.

CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. Thank you to all of the folks that have provided their comments today. Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak? No? Okay. Hearing none, that concludes our Public Comment Session, and that actually brings us to the end of our briefing.

I want to thank all of our panelists and our public comment participants. Today has been a tremendously informative day, and on behalf of the Commission, I thank all who presented for sharing your time, expertise, and experiences with us.

And as I said earlier, the record for this briefing shall remain open until December 15 of this year.

Panelists or members of the public who would like to submit materials for Commission consideration, which we welcome, may mail them to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Office of Civil Rights Evaluation, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite

1	1150, Washington, D.C. 20425. Or email them to
2	victimsofcrime victims is plural
3	victimsofcrime@usccr.gov.
4	I ask that our attendees move any
5	continuing conversations outside of the hearing room
6	so our staff can complete any logistics necessary to
7	close out. And please make sure you exit the building
8	through the F Street lobby, as the exit to the
9	Pennsylvania side is closed.
10	So, if there's nothing further, I hereby
11	adjourn the briefing at 4:24 p.m. Eastern Time. Thank
12	you.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
14	off the record at 4:24 p.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

2