



Village of Winnetka

Village Council Study Session

December 13, 2022 at 7:00 PM
Village Hall
510 Green Bay Road

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Public Comments**
3. **Discussion**
 - a. Firearm Safety Follow Up Meeting
4. **Adjournment**

NOTICE

All agenda materials are available at villageofwinnetka.org (Governance > Agendas & Minutes); the Reference Desk at the Winnetka Library; or in the Manager's Office at Village Hall (2nd floor).

The Village of Winnetka, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, requests that all persons with disabilities who require certain accommodations to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting or have questions about the accessibility of the meeting or facilities, contact the Village ADA Coordinator, 510 Green Bay Road, Winnetka, Illinois 60093, 847-716-3543; T.D.D. 847-501-6041.



Agenda Item Executive Summary

TITLE: Firearm Safety Follow Up Meeting

PRESENTER: Marc Hornstein

AGENDA DATE: December 13, 2022

CONSENT: No

ITEM TYPE: Old Business

ITEM HISTORY:

August 9, 2022 - The Village Council held a public listening session regarding firearms safety.
September 20, 2022 - Village Council adopts Resolution No. R-100-2022: A Resolution Calling for Federal and State Action on Gun Safety and Violence.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On July 4, 2022, the Village of Winnetka was shocked and devastated by the mass shooting committed at the City of Highland Park Independence Day parade, in which several people were killed and dozens were injured. At the August 9th Village Council listening session, Village residents expressed deep concern that gun-related violence is endemic in our society.

On September 20, 2022, the Village of Winnetka joined other Illinois local governments, including our neighbors in Glencoe, Highland Park, Northbrook, and Wilmette, adopting a resolution to promote safe firearms practices and call for the United States Congress and the State of Illinois to take effective and comprehensive action to protect our communities from gun violence.

At the December 13, 2022 Village Council Study session, the Council will review the Village's existing firearms regulations as set forth in Chapter 9.12 of the Village Code and discuss potential amendments - see Attachment 1 Village Firearms Regulations Legal Memo. Any amendments to the Village Code would require drafting an Ordinance, with introduction and adoption at future Village Council meetings. In addition, Police Chief Marc Hornstein and Village Social Worker Dr. Cythnia Plazas will be present to answer Council questions about the social services provided by the Village. See Attachment 2 for a memo summarizing the Police Social Worker role and available community resources.

RECOMMENDATION:

Provide direction to staff about potential amendments to the Village Code.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Village Firearms Regulations Legal Memo
2. Social Worker Summary 2022

Peter M. Friedman
312.528.5192
peter.friedman@elrodfriedman.com

Memorandum

Date: November 4, 2022
To: Robert Bahan, Village Manager
From: Peter M. Friedman
Hart M. Passman
Re: Village Firearms Regulations

At your request, we have analyzed the Village's existing firearms regulations, as set forth in Chapter 9.12 of the Village Code, to identify any necessary or advisable amendments. We have reviewed the existing ordinances in light of recent court decisions affecting other Illinois local governments, including: *Wilson v. Cook County*, 2012 IL 112026 (2012), in which the Illinois Supreme Court held that the Cook County assault weapons ban was not impermissibly vague and did not violate the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution; *Friedman v. City of Highland Park*, 784 F.3d 406 (7th Cir. 2015), *cert. denied*, 577 U.S. 1039 (2015), in which the United States Circuit Court for the Seventh Circuit held that the Highland Park assault weapons ban did not violate the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and *Easterday v. Village of Deerfield*, 2020 IL App (2d) 190879, in which the Illinois Appellate Court upheld Deerfield's 2018 ordinance amendments by which that Village converted a safe storage law into a full assault weapons ban.

In Sections 1 through 6 of this Memorandum, we identify key firearms regulations and components of the existing Village regulations, and discuss whether, and to what extent, we recommend amendments based on the current state of constitutional and Illinois preemption law. In Section 7, we review whether and how the Village might consider implementation of a full ban on assault weapons. In Section 8, we identify the opportunity to increase fines for violations of firearms regulations.

1. Regulation of Handguns.

There is a distinct difference between the Village's authority to regulate handguns and the Village's authority to regulate assault weapons. Recall that the Village Council adopted a prohibition on handguns in the aftermath of the 1988 shooting at the Hubbard Woods Elementary School. The Village Council repealed this ban following the U.S. Supreme Court's 2008 decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008), in which the Court recognized for the first time a right under the Second Amendment to possess handguns in the home for self-defense. Additionally, in Illinois, Section 13.1(b) of the Illinois Firearm Owners Identification Card Act ("**FOID Act**") specifically pre-empts home rule authority with respect to "the regulation, licensing, possession, and registration of handguns and ammunition for a handgun."

Accordingly, we do not recommend that the Village adopt new code provisions regarding the regulation, possession, or registration of handguns or of the ammunition for handguns, as these types of code provisions will be subject to challenge as violations of the Second Amendment and outside the Village's home rule powers. The Village should also be careful not to enforce any of its existing or future firearms regulations in a manner that impermissibly affects handguns.

2. Parental Responsibility.

Section 24-9 of the Illinois Criminal Code generally prohibits access to firearms to minors 14 years or younger if the minor causes death or great bodily harm with the firearm, except if the firearm was secured or used by the minor for self-defense or obtained through illegal means. The City of Chicago has a far broader provision. Under Section 8-20-050 of the Chicago City Code ("Firearms – Protection of Minors"), parental/adult liability attaches to anybody under the age 18 (rather than 14) and is not limited to just when the minor "causes death or great bodily harm," but rather applies if "the person knows or had reason to believe that a minor under the age of 18 years is likely to gain access to the firearm or ammunition." We are concerned that Chicago's provision, to the extent that it applies to handguns (that is, a regulation on how one can legally or illegally possess a handgun) runs afoul of the FOIA Act handgun preemption.

Section 8-20-050 was adopted in 2010, three years before the FOIA Act preemption took effect. It is possible that this provision is not being enforced in light of the FOIA Act preemption even though it has not been officially repealed. We are in discussions on this issue with the Chicago Corporation Counsel's office to determine the City's legal position on Section 8-20-050 and whether there is a legal justification to support inclusion of a similar provision in the Winnetka Village Code. We will be able to provide a more definitive answer on this distinct issue at or prior to the Study Session discussion on November 10.

3. Definition of Assault Weapons.

Section 9.12.20.C of the Village Code sets forth a long definition of the term "assault weapon." In Sections 9.12.20.C.1 through C.6, the Code sets forth general descriptions of the features of firearms that, if present, render the weapon an "assault weapon." Section 9.12.20.C.7 then names over 60 specific types of firearms that are expressly identified as "assault weapons."

As you know, the 2013 amendments to the Illinois Firearm Owners Identification Card Act, 430 ILCS 65/0.01 *et seq.*, greatly restricted local authority to regulate assault weapons. Under those amendments, no municipality may regulate assault weapons unless it enacted local assault weapons regulations on or before the date that was 10 days after the statutory amendments became law.¹ 430 ILCS 65/13.1(c). If a municipality enacted its regulations by the end of that 10-Day Window, then it may maintain, and even amend, assault weapons regulations. *Id.* The statute explains that a proper local regulation of assault weapons must "designate...either make or model or by a test or list of cosmetic features that cumulatively would place the firearm into a definition of 'assault weapon' under the ordinance." *Id.*

Winnetka's current definition of assault weapons appears to be the same as the then-existing definition of "assault weapons" in Cook County ordinance that survived scrutiny in the

¹ This provision is often referred to as the "10-Day Window". Governor Quinn issued an amendatory veto of the bill that proposed the amendments on July 2, 1993. The General Assembly overrode the veto on July 9, 2013. Accordingly, the "10-Day Window" closed on July 19, 2013. Winnetka adopted its current assault weapons regulations on that last day of the 10-Day Window.

Wilson litigation.² That same definition was adopted by the City of Highland Park, and upheld in the *Friedman* case. Because the Village's definition matches the definitions that have been upheld against vagueness, equal protection, and Second Amendment challenges, we do **not** recommend that the Village amend its definition at this time. Unless the Village expands its law to include a partial or full ban on assault weapons (see Section 6 of this Memorandum), the definition thus makes these weapons subject to the safe storage and transportation regulations (see Section 4), but not more.

4. Definition of Large Capacity Magazine for Assault Weapons Only.

Following the 2013 statutory amendments, many communities that adopted assault weapons regulations included provisions governing "large capacity magazines." Generally, a large capacity magazine is one that can hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition at a time. The Village is among the municipalities that defines "large capacity magazine" in this fashion (with three exceptions that are also common across these types of ordinances). The Village's ordinance only uses the term "large capacity magazine" in one substantive manner: one of the definitions of "assault weapon" is "a semiautomatic rifle that has the capacity to accept a large capacity magazine detachable or otherwise..." See Sec. 9.12.020.C.1.

In *Easterday v. Village of Deerfield*, while the Appellate Court upheld nearly all of Deerfield's assault weapons ban, the Court ruled against the Village with respect to its large capacity magazine provisions. The Court noted that while the 2013 statutory amendments contemplated some local assault weapons regulations, they completely banned local regulation of ammunition for handguns. See 2020 IL App (2d) 190879, ¶ 69. Thus, the Court ruled that "to the extent that Deerfield's ban of large capacity magazines regulates ammunition for handguns, it is preempted in its application to holders of valid FOID cards and concealed carry licenses by section 13.1(b) of the FOID Card Act and section 90 of the Concealed Carry Act." *Id.* at 2020 IL App (2d) 190879, ¶ 71.

Accordingly, to avoid any confusion and to minimize the risk of a challenge, we recommend amendment of the definition of "large capacity magazine" so that it applies only to assault weapons.

5. Safe Storage and Transportation Regulations for Assault Weapons Only.

When the Village adopted its 2013 ordinance, it elected not to pursue a full ban on assault weapons, as Highland Park did. Rather, Winnetka adopted a "safe storage" law, set forth in Section 9.12.025 of the Village Code. The Village's ordinance has two components: a requirement that assault weapons are safely stored in the Village, and regulations on transportation of assault weapons. Each of these is discussed in turn below.

a. Safe Storage.

Section 9.12.025.A provides that it is unlawful "to store or keep any assault weapon in the Village unless such weapon is secured in a locked container or equipped with a tamper-resistant mechanical lock or other safety device, properly engaged so as to render such weapon inoperable by any person other than the owner or other lawfully authorized user." The Code further explains

² Cook County has since amended its definition further to add several more categories of assault weapons. Highland Park has not followed suit. We are not aware of any legal challenge to the amended County definition.

that “[f]or purposes of this section, such weapon shall not be deemed stored or kept when being carried by or under the control of the owner or other lawfully authorized user.”

We are not aware of any legal challenge to a safe storage law; to date, the gun rights lobby has focused its efforts on more drastic local regulations like full bans. We do believe that *some* type of safe storage law is legal (for municipalities that acted by the end of the 10-Day Window), given the Appellate Court’s decision in the *Easterday v. Village of Deerfield* case, in which the Court rejected the plaintiffs’ claims that the 2013 statutory amendments prohibited all local assault weapons regulations of any kind. See 2020 IL App (2d) 190879, ¶¶ 39-42. But we cannot be certain as to whether the Village’s current ordinance would survive such a challenge.

With that in mind, we find that the safe storage provisions in Section 9.12.025.A are not as clear as they could be. Specifically, the second sentence of Sec. 9.12.025.A – which states that a weapon is not being “stored or kept” if “under the control” of the owner or an “authorized user” – is vague and unnecessarily repetitive. Sec. 9.12.025.B provides rules on how an assault weapon must be handled when it is not being “stored or kept” -- that is, when it is being carried or otherwise possessed. This Subsection B provides that it is generally unlawful to carry or possess an assault weapon except when the owner of the gun is on the owner’s own land or in the owner’s own home, or as a permitted invitee to another property or another home. Subsection B further provides that these carry-and-possess regulations do not apply if the gun is inoperable, not immediately accessible, or unloaded and enclosed in a case by a proper FOID card holder. Given these provisions, we believe that the second sentence of Subsection A may be deleted.

b. Transportation.

Sec. 9.12.025.B of the Village Code generally outlaws the carrying or possession of assault weapons. That provision contains three exceptions: (1) on the owner’s own land, dwelling, or place of business; (2) on someone else’s land or dwelling, with the owner’s permission; and (3) in transportation, but only if the weapon satisfies one of three conditions:

- The weapon is “broken down in a non-functioning state; or”
- The weapon is “not immediately accessible; or”
- The weapon is “unloaded and enclosed” in a case or box by someone with a FOID card.

As with safe storage laws, we are not aware of a legal challenge to transportation laws, and we believe the general authority upheld in *Easterday* validates the Village’s general authority to enforce its own transportation law. However, we are troubled by the disjunctive connection between the three conditions for permissible transportation. In contrast, Highland Park’s transportation regulation is *conjunctive*: a weapon cannot be transported unless it is “broken down *and* in a nonfunctioning state *and* ... not immediately accessible.” Highland Park City Code, Sec. 136.006(C) (emphasis added). We do not believe that the Village’s transportation regulation is legally problematic; rather, we believe it is substantively insufficient. We recommend amending this provision to make the three conditions conjunctive, such that all three must be met for the exception to apply. Simply, the two instances of “or” should be revised to “and.”

c. Police and Military Exception.

Section 9.12.025.C.2 of the Village Code contains a general exception from both the safe storage and transportation regulations for law enforcement officers and members of the military. The exception is limited to only those who “are authorized by a competent authority to so carry an assault weapon loaded on a public way” and who are “acting within the scope of his duties or training.”

As written, it is not clear if the police and military exception only applies when those personnel are “on a public way” or if it applies anywhere in the Village, if the personnel’s authorization includes carrying on a public way. We recommend that this provision be amended to eliminate the “public way” reference. We note that the Village of Deerfield’s ordinance contains similar language as Winnetka’s, but that Highland Park’s ordinance does not have the “public way” reference.

6. Other Existing Provisions.

We have identified the following additional concerns about other existing provisions of Chapter 9.12:

a. Surrender of Handguns and Ammunition.

Section 9.12.030 sets forth a process for the “voluntary” and “peaceable” surrender of handguns and ammunition to the Village Chief of Police. The Section contains two conditions in Sec. 9.12.030.B, each of which provides that the surrender does not “moot or in any manner invalidate” arrests or prosecutions for certain firearm-related actions. Some of the text of Sec. 9.12.030.B is vague, and we recommend clarifying amendments as part of any approved set of changes to Chapter 9.12. Specifically, we would re-write 9.12.030 as follows (with additions in bold and double-underlined text, and deletions struck through):

“Section 9.12.030 Surrender of handguns and ammunition.

A. Voluntary Surrender. ~~Subject to the provisions of the following subsection (B), any Any person within the Village may voluntarily and peaceably deliver and abandon to the Chief of Police any handgun or ammunition. Except as provided in the following subsection (B), no No person shall be asked for identification nor will such person be subject to prosecution for the possession of any handgun or ammunition voluntarily surrendered.~~

B. Conditions. The voluntary surrender of any handgun or ammunition shall be subject to the following conditions: **shall not moot or in any manner invalidate any pending or future investigation, arrest, charge, or prosecution for a violation of any provision of this Chapter 9.12 or any other law or regulation concerning the use or possession of firearms.**

1. ~~The voluntary delivery or abandonment of any handgun or ammunition after an arrest or charge for violation of any provision of this section shall not moot or in any manner invalidate such arrest or charge.~~

2. ~~The voluntary delivery or abandonment of any handgun or ammunition shall not moot or in any manner invalidate the investigation, arrest, charge or prosecution for any offenses other than possession.~~

C. Destruction of Surrendered Handguns. Whenever any handgun or ammunition is surrendered pursuant to the terms of this section, the Chief of Police shall ascertain whether such handgun or ammunition is needed as evidence in any matter. If such handgun or ammunition is not required for evidence it shall be destroyed at the direction of the Chief of Police. A record of the date and method of destruction and an inventory of the handgun or ammunition so destroyed shall be maintained.”

b. Firearms Dealers.

Section 9.12.040 imposes a blanket prohibition on firearms dealer **businesses** in the Village. This ordinance applies with equal force to handgun and assault weapons dealers. It appears that this provision dates back at least to 2008.

We have the following observations regarding this provision. Section 9.12.040 is, functionally, a zoning regulation – it prohibits a particular land use. As a best practice, zoning regulations belong in zoning codes. Further, because of the public hearing requirement in Illinois for zoning code amendments, zoning code provisions enjoy a somewhat-greater presumption of validity.

That said, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois has, in the past, ruled that complete bans on firearm **sales** do not pass Second Amendment muster. In *Ass’n of Firearms Retailers v. City of Chicago*, 961 F. Supp. 2d 928 (N.D. Ill. 2014), the Court held that Chicago’s “blanket ban” on the sale of weapons impermissibly burdened citizens’ Second Amendment rights. Winnetka’s provision is not the same: it does not ban all sales, but merely bans the *business* of being a gun salesman. We are not aware of a reported decision analyzing how the Second Amendment analysis should or should not distinguish between a ban on gun sales versus a ban on gun businesses. As a result, the Village’s total prohibition on this business could be challengeable.

As you may know, earlier this year, the City of Naperville adopted an ordinance banning the sale of assault weapons throughout its jurisdiction. That ordinance is now being reviewed in the federal court. Although we have concerns about the Village’s current firearm dealer ban, we recommend waiting at this time to observe the outcome of the Naperville litigation. We also do not believe that an amendment now (to move the provision into the zoning code or otherwise remove or amend it) is in the Village’s best interests, as it will call unwanted attention to an ordinance that has not captured the attention of those that might want to challenge local firearms regulations. We can re-evaluate this recommendation after the Naperville case and other pending assault weapons cases are fully adjudicated.

7. Implementation of an Assault Weapons Ban.

If the Village desires to implement a partial or complete assault weapons ban, as Highland Park and Deerfield have done, it can do so either through amending its own Code to expressly prohibit these weapons, or it can coordinate with Cook County for local enforcement of the County’s ban. Each of these is described below.

a. Amendment to the Village Code.

Deerfield, like Winnetka, adopted a safe storage law in 2013 – but then converted its ordinance to a full assault weapons ban in 2018. That amendment was reviewed and upheld by the courts in the *Easterday* decision described above. If the Village would like to implement a ban,

it can do so by simply adopting language similar to Highland Park's and Deerfield's ordinances. The *Easterday* decision secures the rights of Illinois municipalities that acted before the expiration of the 10-Day Window to later tighten their laws to include a ban.

It is possible that adoption of a ban will lead to litigation. At this time, an organization called the National Association for Gun Rights (NAGR) has initiated at least four lawsuits earlier this year against the States of Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, and against the City of Highland Park, challenging those jurisdictions' assault weapons bans.³ NAGR bases its lawsuits on the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n, Inc. v. Bruen*, 142 S. Ct. 2111 (2022), in which the Court invalidated the New York State concealed carry law. The *Bruen* decision sets forth a new framework for review of local firearms regulations that is considerably tougher than the analysis employed to uphold assault weapons bans in *Friedman* and other prior cases. Many scholars and attorneys have surmised that a court applying *Bruen* would find an assault weapons ban to be unconstitutional.

We do not think there would be much value to NAGR or a similar organization to suing Winnetka, given that the same court that would review the Village's ban is the same one that is reviewing Highland Park's – and so we think there is no ground to be gained by suing Winnetka that cannot be covered in the pending litigation. Nevertheless, there is an obvious possibility that the Village would be sued if it adopts a ban.

b. Enforcement of Cook County Ban.

Alternatively, the Village could seek to prohibit assault weapons through the County's ordinance – either through direct enforcement by the County, or through an arrangement by which the County authorizes the Village to enforce the County ordinance on its behalf. Either of these options would require an intergovernmental agreement with the County. In prior conversations that we have had concerning other Cook County municipalities, the County has indicated that it is open to either of these options.

There is one potential legal infirmity to this approach. Despite the County's apparent willingness to cooperate, its ordinance may not be applicable in the Village, precisely because the Village has its own regulation. Section 54-92 of the County ordinance states that the County's law is not applicable to the extent that it conflicts with a home rule municipality's own ordinance. It is not clear whether that provision applies only to firearms dealers' regulations, or to the entire County ordinance – which would include assault weapons. If the Village desires to pursue this option, we will need to contact the appropriate County officials to make sure that the County and Village ordinances contain the correct language to ensure the desired cooperation.

8. Fines.

Fines for violations of the Winnetka firearms code provisions are generally set at a maximum of \$750 per violation. However, Illinois courts have determined that home rule municipalities are not limited to a maximum of \$750. The Village may, therefore, consider whether to increase the fine amounts for violations of Village's firearms regulations, as set forth in Chapter 9.12 of the Village Code.

³ NAGR is also the entity behind the pending challenge to Naperville's prohibition on the sale of assault weapons.

MEMORANDUM

TO: ROB BAHAN, VILLAGE MANAGER
FROM: MARC HORNSTEIN, CHIEF OF POLICE
DATE: NOVEMBER 04, 2022
SUBJECT: POLICE SOCIAL WORKER / COMMUNITY RESOURCES

Background:

During the October 28, 2022 budget hearing, Village Council expressed interest in learning more about the village's police social worker position. Council identified they would like to know more about the social worker role or whether the community is aware of the position and the services provided by the police department. The Council asked the police department to provide additional information at an upcoming study session, to include the scope of services provided by the social worker, the availability of resources outside of the police department, and the current social worker's experience as it relates to firearms. Staff has compiled the following information in an effort to address the council's questions.

Police Social Worker Role:

The police department has either employed or contracted for social worker services dating back to 1981. The first social worker was a non-sworn, full-time position. The position remained unchanged until 2003. At that time, the department eliminated the position based on a recommendation from the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) after conducting a staff study at the request of the Chief of Police. From 2003 – 2014, social worker services were contracted through New Trier Township. Late in 2014, after the Township terminated the agreement, the social worker was reintroduced to the department as a non-sworn, part-time position in the police department. The position currently provides crisis intervention, evaluation, short-term counseling, resources, referral, and court advocacy to individuals and families in domestic, juvenile, and other situations. The social worker also serves as a community resource and liaison between the police department and professional social service agencies and civic groups. The position is expected to be available 24/7 for active call outs, to include psychiatric situations, domestic situations requiring orders of protection, death notifications, juvenile or elder abuse, attempted or completed suicides, and other critical incidents.

In the course of her regular duties, the social worker, Dr. Cynthia Plazas, provides follow-up to residents in cases that are referred by police officers or that are identified through her review of the police daily bulletin. Follow-up includes short-term counseling, advocacy, and referral to other resources. In the context of police social work, short term counseling refers to counseling sessions provided to an individual to bridge the gap until they can get into long term counseling. Typically, this is one to three sessions only. It is meant to provide an individual

with active coping skills to work through what is impeding their daily functioning and stabilize them in the interim between an event and long-term care. In 2021, Dr. Plazas assisted in 195 cases, a 91% increase over 2020 when her case load was 102, and more significantly, a 135% increase over 2016 when her case load for the year was 83. Prior to 2021, Dr. Plazas worked an average of seven hours per week. With the increase in cases, Dr. Plazas currently works an average of 12 hours per week. While Dr. Plazas' caseload has increased due to varying social factors including the pandemic, at this time we believe that the position as structured and budgeted is meeting the demands of the department.

Due to the nature of the position, the social worker position has not been intended or structured to provide routine clinical services or prevention services. Her position is designed to provide support services to police officers and assist residents who have been referred after a police officer initiated contact.

Outside Resources:

Because the role is designed to support police officer case work, the social worker is required to have an intimate knowledge of community resources available to residents. Dr. Plazas has a large network of service providers, and she regularly refers residents for long-term counseling or other services as needed. Available resources include:

Service	Available Community Resources
Bereavement	Willow House (Wilmette) Barr- Harris Children Grief Journey Care
Domestic & Family Violence	A Safe Place Skokie Courthouse – Victim Advocacy Center for Contextual Change Children Advocacy Center WINGS Lifespan YWCA Evanston/North Shore North Suburban Legal Aid Clinic
Elder Abuse / Senior Services	North Shore Senior Center
Family Services	Josselyn Center Counseling Center of the North Shore Haven Family Services of Glencoe Family Services of Lake County- HP Family Services of – Wilmette, Glenview, Northbrook and Kenilworth NAMI –Cook County North Suburban Metropolitan Family Services- Evanston OMNI Family Services

	Samaritan Counseling Center- Evanston, Wilmette, Winnetka, Lake Forest, Libertyville, Chicago- Loop
Homeless / Housing	Connections for the Homeless The Harbour Haven Youth & Family Services JOURNEYS/ The Road Home PADS – Lake County Pacific Garden- Cook/Chicago
Sexual Assault Counseling	Children Advocacy Center of NW Cook County, Gurnee Northwest CASA Zacharias Sexual Abuse Center
Substance Abuse	Rosecrans (Rockford – Inpatient / Northbrook- Outpatient) Recovery Centers of America Edge learning Narcotics Anonymous North Shore Adolescent Recovery Center Peer Services
Youth Services	Children’s Advocacy Center of NW Cook County Counseling Center of the North Shore Edge Learning & Collegiate Health Solutions Erika’s Lighthouse Glencoe Junior High Project Glencoe Youth Services The Harbour Haven Youth and Family Services Jewish Child and Family Services Lurie Children’s Hospital North Shore Adolescent Recovery Center OMNI Youth and Family Services Warming House Youth Center Winnetka Youth Organization Youth Connection Youth Services of Glenview/Northbrook

In addition to the above-listed resources, Dr. Plazas works closely with the New Trier Township Social Worker. The New Trier Township Social Worker does not provide clinical services. The primary function of the position is to provide financial assistance referrals along with directing township residents to any of the above listed resources to obtain services. It should be noted that a Winnetka resident can access any of the available resources as they are part of the New Trier Township network.

Court Services:

Another important role of the social worker is to provide court advocacy to individuals and families. The basis of advocacy is to provide practical guidance and emotional support for individuals who must navigate the court system. An example of court advocacy is offering

support to victims of domestic violence who choose to appear in court to testify. By providing court advocacy, Dr. Plazas assists crime victims as they complete the application process for crime victim compensation. She also serves as an advocate for victims of violence by attending court proceedings, assisting with petitions for civil and stalking no contact orders, and orders of protection. Dr. Plazas also serves as a resource to families who seek to obtain a writ of detention. This typically occurs when the behavior of one family member becomes concerning to other family members. When the concern exists about the mental health and safety of an individual and there is a belief that there is a risk of serious physical harm to either the individual or the family, the mental health code allows families to petition the court for an Order of Detention and Examination. This writ directs law enforcement to transport an individual to the hospital for a psychiatric evaluation. Additionally, Dr. Plazas works closely with the North Suburban Legal Aid Clinic to provide mutual aid to residents experiencing domestic violence, family law, etc. When scheduling allows, she attends District 2 court committee meetings and other professional meetings related to court advocacy.

Experience with Issues Related to Firearms:

Dr. Plazas has extensive experience related to firearms issues. Typically, cases involving firearms start with a law enforcement contact due to a domestic violence or order of protection issue; however, Dr. Plazas occasionally receives calls from families she has worked with in the past who are seeking advice. Depending on the nature of the concern, Dr. Plazas will advise residents to contact the Domestic Violence Division of the court to learn about their options related to Firearms Restraining Orders (FRO's). Dr. Plazas herself has attended training sessions through the Attorney General's Office regarding FROs, to include the FRO process, who is eligible to petition, duration and renewals, evidence required to obtain, and the difference between an FRO and Order of Protection.