



NYC Racial Justice Commission

NYC Racial Justice Commission Public Meeting 9/14/21

[View online](#)

APPEARANCES:

- [Jennifer Jones Austin](#)
- [Henry A. Garrido, Vice Chair](#)
- [Ana M. Bermudez](#)
- [Melanie Ash](#)
- [K. Bain](#)
- [Darrick Hamilton](#)
- [Chris Kui](#)
- [Jo-Ann Yoo](#)
- [Anusha Venkataraman](#)
- [Phil Thompson](#)

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 0:00:03

I want to thank the staff and the Commissioners. We've had an incredibly busy summer. Just a few months ago, we got started. We were getting our bearings, staff came on board, Commissioners signed up, and we were essentially just trying to put the organization and structure in place. But what we found ourselves doing over the course of the last, I'd say, eight weeks or so is really beginning to delve into the heart of the matter with various conversations and meetings, both with people in the public, community, thought leaders, and amongst ourselves. I think we've gotten off to a great start in terms of the substantive work. We're now at the point - our Executive Director will speak to this at greater length - of honing in on the specific issues that the mission will address through structural change to get at underlying structure and equity to end the system: the structural laws and the provisions that allow for inequity to persist. Today's agenda is mostly going to be of reporting, staff and what they've been working on, what we've accomplished as a Commission, and what the next two months will look like. So, we're going to have an update from the executive director. We're going to hear about public engagement, what we've experienced, and what we can expect going forward. She's going to provide us

with a Commission timeline and a meeting calendar. We'll have a report back on the work of the working groups. Every Commissioner is a member of a working group, but as we all know, every Commissioner is assigned to only one group, and there are three. So, we're going to try to give you an update on what the working groups that you're not in are doing, and give our public an update on what the work we're doing in general. Then, we'll talk for a few minutes about the preliminary board, where it stands. We'll talk about the outline of it, and what you can expect Commissioners, and what you'll soon see regarding it. Before we jump into the business of the meeting, I am going to ask that Commission members review the 8/9 – the August 9, 2021 meeting minutes. Take a minute to review them. I believe they went all out to you all. I didn't see them in advance, so I'm hoping that you got a chance to look at them, to read them. I'm just going to give you a minute to do that. Then, we'll call for a vote to approve the meeting minutes. Okay. So, I am going to ask for a motion to approve the minutes.

Phil Thompson (PT): 0:03:10

Motion to approve.

JJA: 0:03:12

Thank you, Commissioner Thompson. I'd like someone to second the motion.

Chris Kui (CK): 0:03:16

I second.

JJA: 0:03:18

Thank you, Commissioner Kui. Are there any questions, any comments? Any issues that anyone may have with the minutes as they've been presented? Hearing none. All in favor of the approval of the minutes, please say "aye."

Commissioners: 0:03:44

Aye. Aye.

JJA: 0:03:47

I heard a few "ayes." Any more "ayes"?

CK: 0:03:50

Aye.

JJA: 0:03:54

Thank you. Any opposed? Any abstentions? All right. Hearing none. The motion to approve the minutes has passed. Now, I will turn the meeting over to our Executive Director Anusha Venkataraman. Venkataraman! Excuse me.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 0:04:15

Yes, perfect. Thank you so much. It's so wonderful to see so many of you. I know we've seen a lot of each other this summer. We've been quite busy. So, looking forward to sharing back with you a summary and some of the results of what we have done a little bit later. Reordering the agenda a little bit, I'm going to start with a timeline of what you can expect over the next few months. Then, we'll go into the preliminary report. Harold, are you able to move to the slides with the timeline? That's great. One before. So, here's what we're up to between now and September 30th. The staff is busy at work, continuing to synthesize the public input that we've received. You've seen much of it. You continue to see it in the working groups. We're finishing up anything that we need to get to you to see what the public has shared with us by way of feedback. We're also busy starting to draft the preliminary report. We'll get into a little bit further detail on that soon. We are targeting September 30th for release of that preliminary report. So, very quick timeline, a quick turnaround. We want to make sure, given the short timeline of the Commission, that communities across the city have the opportunity to review that report and respond, provide their feedback, as we continue to work on our research. Through the month of October especially into the first half of November, staff will be sort of "heads down" doing research on the things that we've identified as potential areas of interest coming out of the working groups especially. November, we will start up public input sessions again with. We'll have a little bit further detail on that later today. And we'll begin actually drafting the proposals of the things we will put forward, ultimately, in December. The vote on those proposals is right now targeted to happen on December 3rd – that's a Friday. Then, we will reconvene December 15th to adopt the final report before submitting it to the City Clerk's office. So, we wanted to give you a sense of what's happening over the next few months so that you can see the urgency that we, as staff, feel. I'm sure many of you feel that urgency as well. I see we have a question from Commissioner Bermudez.

Ana Bermudez (AB): 0:07:14

It's not on point, I have to say, but I can't not comment on it. Who created the logo, if you will, with the colors?

AV: 0:07:28

We had a designer do the logo. I believe her name is Ivy Newman.

AB: 0:07:37

I love it. It's great.

AV: 0:07:39

Awesome. We will let her know.

AB: 0:07:40

Just wanted to let you know. It's very warm, inviting. I don't know. It works. I just wanted to comment on that.

AV: 0:07:48

Awesome. Compliments are always on point. Great. So, Harold, if you can go to the next slide. In terms of how those dates line up with our Commission meeting calendar, you may have seen an email earlier this week or last week noting that we will need another meeting towards the end of this month. The date that we have identified is September 27th. So, a few days before our preliminary report comes out, that will be in the late afternoon, 4 to 6 p.m. The goal of that meeting is to finalize the preamble that we've been working on and look forward to getting your input on before finalizing it on the 27th. Then, we'll have a meeting October 19th, November 16th. Some of these are slight variations in dates. Then, I mentioned the December 3rd meeting where we'll actually vote on the proposals. Then, December 15th for adopting the final report. So, it will be a busy few months. We want you to see and know what is ahead of you and head of us, as Commission and staff.

AB: 0:09:07

I just want to note I might not be able to make the September 27th. I'm trying to figure out a scheduling issue that I have, so I just wanted to tell you. Thank you.

JJA: 0:09:19

Thank you. If I may just ask – maybe I just missed this. So, these dates - agreed to these dates. Is the meeting set at four p.m. or four to six p.m.?

AV: 0:09:29

The 27th four to six p.m. seemed to be what worked the best for folks, but it's not completely set yet if we have any conflicts.

JJA: 0:09:40

That's fine. I guess what I'm asking is, can we look at all of these meetings and ask people to look at the four to six p.m. slot? Just so that we can...? Does that work?

AV: 0:09:53

Yeah. That seems to be a time of day that you are all more available than other times of the day. I know the morning is typically busy. That certainly seems to be the sweet spot for the Commission.

JJA: 0:10:04

Then, there's one other suggestion here. It's that just looking at that December timeline, what I suggest – and what I ask other Commissions, ISU, and another Commission – to consider is maybe having a hold date sometime between the 3rd and the 15th if it seems that we have to get together once more to work up the proposal or to just do some more work. So, if we could find maybe a date that is just a hold... Our thinking here, Commissioners and ambitious thinking, we've got to write the report and finalize the report. We'll be running up against the winter holidays, the December holidays. So, we want to finalize the report – I mean, the proposals. We want to get everything done. Our aim is by December 17th so that we can respect your holidays and however you spend them. Unless there are objections.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 0:11:27

I'm sorry, this is Henry. Can you hear me?

JJA: 0:11:32

We can hear you now.

HAG: 0:11:34

I was on one end, and I didn't know I was on the other side. But I wanted to know, this meeting for the 27th, is it a virtual meeting or is it an in-person meeting? Do we have any clarifications of in-person meeting after the last discussion we had?

AV: 0:11:52

Yeah. That's a great question. I'm seeing that's in my talking points and I forgot to mention. We were thinking the 27th of September and October 19th would be virtual, but the December meetings would be in-person, and in the likely November meeting as well. You know, we'll be really grappling with the content of the proposals – especially at the November meeting. The December meetings are very important meetings for the Commission. You know, not just from the perspective of the work that we're getting done, but from a legal perspective, too. It's also, perhaps, good to have those meetings in person. So, that's the strategy right now, but certainly open to thoughts and feedback. We have the ability to meet virtually or in-person. So, that's good to have that flexibility to be able to choose what works and what we need as a Commission. Great. So, unless there are any further questions... I see a question from Commissioner Hamilton.

Darrick Hamilton (DH): 0:13:06

So, I guess I wanted to ask what could also be useful is if we have maybe more directive on what and when it might be appropriate for our best input as Commissioners. Like, for example, I know the report. I see the date that you have for release. What is the specific engagement? Is that an approval of the report, or is it an acknowledgment of the report? Stuff like that.

AV: 0:13:37

That's a very good question. For the preliminary report – and I think we can actually go to the next few slides here – you know, it's really more of a summary of what we've heard from community members, and a little bit on how the Commission is thinking about our work. There doesn't need to be a vote on the report specifically, but we will be (today) considering a resolution to authorize the staff to produce the report. So, Harold, if you could go to a few slides from there. So, this is the outline of the report as we are considering it right now. We'll write it according to this outline, assuming you agree, and give the staff authority to prepare the report. With that authority, we would then share a draft back with the full Commission for feedback before we release it even though we do not need a vote. The date we

were planning on sharing it with the Commission is next Monday, the 20th. I'm happy to go into further detail on the outline of the report and the consideration of the resolution – which we will also drop in the chat here. But I want to make sure I'm answering your questions, Commissioner Hamilton.

HAG: 0:15:31

Now, will the... I'm sorry. This is Henry again. Will the preliminary report have...? I missed this timeline. The preamble would be inclusive of it?

AV: 0:15:43

That's correct. So, just going over the outline, typically we're thinking it would be nice for the report to be introduced by a letter from our Chair, then an introduction that will include background information on the Commission, an overview of our timeline and our process across the year, then a bit about the Commission's approach to structural change, since we're really focusing in on structural change. Then, an emphasis on the inequities that we're hearing about, and what we're hearing, what we've heard through public engagement as sort of organized under those inequities. Then, we do plan on including the preamble to the charter. That's one main reason why we've scheduled the second meeting this month, later September, to make sure that we have enough time to work with all of you on the content with the preamble. Then, there will be a section on what members of the public can expect next following the release of the preliminary report, what opportunities will they have to review, to comment, to continue to provide, and put in feedback on the proposals we should be considering.

JJA: 0:17:01

May I ask a question? [inaudible] The preamble, I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page with the preamble as I think about it now. The preamble, does it need to be voted on as a proposal?

AV: 0:17:24

That is a good question that we can take back to our legal team. You know, most of the rest of this is a summary of what we've done and what we've heard. The preamble is the portion of the report that has the greatest specificity and does take the form of something closer to a proposal. So, I think we should consider whether it's necessary, or whether it might be strategic.

JJA: 0:18:01

I appreciate that. I guess the next step that I'm going to affect, when I think about a preamble, a preamble for the New York City charter, I'm actually thinking about a charter or vision that would include a preamble. So, it would seem to me that the voting public has to approve the preamble, and that would then become one of our proposals. In which case, at this point, I don't know. Are we going to be ready by the report, the preliminary report, to vote on a preamble proposal? That's my question.

AV: 0:18:43

Yup. It will be a draft that would ultimately become a revision to the charter. I know we have our General Counsel Melanie Ash who is on. I know she's been working on this and may be able to answer the question better than I. Melanie, are you here?

Melanie Ash (MA): 0:19:03

Yes, I am here. Thanks, Anusha. Yeah. The preamble section of the report, the preliminary report, is intended to be simply a draft: a draft of a preamble that could be shared out to the public so that the public can see the direction that the Commission is going in with the preamble, and provide feedback. You're correct, Chair, that the actual approval or addition of a preamble into the charter would need to be voted on. So, would be a part of the proposals that would be considered by the Commission at the December 3rd meeting. Then again as part of the final report, which will attach all of the proposals. So, there will be a voting by the Commission on the content of the preamble during those two meetings. But, so the version that would go out, what would go out in the preliminary report, would simply be a report to give the public the opportunity to see where the Commission is going, and to provide feedback on that draft.

JJA: 0:20:13

Okay. So, thank you. I appreciate that. I do think, though, that we need to take note of and just spend some time – but, perhaps, not in this meeting – just picking up on the points that Commissioner Hamilton has raised in earlier meetings and conversations. Ensuring that if the draft is a preview, we need to make sure it's different than reporting out what we've heard. It's very different than reporting out what we've heard, and we need to make sure that we have the agreement of the Commission body that the draft is representative of their thoughts and ideas, it reflects them, it's consistent. I just want to make sure because anything that becomes a draft – even if it's *draft* – for the public, it becomes the base on which

we're working. We need to make sure that our Commissioners have an opportunity to... I know you have the 27th reserved for this, but we'll have to make a decision thereof whether or not we're in a good place.

AV: 0:21:29

Right. Even before then, too. I think many of you may have the level of input that we can set up a private meeting and you can share your feedback directly with the staff to make sure it's fully reflected. You should be seeing that draft in the next day or two. We have worked on it a little bit with leadership of the Commission, and I think we're about ready to share it with the rest of the Commission for your input and your feedback well prior to the meeting on the 27th. So that what we're seeing on the 27th already integrates all of your input.

JJA: 0:22:14

Are we good? Are the Commission members good with that?

HAG: 0:22:20

Madame Chair, I mean, I think the question here is timing. I appreciate and thank you for the clarification about the voting of the preamble, but I think that if we send out a preliminary draft of the preamble that is also a preliminary draft of the preamble, that we'll begin to look at... I think that we would have to move very quickly to take a vote on the preamble, and then take a vote on the other issues that may take longer. That would be my suggestion. Otherwise, the other ideas that we have are not fully out. It's only what we've heard. The only thing that would be fully out, for argument's sake – wrong words to use, but – would be a preliminary draft of the preamble. Does that make sense?

JJA: 0:23:13

I appreciate what you're saying. Yup.

AV: 0:23:17

That makes sense. As far as I know, I don't think we have to vote upon all of our proposals in one place or in one meeting. So, we should certainly consider and discuss what you're proposing, Henry, in terms of addressing the preamble earlier than we address other proposals.

JJA: 0:23:43

Commissioner Hamilton?

AV: 0:23:49

You're on mute.

DH: 0:23:50

I'd like to echo Henry's point about putting out a preamble. I would suggest we don't put out a preamble until we fully approve one. We can put out our intentions of putting out a preamble, but I wouldn't release it until we get it approved. Also, a question about the structural inequities. Is that basically the Commissioner's approach to structural change, is what we approved earlier by vote, or there something else that you had in mind?

AV: 0:24:27

It's mostly background information about what structural change is, building on how we define structural racism. So, the framework that the staff had developed and that the Commission voted upon in May, I believe, is sort of briefly mentioned there, but it's more of a methodological approach to structural change.

DH: 0:24:59

Yeah.

AV: 0:25:01

I'm happy to share with you further details. Any other questions on the report, the outline, the contents? I will say in terms of language and tone, we really want this to be as accessible as possible in terms of how the staff and some of the leadership of the Commission have talked about it so far. We want both people who have been involved in the Commissions process to date - either testifying, submitting an input online or whatnot - to see themselves in the report, but we also want folks who may not have engaged yet to pick it up, be excited, and what to contribute over the following few months. So, we're trying as much as possible to make it an accessible document that can be useful to a wide variety of New Yorkers.

AB: 0:26:06

I'm sorry if somebody asked this before. I don't think I heard it. So, this report – this first report – is not going to have any of our “concrete recommendations” yet, or even telegraph any of that? Like, what's the balance between, you know...? Because, by then, we know the themes that have been emerging, what's been constant in almost every single panel, almost every single public... You know? The good ole policing issues, let's say. Let's take that as an example. So, will this report include any of that at all? I mean, I'm assuming... Let me back up. It will include the themes because it will include the summaries of the, you know... But it won't necessarily say, “And the Commission is going to probably act one of those.” Right?

AV: 0:27:01

Right. That's exactly right. It will have the themes. It will have, “Here's generally what we've heard from the public on these themes that have really emerged because we've heard from many people on this theme or this topic, or many people share this proposal.” But the report doesn't say – or is not planning on saying – what the Commission is and isn't interested in taking on, with the exception of the preamble - which is much more specific.

AB: 0:27:33

Thank you.

AV: 0:27:42

I dropped in the chat a copy of the resolution that we shared with you in advance. Not sure if we're ready to move there if folks have more questions on the report or even the calendar of our timeline and process that we shared prior. Happy to answer any of those questions or address any thoughts. If not, I think we could probably move towards the resolution.

JJA: 0:28:15

Are there any additional comments or thoughts that people want to hear before we take a look at the resolution? Okay. As we move to look at the resolution, I just want to note for the record that Commissioners Mata, Bain, and Garrido, and Hamilton are now with us. So, let's make sure we make note of that. Talk a little bit about the resolution and what we're doing here. So, as you'll recall when we first began meeting back in the spring – specifically in April – we delegated authority for day-to-day operations of the Commission to our Executive Director. That delegation didn't explicitly include the

power to produce and release public reports on behalf of the Commission. So, as we prepare to release a first report – and we'd even talked about we need to make sure everybody else knows that we've talked about that we'll actually call it a preliminary report once we look at what's actually in it. Is that the specific title? But a report that essentially - I'll just say it differently for purposes of resolution – it's a report that will give the public a statement and understanding of what we have done to date, what we've learned, what we've heard, and what are the inequities that we believe are structurally based in racism that merit attention. As our Executive Director said, we – depending upon what we get over the next two weeks – we may have a preamble that would include a direct report. So, we have not given the leadership (the Executive Director and the Operations/Commissions staff) the authority to release the report. It's not released by the Commission. It's released by the Commission staff. What has been prepared is a resolution that would do just that: give them the authority to release the report, keeping in mind that the Commissioners are going to have opportunity to review and provide feedback on the report prior to its release. Understanding that we're doing the resolution, not a vote. We don't have to vote on the report. So, Anusha, I'm not sure whether you've asked a Commissioner to read the resolution. Are you going to put it up on the screen?

AV: 0:31:02

We can if that is easiest.

JJA: 0:31:06

Would that be helpful for people who may be watching?

K. Bain (KB): 0:31:10

Yeah. I can screen share it.

JJA: 0:31:12

Okay. I did believe that you also put it in here. Thank you. Thank you, Melanie. Commissioner Daniel Favors has joined the meeting as well. Can people now see the? Yes? Okay. Have you asked someone to read it, Commissioner?

AV: 0:32:05

We have not asked anyone in advance to read it. Especially for members of the public joining in, it would be nice if someone could.

JJA: 0:32:16

Okay. Is there anybody who would like to read today? I don't see anybody raising their hands to read.

AB: 0:32:29

All right. I will do it.

JJA: 0:32:30

Okay. Thank you.

AB: 0:32:33

Okay. "Resolution of the 2021 New York City Racial Justice Commission. Whereas, the 2021 New York City Racial Justice Commission has completed an initial round of public input sessions, including one focused on, and located in, each Borough of the City, and four city-wide public input sessions comprising one in-person session and three virtual sessions with one of those focused on hearing input from youth below the age of twenty-four; and Whereas the Commission has heard and received written testimony from members of the public at those sessions in-person and virtually, including from representatives of public interest and advocacy groups, community organizations, elected officials, and local residents, and Whereas the Commission has heard and received testimony from thought leaders through its series of Transforming Foundations issue panels; and Whereas the Commission has solicited comments and ideas from City Agencies including leadership and staff, and Whereas the Commission has solicited comments and ideas from New Yorkers through the Commission's website, and Whereas review of the testimony, written input, comments, and ideas reflect a wide range of issues of interest to New Yorkers; Whereas review of such testimony, written input, comments, and ideas has identified persistent areas of racial inequity across the City, including: (1) inequity in quality services that promotes social and emotional wellbeing; (2) inequity in work – thank you – advancement, and wealth-building; (3) inequities within and across neighborhoods that inhibit thriving individuals, families, and communities; (4) marginalization and over-criminalization of communities of color; (5) inequity in representation and decision-making; and (6) lack of enforcement and accountability of government and other entities. Now, therefore, be it RESOLVED that the Commission direct staff to prepare a preliminary report summarizing the testimony,

written input, comments, and ideas received, discussing the persistent areas of racial inequity that have been identified, and setting out certain planned areas of focus for the Commission's work, including the creation of a preamble for the New York City Charter; And may it be further RESOLVED that the Commission direct staff to further research and analyze the causes of the persistent inequities identified, as well as potential solutions, including those already identified by the public; And be it further RESOLVED that after the release of such preliminary report the Commission shall invite further discussion, testimony, research, and analysis on the preliminary report, including through a second round of public input sessions to solicit input on the preliminary report, the preamble, and other planned areas of focus. You're on mute, Jennifer.

JJA: 0:35:42

I was trying to unmute and was having a hard time. Thank you so much, Ana. We will vote now on the resolution. Now, before we do that, having had the conversation about the preamble, are there any changes that we need to make in order to reflect the conversation had? I believe there are changes we need to make to reflect the conversation we've just had.

HAG: 0:36:11

Madame Chair, I believe we need a motion in the order in a second, and then discussion thereafter. So, I call for a motion to approve.

JJA: 0:36:21

Thank you for saying that to me, Henry. I didn't know if we needed to make the changes before we even make the motion, given that the resolution that we're looking at beforehand we've already determined there are changes. But, I got you. We'll do it this way, and then we'll make the changes if we need to. Motion to consider the resolution. So, moved. Is there a second?

Jo-Ann Yoo: 0:36:49

Second.

JJA: 0:36:50

Okay. All in favor...? Do I need to...? Okay, now I'm confused, Henry.

HAG: 0:36:58

It's a motion to consider a resolution as amending.

JJA: 0: 37:01

Right. So, once we've second it, we just move into the consideration.

HAG: 0: 37:05

The discussion.

JJA: 0: 37:06

Yes. Thank you. I was confused for a minute despite the fact that I had a Chair of Board meeting this morning. Okay. So, now that it's been moved and seconded, time for discussion. What I was thinking until just a minute ago was before we even read the resolution, we had discussion about the preamble. Concerns were raised about the preamble, about if it would appear in the report. So, if I am of the opinion that there needs to be a revision of language, that doesn't make it a definitive – like a definite that it will be included – but that working with the Commission, or the Commission will determine if staff should or should not include a preamble in the report.

HAG: 0: 38:00

Madame Chair, if I may, I would just say that we have to start from the premise that we have the best possible intention of getting the best language on a preamble. I think we all agree that there ought to be a preamble to the Constitution: the most important document of the city. I think we would agree on that. But, I also think that we have to acknowledge that this process will probably not be perfect. That getting every single language... You know when you do these kinds of preambles? Years ago, years later – decades later – that the United States' Constitution... You look at the preamble of the Constitution, you say, "Oh, well we skip that." Right? There's been so discussion on what one word may mean over the other. I think that, with all due respect to us, the Commissioners, and to the staff – we have to sort of go for a language that encapsulates the feel and the sentiment for what we want to [inaudible 39:03]... understanding that it may not be inherently perfect, but we've got to start somewhere. I'm not selling us short. Please don't misunderstand what I'm suggesting, but I am suggesting that if time is of the essence with a preamble, that perhaps we don't want to get bogged down on individual discussions and nomenclature that may

mean something else, but rather we agree that our intent is to have the sentiment in a preamble be captured as best we can.

JJA: 0:39:48

Point well-taken. I also just want to make sure that we hear from... I know Darrick has had some concerns. I don't know if there are others that have concerns just about what is in there, and wanting to make sure that it is reflective of schedules. I appreciate the point that you've made. Are there others that would like to comment on that, on this point, or any other point? Commissioner Hamilton?

DH: 0:40:30

Yeah. So, I appreciate Henry's point, but I actually have a slight difference stance and think that the preamble is one of the more important things we can do. I think we are in unison that we need a preamble in the Charter, but in the interest of getting it right, I would not recommend that we release a statement of what the actual preamble is going to be – even in draft form – until we actually get it right. To me, it's one of the most important things we can do, which is setting the values of the City as stated in the Charter. So, my suggestion is that we express our intent to do preamble, but not actually release it until we get it right. I've got a couple of other points. Is it appropriate to talk about those things now or should I hold off?

JJA: 0:41:21

Please, please.

DH: 0:41:23

In the list of topics that are written, we do say "include," but I might suggest we wordsmith it to make it clear that it's not an exhausted list, that there may be other topics that were expressed, and that we're not limited to examining those topics. I think it's important that we word the resolution to make that a little clearer. Then, a little bit more wordsmithing in the paragraph right after. We used the word "the" – I'm not looking at the document. We used the word "the," as in "these are it" in the next paragraph. I would just say something more generic, as "these are some examples" or "some of the structural inequities." I'm sorry I'm a little incoherent because I'm not looking at the document right in front of me. But, then, the last point I want to make is in a lot of ways, we're authorizing not only the production of a preliminary report but the release of a preliminary report in this vote. So, I want to be careful in making

it clear that if it's the release, that it's the release of the executive committee's interpretation of this summary of what was said. Because, you know, it very well could have ramifications later on when we do our work of making recommendations. So, just to get the record clear that if we are going to vote on "yes" that the language should be cleared, that this is coming from the executive committee's interpretation of what they heard.

JJA: 0:43:14

Good points. Are there others? Please, go ahead.

AV: 0:43:19

I just wanted to note that I started screen sharing a live version of the document so that we can make edits here. I don't think, Commissioner Hamilton, I noted exactly where your revisions were. Oh, you're on mute.

DH: 0:43:43

I'm making my screen bigger so I can see better, but that is good. So, the first comments were with regards to the paragraph one, two, three, four, five, six, seventh paragraph: "Whereas we review written and identified..." We have "including," but I would make it very clear that "including but not limited to," so that language is clear.

AV: 0:44:10

So, in this section?

DH: 0:44:12

Yeah. See where "including" is? So, the wordsmithing I would suggest: "including but not limited to." Yup. Then, if we go to the next paragraph, we have... Where was it? Where was my concern?

AB: 0:44:38

Darrick, I think it was the part about "release." We were saying, "to prepare..." It says, "...for the RESOLVE that after the release of such," right? But it doesn't say who's going to release it, or under who's umbrella, I guess. Is that what you're concerned about?

DH: 0:45:07

That's right. I had another minor point, but it's so minor that I can't remember that I'm willing to look beyond it. But that's the major one, that one right there. Yup. Making it clear that it is the executive committee's interpretation of... I don't know. I'm sorry. I'm losing track of what I was trying to say, but basically the release of the executive committee's interpretation – and this ain't the exact wording – of the testimony that was presented.

JJA: 0:45:48

Okay, it's not essentially a... What you want to make sure is that we are noting that it is the interpretation given to, but it may not be the voice specifically of what we heard or what we interpreted was not necessarily at every turn of that which was spoken, and we want to reflect that.

DH: 0:46:15

Perhaps it could even say – in that last paragraph, that's where we are – “After the release of such preliminary report as...” I guess I'm trying to put the ownership on the executive committee and making it clear it's that report that they did because we would not have had a chance to vote on that report.

JJA: 0:46:38

I see what you're saying. You're saying that this is the staff. It's not. It's the Commission staff, and it's not the Commission's report.

DH: 0:46:48

You know, ultimately, we own it, but we authorize *[crosstalk]*.

JJA: 0:46:49

Yeah, but I guess what I'm trying to make clear is that this is not an official body of work that has been created... It is the Commission's at the end of the day. The Commission is authorizing the staff to put it out, and that's what I'm saying to you. What you're really speaking to is it's a summary of – which, again, takes me back to whether or not we actually call it a preliminary report. We're just reporting *[inaudible]*. Preliminary suggests that we're now... Everything that we see in here is where we're going, and I just want to be careful about that.

AB: 0:47:30

Yeah. To me, preliminary also covers the, “and we may have gone in a little wrong...” It’s preliminary, so we’re going to get reactions from people. As it says there, we’ll invite further discussion on this, solicit input on the preliminary report, the preamble, and other planned areas of focus.

CK: 0:47:57

Well, maybe what we can do is for the last paragraph would be something along, “So, then, now that we get the release of the preliminary report, we get additional rounds of public input, and then for the Commission for a final report of some sort. You know? There should be some conclusion – the purpose – you know? So then we could... We’ve got to do either a final report later on, and then also try to get some proposal for the voters to vote on, too. Right? So, if we want to say anything about that, or we just leave it as is.

AV: 0:48:42

I could say at the end something like, “For consideration for the final report,” or something like that.

JJA: 0:48:54

Commissioner Thompson just put in the chat, “Should we call it an interim staff report?” I think so. What I’m really getting at here – and this builds on what you said, Darrick, when you say if you look at that paragraph that begins, “Whereas review of such testimony...” You asked us to insert the words “including but not limited to.” We want to be very careful that what is presented in this report is not seen as the precursor, the outline of what is to come in the event that we make some adjustments. It may be the case – and I’m just talking right now – that the inequities in this resolution, that our proposals may not... I’m just talking. May not address all six. So, I hesitate to call it a preliminary because that suggests that we’ve already done the outline. I like interim report. I like the staff report, presenting the work to date, a summary of what we’ve heard – all of which is providing insight for the Commission to deliberate.

CK: 0:50:27

Yeah. I think that’s good. Yeah, yeah. I agree with that.

AV: 0:50:33

Happy to wordsmith what we call it. We may also want to give it a more exciting title, too, to grab public interest. Then, have a subtitle that says, “Interim Report of the Staff of the Racial Justice Commission,” or something like that. I will note that we have called it a preliminary report publicly. So, that’s my only concern here is potential confusion because we have referenced it publicly.

JJA: 0:51:03

I think that’s okay. I mean, we’ve got a lot of work to do. Some people still don’t know that there’s a Racial Justice Commission. So, I think, you know, even with all the hard work that all of you are doing, I think we’ll be okay.

Melanie Ash (MA): 0:51:22

If I could just... This is Melanie Ash here. Just to confirm, the precedent in previous Charter commissions is that the preliminary report is issued by the staff. So, this would be consistent with the sort of standard practice. The resolution authorizes the staff to do that, but I don’t think it would inconsistent to have this be styled more clearly as from the staff. They do use the term “preliminary” sometimes, but we can choose however you would like to name the report.

JJA: 0:52:00

What I’m centering on here... Just seeing what people have written in the chat. Are we all okay with approving this resolution as a report, a staff report?

CK: 0:52:14

My worry is that we make such a distinction of a staff-only report, it doesn’t give enough weight because, I mean, that’s my only concern. I don’t know how we should address that. I mean because it does reflect what the Commission also have heard. Right?

JJA: 0:52:36

I hear your point. If it says “The Racial Justice Commission” and “Staff Report” or “Report of the Executive Director,” I think that would give it some heft. Right? Okay. All right. Interim report. In the interim, prepared by staff. Sounds good.

AV: 0:53:05

Yeah. I was just thinking that it could be called an interim report, which sounds less like it's produced by the Commission than "preliminary," and then all of the introduction and descriptive language about the report, it can make it very clear that it's produced by the staff.

JJA: 0:53:22

Okay. All right. We've wordsmithed this together, and I think we're getting to a better place. It's not much wordsmithing. There are some specific content changes in here that I think are good. I agree with... Let's just very quickly jump back to this preamble piece, and what I would suggest at this point, we've got two weeks where we're going to be spending a little bit more time with this. We'll know where we are, we'll know where the Commission members are. I would put in language that is not definitive, that is not absolute. I would put in language that the report may include. Then, we'll see where we are in two weeks.

AV: 0:54:07

So, I had written in, "including the intention to create." Should we say, "potential intention" or something like that?

JJA: 0:54:15

I guess what I'm saying to you is that I don't think the resolution needs to...

AV: 0:54:23

We can delete that, too.

JJA: 0:54:25

Yeah. I actually don't think you need it in there because if you say that it will set out certain planned areas of focus, then that would capture it with the preamble or if we want to make a statement that there would be a preamble. I think it would capture it.

AV: 0:54:49

So, I have changed, I think, every instance of "preliminary" to "interim." So, "interim report prepared by the Commission staff."

JJA: 0:54:59

Right, but that paragraph you're reading from, just go two words over and take out the preamble.

AV: 0:55:10

Got it.

JJA: 0:55:11

We may get there! We just don't need to have to then vote on another resolution if we don't. So, let's aim to get there. [inaudible]. Are there any other questions, considerations? Darrick? Darrick, you're on mute.

DH: 0:55:44

I guess I'm going to try to push again on naming it what I think would be more accurate, which is an interim staff report. The reason why I guess I'm putting that emphasis is because I expect it to be an excellent report, but it's still almost a blank check. We're voting right now not only to authorize the production of the report but even the release of the report without another vote, without knowing exactly or having another opportunity to review it. I'm happy to vote in favor of the production and release of a staff interim report.

JJA: 0:56:28

Are there any other comments or thoughts about that?

PH: 0:56:32

I think that's wise.

AB: 0:56:34

Yeah, well, I don't think I had, I guess, breast that this would be preparation and release without us "weighing in on it." Is that...?

JJA: 0:56:51

There will be a weigh-in. I think the concern – and I don't want to speak for you, Darrick – but I think the concern that he's raising – and I think it's one that can be appreciated – is there may be... How do I say this? Oh.... We may find ourselves some agreeing with the report and 80-85% of what it said. We may

take issue with how things are described in the report. We may want to... There may be people who question or challenge whether or not the report is leaning in a way that it should not. I'm just talking right now. There could be any one of those concerns or more, and we will not have had the time to discuss and debate that and make sure that the language that is included is reflective and considerate of those concerns. So, I honor that in this moment, and I understand the time that we've had. Darrick, I don't know if I'm capturing...

AB: 0:58:01

Got it. No, no, no. Yes, I realized after I said it that the timeline is such that we couldn't really have meaningful discussion among the Commission, really, to resolve any issues that we had. So.

DH: 0:58:18

Chairwoman, you have exactly captured my sentiment. Thank you.

AV: 0:58:24

My only ask as Executive Director is once we get towards release that we have the ability to title it publicly something maybe a little bit more exciting with "Interim Staff Report" as the subtitle. So, I would want to retain that possibility so that it's something that the public, the media can get excited about.

JJA: 0:58:49

You want something that captures what's in it, that draws you in to read it.

AV: 0:58:55

Exactly.

JJA: 0:58:56

I think that is fair. Like, I'm just talking like – this is not it – but voices of the community: interim report...

HAG: 0:59:08

Madame Chair, I have a technical question.

JJA: 0:59:11

Okay.

HAG: 0:59:12

Forgive me, I don't want to believe this, but if we ourselves as a Commission will not be drafting our own report separate from that of the staff report so that it becomes one and the same. Isn't putting "interim staff report" suggesting that a Commission itself would have to have a report?

JJA: 0:59:33

That the Commission itself would have to have a report?

HAG: 0:59:37

Right, because if it's an interim staff report, and there's a final report, it seems to be that it's one and the same. [inaudible; crosstalk]

AV: 0:59:45

The Commission does need to have a final report.

HAG: 0:59:49

Right, but I'm saying is who's going to draft it? [inaudible] Just asking.

JJA: 0:59:56

Let me ask you something. You have something? What I'd like to do... I think we're all picking up an appreciable point of concern: is it an interim report prepared by the staff, the Racial Justice Commission staff? Does that resolve the issue?

CK: 1:00:18

Yeah. I think, you know, maybe. I feel like if we just say it's a staff report, that's not really giving them credibility and backing to the staff. Then, at the same time, there's a difference. I understand that there is a concern in others, but at the same time, if we just say it's a staff report, then it comes like this. There's not a strong enough backing of unity. So, if we say that it's an interim report prepared by the staff, maybe that could work. But, you know, that's my concern in terms of potential distance. I mean, the staff doesn't

get a lot of feedback from Commissioners before they publish it. So, I feel like we need to have some kind of support, backing behind it, to show backing behind it.

MA: 1:01:27

If I could weigh in again here. This is Melanie Ash. I just pulled up, looking at the 2018 Charter Revision Commissions Report, and it is in fact termed an interim... Sorry, I lost my spot in my email here. Preliminary staff report. So, it is consistent with practice that the initial report be termed a preliminary staff report. The final report is different in that it is going to be reviewed and voted on by the Commission itself. So, while also drafted initially by staff, in both cases there can be feedback from the Commission. In that case, the final report does receive a vote by the Commission on the report itself. So, it differs in that way, which would be a reason why it could be titled differently. So, a preliminary staff report is a consistent practice in previous Charter revision Commissions, which we could follow here.

JJA: 1:02:30

Okay. I want to put this to bed as quickly as we can. I'm just going to say this. What I'm centering on here is the nuance here is that we are talking about race and race matters – very different than a report about rank choice voting. The sensitivities, the language, how we talk about and present this work, it is something that isn't as easy to put it on paper and make sure it represents the voices of everybody in the way that they want to be heard. On a short timeframe, I think that there is a legitimate concern about that. That's what I'm trying to figure out how to honor here. This is a little different. It's a lot different. I don't want to minimize that, that concern. Darrick?

DH: 1:03:43

It's also more accurate to call it a staff report for the reasons already mentioned, that we won't have had time to have reflect and come to cohesion. To me, that's okay. What's its purpose? Its purpose is to summarize what's been done for us to move forward in our ability to come up with a final report. So, I think it's more accurate to call it a staff report for the purpose of informing our work going forward.

JJA: 1:04:23

Am I hearing that there...? I think it's time to call a vote. What we're looking at is I'd like a motion.

CK: 1:04:33

Yeah, I think I can agree with that, with what people just said. So, yeah. I'm fine with it.

JJA: 1:04:39

Okay. The resolution has been changed in several critical areas. Henry, I'm going to ask you to help me on this. Sometimes when making some changes to other resolutions, you go point by point, and you reread the resolution. I want to make sure that we are following the rules. So, would you please give me some guidance?

HAG: 1:05:01

You have two options. [inaudible] the amendment to [inaudible] a motion, and [inaudible] a motion [inaudible], or you could do an amended motion and read it for the record the changes that have been made. We can do it either way on the [inaudible]. I would accept a friendly... I would consider a friendly amendment because I said "as amended." So, if you want to read the changes, that would be my suggestion.

JJA: 1:05:32

Okay. So, I just want to make sure that we're saying a friendly amendment with the rereading of all of the changes, not the resolution in its entirety.

HAG: 1:05:38

Correct.

JAA: 1:05:40

Do I need a motion to consider the friendly amendment?

HAG: 1:05:46

You don't need a motion. It's a friendly amendment. You need the nature of the motion to accept that I am the maker of the motion. I have set that as a friendly amendment.

JJA: 1:05:56

Okay. Does it require a reading?

HAG: 1:06:02

You have to read, and then you take a vote.

JJA: 1:06:04

All righty! Okay. Who would like to read? Darrick, would you read the friendly amendments, please?

DH: 1:06:19

May I read from where the amendments have been made?

JJA: 1:06:24

I would think that's okay.

DH: 1:06:26

I guess someone asked... Let me see if I can make it bigger. Here we go. All right. "Whereas review of such testimony, written input, comments, and ideas has identified persistent areas of racial inequality across the City, including but not limited to..." and then the text remains the same. Then, we move down to another amendment. "Now, therefore, be it RESOLVED that the Commission direct staff to prepare an interim staff report summarizing the testimony, written input, comments, ideas received discussing the persistent areas of racial inequality that have been identified in setting out certain planned areas of focus for the Commission's work." Then, we skip to the last paragraph where other amendments have been made. "Be it further RESOLVED that after the release of such interim staff report, the Commission shall invite further discussion, testimony, research, and analysis on the interim staff report including through a second round of public input sessions to solicit input on the interim staff report and other planned areas of focus."

AB: 1:07:52

Okay. Can I make one last suggestion?

JJA: 1:07:55

Friendly, friendly!

AB: 1:07:57

Friendly! No, because it's just to mirror the language used previously. So, other planned areas of focus for the Commission's work, which is two paragraphs before is how it's laid out.

DH: 1:08:13

I second that suggestion.

JJA: 1:08:18

All right.

AV: 1:08:19

Did I capture that accurately?

AB: 1:08:21

Yeah.

AV: 1:08:21

Okay.

JJA: 1:08:25

All right. Having heard the friendly amendments, if I'm on point Henry (be here to help me), we'll call a vote. All in favor of the resolution please indicate by raising your hands or saying "aye."

Commissioners:

Aye, aye.

JJA: 1:08:51

Any opposed? Any abstentions? The resolution carries.

HAG: 1:09:00

Let the record show, Madame Chair, the resolution passed unanimously.

JJA: 1:09:04

Thank you. Thank you, Henry. All right. We've got a resolution. We've got 15 minutes remaining in this conversation. I do know that our Executive Director wants to give us some further updates as well as give us an update on the working groups. If I may ask, that we prioritize that, perhaps even over some of the public engagement, as that will be reflected later.

AV: 1:09:35

Absolutely. Thank you so much and thank you for the authority to now prepare the interim staff report. We're really excited to share with you soon what we have already gone ahead and started working on at risk, but now with authority. So, very excited to share that with you soon. Moving back to our full agenda. You know, the other things that we wanted to share with you today is a very brief report for myself as Executive Director, a report back on public engagement. We have now closed out this phase of public engagement over the summer, which is incredibly exciting. I'll share with you the plans for engagement in the next phases and then do a brief report back on the working groups. So, I think I will start with the Executive Director report because it's very short. I just wanted to share quickly with you that we've had some changes in staffing since our last meeting. We have brought on Chi [inaudible] as Senior Advisor working on sort of the intersection of communications and public engagement strategy, as well as how it connects to policy works. So, very excited to bring Chi on board. We also now have a college intern through the end of the year working with us part-time. We do have some not as great news, which is that Jaclyn Kennedy, who's been with us since almost the beginning of the Commission, will be leaving the staff of the Commission after this week. I just want to thank Jackie for all of her hard work in putting together the input sessions over the summer, and many other things including fantastic youth input session just last Friday. Jackie, thank you, thank you. We wish you all the best. That brings us to our team being a small but mighty team of 13 behind the scenes doing all the work that you see. You'll see a report out shortly on the public engagement. We already have talked about the preliminary report, but meanwhile, we're already getting started on a good amount of research based on the work coming out of the working groups. Lastly, as you may notice from my background, we're all in-person in the office full-time at 253 Broadway. We welcome you to come visit us any time if you'd like to stop by in person. Please let us know if you would like to. We're here every day. So, that's it for my very brief report. In terms of agenda, I would actually love to do the public engagement now and then move to the working groups, but happy to switch, Jennifer, if you'd prefer.

JJA: 1:12:43

My concern is that we're going to lose some Commission members. They may have more awareness of public engagement and less of what's happening in working groups. That is my concern.

AV: 1:12:56

Yeah, that's fine. I'll say that the stack that we're sharing – which we also emailed to you – has a lot of good stuff and sort of takeaways from public engagement that I think you can read through yourselves. So, if we're ready to move to the working groups, I will bring Jimmy over to share with you. Yup, I see we have Jimmy on. You can go right ahead.

Jimmy Pan (JP): 1:13:28

Hi, everyone. Thank you so much for joining our working groups. Just a really quick status update. All groups have been meeting weekly, schedules permitting, and will continue to do so. We've focused on root cause discussion, age group, and analysis of that. There has been a lot of conversation which has informed our approach and our thinking. For example, we've had discussions, frankly, about the value-add of root cause analysis on how that plays into the proposals that we may want to lift up to the Commission. We've also discussed how we're even bucketing ideas. That's certainly informing how we are approaching the interim staff report. We've also had discussions to flesh out different concepts and facilitate mutual understanding between Commissioners and staff, just to make sure that there's alignment so that we can see the road ahead of us more clearly. Just so you all know, staff will be working very hard these next few weeks on idea review and synthesizing all of the information that we heard in our public engagement so that we can provide a clear menu of options for Commissioners. Like I said, these discussions in the working groups, although they go in a lot of different places, they have been very crucial for the narratives and the framings that are going to be in the interim staff report. So, for example, we had a meaningful discussion about the root causes of lack of accountability, such as the foundational failure to hold entities accountable for being unaccountable. We also had a discussion about, for example, how marginalization and overcriminalization go hand-in-hand with deprivation of services and resources – that these foundational orientations serve together to maintain the disparity of power. So, just real quickly, we do intend to continue these working groups through at least the end of September unless we find out they're no longer needed, and we can better spend time elsewhere either internally or as a full Commission. But, you know, when you see the interim stuff, you'll see a lot of these discussions that we've been having in working groups reflected in their narrative, and how we are framing these ideas.

JJA: 1:15:58

Is that the full-body report? Okay. I would just ask at one point what the Commissioners learn about the work of the other workings groups in which they're not.

JP: 1:16:18

Yeah. Our goal is to reach out to Commissioners in the next week or two. Everyone's schedules are really busy, so if you are able to provide availability to us as to when you can meet with us, that would be very helpful. We'll try to reach out to you and find time as well to show you what other groups have been doing and to hear your ideas about the issues that the other groups are talking about, and just to hear your thoughts on process overall.

AV: 1:16:50

Just to chime in here, we thought one-on-one meetings would be an appropriate place we can share with you the mural boards and the work from all the other working groups, but they need a little bit of explanation. So, I think that's a little bit easier done in a meeting that we can schedule at your leisure.

JJA: 1:17:23

Are there any questions on this? Okay. Then, I guess also just giving your feedback to Jimmy and Anusha about these working groups. The question that Jimmy posed about whether or not once we get to narrow it down to the specific areas, do we want to continue as working groups, or do you want to come together as one body and work on these issues together? Please provide your feedback to Jimmy and Anusha. That would be extremely helpful – sooner rather than later as they plan out the next month's work.

AV: 1:18:07

Absolutely. I will note that we don't necessarily have to make the same decision for every working group or every Commissioner, especially moving past September into October you may have different things to give. You may want to continue to work with us to flesh out proposals, or you may be more interested in working with us to engage constituencies in communities. So, I think there are multiple options, and we don't necessarily have to choose the same option for every Commissioner or for each individual working group.

JJA: 1:18:51

All righty. If you want to turn to public engagement?

AV: 1:18:55

Yup, we can do that briefly. I know, Harold, you will be screen sharing and presenting at the same time. So, please let me know if you need any help.

Harold Miller (HM): 1:19:08

Hi, everyone. Can you hear me okay? So, wanted to just quickly go through the public engagement work that we have done over the last about nine weeks now. Focus on gathering input and ideas to shape the ballot proposals that advance racial equity through digital and in-person channels. So, we had public input sessions. We have an online public forms. We have done small groups and community partner interviews with our consultant team. We had a panel series of multi-disciplinary thought leaders testifying on specific issue areas with our Transforming Foundations series, and then we have other events and meetings that we participate in: People's Festival that the civic engagement has led and other meetings. For example, tonight, I'm going to present the work we have done so far to the Addisleigh Park Civic Association in Queens virtually. So, just to give you a perspective of what the work we have done at a glance. A lot has happened within a short period of time. July 12th announced public engagement plans were announced. Then, the 20th we kicked off our virtual panel series. Then, July 29th was the first input session held in Staten Island. Then, the color code, you'll see was public input sessions in purple, light grey, and then light blue are virtual, and then Commission Meeting is in pinkish, and then public events are in light blue as well. Then, upcoming we have the report release. Just note that the 23rd, 26th, the 10th were virtual sessions. Then, we had a really good youth panel back on the 10th. So, just to give you a visual of where we had these meetings, these meetings were hosted during the weekdays in the evening hours, all live streams. Languages in American Sign Language, Cantonese, Mandarin, and Spanish. We held the Staten Island meeting at the Gerard Carter Center, the Bethany Baptist Church in Brooklyn, Queens Borough Hall, The Schomburg Center in Manhattan, the Bronx Museum in the southern part of the Bronx, and then the Hamilton-Madison in China Town just recently. Then, with that, we had a pretty good media presence at each of these events. We had coverage from various outlets. We also invested in getting local ethnic media ad-buys. So, we did radio, we did print, and other ad-buys [inaudible] time. Direct outreach to community-based organizations and leaders. As a result, we had an average of about 900,000 impressions over the six events. 260 members of the public attended in-person or online (not including who registered). We received about 60 testimonies up to this point from those input sessions. As you

see here, some of the outlets that covered us was the Amsterdam News, all the way down to the Staten Island Advance. Many of you have been interviewed and gave quotes and were quoted in some of these publications. Then, the Transforming Foundations Panels. The topics covered overcoming racial disparities in health and mental health, eradicating education inequities for BIPOC, achieving racial equity in housing and land use, planning for a racially equitable future, economic equity and closing the racial wealth gap, racial equity, and early foundations, ensuring a fair and just legal system for all persons, and ensuring civic and political engagement and empowerment for all persons, and then most recently the intersectionality: equity across identities. In total, the Commission has heard 1,950 minutes of testimony and question and answers. So, shout out to all of you who have participated in the majority of that. You have heard from about 71 panelists during that process. So, the next phase, which I'll touch on, is that our goals are that the next phase of engagement is to educate the public on the contents of the report, solicit feedback, and collect input from the public on ideas and the proposals being formulated, expand awareness of the Commission overall, and seek validation from civic leaders. The format that we're going to use is public input sessions, having online feedback, and then constituency-based engagement – which I could certainly use everyone's help on. So, any questions on the public engagement piece?

JJA: 1:24:37

I have no questions, but I do want to thank you and thank Jackie. I actually shouldn't be naming people, but I do want to thank you all. Jackie, as Anusha mentioned, will be leaving us, but she's like a [inaudible] early on in coordinating the strategy for public engagement, and then getting things set up, and has had a team working with her. We want to thank everybody for that. Then, I just want to thank Harold who just came over maybe a month ago and has just jumped right on, right into position, and has made sure that when we move into communities that key leaders and community members know that we're there. He does a lot of advanced work and troubleshooting, and I'm sure he'll be working all the more closely with us in these next phases of public engagement. So, I just want to recognize everybody. Again, appreciate that there are names that I haven't called, but this has truly (truly) been a team effort. Because of your work, we've gotten some great, great, great input and insight from the community. The last thing I'll say on this is that you all have been very busy, but we're about to get even busier. Just lean in, and please know that you are appreciated for all that you've done and are doing.

AV: 1:26:12

Thank you so much.

JJA: 1:26:16

Are there other matters you'd like to speak to at this time, Anusha?

AV: 1:26:22

That's the agenda. I know we are at time. If we had a little bit more time, I'd love to hear some of your thoughts and impressions from the public engagement, any key takeaways. But we can certainly discuss those in other meetings. So, we have covered everything we've needed to cover today.

JJA: 1:26:42

Good deal. I thank you for that. Let me ask of the Commission members, are there any items that you would like to raise at this time? Any issues? Any questions? For those who have joined us after we began, Anusha did present to the Commissioners the schedule of meetings (the full Commission meetings) through December. So, we'll make sure that you have that in your inboxes if you don't already. I can't remember. There is an upcoming meeting on the 24th?

AV: 1:27:23

27th.

JJA: 1:27:24

27th. We ask for full participation as that meeting will be substantive. We'll be spending some time with the draft preamble You will receive it in advance in your Charter inboxes, and we just want to spend some time with that. You'll also be receiving the draft report that will be released at the end of the month. So, we want you to pay attention to your inboxes to be sure that you've got what you need to be engaged, get feedback, and make sure that your voice and your thoughts are thoroughly considered. I am not seeing hands signifying that there are additional questions or comments on the part of board members. So, that being the case, I will officially end the meeting. We'll bring the meeting to a close, and I will see all of you – hopefully as many as possible – at the next meeting: September 27th, four to six p.m. It is a virtual meeting. Thank you all. Thank you to the team, the staff, and to all the Commissioners, and all listening in. Have a good night!

Commissioners:

Thank you. Bye.