



NYC Racial Justice Commission

NYC Racial Justice Commission Public Meeting 08/29/21

[View online](#)

APPEARANCES:

- [Reverend Fred Davie](#)
- [Phil Thompson](#)
- [Jennifer Jones Austin](#)
- [Darrick Hamilton](#)
- [Anusha Venkataraman](#)
- [Henry A. Garrido, Vice Chair](#)
- [Jimmy Panos](#)
- [Ana M. Bermudez](#)
- [K. Bain](#)
- [Lurie Daniel Favors, Esq.](#)
- [Chris Kui](#)
- [Jo-Ann Yoo](#)

Interpreter: 03:19

Hey, can you hear me? I just unmuted myself.

Reverend Fred: 03:25

I can actually hear you.

Interpreter: 03:29

Okay, good. I'm on the phone, and he's like, can you take yourself off of mute just so you can hear me? Hey can you hear me? I just unmuted myself.

Reverend Fred: 03:51

Yes, I can hear you.

Phil Thompson: 03:53

I can hear you.

Interpreter: 03:55

Okay, good. I'm on the phone, and he's like, can you take yourself off of mute just so you can hear me. Hey, can you hear me? I just I unmuted myself.

Reverend Fred: 04:18

Yes, I can hear you.

Phil Thompson: 04:19

I can hear you.

Interpreter: 04:21

Okay, good. I'm on the phone, and he's like, can you take yourself off of mute just so you can hear me. Hey, can you hear me? I just unmuted myself.

Rev. Fred: 04:45

Yes, I can actually hear you.

Interpreter: 04:50

Okay, good. I'm on the phone, and he's like, can you take yourself off of mute just so you can hear me. Hey, can you hear me? I just unmuted myself.

Rev. Fred: 05:13

Yes, I can hear you.

Interpreter: 05:15

Okay, good. I'm on the phone, and he's like, can you take yourself off of mute just so you can hear me. I just muted are you able to hear me? Can you hear me, interpreter? Can you hear me?

Phil Thompson: 05:35

Yeah, I can hear you. But whatever it is, it's been playing on a loop.

Interpreter: 05:44

Right, I noticed that.

Phil Thompson: 05:48

That was weird. For the first time, I was going to reply.

Racial Justice Commission 05:52

What about the in-person? Can they try that, technically the people joining remotely?

Phil Thompson: 05:59

Don't try that.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 05:59

Works for them, can they hear what's happening in here?

Interpreter: 06:02

They can hear.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 06:03

They can hear.

Phil Thompson: 06:04

You just hear the issue right now is that they're sounding muffled.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 06:11

Well, I think we need to do it because this is going to take a (Inaudible 06:17) Okay.

Jennifer Jones Austin 14:09

May I have a motion to approve the minutes?

Darrick Hamilton: 14:13

A motion to approve the minutes.

Jennifer Jones Austin 14:15

Okay. May I have motion seconded?

Rev. Fred 14:18

Second.

Jennifer Jones Austin 14:19

Thank you. But is there any question comment debate corrections to be made to the minutes?

Darrick Hamilton: 14:32

None.

Jennifer Jones Austin: 14:32

It appears there are none. I'm going to ask that all in favor of approval state so by saying I?

All Speakers: 14:41

I.

Jennifer Jones Austin: 14:43

In the opposed? Okay, the meeting minutes have been approved and to be entered into the record. So today's agenda is centered primarily on a review and discussion of the public meetings that have been held to date.

I first want to thank all of the Commission members for joining us for the public meetings and the panel conversations that have occurred to date. We have held three public meetings in Staten Island, Brooklyn and Queens. Then we've held several meetings via Zoom with thought leaders, persons with lived experience and subject matter experts, in what we have turned transformational foundational conversations where we're looking at in equity in areas ranging from health and education to environment and land use.

We'll be soon looking at legal issues, criminal and otherwise, as well as economics and economic and equity. These meetings are the foundational meetings, also early learning foundations. The purpose of these meetings and the public engagement sessions; the purpose is to gather from the community again, people, everyday persons like ourselves, and then some with the expert knowledge thought

leadership in spaces concerning racial inequality and racial inequity, to garner from them what they believe are the issues on which the commission should be centered.

The aim is to hear as much as we can and to learn as much as we can, and then to take those leanings and identify themes. Then the themes that relate to underlying structural issues. That's the work of the Commission to Center on structural issues. I'm going to pause for a minute and note the presence of Vice Chair Henry Garrido, good to see you. Glad you're here. I understand you've had some traffic challenges, so we're glad you're here. Today's conversation is going to center on what we've heard to date in these conversations. Essentially, we want to hear from the commission members what their observations are, having heard from the public and thought leaders. We want to hear your thoughts about what is rising up with respect to themes and underlying structural issues. The leadership team led by executive director and cochairman and our policy director Jimmy Panos. Thank you. Jimmy Panos is going to walk us through essentially a summary of what we've heard thus far and guide us in a conversation centering on emerging themes and the next steps for our work to essentially take those themes and then translate them into or use them to delve into underlying structural issues. Then they'll talk to us a little bit about the next steps that are underway for each and every one of us as commissioners. Again, I want to thank all of the commissioners for all that they've done. You've been present in meetings both online and in person, and it just demonstrates your commitment to this work. I can't speak for the community, but I'd like to think that they appreciate your having been a part. You're being present. I think it says a lot to the staff as well, who have played an instrumental role in getting us here and getting us to every meeting, the yeoman's work that the staff has undertaken to make sure that we are engaging in the way that we should. Without going on and on and on let's turn to our executive director, a newbie engagement for a walk through report on the public engagement and what is resulting.

Anusha Venkataraman: 19:18

Wonderful, thank you so much, Chair. I will start with just a brief update of what we have done here from the community here, from thought leaders here from leaders and practitioners in communities. If you're looking at the slides which we have distributed in person and also uploaded on our website from members of the public to view, this would be slide four and slide five. We are about midway through or almost mid-way through our Transforming Foundations issue area panels. These are the panels where we have invited key thought leaders and practitioners to share their recommendations and also the barriers and issues that they see that stand in the way of racial equity and racial justice. There have been six to ten panelists per session to date, organized into two to three panels of speakers. We have heard from folks on overcoming racial disparities in health and mental health, eradicating education inequity for BIPOC communities, achieving racial equity and housing and land justice, planning for a racially equitable future just last week and we look forward to shortly sharing with you what we heard in terms of content at those sessions. Just want to highlight the upcoming sessions we have tomorrow; Economic equity and Closing the Racial Wealth Gap. Then this Friday, Racial Equity and Early Foundations with which builds on our education equity panel which was a few weeks ago, followed by three more sessions to close out by the end of the month.

I want to thank commissioners who have recommended speakers for those panels. They have been incredibly enlightening and helpful so far. Certainly for the staff, I hope for commissioners as well, and we're looking forward to the remaining ones, just as a reminder to everyone. Folks are able to join and watch all of these panels publicly. Links can be found on our website, and I encourage anyone watching or listening here today to do so. They have truly been quite beneficial, and I see that we have some edits actually to what is written in the slides, ensuring a fair and just legal system for all persons is actually on the 17th, and that's it. Moving to communities and the general public we have started our

tour of New York City. It's going quite well so far. We were in Staten Island just two weeks ago then in Brooklyn and in Queens. This Wednesday we'll be in Manhattan, followed by the Bronx. The week following on the 19th and then we'll have three citywide engagements that are really for anyone around the city who is able to join, wants to share their stories their input, their ideas with the commission directly.

It's a great time to get some face time with the commission. Commissioners have been engaging actively asking questions, sometimes probing questions. We want to thank you for your engagement there and continue to encourage any member of the public to come out. The three citywide ones, one of them will be in-person at a location to be confirmed and two of those will be virtual opportunities for people to be able to testify over Zoom. At this point we're going to move to the substance of what we have heard. We'll be recapping our input. As you know, I think all of you have been at most of the session, some of you at and all of them, we've heard a lot of input. It's been a lot of information. There are many different ways that we could have organized the input that we've heard today. Since our commission is really focused in on making foundational structural change, we thought the first step would be to look for patterns. What are the patterns? What are the themes that are emerging across input that we've received via testimony and via expert panels? Those patterns can begin to help us to identify the root causes that are causing those barriers, causing those issues that folks are raising. We're presenting these teams here today to begin to move us into that direction of what those structural changes may be, to help us surface those structural roots that continue to perpetuate inequity in our city. We hope that this is a helpful way of presenting the information to you. It really encapsulates the synthesis especially those four issue area panels to additional public input sessions. I will note that we are starting to receive input from city agencies and city agency staff. We've saved that information to present together at a later date at a future commission meeting. This really represents community input sessions to date. With the exception of Queens, which has not been entered yet, I think I cover all the framing here. This is now on slide number seven.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 00:24

If I may, I just want the commissioners to keep in mind that at this particular point, in our process. We are framing key themes, but that does not necessarily translate into a theme will result in a specific structural change that looks exactly like the theme that is put forward, said differently. We may see that we have what's a good example, trying to think of something, a theme that might present. Maybe we'll wait and go through this, maybe we'll use an example when we get to, what I'm really getting at is that I don't want you to be centered so much on this theme is now going to translate into a specific structural change in the charter. That theme may pinpoint an underlying issue that has to be addressed so the theme itself. We may be looking at education, lack of cultural humility, or cultural competence. But when you go to the charter, you will not necessarily see anything centered on cultural competence. I just want you to keep thoughts and ideas in your head and really center on what is the underlying root of the problem. Themes are helping us to pinpoint underlying problems, but the theme itself may not be the solution.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 26:29

I couldn't agree with you more. I think one of those areas where the state and federal government have a lot to say and implement and distribute resources, particularly the example the New York City Housing Authority is an example. There is clearly an equity but that's something that there's limitations where we will be able to sell. I think one of the hardest things we're going to have to do is that we stand aside these themes. Is how do we begin to reduce the issues in our charter or changes as

recommendations of the commission and also a policy that may still be pursued that are clearly on the line in an inequity and a structural Racial deficiency that we have in the system. But there is more policy than it is a true charter amendment. I think that that's going to be one of the hardest parts and difficult to start the framework.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 27:34

Absolutely, we have to continually orient and reorient ourselves to appreciate that we are looking at policies, but the work. But when it comes to the charter itself, we're looking at how policies are enabled or disabled by the charter. Our work is like in terms of structural change. It's the charter that allows for that, which we need to do away with or will allow for us to do that, which needs to be done. Then that gets manifest sometimes in policy and in public. It doesn't mean we're not going to pay attention to policies as well. But if we're going to root out the problems, we've got to look at the structural underpinnings. I'm not going to get into too much personal, but I'll give an example that I was sharing with one of the staff and with the new Newsier. I learned when I had cancer that the doctors believe was environmentally caused, that I had a cavity in my lung. They believed that the cancer was the cavity lung was the result of something that happened environmentally. They gave me antifungal medication while I was going through a bone marrow transplant to ensure that I would not get a fungus that would penetrate the cavity. Ten years later, I began to cough up blood. Now, they could have continued giving me antifungal medication because they found it was a fungus that had penetrated the cavity, but they would have to keep doing that over time. It was treating the problem, but it wasn't addressing at its core. So what they determined to do was to go into my lung and cut out the wedge of the lung that had the cavity in it that had the hole. They cut out the root problem. Now I'm living with one and two thirds lungs, but I don't have a cavity. I don't have a problem. I don't have anything that can cause further problems or allow the problem to persist. We're going in to cut out the core problems that allow for these things to persist. So now you know a little bit more about me than maybe you needed to. But I think it's a very clear and analogous easy to understand example you can live with one or two thirds lungs.

Anusha Venkataraman: 00:30

Thank you for that example and for setting the stage for what we would go into, I think beyond what we are capable of taking on within the charter, we're also presenting more themes that we will be able to take on. So this is food for thought to help us get to those structural underpinnings you will see the 13 themes that have emerged so far as we move along. Some of these may be collapsed or overtaken by other themes. There may be others that will emerge. For instance, we have not held our economic equity panel yet. So I would anticipate that next time around we will see some more themes that move and in that direction. So with that, I will hand it over to Jimmy to present the content.

Jimmy Panos: 30:53

Thank you. I'll walk you through the themes that the staff has been working to identify. Can you all hear me okay?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 31:01

There is a little something, perhaps you can use Anusha microphone.

Jimmy Panos: 31:09

All right is that a little better. Just to reemphasize, these are themes that the staff brought out from the many, many hundreds of ideas we've already heard and the issues that we've already heard. We

brought these 13 themes together as a way for you to organize your own thoughts and reflect. I'm going to run through these there in alphabetical order, not order of importance. Certainly the themes can change. So for those at home, we're at slide eight rights now. That first theme is accessibility of government services to all.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 31:50

Just please clarify first, you want to go through everything before we have discussion. Or would you like commissioners to comment as we go.

Jimmy Panos: 32:01

Let's go through a few at a time and then pause that sounds good.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 32:06

Yes.

Jimmy Panos: 32:09

The way we've organized these slides for you all is to have the session in which the underlying ideas came up. So that you can remember, oh, this relates to how someone was mentioning that this came up during education. This came up during the planning panel, it's so that you can connect those ideas and that's to the left of the slide, to the right of the slide. There's the stakeholders who may have mentioned that idea that again, is tied back to this theme, but I won't read those stakeholders out to you. If you have the slide, you can see it for yourself. What did we decide to put under this theme of accessibility to government services for all? We heard a lot of comments in both the Health and education panel about the lack of diverse culturally competent, culturally humble staff that contributes to disparities. We heard that the services provided by government are not always themselves culturally relevant or responsive to cultural needs, and that the systems that we create for people with disabilities or communities in general are not always inclusive of the variety of needs. Of course, we heard a lot about insufficient language access programs that themselves result in difficulty and inequities accessing care, education services. Of course, in our education panel, we heard a lot about the complexity of navigating school and government services, and that's of course, a barrier to BIPOC immigrant and disabled communities. As you hear this, you may recall a lot of the individual ideas and recommendations that came up regarding how education may not be accessible, especially in the health panel, how the services that people receive don't speak to who they are or are hard to access. I'm spending a little more time on this theme in particular to show you that even though ideas may come from different panels, we can tie them together in this way and think about what that charter may or may not say about accessibility services in general. I'm going to move on to the next slide, accountability. Maybe a little bit more straightforward and that came up in our housing panel and our planning panel. We heard folks talk about how the laws that should protect against racial discrimination are often not enforced effectively or often. We heard that the demands of community are often not met because there are limitations in the government process because they don't have the ability to hold government accountable or simply there's no substantive discussion when that happens. We heard about the need for greater transparency and accountability in community input in decision making, and we heard that the inability to track or report because of so many agencies makes it harder to hold government accountable. We heard about the lack of legal services, and we also heard that committee investment by private entities is encouraged but there are not very strong enforcement mechanisms for those. Another theme we've heard is budget justice, which gets at how government allocates money or how it chooses to spend the money it does have. We've heard that in

housing and planning panels, as well as in Staten Island and in Brooklyn. What we heard is that the affordable housing crisis in New York City disproportionately affects BIPOC communities. We heard that certain types of workers like care work is undervalued and underinvested. We heard people say you should reallocate funding from place on jails to fund the services that communities need. We also heard people mention things like value capture and other ways that we should leverage public and shared assets as an opportunity to invest in racial equity. I'm going to pause there we've done three and see if anyone has questions about those so far or about the way these are organized.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 36:28

Thank you. Thank Jimmy. What I would ask is that commission members raise their hands in the room. I don't know if we can yet have any participation. Okay, already so unfortunately, perhaps with a commission member, Darrick has a question. He can email it, if you have a question or comment commission. Commissioner Darrick, if you want to put it in the chat, we can pick it up there and share it with the group that I'm going to ask commission members in the room to raise your hand and I'm going to kick us off. As I listened in, as I read there were there was one overarching thought slash concern that came to mind. This is something I think the Commission has to chew on the whole and that is as you as you presented we heard was very government focused. Now we are a commission appointed by the government, and we are looking at the government charter. But it ways you need to question government shapes and influences and informs not just what happens by government authorities and government agencies, government workers, but what happens outside with private entities, independent entities. A lot of what I'm reading reads as though we're just centering on what government is or is not doing. I want us to raise that as a caution and as a concern, because this is not just what this government do you know, the 300,000 plus staff and how they conduct themselves, but what's happening with respect to them. Just knowing about what is equity look like in private hospitals versus public hospitals, what does it look like? When we look at education and the experience of children who were in independence, schools versus public schools, and what is the role and responsibility of government to ensure equity in that respect? Let's just make note of that. Then looking at the first slide on accessibility of government services to all what you all put in this getting done a great job. But as I read it, what we're really centering on is disparate access to services for all. Because some have no problem getting the best of education services and what we were hearing is that the lack of cultural competence, of cultural humility makes access for some more challenging. I think we should think about it more in terms of its disparate and not just overall, it's the accessibility. Then going back to my first point is that disparate access to government services or disparate access to basic human services and economic supports or whatever it is. But what I'm saying, it's beyond government. We're talking about what government's responsibility is, but it's not just the government service about which we're concerned. Those are my two initial points. Are there commissioners that have other thoughts or points they'd like to raise? Vice Chair Garrido?

Henry A. Garrido: 40:07

Yeah, Madam Chair, I guess the question around the line mentioned digital health as one of our biggest concerns is how we prioritize. These are all obviously organized in a way that make a lot of sense based on the testimonies that we've heard, but they're not organizing in particular order. I guess my biggest concern with what we saw with the Charter Commission revision last time on the ballot measures, that there were all these questions on the line subset of ideas, and we vote for everything on the need, whether you agree with the entirety or not. I could have agreed with questions three to four, but may have questions, have concerns about the fourth. I want to make sure that we're not going in that direction unless the entire commission understands what a subset of those issues I'm not against,

particularly putting one idea in a subset of ideas, but it seemed that time. This was my public criticism of the previous idea not that I didn't. The value of the work is that there were things that didn't seem to align with being in the first place. So you had a big subset and then you have four or five different things on the need. One of them seemed to be completely alien to the discussion of the subject. I just want to make sure that we don't go down that path again, to have people have to be forced to say what they can do with 80% of the concept from the nation health, housing, education. But then I have to vote for it even though I disagree with the 20% list sentence, it represents 20% of the value of that particular idea. While, I applaud Jimmy in the wilderness, I want to make sure we're not.

Anusha Venkataraman: 42:06

Yeah, absolutely. Thank you for that question. I just want to affirm that these 13 themes do not in any way align with the questions we will end up with. This is to help us get to that point of a smaller number of finite, structural, meaningful long we can make. This is just an initial stab at organizing what we have heard. I just want to affirm that. Thank you.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 42:34

Commission member Ana.

Ana M. Bermudez: 42:37

I echo Anusha. I am really appreciative for the work of everybody. As I look at the accessibility of our services in particular, what comes across to me is that while, yes, there is inequities accessing services, it also feels as though there is a thread of an inability to equitably access the levers of power that determine what the distribution of services should look like and that are able to then make corrections through that distribution. It's the services but I think if we only focus on services, equitable receipt of services without ensuring that there is equitable ability to manipulate the various levers of power to be pointed at accountability, we are appointed at reassessing what those services should be. I think we would be missing a key thread that's here. I just want to point out that in addition to the service provision, when I'm thinking about what an equitable community looks like, when I know that there are some in our community who in context might have the Chancellor's phone number and their cell phone. It's not so much that is a matter of access to services but about whom else have access to that particular power. I've always been a hypothetical. I just want to ensure that as we're looking about the equitable access to receive a benefit, that there's also an eye towards the equitable distribution of power levers that determine with those benefits.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 44:07

If I may just jump in here and say to you, Commissioner Ana that actually you just model, if you will, the work that has to be done. That as the result essentially this means a better way of putting the thinking that is the themes that have been presented are like the results, like what is happening. We're trying to get it. What is it that is causing these things to happen? Inequitable access is one of the root causes of it. Is inequitable power, inequitable access to power? It's like both ends in who holds power and who can access power when it comes to decision making about services in communities and that's when you look at the charter. So how is power distributed? If we change those dynamics, we have to do so in a way that then you get to see it live out in terms of service delivery and service provision. I think that was a great example. Commission member Bain?

K. Bain: 45:37

Thank you, (Inaudible 45:56) said that almost and I'm really grateful I can say, for example, things that not include a lot of what was mentioned with considerable success in the making of our works space. My service over example, so my question is where we do when we talk about accessibility based on that. (Inaudible 46:35) There are some areas that have experience in the city. We have this humongous responsibility to this larger purpose then to figure out. I think part of our conversation with, say, almost all of the stakeholders for a period is we're the console that will have the greatest outcome based on the fact that this or that we can work together to carry out this evidence that I think that's more than an extended process ever.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 47:36

If I may just respond and give you a sense of how I'm thinking about it and how I've been talking with a mission with Jimmy about it. The themes that you're being presented help us to begin thinking about what are the causes of those things? Then thinking about applying like the theory of change with research, some of it may be evidence based and some may just be innovative in of the moment. What tells what we have to do is figure out what is the tie, what is the relationship of the root cause to the problem, how significant a contribution is it to the problem so set differently? What has been happening is people are bringing us issues that they are aware and sometimes they have solutions for those issues. But the solution that they may be visiting maybe only addresses 30% of the problem because it's not really getting to the root to the heart of the matter. The work that Jimmy as policy director and his team will be leading is trying to take these themes and unpack them to do that root cause analysis and then look at, well if you did these two or three things, how much might that move the needle?

How much do we know based on research and otherwise about whether it's going to move the needle or not? Some of the solutions that have been presented to us are good ideas, but they may simply be like only going to affect 5% of the people who are identifying as having that problem. If we determine an example, the other day we were in a meeting in Brooklyn and there was an individual who shared that in her agency. She's a city employee in her agency. There is an issue around hiring and promotions. You remember you were there. We could look at what's just happening in her agency and the solutions she might offer referencing, oh, that's the fix. But it may be something more like underlying a more structural just like it may be in the examination. It may be in the underlying who holds power in decision making of that, who gets promoted from one city agency to the next. It may be a solution that requires a union, like role. But if we just interrogate, let's just look at this agency, this particular this particular problem, we're not going to get at it. So the work that the policy team has to do, to your point, is to take some of these themes, try to identify what are these themes and then what's at the core of them and what's the fix that's going to move the needle to your point.

K. Bain 50:25

Next question was (Inaudible 50:39) once that was reached successes that will have some sort of incentive for the force to resolve. This is another powerful situation so that we were in that moment considering how to look at how that's possible or that something is not right now to solve this. So, yes, I agree. This is an area where there's a need or expressed but we are working on some that were involved in some of these things. Almost everyone we're able to make a right that we would end up grace that. We don't see that. It's as a father or as a nurse, it's a whole other person, pastor or knows what we have to figure out of all of these themes in areas which one, two or three can we drive the furthest, which one, two or three can stand at legacy piece to affect the greater change when we're no longer a commission.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 52:08

That's right, absolutely.

Anusha Venkataranman: 52:10

If I may, we will be going into this a little bit more after we present the themes that we've heard so far. We'll be talking about the work that we have to do in the working groups and a little bit more depth. That's exactly what the working groups will be doing, is looking at the themes, looking at we've heard to date pulling that back. What are those root causes? And then from there, what are the things that we should focus on and put forward to the full commission as priorities as we move towards our preliminary report.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 52:43

Commissioner Phil.

Phil Thompson: 52:43

I think the chair makes a good point, then the question for me, it comes up to me would be like, can we actually try to invite people who might have influence or power at this point, all people who are actually running some type of program from their perspective and see what are some of the challenges issue? Because I think we've heard a lot on the community, the recipient of these services that they feel this like an equal treatment or not equitable treatment, but then can we get that other perspective so that maybe we could build alliances or maybe just get a perspective of what the power folks are seeing from their perspective that this will can engage them so that would be my recommendation.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 53:34

Thank you very much.

Jimmy Panos: 53:39

Well, I love everyone's comments, and I'm glad these things have encouraged a lot of conversation already. I'm sure we'll have much more as well. Why don't we jump right back into it? Right now, we're at the slide community ownership and asset building. We know we heard this lot in our housing and planning panels, as well as in Staten Island and in Brooklyn.

Again, just to summarize some of the things that came up, some of the themes, some of the ideas we heard related to barriers, including high interest loans and lack of access to grants that prevented communities or individuals from building community assets or generating wealth. We also heard a lot about nature and its underfunding. We heard about whether the capital centered approach towards land use development disempowers BIPOC communities and whether that same approach focusing on capital and how it vacant land is used in the city.

Also further divests BIPOC communities from resources like green spaces, gardens or affordable housing. Then we also heard a general comment about how systems are not generally conducive to cooperative or community ownership. Our next theme is related. It's about community power itself. A lot of co governance ideas came up, especially again in housing and planning panels. We heard that government doesn't reflect communities and that it breeds distrust and inhibit participation. The idea behind that one is that because are not the table, it's hard for them to work with government in general. We also heard comments about community boards and their representations and those they're not empowered to make sensitive changes in their own communities. We heard that the

current processes for communication that exist now are either not sensitive or too complex or inaccessible or under communicated or all of those and which results in an underpowered community. We heard about existing procedures that do not enable self-determination of communities. And again, we heard a lot about distrust and how a lack of community representation prevents communities from engaging in the decisions about their own neighborhoods. Then BIPOC communities are often not empowered to make changes or decisions to the allocations of funds and resources. Another theme that was touched upon in the education panel, as well as in Staten Island and Brooklyn, was criminalization. A lot of people talked about the lack of accountability for police, police abuse, mass incarceration, and how that disproportionately affects BIPOC communities. We heard a direct connection between the lack of culturally competent teachers and how that contributes to over policing of BIPOC students. We heard folks criticize a deficit based or punitive education model that focuses on behavioral norms that reinforces policing of students as opposed to other models. We heard statistics about how BIPOC students face punitive consequences at this proportional rates as well as suspensions and P.D. Police Department child in crisis interventions that target BIPOC students. Then the next theme is a big one we heard a lot about Equitable distribution of resources as well as equitable distribution of responsibilities or burdens. Again, this came up in education and came up in the housing panel, in the planning panel, as well as in Staten Island and Brooklyn. The core of idea, that idea is that certain communities are continually underinvested in, and that perpetuates inequities across generations. We heard that historical inequities in public school and after school resources continue to persist because schools remain systematically underfunded in BIPOC communities. Many people spoke about the need to have an equitable funding model for services. On the other hand, we heard a lot about how burdens or responsibilities are concentrated in BIPOC or low income communities such as waste infrastructure, jails or shelters, as compared to white communities, and how those exacerbate health and economic disparities. Then we heard that resources are not distributed towards greatest need. That's the core of this theme and how that again exacerbates inequities.

We heard from someone on our planning panel that there we need to have equitable or at least a minimum access to safe parks and green spaces. Otherwise we risk undermining the health and public safety of BIPOC communities and also their own mental health as well. In the health panel as well as in housing and planning. We've heard a lot about procurement. Not just that the procurement process is complex or inaccessible for small businesses and CBOs, but also that community organizations that are looking for these contracts are often underfunded, underutilized or under empowered and unable to therefore get the contracts that they need. We heard specifically about social service workers, many of whom are, of course, BIPOC women and how the city isn't paying city funded CBOs enough to give them a thriving life. The theme behind that one is how the city can leverage its contracting power in different ways to address inequity. I've been through a lot, so let me see if I should pause there for a second, if anyone has comments.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 59:50

Thanks Jim.

Phil Thompson: 59:53

A question, a comment about something that Commissioner Bain said very eloquently, which is about what happens when you have overlapping and paraphrasing overlapping responsibilities. Let's say you were to create an agency that would have some powers around, let's say for hypothetically you do that, but then you have procurement and equitable distribution of resources, which is a function of the budget, but also a function of policy. Then you have the issue of power, you can't talk about

criminalization or decriminalization without talking about a budget reckoning and the closing facilities. I guess my question as we get closer to begin to discern a lot of the stuff that's in it goes to the core of the mayoral power in the charter, which still establishes and leads the mayor as a chief executive. To make the termination to the council so that distribution resources but yet the charter leads towards, it's like awaits the law when it's also gone. I'm looking at procurement as an example of that. A lot of the procurement changes are done to PPV rules. They get promulgated and change all the time. Sometimes in the middle of it, they are rules that are established to expedite prompt payment or any kind of procurement. But in fact, the application of those ideas to try to make government less bureaucratic in many ways become and are directly responsible for the inequities we're talking so that the linking back to the commissioner being side of my office.

Now, would you ever see in perpetuity if this commission were to look at the idea of creating and would oversee that? In that power in terms of resources I guess my question would be, is there a point where there's some form of discernible boundary between exceeding what would be the executive power and that of a city council on the same chart where you draw the line. If I said, for instance, we're going to create this office, and that office shall have no more than a less than 5% of the city's entire budget as part of its portfolio. Will we then be taking away some of the responsibilities and power of the council and the mayor to allocate resources? So, this may be a legal question. I don't know if it is, but I want to make sure to know what our limitations are. Because I tend to shoot for the unit, the sky, the But I think it would be helpful in the context if we understood.

Jimmy Panos: 01:02:55

I think certainly as we discuss these in the groups, we will be able to take these questions to legal counsel, but also say that the power in the charter is pretty great to establish not only new offices, but new officials and even put the powers into them as well or remove offices or remove officials, remove elective offices. There are many ways to get at the same fight at the Apple and certainly we'll have legal counsel for a more in-depth response.

Anusha Venkataranman: 01:03:32

Absolutely, there are things in the charter that might be derived from state or federal law. Those are basically the things that we can't change because their source is elsewhere, but otherwise we can make major sweeping changes. The example that you've heard before was the elimination of the Board of Estimate, which was a major structural change that shifted the distribution of power in the city so it's certainly possible.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:04:01

The commissioner Lurie Daniel Favors.

Lurie Daniel Favors: 01:04:05

One thing that I notice that is not necessarily explicit we laid out, but at least based on my memory of the conversations that we've been able to participate in and the comments that were heard, is that part of what is going to be necessary? This is not necessarily directly related to a structural change that can be made, but more of a philosophical change. I think that may need to take place within the mind of the public to better understand the goals that we are striving for. This was something that Council member Brad Lander, I think, pointed out in his commentary when we were in Brooklyn and that is this notion that at the heart of much of this inequity is an overconsumption or over consuming of benefits and power that is taking place within white New York communities. The fact that when we're talking about implications for care of health care, that when we're talking about disparity what is not being

said is that that disparity at the heart of it is that there is an overconsumption of those benefits by particular communities. As we're thinking about how these things are going to show up on ballot measures, as we're thinking about how we're communicating about these issues, oftentimes in conversations that are equity driven, there's a hesitancy to name the fact that at the heart of inequity is a sizable portion of the community, maybe sizable, perhaps not, that is over consuming relative to their fair share. As we're having these conversations, even though again, I point this out only because it's not here, but it is certainly something that I think ties through each of these broader themes. There needs to be some thought. I think to the extent it's not happening already, that that has to also be communicated that we're not talking about creating equity and increasing equity and removing structural barriers in a vacuum. We're talking about moving structural barriers that have been erected to funnel benefits, privilege and power to specific communities and away from others. I think it will be helpful as we consider how we move forward, as we consider what the language of these proposals is going to ultimately look like, that we must also be talking in terms of overconsumption of benefits by some communities and how that overconsumption is at its heart, part of what's contributing to these structural inequities. I just add that because I think that needs to be an open and transparent part of the conversation so that as we're determining what structural change will look like it is, with that understanding.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:06:33

Very much appreciated. Are there other comments questions?

Anusha Venkataraman 01:06:41

We have a question coming in from Fred Davie. On the zoom here, he writes, under education and under the subtheme of cultural competence, teacher demographics was also raised as a concern. For instance, someone said teacher make up as 80% white and 80% of that is female, is a city structurally and systematically supporting and sustaining this level of homogeneity in teaching and sorry if I misinterpreted anything that I said Fred.

Jimmy Panos: 01:07

I think that part of that does fall within accessibility of government services because it speaks to the ability of that staff to provide culturally relevant and responsive education but also guidance and also interact with students as it relates to discipline, emotional support and other areas that students need. I think the question of how diverse is the city's workforce or whether it's the government itself or the city itself, that's maybe a question that doesn't quite fall under that accessibility theme. But it may fall into one of the later themes, I forget. It also may come up in another panel as well. But we can look into it. I think the first theme speaks more to what teachers provide as opposed to the composition of the workforce itself. But certainly something we're the.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:08:27

I'm just going to jump in here from appreciating what the point that Commissioner Davie is raising in this is one of these moments where essentially what we have to do is we have to do the work of discerning the ascertaining what is the contribution, how much of a role does representation in the education workforce of BIPOC persons contribute to the education, to the to the educational, the development and the educational attainment of children? You get what I'm saying. There's a lot of research on it, but that's the work that we have to do to thread the needle. The other point that I just want to throw out, I value this conversation, but what I'm also centering on is just when we look when we look back on all that we've talked about in this conversation, some thoughts

are percolating for me that I want you, Jimmy and Anusha to center on. I'm a little anxious if we delve into the themes because what I'm hearing in this conversation is that we're talking about marginalization and criminalization of BIPOC communities. We're talking about inequitable consumption slash access to basic quality goods and services that ensure well-being. We're talking about an equitable access to opportunities for advancement and wealth building and equitable environmental protections in equitable representation and decision making in service delivery, and then enforcement and accountability. These themes, these are the issues that people have brought to the table. What's percolating for me is that it all ties to the overarching. These are overarching themes. That may be what we need to be centering on and want to keep going, but we may want to pull back for a minute about whether or not we're going to look at education as a group or housing as a group. Maybe what we're looking at is marginalization and criminalization of BIPOC communities. Maybe we're looking at inequitable consumption slash access to quality basic goods and services that ensure well-being. What the charter does to enable that would not allow for that procurement, hiring, whatever it may be, it's not that we can't center on. We can't center on every specific problem. It's what is the overarching what is it speaking to and maybe those are the groups that how we need to group our work. We're talking about inequitable access to quality basic goods and services that ensure people's well-being. When we looked in the housing section, that was not where, say, asset building, that was just quality affordable, safe housing that ensures your well-being. What is denying people that? What in the charter do we need to address that will overcome that? Just let's keep going. But maybe we want to shift a little bit more and look at how what are these groupings? Does anybody get what I'm saying?

Jimmy Panos: 01:12:03

I like that. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:12:06

Because when we talk about community and assets, we're talking about like the lack of opportunity for wealth building and opportunities for advancement. When we talk about promotions, which get hired? We're talking about lack of opportunity for advancement. We need to look at the charter and how the charter allows for that inequity, you're on point.

Jimmy Panos: 01:12:36

I think that's absolutely right and tomorrow afternoon's panel on economic equity may also bring life to that as well.

Phil Thomson: 01:12:43

To that end, My question is, are we going to have the opportunity to hear from city agents, for instance, in issue of hiring and the diversity department of citywide administrative services located in this building has a lot of hiring, promulgate hiring all city and for many city of all city agents. We're going to hear from agencies in that respect.

Chris Kui: 01:13:09

Also beyond the agencies but maybe these people will one pilot to, you know, maybe who have access to resources or control the resources now that some of them might have good ideas also because like they might feel that this is on restraint on them in terms of how they can allocate resources, just like pension funds, some of the investment like pension funds, etc. So I get all them.

Jo-AnnYoo: 01:14:10

(Inaudible 01:13:34)That's right.

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:14:12

Absolutely, thank you for that. I think we haven't quite worked out or spoken as a group about how, when, in which case we want to hear from city agencies. I think right now, as they are coming up with their own ideas to submit to the charter, you know, they're doing this work day in day out. There are many folks that are equity minded within agencies. They will have some ideas for us to consider. We can think about how those are then presented to the commission and perhaps even have agencies involved in that. You have an opportunity to engage directly with them on not only what they're proposing, but also some of the challenges or the ways that they're doing their work. But I think the timing is critical. We're going to get into the process for the working groups but I think it's important to bring the agencies in when we have a sense of where we may be heading so that we can really ask pointed questions and I think have that be as productive as possible, in my opinion. Happy to hear other folk's thoughts on that, too.

Henry A. Garrido: 01:15:15

I just want to add one more. I realize it's not a city agency, but I think hearing from the city's comptroller to the extent of pension investments mentioned to say but also diversity in registration of contracts and asset management may be a good idea to hear from their perspective. Now they're going to have a new administration coming to the city with the experience of what they've experienced to be there and maybe their ideas.

Phil Thompson: 01:15:48

We may want to hear it's not just the agencies, but an agency like that may have a different perspective. Then we may want to hear. Well, two things on which I think it would be interesting to hear from the council also. Interested in hearing from some former executives of the comptroller such as Iraqi and others who care about racial justice issues and worked in those spaces before or maybe even John Liu or others who held those offices who have insight? I think it'd be good to hear from them as well. I also wanted to make a point that about going back to what Commissioner Davie raised about composition of teachers and the racial and ethnic composition of teachers. I want to make sure we don't conflate cultural competence with some of the other things that I heard being called for. One was curriculum change to better reflect the diversity and history accurately of the many different folks who attend New York City schools. Like Africa didn't begin with colonization and slavery. There was Africa before that, etc. I heard people say that just because someone is black doesn't mean they know or have been trained any differently than anybody else or that they use textbooks that have been written to actually reflect that. That different is.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): **01:17:43**

Just what the research shows about policing Just because you have a black officer does not mean that a black officer is not going to engage in biased and radicalized practices.

Phil Thompson: 01:17:57

Yes. I think that's a separate point that if we're going to summarize education, I think that's a very important one to include. The other thing I heard was that kids are not being trained in critical thinking skills and interactive skills, which is how you develop critical thinking skills, but more in a cognitive accountability, which is like memorize the mathematical tables and two plus two equals four and one

plus one was two. But they are taught that the linear model, one plus one equals two doesn't work with your measuring and oxygen. That only works between 32 degrees and 36 degrees. You go one degree above you no longer have whether you're in a qualitatively different space and they are taught that oh you have to qualify these additive models according to the substance you're looking. That's the next level of critical thinking which in programming and all these other newly emerging fields. That's what folks are looking for. I thought that is a distinct point also that we are training kids to occupy certain occupations, but not at the highest level of what's out there needed in the economy where they're going to be able to succeed and be leaders, etc. I thought that was a very important point to have that I didn't want to see just lost.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:19:35

Speaker 4

To your point, and this is why I'm trying to figure out what is the most appropriate brain. That's part of what we're doing here this afternoon. Part of the discussion that we want to have as commissioners is because how we frame this is going to determine what rocks we're looking up under what we're looking for in the charter. When I hear you talk about education, what I think to myself is and this goes back to the point that Commissioner Daniel Favors was making about consumption, inequitable consumption, and then how you've got to look at kind of two sides of the slate. There's the inequitable and lack of access and then there's over consumption. What contributes to that? When I hear you talk about education, I can't help but think that is the overarching inequitable access consumption to basic quality goods and services that ensure well-being. Then you have under that, what does it look like in education? What does that look like in healthcare? What does that look like in housing? What does that look like in health and mental health? Then you look at what the issues are that the points that people have presented to us. We have to figure out what is it in the charter, what are those what are those elements those laws in the charter that are going to allow us to move the lever on all of this? Because we're not going to be able to hit every specific issue in education, every specific issue in housing. You have to figure out what is that underlying structural issue that if we make that change and then we couple it with some other changes that assure enforcement and accountability, we can catch the issues but you have to call it out. I'm with you. I'm just saying that it may not be delineated because if we delineate everything, it may be 1500 things. How do we how do we make sure that we're catching using what people are bringing to us, catching what is the overarching inequity that's present, and then making sure that we structurally go in there and gut out what allows for that and replace it with that which is going to control Board of Control against.

Henry A. Garrido: 01:22:13

I just wanted to say I'm sorry that I want to be clear that we're talking about K-12 education, because when you look at diversity among the teachers, I represent early childhood access school; Head start, diversity in the office. You have more diversified workforce and they're getting paid substantially less. The role of the nonprofit to deliver early childhood education, three K pre-K, and then after school program, we haven't talked and I think by extension, the role of higher education, although CUNY is a function of the state in the city. City diversity has also diversity issues. That when we talk about education, I personally, I want to make sure that this is not just a K-12 education, because when you're talking about procurement, where we're procuring contracts from nonprofit and paying teachers \$20,000 less than the same teachers that are teaching our kids in a K-12 education, if we're going to talk about inequity, we're going to talk about diversity. You have a diversified workforce. Well, mostly people of color. I represent that and then making pay of 15,000 dollars less. We are questioning diversity in a K-12 education and they're getting substantially more and not only getting more in

salaries, but getting more in access to education and training. They can go to a Dell find this is no disrespect to my brothers and brethren in the law in the U.S. to anybody else. I just think that if we're going to talk about that in this space, we need to expand the concept of education beyond K-12 and look at early childhood education after school. Head Start and look at CUNY, even if it's for city universities, because it is part of our procurement and it is a policy that we're pursuing right here. I want to make sure that we don't leave those members.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:24:14

Yes and what I would add to that is that what I want all of us to also look at is how jobs segregate nation contributes to that. Why is it that black and brown women are more often relegated to early childhood programming and it's not seen as quality in value add. We have to look at it in terms of wages and opportunity. But we also have to look at this notion of job segregation, how our society determines who should be and what roles and how they are and how they are valued and that gets into your structural.

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:25:01

I note Commissioner Davie has made a point on this. He writes are there structural, systemic issues that create lack of representation?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:25:09

That's what I'm talking about.

Henry A. Garrido: 01:25:10

Teachers' certification is a key one.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:25:13

Exactly right.

Henry A. Garrido: 01:25:14

You are the people I represent that have to pay between \$70,000 out of pocket to get certified. In the city covers them from the K-12 education if you're in a city one. You start from the perspective you're in a deficit to begin with. Who have that amount of money? To the issue of diversity is the same thing. If you don't have the \$400 that it takes to take a civil service exam, in some instances, how do you begin to have that conversation to have community access to people who may be there may be for the range. I think we have to talk about this from the perspective to talk about those levers. It's good to talk about curriculum and I'm all for it. Commissioner, I'm sorry that we should talk about curriculum in that curriculum should not just be one. It came to the K-12. But if we're going to address the serious problems that we have, those inequities I you spoke about, Madam Chair, we have to be honest and be honest and say, listen, those are some of the roadblocks to begin with that create a segregated society and a segregated education system.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:26:24

Absolutely and then what is the city willing to do about that or what are we going to push the city to do about that? Commissioner Yoo and then Commissioner Favors.

Jo-Ann Yoo: 01:26:44

We BIPOC communities, communities where we need to get information to get all the Socioeconomic and so there are simple immigrants for instance, come here. They want to be able to access going to college and teachers or whatever. But the system isn't set up to help them and everything is like a Clinton check process and nobody knows what to do. Everybody comes here and there's many diverse communities and immigrants and New Yorkers that everybody it's almost like everybody's doing like there isn't any continuation. Like you hunt and peck for your own self and your family because there isn't a system that really helps you to navigate and it's really hard to find that relevant to you. I think that's something that we also need to think about.

Lurie Daniel Favors: 01:27:41

I think that it's important to have a bold ban as opposed to an either or approach. Particularly about something like education because even if we did have that equity that we're speaking of in terms of representation as it pertains to the number, if the educators that we're talking about in this hypothetical are trained to the same types of teacher preparation program would still center curriculums that are grounded in the higher value placed on whiteness and the ability to access whiteness, then we are simply replicating. I'm reminded as African nations are throwing out colonial leaders without having quite substantive thought into what new systems would look like, we often ended up with situations where those same structures were in place they were just populated with people from within those communities. It would be a travesty to me if we were to focus on the numerical representation in an example like this, without also looking at the substantive curricular aspects of what it means to be taught that in order to successfully navigate the education system, one must master whiteness in terms of an approach to academic learning. I would hope that as we're thinking about these structures, that we are definitely holding space for the example that is mentioned, because I think that the numbers themselves are now the same, particularly since we know that those numbers have fallen off a cliff ever since. Brown, the Board of Education, but it would be a really missed opportunity if we did not also look at the substance of what children are expected to master in order to demonstrate academic excellence. So long as they are still being required to master accessing whiteness as a tool or a pathway for academic excellence, or if you have to take a Regents exam that asks you to weigh them into the mentioned two ways of to speak two ways that British imperialism benefited Nigeria, for example, which is an actual question of the reasons, is that it doesn't matter if it's a black teacher or a BIPOC teacher, that's to you that information, you are still being taught to view the world through the benefits that whiteness and its accessibility can provide. I think that as we're moving forward and as we're sort of fine tuning what the actual structural underpinnings are, I would hope that we are able to take up close and approach that we're looking at those structural numeric because I think that it's vitally important that opportunity, whereas as we're looking at those numbers, it would be a missed opportunity if we are not also talking about the substance that children are expected to match that because that also contributes to lifelong inequity.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:30:18

What you're saying builds on what commission member Thompson was speaking to and I don't think that you have any argument in this room. What I am saying is that when we look at what inequitable access to slashed consumption of quality basic goods and services that promote and ensure well-being, you have to look at the education bucket and then you have to look at what contributes to that inequity. The research does largely show rightly shows that what children are being taught and how they're being taught influences, informs and shapes their educational development, their attainment, their growth, their maturation. That's when you then look at what is the change we need to make here, and we're going to have to map that out. But overall, what we're trying to ultimately get to is

ensuring greater equity in access to and consumption of those basic goods and services that promote and ensure well-being for everyone. Get what I'm saying? We're there. We just have to map it and make sure that at the end of the day, while we may be centering on this, is what I meant Commissioner Thompson, while we may have something in there about curriculum and we may have something in there about the numbers the overarching concern is in is addressing the inequity. There may be this overarching structural change with some elements of it. I'm sorry, Commissioner Thompson.

Phil Thompson: 01:32:07

Let me make two points, one just agreed with the agreement with Commissioner Favors. There was a book in the 1970s by the economist Michael Peri, which was a cross-national study of social status and then occupation in wages, occupational prestige and wages. What this study is about and pure is a very well established, well known economists but if found that wages and occupational status follows social status, not the other way round. If you find a country or profession that's predominantly women worldwide, that becomes a lower status occupation at a lower pay. Similarly, that's how the system works globally. In Russia, doctors tend to be women, it doesn't pay well because it's women and so the conclusion of the book is if you really want to change the way occupational status and wages are distributed, you have to tackle how people are categorized and received and you have the volume of rapes and you have to go after the gender. That was the conclusion of the book. It's not like the occupations themselves deserve that kind of money or that kind of money. I think that argues for both ends and we need definitely to tackle the inequalities among teachers according really to who they are. But in order to do that, we also have to reeducate folks. So that's the point I wanted to make.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:34:10

Let me just reply to that. We have to reeducate, but that's also where part of that kind of centering in the preamble, like what do we value? What do we believe?

Phil Thompson: 01:34:20

Well, that was going to be my second. I think it's exactly that. I think the preamble, then we should think about the preamble setting out, what does it take to thrive. What does it take to thrive at it? Then once we identify and put there, what does it take? Maybe it's not like liberty pursuit of happiness, but some more stuff. Once we say what does it take to thrive? Then we can say and how about access and distribution of who gets those things and the list. One cautionary note I would put in there. One of the things I think it takes for everyone to thrive is some common belief in a common set of values. Like, we all are human beings. We have equal potential and it doesn't matter where we come from, that kind of thing so none of this other stuff makes sense. But I agree. Holding on the same, I think that would make the preamble hold. It fits with consistent.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:35:34

I agree.

Jimmy Panos: 01:35:44:25

I'm ready to actually go into the next one, because I think it responds to the comments of the vice chair and the deputy mayor as well so this next one is a big one. It's measurement of disparate impacts and remedying disparities in race neutral decision making and I think some people might see that as separate. But we brought these together because these came up in every single panel. To some of the mechanisms that have been discussed may overlap as well. Just to summarize this a little bit, it's the idea behind this theme is that we need to know what disparate impacts exist across race or other

identities in a discrete enough way to be able to act upon it. Then we need to look at what criteria is used in society and whether those are tied to the disparate impacts themselves, including in the composition of the workforce, including and how people are paid. Some of the things that we have heard which fall under that are about fair share regulations and whether they're sufficient or not. We also heard about the racial wealth gap, and we heard about city employee and promotion processes and how those are difficult to navigate and lack transparency. If we had a way to measure that, then we could elucidate what about that process actually is causing that. We heard about simply there are not enough mechanisms to identify or enforce against disparate impacts. We heard that from many people that the city or other entities can use quote unquote, racial neutral criteria in application of the policy that produces unequal outcomes based on racial lines. The next slide is a continuation of this. This is just such a large category that we heard over and over about. We heard that recruitment practices and health care staffing do not reflect communities being served because of those types of criteria. We heard that there's a lack of deal. We oversight in terms of specifically looking at racial equity monitoring and rule enforcement so this is a pretty big one that not only spans health, education, housing, and planning, but presumably would come again and again in the panels that we have, especially economic equity coming up and a fair legal system as well. The next slide is a theme that's a little more discrete. It's about mental health.

Phil Thompson: 01:38:25

One of the issues, and I acknowledge no one agrees was on the way we measure MWB, for example, it's women generic the five different women, then it's black, Latino, Asian. There is no category for black women, Latin next women, Asian women into what we measure who gets contracts according to our criteria that I believe may be defined in legislation. We don't see unless we asked for it how many women of color get contracts. We just see women. But if you look at how many women of color get contracts, black women it's like less 2% or less Latin. That's 2% or less Asian women, similarly; white women 33% of the contracts, even though it's very disproportionate so women of color are invisible. I just want to note as an issue. Do we want to address that? Like the way we characterize MWB and this cuts across all programs makes women of color at least I'm saying invisible. Literally, you don't collect to show the data of how they're doing and they're not doing well. I just want to make that an issue.

Jimmy Panos: 01:40:18

Certainly the way we conceptualize this includes that because it highlights the need to have data at discrete enough levels to just aggregate that data, whether it's women of color, whether it's different types of Asian populations, whether it's different types of black populations to collect that data at a small enough or detailed enough levels that you can get to.

Phil Thompson: 01:40:44

I'm being very specific I'm not talking about Asian versus Jamaican. I'm talking about women of color specifically because I think the disparities are greater that they're in variations among types of blackness or variations among types of Latin acts, etc. I think there's a real issue here for black, Latin and Asian women.

Henry A. Gallido: 01:41:12

Madam Chair, for that point, I think this is a real critical question when you get to the issue of procurement between these relationships between the PPE. The Procurement Policy Board promulgating rules, the mayor's office of contract supposedly in enforcing the rules. But then everybody does pardon my language, whatever the hell they want. Then the city agencies then they

interpret their own rules. To that point, the idea of the creation of an agency that oversees is a power is we take a mayor's office of contracts and beef them up to give them full procurement. With the understanding that these rules will have to change over that to implement what I lofty goals, but never get implemented because they just sit well on a piece of paper and say We're going to procure 20% of this and a lot of it has an under theme to it or do we just do away with, to your point, a new show within agency completely and create a new one. I think it's an interesting discussion for us to have because I believe in the experiences that we have on the issue of power that we started with. If you form an agency, I don't care how big it is, I don't care what you call it, and you don't empower them to make those decisions and to set those inequities that commission Thompson said right, then what do you really do? I'm tired of lofty ideas that sit on a shelf. Well, we put great reports, shows what we already know, which is inequities that exist in the system. And I've seen that with promotion. I've seen them with NWA's. We've seen it everywhere. But unless you really empower someone, an agency and entity to really be have the authority to make the things right, then why create one? I think that's a big challenge for all of us. Because we've seen the application of so many good ideas and in the end up perpetuating the same inequities or actually making them more to the point of Thompson.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:43:33

Let me show that I hear, I understand. I agree. As you all speak, what I am continually doing in my head is trying to figure out how do you organize and structure to ensure that we're addressing the points that you're raising, the very critical points that you're raising while at the same time appreciating that there may be five other like points. When I hear you talk about MWBE and the very issue that you rise, which is hugely problematic, and it's something that in this society they've known about, but they don't really document it. We know the same thing manifests in procurement for city contracts. We know now from input of people in the community that we see it just even in working in government. The City Council report about the experience of women of color in terms of being employed and getting ahead and getting ahead and being paid different elements and aspects of it. What I'm centering on is how do we structure in such a way that we're capturing we're dealing with the overarching issue of inequity in work with or working with city government right. That that's a large looming it's a constant theme that is surfacing. It may be in vendor contracts with the city of New York. It may be in appointments and promotions within the city of New York. It may be pension contracts. It may be construction contracts. It may be community based organization contracts. But the overarching issue is there is an inequity in how and who does business, who works for how we capture that data, how we manage it. Our aim as a charter has to be that we try to we identify the areas and we try to figure out how we come up with a proposal that speaks to those specific areas, but that also captures the ones we don't know about, the ones that are flying under the radar. We know absolutely nothing about them because nobody's surfaced them. Again, it's that both ends. I'm with you so when you see me like this I'm just trying to piece it together because we're not going to catch everyone. Let's make sure that we identify the ones we meet that are out there, create the response and then ensure that response also begins to dismantle that which we haven't even been brought to our attention.

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:46:36

I want to note at this point in time that we are at the scheduled close time of our meeting. If folks are staying a bit longer, I think it would be beneficial to do so. Does that work?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:46:48:17 - 01:47:09:06

I think it would be beneficial. At the same time, I want to honor people's time. People came, they showed up. We had some technical difficulties. If we're going to go another five to 10 minutes, let's do that. But let's center on how we're going to move forward. Is that fair?

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:47:10

Sounds good, would it be worth Jimmy, quickly going through the remainder of the deck or would you like to digest it in print?

Phil Thompson: 01:47:18

Yeah, I feel like we can all agree to it.

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:47:21

Okay.

Phil Thompson: 01:47:23

I also wanted to comment on what Commissioner Jones Austin just said. I think what Commissioner Garrido has suggested a few times was that we also, given the things that you just noted, things we see things that are unseen but captured within a theme. I think Commissioner Garrido was saying maybe that's an argument for an agency or somebody that will continue to dig into these things. I just want to note that.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:48:05

I agree and I think that it's going to come down to we're going to come up with structural changes. But then there's going to have to be this continuing review enforcement and accountability mechanism, because even if we capture it and we make the change we've seen time and time again that something gets embedded in the charter and then it's not carried out. Again, I think it's that both in and setting the stage for what will come next.

Henry A. Garrido: 01:48:41:12

Can I have a point? Commissioner, you talked about language access is an example of that. We went through this whole thing about local law 68, which then turned into local law 75, and the implementation of language access. The idea was that city agencies would submit to the mayor's office of immigrant affairs their plan on how to implement language access. Then that office will promulgate what was deficient about it. But then we found ourselves being debated by budget concerns and by all kinds of language access and phone access. It turns out that all the discussion, for instance, about police department, when you pick up a phone call now a one and you want to ask for a specific language, you say more to the police budget than it was tied to a language access. In extricating those things, I still gave access or presented hurdles. I think you talked about barriers and that was something that even well-intentioned structure didn't carry out well. I know that the time of our commissioners is limited and at some point we're going to dissolve and go to the public. But to the point of the agency, the creation of the agency and the idea and I think, Commissioner, you put it back, is the idea of accountability behind. Who responds to what to implement these ideas even when you have an overarching agency? Perhaps the idea is that if we're going to look at things that are looking at this in perpetuity, or at least as long as the entity exists, then we need to make sure to see that if we have the ability as a charter commission to empower that agency. To not just look at the report, but actually send to the agency, well, we have the power to say your plan doesn't go far enough. Or your

plan and whether it's procurement or WIN and any of the access to the idea that that power goes to the center or we're talking it. If we have a power to do that, I'm all for it.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:50:52

Absolutely and I think that what we need to look at, and we've talked about this before, is if there is such an office, where does that office sit in the government, the overall New York City government structure? Is it in an office independent of the mayor's doing you like to really ensure that separation of power? Then what is the enforcement mechanism that attends or points? Anusha?

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:51:24

For the record, I want to note that Commissioner Davie has noted that he strongly endorses a monitoring and accountability entity.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:51:38

Our next steps.

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:51:42

Next steps, we've heard some very valuable feedback on how we've organized the information to date. We intend to move into working groups where we can really get deeper into the root cause to identify areas for further and deeper exploration including looking at the charter itself. I think we've discussed here a little bit of reorganization from what you have seen prior. We will follow up with you on what will constitute those groups and how we group both topics and people in them. In the meantime, please do reach out if you have any thoughts on that, but we will need to move into groups rather quickly because we have a pretty short timeline in until the end of September when we intend to release our preliminary report. Thank you for your work that we will see in the working groups. Staff will be on those as well working online alongside you, supporting with research, supporting with legal analysis and we very much look forward to that next phase of our work as we continue to hear from communities and from folks on our issue area panels. Thank you.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 01:53:02

I want to thank both Jimmy and Anusha for walking us through the input that we received to date. More to come actually Wednesday, August 11th, from 5 to 8 p.m. we will be at the Schaumburg Center for Research in Black Culture that is on Manhattan convening. Then Thursday the 19th, we will be in the Bronx at a location to be determined. Then we have two virtual public input sessions on the 23rd and 26th of August and one final one the Wednesday or Thursday in I guess the first full week of September, September 8th or 9th in person. I want to take a minute to thank all of the team, the staff and the leadership of the Racial Justice Commission for the work that they have done to date in just organizing and planning everything from the substantive work to the scheduling, getting us where we need to be, making sure that the mikes are working, people in position. You all have done a tremendous job. Every time I think about that and we're talking about the team is still building. It's been about four full months, but just tremendous work. I thank you all for everything you're doing. I cannot express enough my appreciation for my fellow commission members seeing you out and about seeing you here this afternoon, being able to see you virtually and participating. We're all committed to this and we're committed to achieving the best outcomes that we can for the commission, but more importantly for the people, the communities here in New York. I thank you. We are adjourning this meeting and we will reconvene before we adjourn what's our next public meeting. September 14th. We will have our next public meeting of the commission. But of course, we'll be

seeing each other several times before then. Thank you all. The meeting is adjourned. Have a good evening.

Anusha Venkataraman: 01:55:36

Thank you so much.