



NYC Racial Justice Commission

Racial Justice Commission Public Meeting 9/27/2021

[View online](#)

APPEARANCES:

- [Jennifer Jones Austin](#)
- [Henry A. Garrido, Vice Chair](#)
- [Lurie Daniel Favors, Esq.](#)
- [Reverend Fred Davie](#)
- [Chris Kui](#)
- [Jo-Ann Yoo](#)
- [Anusha Venkataraman](#)
- [J. Phillip Thompson](#)
- [Melanie Ash](#)
- [Ana M. Bermudez](#)
- [K. Bain](#)
- [Yesenia Mata](#)

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 00:00

General Counsel, Melanie Ash who has taken the lead on the staff in developing the preamble and then we're going to (garbled). Melanie?

Melanie Ash (MA): 00:11

Thank you, Chair. It's pleasure to see you all remotely this time to the Commission. And we are excited to engage in this conversation with you today over the preamble. So if we could go to the next slide, please. So as you all will recall, in some of our earlier meetings, the Commissioners have expressed an interest in creating a preamble as Chair just summarized for you. The staff went and did some research to identify other preambles around the country and around the world. And at a prior meeting, we presented examples of those preambles to the Commissioners for some discussion. At that time, Commissioners requested that the staff and the Commission itself engage with New Yorkers to try to identify what foundational values were New York City values. What did New Yorkers feel were the important foundational values that should be guiding government? In order to do that, the Commission hosted a virtual input session on foundational values. We also received public input through several other forums, one of which was a forum that was launched on the website to obtain input from New Yorkers on foundational values. If we could go to the next slide. So taking that information, a draft preamble was created by staff incorporating the input that we received from Commissioners at the public meetings, as well as from New Yorkers at the dedicated foundational values input session, and other public input sessions around the City and as well as from panelists at the panel discussions and through online submission forums. The Commissioners have provided comments and proposed additional edits to the initial draft. And so what we have now is a revised draft preamble and the

revised draft incorporates all of the feedback that we have received from Commissioners to date. And I believe a copy of that revised draft was circulated to Commissioners in advance of this meeting. However, there have been some additional feedback that has been received in between then and now. So you'll see a version today that is slightly revised from the version that you would have received in your email. So the revised draft preamble has four component parts. First will be a statement of values. Second, a vision for a just New York City. Third, a historical acknowledgement, and fourth, a call to action. So we're going to go through all four of these parts and show them here on the screen for the Commissioners to review. And then we would love to open up the floor for discussion and comment and further edits. So if we go to the next slide, we'll look at the statement of values. It would be easier-- I'm not sure if everyone has access to read the screen. But we can read it out if you'd like or we can allow you to read it yourself.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 03:31

May I just ask very quickly? Would you like the Commissioners to comment after you've presented the preamble in its entirety? Or would you like them to comment, like us to comment as we go through the slides?

Melanie Ash (MA): 03:49

I thought we could go through all of the slides for the first time, see them all once, and then we can go back and Commissioners could identify a particular section they would like to comment on. We could go back to that slide. But if others would feel so moved, they could feel free to jump in if they want to stop us. But that was my initial thought.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 04:07

I think that's a good thought. That way we can see it in its entirety. And then come back slide by slide.

Melanie Ash (MA): 04:13

Okay, so in this first section, obviously we describe this as a statement of values. I wasn't planning on reading it. But if someone would like me to please say so. And I can do that.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 04:26

It might be helpful for those who perhaps use the assistance with the literacy.

Melanie Ash (MA): 04:33

Sure. So the part one statement of values starts off WE people of New York City declare that our City is an incomparable mosaic, and that our diversity is our strength. We honor and respect the cultures, languages, and histories of all who call and have called this City home and we celebrate their revolutionary imagination, courage, and resiliency. Second paragraph reads WE strive to be a City where the worth, talents, and contributions of every New Yorker are valued and recognized. And where equity and inclusiveness, community empowerment, accessibility, and opportunity for every New Yorker are the unwavering standards to which we are held accountable in all aspects of governance, business, and service delivery. We go to the next slide. This is part two, which we've titled, just for the

purposes of this conversation, envisioning a just New York City. And that section reads, we endeavor to ensure that every New Yorker has the opportunity to thrive with a healthy and supported family, a safe, healthy, and sustainable living environment. Resilient neighborhood served by quality and accessible infrastructure, including roads, parks, transportation, and a robust local economy and dignified living with the opportunity to prosper economically and build wealth. Safe, secure, and affordable housing. Quality, culturally relevant education, and childhood supports. Compassionate, culturally-responsive, and informed healthcare and mental health services. Access and opportunity to participate meaningfully in government decision making, and a government responsive to that participation, and humane and respectful treatment from all City agencies. And the third slide, part three, as we've described it here today is a historical acknowledgement. And it reads, we recognize that New York City sits on the traditional territories of the original inhabitants, the Munsee Lenape, Canarsie, Wappinger, and other Indigenous people, and we honor their stewardship of the land by protecting our environment and all living things. We also acknowledge the grave injustices and atrocities that form part of our City's history, including the forced labor of enslaved Africans, the colonialism that displaced Indigenous people from their lands, the devaluing and underpaying of immigrant workers, and the discrimination, segregation, and other forms of violence against marginalized groups, including but not limited to Black, Indigenous, LatinX, Asian, Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, and other People of Color, women, religious minorities, immigrants, LGBTQ+ individuals, and people with disabilities. And the final section, part four was described as a call to action for the future. And that reads, we condemn the legacies of those harms. And we act intentionally to ensure that our City's foundations, structures, and laws promote justice and equity for all New Yorkers. And that the collective values set out in this preamble ground the operation of our City government, and inform and shape how the City carries out the duties, obligations, and authorities and upholds and protects the rights set out in the charter. The final paragraph reads: WE the people of New York City united in our resolve to build a just and equitable City for all honor the contributions of all those New Yorkers who have suffered in the name of freedom and who fought, struggled, and dreamed for a better life and a better City. Together standing on their shoulders we move boldly toward a brighter tomorrow for ourselves, our children, and future generations. So if we could perhaps put up on the screen the full text of the Word version, then we can see it all on one screen and we can open the conversation to the Commissioners to discuss anything you'd like to about that draft, give us their feedback, suggestions, ideas.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 09:12

Part of me is wondering if we should actually put-- is there a way to split screen like put the first--

Melanie Ash (MA): 09:19

The first slide rather than the entire document? Okay. Harold would you be able to put the PowerPoint back? Yeah, the PowerPoint back up to the first section of the--

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 09:34

Do you have the entire document so we can see it all at once?

Melanie Ash (MA): 09:39

Yes, we can put the entire document. I'm sorry.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 09:43

Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a friendly suggestion on the first slide, the word worth. If we could substitute that to value, supposed to worth. Worth often refers to monetary ability and we do want to have precisely the impression that people are value, not what the level of the bank account but that you know, we use the word value instead of worth.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 09:43

Commissioner Garrido?

Fred Davie (FD): 09:54

Is it possible to make the copy a little bit larger?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 10:40

We strive to be a City where the worth, I would suggest the word value or values, right, talents and contributions. Just (inaudible 10:53)

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 10:54

Thank you. And perhaps if you are filling that, then towards the end of that phrase, maybe instead of are valued and recognized, change that to are recognized and embraced or something along those lines. Commissioner Daniel Favors?

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 11:14

Thank you, Madam Chair. In the first section, second paragraph, I'm sorry, second sentence: we honor and respect the cultures, languages, and histories of all who call and have called this City home. Out of recognition for the fact that we are sitting on indigenous land, I would suggest as opposed to City that we say land.

Phil Thompson (PT): 12:05

I would suggest that maybe instead or in addition to talking about mosaic, we say that in a City and country built off the backs of slavery and racialized colonialism, the only democracy possible is a multiracial democracy, something like that, I would suggest, which I think is a stronger statement than saying we're a mosaic.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 12:44

So what is the language-- just help me for a second. What is the language like you'd like to replace mosaic?

Phil Thompson (PT): 12:53

Multiracial democracy is the language basically, I'm trying to suggest, which is explicitly not colorblindness, explicitly not. We're all individuals and race doesn't matter.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 13:08

I got you. Yeah. And let's just make sure that we capture Commissioner Garrido's note in the second paragraph, the word worth let's change that to values or with the value. Forgive me. Value. And then towards the end of that, take out the D and at the end let's make it are recognized, just off the top my head, recognized and embraced towards the end of that sentence that first line so we're not repeating the word are valued.

Melanie Ash (MA): 13:54

Instead of valued and recognized we're saying recognized and embraced if I understood you correctly?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 13:58

Correct. `Commissioner Mata?

Yesenia Mata (YM): 14:06

Can you go a little lower with this access and opportunity in decision making? Access and opportunity to participate in meaningful government decision making and a government responsive to that participation. Like I like this particular bullet point, but I want it to be a bit more bold. And I guess like when I saw this, I thought about how immigrants, undocumented individuals are constantly being left out of meaningful government decision making, and especially when it comes to voting. So I'm just wondering like, what can we put there as an opportunity to participate in meaningful government decision making regardless of immigration status. I am just trying to think of something where I do want to include that and be more bold on that.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 15:08

So I think we have to-- I'm just gonna jump in here, and I don't want to go back and forth on this. We're speaking about every New Yorker at the outset. And so when we talk about every New Yorker, maybe it's more that we need-- I'll be talking about how do we define New Yorkers, because we're making this not based on citizenship but just based on overall like, are you a New Yorker who resides here? I don't know if we should in the preamble start getting into like voting, but aren't we implying all New Yorkers, regardless of immigration status, citizenship status?

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 15:55

Would it be possible, Madam Chair to state that at that beginning sentence, we endeavor to ensure that every New Yorker regardless of status, so that we don't have several years from now some creative lawyer, and I'm putting creative and almost sarcastic as I can, making some sort of carve out for residents who perhaps do not have lawful permanent status? Would it be possible to make that just right there at the beginning, "regardless of" and then Commissioner Mata, I can't remember the specific language you used. But if we include it there, then we prevent, well, minimize. Crafty lawyers will do what we do. But we can at least minimize the ability to create carve outs based on citizenship at some later time.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 16:45

How about the expression for all so that when you say acts as an opportunity for all as an indication that is as opposed to getting into immigration, non-immigration status.

Yesenia Mata (YM): 17:00

All right. Yeah, correct. And that's what I meant, like making very general but, you know, being purposeful that includes like immigrants and being inclusive of all. Yeah, I like how regardless of status and for all. It's very general.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 17:17

Just the for all will not fit in there in terms of just the language. It doesn't work. I guess I'd ask the question is why regardless of status does not capture for all.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 17:37

Because in my opinion, Madam Chair, the problem is because it's the very definition of New Yorkers, right. So, you know, for some New Yorkers mean people born and raised in New York. I mean, all those New Yorkers are those who reside in New York, whether they are immigrants or People of Color who have-- you know, even transient, people who are visiting right now. The implication is that if you're visiting, if you're in a visiting status, you're not a New Yorker. So, you know.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 18:11

Arguably something that people can do.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 18:14

I'm sorry. I missed that.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 18:16

Are we talking about people who reside in New York? But should we speak specifically to that? Every New Yorker or we've endeavored to ensure that all who reside in New York City, regardless of status, have the opportunity to thrive.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 18:40

See, the problem I have with this is if you start deleting that level, then you get to marital status, your immigration status, economic status. It gets to a point where it just goes crazy. That's why I was trying to not very eloquently interject the word "for all" somewhere, as a way of catch phrase that would allow us to do that without necessarily getting to that. Because even if you go to the first bullet point, and you say, the healthy and supportive family, right, you have an opportunity to do that, you know, the definition of a family, right, a traditional family comes into effect. So you know, you almost have to say healthy and supportive family for everyone who wants a family. Somebody may not want to be in a position. Somebody who wants to be an individual who doesn't want to strive for a family may feel I'm being disenfranchised for that. So I just think that I would prefer if the lead sentence that says we endeavor to ensure that every New Yorker, that if we work on that, rather than get to every bullet point that follows so that we don't get into the minutiae of what does that mean over that, you know?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 19:58

I agree with you. That's exactly where I'm going. And I guess the question that I'm posing to you all is do we need to define what it means to be a New Yorker? I believe that's what Commissioner Daniel Favors was doing with the regardless of status. What does that mean if you take it to the next step? Like it begs the question, are we talking immigration? Are we talking socioeconomic status? Like, what are we talking? Such that every New Yorker is not suffice, is not all inclusive.

Yesenia Mata (YM): 20:48

Like regardless of status, and I see what Commissioner Garrido was saying it gets-- for me it was like regardless of citizenship, every New Yorker regardless of citizenship, or regardless-- so I guess I was just thinking more like with a community organizing, it usually comes to like, I'm not a New Yorker because I wasn't born here. Right. So I guess that's kind of what some people don't consider me a New Yorker because I wasn't born here. So I guess I was just coming from that side.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 21:25

Uh huh.

Phil Thompson (PT): 21:26

Could we say every New York resident?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 21:36

I thought about that, but also some people, that means those who have resident status, you know, if we do immigration, right. So what happens if you're undocumented, and you're not a resident, right?

Phil Thompson (PT): 21:48

Yeah.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 21:50

Well, can we argue that-- well, is there a difference between being a resident of New York and having lawful residency status? Because to be overly inclusive, you know, if I'm a tourist and I'm here for six weeks, have I established residency? As opposed to, am I here lawful? Or do I have lawful permanent status to be here, I think is a separate question. But if we were to say, and I can't remember what the residency requirements are for the City of New York. I don't know if this is a matter that we would need a little additional research on. But if you properly reside here, regardless of your immigration status, then that sufficiently I think distinguishes this body of people that we're talking about from tourists, who are not intending to reside in the City, but it would still provide a blanket covering and it would be inclusive of all of those of us who live here, whether you happen to be a citizen, or a Green Card holder, or undocumented. If you reside in the City, you have the expectation that these rights, privileges, and benefits would enure to you as well.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 23:07

I appreciate all that is being said. I think it takes us back to do we find ourselves in a position of having to define what residence is. Perhaps we endeavor to ensure this is wordy, but we endeavor to ensure that every person who resides in the City of New York has the opportunity. Does that get at it?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 23:44

Just a question. If you say we endeavor to ensure that every person or individual that resides in the City, that resides or visits the City, I mean, the problem we have is we have people who work in the City and have no residency requirement. You know, police, but that's part of the big deal, right? So if you're part of the City government, and you don't reside here, then are you excluded? But if you get to the point where you say you reside in the City and visit the City, does that count everybody driving through the State to get to Connecticut? So one would assume that that's the case. I think we could get down to the point where this becomes an exercise in futility because the language is not going to be perfect, no matter what. I would just I guess regret some of my comments and suggest Lurie, perhaps Commissioner Daniel Favors' suggestions. But perhaps, as best as we could get the same, you know, regardless of status, or every New Yorker or something to that effect because if we step down on this road, we're going to get into trouble.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 25:03

I don't have an issue with that, but for the fact that you know, as Commissioner Daniel Favors then pointed out, we then started getting into you know, what is the definition of status? What is the legal interpretation given? And always centering on immigration, which often is what we talk about wondering about status and we are centering on socio-economics, and are we okay with it being a term that is not clearly defined? I don't know. Commissioner Daniel Favors do you want to comment on that, and then I see that Commissioner Yoo wants to comment as well.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 25:46

So I think that and I'm just doing a basic Google right now. But there are essential metrics that one has to meet to be considered a resident of New York City, at least for taxation purposes. Like you have to actually be domiciled here, have a permanent place of abode, and you spend more than 30 days there. And technically, you are subjected to the tax scheme for New York City, which is what you would need in order to establish some form of residency, and I'm not at all saying that this is the definitive definition. So please, awesome back members for the Commission, this is, I think, a research question. But we have an understanding, at least in legal terms, I think we should, or I believe we do, a basic definition that one must meet in order to claim they are resident of the City. So that, you know, it creates a carve out where if you are a tourist or if you're traveling, you know, from New Jersey, through New York to Connecticut, you would not necessarily perhaps be able to claim benefits that we are promulgating here. But if we're talking about people who reside here, assuming that that is a properly defined term that exists somewhere in the charter, if you reside in the City, regardless of your immigration status, then instinctively I feel like that's a sufficient enough umbrella that we're capturing the folks we're talking about while

excluding those that we are not. But then again, you know, our constitution, the Nation's Constitution says all men are created equal, and we know that that was certainly interpreted to mean different things immediately thereafter. So I appreciate the desire to want to be as specific as possible. And just making sure that we are covering all of our bases and getting all of our folks covered here.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 27:32

Thank you. Commissioner Yoo?

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 27:35

For that list, when we start to make the bullet points, a healthy and supportive family I agree with Henry that it should maybe read a healthy and supportive individuals and families. I think we need to include individuals in recognition that not everybody has a family here. Individuals and families.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 28:07

Well, I'm just gonna beg the question here. When we go on to what we're doing, if you look at all those bullets is we begin to describe what is healthy and supportive? So I'm actually beginning to wonder if you can move that forward. Like, what are we speaking to there? We talked about dignified living, resilient neighborhood, education, childhood support, health and mental health. So what is the healthy and supportive individuals and families? Like, are we getting at-- I guess what I'm saying is are we trying to get at specific policy issues here?

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 28:55

I think actually that whole first bullet could be eliminated.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 29:00

That's what I'm saying. That we're describing it below.

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 29:07

That's right.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 29:12

I think we got three Commissioners who are in that same position. Am I hearing (garbled)? Commissioner Kui?

Chris Kui (CK): 29:21

Yeah, no, I agree with that. Maybe we don't need that first sentence. I mean, that first slide.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 29:32

I'm going to suggest that with the regardless of status, we move forward but we hold that. You know, put a place marker there to figure out if there's anything more we need to do there. Commissioner Bermudez did put in the chat that perhaps we say people who reside or work in the City. The one concern I have and I know Commissioner Garrido you spoke to this as well, the one concern I have about the work is that the bullets that are provided then,

you know, if you work in New York City, but you live in New Jersey, like, are we endeavoring to ensure that they have education and childhood support in another locality?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 30:32

Actually, through a technical, if you are in the City, you're an employee of the City and you reside elsewhere, there are assumptions that allow you to have your child in the school system, even though you don't--

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 30:48

Yeah, I got that, but I guess what I'm saying is like, what I'm really speaking to is, does the City of New York have a responsibility to people who work here but live elsewhere, to ensure that they live in sustainable living environments, that they live in neighborhoods that have the--

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 31:07

Yeah, I hear you. And I will suggest to you by the beginning of your sentence that says every person who resides in New York, you've already fulfilled that area.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 31:16

No. Commission Bermudez suggested that maybe we put reside or work. That's what I was thinking on. If you add the work, are we suggesting the City has a responsibility for you know, beyond livelihood, you know, a sufficient livelihood in terms of sufficient income? Or do you put on the City that responsibility or suggest the City has responsibility outside of the City walls around environment? Commissioner Kui? Commissioner Kui do you have your hand up or was that from earlier? Can I be here? Okay. (Garbled) Commissioner Garrido?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 32:24

I just saw the bullet that starts with quality and cultural relevant education. Something doesn't add up at the end with childhood support. There's something missing there. So the opportunity to thrive with quality and cultural relevant education. And is that referring to early childhood education, childhood support? What does that mean? You know, forgive me, I don't want to be-- But there's something here. Is that early childhood? What is that?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 33:04

Melanie?

Melanie Ash (MA): 33:06

I believe that was really getting at daycare and services for young children early in childhood. So it could include, I guess, you know, pre-K, although some would call that education, but some might also call it childhood support, but also, yeah, I think child care was one of the things that the Commissioner who suggested that had in mind.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 33:31

Sure. Can I suggest the word early childhood support because I think I get where it's going at, right.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 33:40

Before you make the change, just put a page because I think we should do something else there. Please, go ahead.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 33:48

Or because this is so important, I believe, perhaps this deserves its own sentence, not just barely education. And I say that because an incident this week regarding an ACS child abuse case that was horrible, like two or three child abuse that was so outrageous to me. That when you talk about support, we often don't realize the children and the rest that they're in that we try to lump that with the regular structure educational system. But this school system of early childhood education, Headstart, ACS, youth and community develop, like all that stuff was happening that is not tied to the educational system, i.e., you know, the Department of Education or something. That perhaps it deserves its own proper weight by either another bullet or an expansion of the current bullet to give it its due right.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 34:49

So Commissioner Garrido, Vice Chair Garrido, I appreciate you're raising this. And I think the way that we could maybe build out is that it should be quality, culturally-relevant early childhood and education supports. And then it could be in children, in youth support, or something like that, or quality, culturally-relevant early childhood and education, comma, in children and youth supports because what we don't have here are the centering on youth services, critical youth services. Early childhood education, early childhood and education, early childhood.

Melanie Ash (MA): 35:33

Chair, I think that maybe part of that was supposed to be included in the healthy and supportive families. And so I think it's a good point to move it somewhere else now that we've deleted that first bullet. So I think that's a very good point that we were thinking that it was included in that first bullet, but now that's been removed, so.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 35:53

We're saying early childhood and education, comma, in children and youth support. And maybe it's critical for our children and youth supports but it seems like there needs to be something there that builds on the type of support.

Melanie Ash (MA): 36:22

First that line was early childhood and education. Is that right?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 36:26

Correct. I'm going to ask those who are better versed in mental health and trauma to just look at that next bullet. There are many people in this area of expertise who distinguish between mental health and trauma. So we maybe need to think about our communities are traumatized. It does not mean that they it's like, you know, diagnosable mental health. Services and support, so we maybe need to do something that will really speak to trauma.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 37:35

Could we possibly add-- I don't know what just happened.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 37:43

I think it's our connection today.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 37:50

I'll type it in the chat.

Melanie Ash (MA): 37:55

I think if everyone who's not puts it on mute, puts their thing on mute, then hopefully, it won't repeat back.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 38:12

Commissioner (garbled) You know what I think? I think it's (garbled) system. Okay. Commissioner Daniel Favors, and then we're gonna go to Commissioner Bain, and then come back to Commissioner Yoo.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 38:32

And thank you for that. Good Zoom detective work there. I was just saying perhaps we could just say informed trauma care, healthcare, and mental health services so that it's carved out as its own separate element. And I appreciate the recognition that those are not the same, and they should be treated differently.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 38:57

Thank you. Thank you. Commissioner Bain?

K. Bain (KB): 39:00

I was just typing in the chat. Compassion is strong, but I'm not sure how to (garbled).

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 39:24

Okay, thank you. And I'm seeing like empathetic is perhaps the word to be used.

Melanie Ash (MA): 39:37

Just one note for Commissioners. I know with the sound issues it's challenging, but ideally, we're not going to be writing anything in the chat because the viewing public is not able to view it. So if someone does happen to write something, then we'll have someone else read it out loud so that it's visible or it's audible to the hearing/watching public.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 40:01

Thank you. So we'll take a look at and consider the language empathetic, how we can bring that in. Compassionate. Empathetic is captured in compassionate. Let's think about that. But if you can make a note of that, first to take a look at what is the best language there? Did we

determine that we're now taking "for all" out of access and opportunity? I believe we thought we captured that with the person that resides in the City.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 40:41

That is my recollection.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 40:43

Okay. Thank you.

Melanie Ash (MA): 40:58

I think we do have a couple more Commissioners do have their hands raised right now. Commissioner Yoo and Deputy Mayor Thompson.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 41:07

Yes, I'm sorry about that.

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 41:11

The bullet point about early childhood education that reads a little clunky to me. I don't know what it is. But it reads a little awkward. If we can wordsmith that a little bit because we say early childhood, we single that out. That's great. And education, does that encompass K through 12? Right. Like, what does that mean? And so already culturally relevant early childhood and education.

Melanie Ash (MA): 41:47

We can say early childhood learning and education.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 41:50

So I just want to let y'all know. In this space, it is referred to as early childhood and education. I'm wondering if what makes it clunky is the comma between quality and culturally? Do you understand what I'm saying? If it said quality and culturally relevant early childhood and education.

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 42:15

So early childhood and education, that's a term of art, you're telling me?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 42:19

Uh huh.

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 42:19

Okay.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 42:24

Or you could say early childhood programme and education. I think people use the early childhood and education or K through 12 education.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 42:33

I was just going to ask, is that possibly an area that could later be reinterpreted? So perhaps we could make it clear. While recognizing it's a term of art today, it might not always be. And if that is the case, could we say quality and culturally relevant early childhood and comma, K through 12 education? And if we intend for this to extend to the college level and secondary education, but just make those specific so that a language evolves, and perhaps our preamble may not, so we can preempt that to the extent possible.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 43:17

I think that works.

Melanie Ash (MA): 43:19

So it would be post-secondary education after education and before children and youth supports?

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 43:29

I'm envisioning quality and culturally relevant early childhood, comma, K through 12, comma, and secondary-- is it secondary or post-secondary?

Melanie Ash (MA): 43:40

Post-secondary, yeah.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 43:41

Post-secondary education.

Melanie Ash (MA): 43:43

Okay.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 43:46

Madam Chair, I'm sorry. I don't have my hand up.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 43:49

That's fine. I see Commissioner Thompson, but if he would yield to you for a minute if you want to jump in or?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 43:56

At this particular point, I just respectfully suggest we don't go down this road. Because there's pre-K, there's 2K. There's now 2K program. If we start listing them all, I think education is a term that-- Early Education broadens it because then we have to get into after school program. If you start listing them, I think we're going to go down a rabbit hole that will make this-- will take away what we intend to do in the first place.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 44:28

Okay. I think that's a valuable point. You know, because I sit here and I think about are we talking about threes and fours? Are we talking about infants and toddlers and maybe there's some value added naturally having it be broader than defined.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 44:56

And then there's adult and continuing education. So Vice Chair, that's actually a really good point. The more categories we think of, the more commas and sub-paragraphs we actually may need.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 45:09

Fair. Thank you. All right, then we figured that out. Commissioner Thompson?

Phil Thompson (PT): 45:16

Are we going line by line or can I jump around?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 45:19

Jump up, jump around, jump down.

Phil Thompson (PT): 45:22

Okay.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 45:24

I'm a rapper.

Phil Thompson (PT): 45:25

In the paragraph where we talk about, we also acknowledge the grave injustices and atrocities. It talks about all this in the past tense. It doesn't talk about the current pain and anguish caused by all these various things. And I think it reads too impersonally. And like, it's all something that's behind us. So I think we should have language that talks about we acknowledge the pain that people feel, both because of the historical injustice, but also because of mass incarceration, or other things we can mention that are happening right now that are causing people pain. I think that'd be stronger.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 46:07

I thought on it. And earlier, I mentioned that I think we also need to speak to how these injustices are not by chance or happenstance, but they are by design. And that is important, why we're doing this structural work.

Phil Thompson (PT): 46:25

Also, I wondered why we did not use the word racial segregation. When we say segregation, it opens it up to other kinds of, you know, segregation by income. You know, racial segregation is specific and it was legal. And, you know, I just think it carries more weight when we talk about racial segregation.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 46:50

We need to name it. Thank you. So let's make sure we speak to the racial, we speak to the continuing, and we speak that these injustices they are by design, not just you know, by chance. They aren't. Essentially, the points I want to make sure that we're capturing based on what Commissioner Thompson shared. Continuing injustices that, you know, it's not just historically based. The racial segregation piece. We need to speak to the, you know, the structure, like the structuring of this, the design. Like how this is designed. I think he mentioned mass incarceration. So, let's just make note of that, that we need to bring these elements in, these factors. Commissioner Kui, I believe you had--

Chris Kui (CK): 47:48

Yeah, around the call to action. Are we going to talk a little bit about whether we want to have some kind of like a program to level the playing field that's kind of resulted by all this racial segregation or this injustice? I mean, we can talk about the future, you know, the value, but then in terms of all the negatives that's a result of the legacy. You know, the unequal treatment that resulted in the-- you know, that level playing field is not there. So now can we talk a little bit about maybe adding in some kind of like we can proactively take on some programs or something? You know, I mean, I'm not sure we should use the word reparation or not. But you know, that's something that I was thinking. You know, should we have something like that in the preamble. Compensation of injustice (garbled).

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 49:02

Commissioner Bain, if you can mute your line. Commissioner Kui, are you with us?

Chris Kui (CK): 49:15

Yes.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 49:15

I'm sorry. I just wanna make sure that we captured everything. So you're asking a question about whether or not we begin to center on the call to action in kind of more declarative statement?

Chris Kui (CK): 49:28

Yeah, the redress. Should we talk about adding something about a redress or maybe some kind of reparation or programs that we're going to try to level the playing field so that we could, you know, move forward, or is that, you know, that we got to just do something different in the future.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 49:50

I think you've raised a very good point. And I'm just trying to figure out what we would say. And I guess part of my thinking, my concern here is we haven't yet figured out what it is. So it's hard in this moment to figure out how we would then in one sentence or two reflect what it is. Like, you know, the specific things that we're going to do. So what I'm going to suggest, and if you all feel differently, please push back. Let me know your thinking is that maybe we have a placeholder for your comment, your point for us to return to it.

Chris Kui (CK): 50:52

I'm fine with that. You know. Yeah.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 50:54

I think it's a most apt point and one worth considering. I feel like we need to get a little bit, we need to get further along the road in terms of what to be able to articulate it in this statement. Melanie, I do want to make sure that in the paragraph when we speak to the atrocities and the injustices, that we speak to essentially that this is not happenstance. That these are structures. This is a structure.

Melanie Ash (MA): 51:28

Right. The structural point, yeah. I've definitely made a note of that. And we can try to put something in here now or we can do some drafting and circulate it.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 51:40

I'm fine if you don't want to do it here. I do not want to miss that. Because that is in part the reason why we are creating the preamble, and we're doing the changes.

Melanie Ash (MA): 51:53

If you have some thoughts you want us to put in right now, we can do that. Or we can just put a pin and placeholder, make a note for after this. Is there some language that comes to mind right now?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 52:14

The first thing I'd say to you is that just when I read it, I think that the word pain is not placed in the right place. We're talking about the injustices and the atrocities. And then in the including--

Melanie Ash (MA): 52:30

And the pain arising from-- Yeah, we should put more detail about that, I suppose perhaps a little later in this sentence. Yeah.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 52:41

Absolutely. Um, I think that may be what we need is we need something that speaks to the pain maybe in a separate paragraph, a short paragraph. Just the pain, the enduring pain and trauma that has resulted to individuals, families, and communities. What I'm speaking to is somewhere after you go through segregation, mass incarceration, and other continuing forms of violence, there needs to be something in there about the structural nature of all of this.

Melanie Ash (MA): 53:25

Yeah, I've made a note of that for sure. If you have something that we can draft now, we could definitely do that. Or we could take a crack at articulating it afterwards and circulate it.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 53:37

We don't have to do it now. But what I would ask is I just want to make sure. Are there Commissioners who have questions about the point I'm making or want to add to it? Phil, I see your hand up, but I think it was up from earlier. Correct?

Phil Thompson (PT): 53:57

Yes, correct.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 53:59

Okay. So we're good on that point. We can just come back a bit later. We're good on that? Okay.

Melanie Ash (MA): 54:07

Yes, I think we understand what you're looking for. And we can draft some language and then circulate it.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 54:15

I just want to make sure I'm understanding. I apologize. I don't want to belabor the point. But are we suggesting that we need language that says this enduring pain and trauma which results from something along the lines of which results from the systemization of institutionalized white supremacist ideology as experienced through policies, practices, and procedures?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 54:37

Yeah.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 54:39

So that's what comes off the top of my head.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 54:42

Works for me.

Chris Kui (CK): 54:44

I like that, you know.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 54:45

I don't know if I can remember it.

Phil Thompson (PT): 54:48

I think we need something that says this Nation was founded on incompatible principles, you know, of democracy, equality, et cetera, on the one hand, and the things that Lurie just mentioned on the other hand, and this is the reason for pain and trauma suffered through the centuries and generations and so forth.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 55:21

Phil, we're talking about New York preamble not the National preamble.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 55:21

I see.

Phil Thompson (PT): 55:29

Well, if we can go straight from the nation to the City, we can say this nation and this City. And by the way, the National was written in New York City Hall, by the way. That's where the Constitutional Congress met. But we can say this nation and this City.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 55:36

Leave that as may, that representing a compendium of stakes. And while I agree with you, I think if you start instituting stuff that is problematic, that were even problematic in the preamble of the United States Constitution, then we may be getting into the whole discussion that our Chair mentioned before, which is, do we have to go beyond the New York City? Because if we're going to be consistent with that, then that brings a whole matter. Are we part of that consequences of that mentality? Are we foundationally-- well, we are the foundational catalysts of that inequity that you mentioned. I think that you may want to just-- my suggestion is that you stick to New York as a foundation.

Phil Thompson (PT): 56:55

I don't think we can talk about structural racism.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 57:01

I'm sorry, you don't think we can?

Phil Thompson (PT): 57:03

I don't think we cannot talk about where New York City fits in the system of federalism, both in terms of our powers but also our limits. We cannot address, you know, structural racism, all aspects at its core because it's federal. It's not just in the City. And I think that needs to be clear to people in the City. Like, otherwise, they'll say, well, you're not really getting a heart of all the problems or whatever, you know, but we can't because it actually goes beyond the powers of the City.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 57:46

So I think that we should think about how do we speak to that in this preamble that you know, that speaks to what our power and authority is as a City, but how some of this is deeply rooted in the larger, you know, the government structure in the federal, and then we need to speak to that in the introduction as well.

Phil Thompson (PT): 58:10

Yeah, that's what I'm suggesting that we do that.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 58:13

Commissioner Bain, did you want to land?

K. Bain (KB): 58:17

I definitely feel the challenge of the (garbled).

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 58:36

Okay, go ahead, please.

K. Bain (KB): 58:39

I appreciate the discourse around the parameters of this structural conversation. Because when I see, for example, mass incarceration, I think about the other major ways in which oppression has reared its ugly head in a lot of conversations we had and Commissioners talked about food justice, for example, or injustice. And I think we look at how New York City (garbled) they have many experiences to deal with to date. So again, it triggers me to (garbled) the monumental approach mechanisms. But the question is opening out, are we adding on more in terms of descriptive language to drive these important points or are we (garbled).

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 59:51

I was unable to decipher what Commissioner Bain said in the last like five seconds where he began are we going to or are we able to? I don't know. Perhaps others have heard or if you could just repeat that again, or put it in the chat and we'll read it out. I just couldn't make it out.

Phil Thompson (PT): 1:00:17

What I thought he was alluding to was how in discussing mass incarceration, it just triggers a bunch of policies. And what I thought he was speaking to was that some are local, some are state, some are federal. And so there's a need to, you know, put this stuff sort of in context. That's what I thought I was hearing.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:00:53

Okay. Commissioner Davie, you've been listening along. Are there any thoughts that you'd like to add, any comments?

Fred Davie (FD): 1:01:10

No, nothing of any substance. So I just appreciate it the conversation and the edits made by my colleagues. I did have one minor thing that I saw. And then I thought I might do it offline because it's so trivial, but since I've been called on I'd like to mention it. There is somewhere at the beginning of the document where we say we honor their tradition, memories, I forget, by our treatment of the environment. And I wanted it that should be a little more conditional, and say something to the effect that we would honor their stewardship of the land by protecting or something to that effect. It makes it sound as if when I read it, that it is as if we're already doing it. And we know that we're a long way from protecting the environment and all living things. So rather than just saying we are, making a declarative statement that we honor. Condition it somehow.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:02:20

Very much appreciated. So maybe, you know, along the lines of-- I'm sorry. I'm reading.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:02:41

I just wrote in a proposal aiming to or something like that.

Melanie Ash (MA): 1:02:48

I think the condition was supposed to be on the honor, though, if I understood it correctly. We endeavor to honor or we--

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:02:57

I think that's right. That's exactly where I was going, Melanie, that we endeavor to honor. Can I ask us to step back for a moment and just reflect upon the document on the whole and consider the question of whether or not it sets forth a vision that is inclusive, that is both aspirational, and feels achievable if New Yorkers are so committed. Does it strike you as a preamble? Is there anything that's missing that we haven't already spoken to? How does it grab you?

Phil Thompson (PT): 1:04:21

I'll just start. The substance I think it grabs me as very rich. The language at times I feel almost like it's a legal affidavit as opposed to a declarative. Here's where we stand. It's like, you know, we condemn, we acknowledge, we recognize, we endeavor, we strive rather than just saying New York is stronger when the worth, talents, and contributions of every New Yorkers are valued and recognized, et cetera, period. Rather than we strive. Just saying this is where we stand and voters are you with that or not? And if they say yes, then that's the statement of the voters. Anyway, that's just a stylistic. Maybe it's just me. But I always think back to Thomas Jefferson. That was bold, whether he was a hypocrite or not, it definitely sounded good. You know?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:05:34

I think that's a fair point. Others? Commissioner Bermudez, I know that you are traveling, but I want to make sure that your voice is in here as well if you'd like and perhaps you can't talk and can only chat. I just want to make sure.

Ana M. Bermudez (AMB): 1:05:57

No, I'm actually very good with that conversation, if you can understand me, but I'm about to board a plane. So I'll keep trying to monitor the situation.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:06:08

Okay. Thank you.

Melanie Ash (MA): 1:06:12

Chair, I think Commissioner Bain has written some language into the chat.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:06:17

Please read it or if you'd like I can read it.

Melanie Ash (MA): 1:06:19

So he says mass incarceration triggers for me related oppressions that are currently relevant such as but not limited to food injustice, redlining, or discrimination in housing, health disparities perpetuated.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:06:45

I can't help but think about a conversation we had in one of our earlier working group sessions just today about the importance of us in our work centering on all of the kind of like the domino effects, or the, you know, the intersectional issues, and the, you know, the-- and he uses the word trigger, but, you know, mass incarceration, not being just for the purpose of locking up Black and Brown, men and women, but knowing how being locked up deprives the family of critical resources that in turn, you know, challenge them to live and thrive. And the importance of us as a charter Commission, Racial Justice Commission, calling that out and looking at how the changes we make, also must have that domino effect, the reversing, the reversal domino effect. The question is, is Commissioner Bain suggesting that we speak more to that in terms of the acknowledged harms or is he just using that as an example? And while I'm waiting to hear from him, Commissioner Kui, do you have another comment?

Chris Kui (CK): 1:08:18

You know, regarding the pain and trauma, I thought maybe there's a little bit more than just the pain and trauma and maybe the loss of opportunity and generational gap, you know, due to the structural racism for the people. Is it possible to add in something like that, that loss of economic opportunity and generational wealth?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:08:45

I think that's important. Thank you. What you're speaking to is about the systems and then what the systems have produced?

Chris Kui (CK): 1:08:59

That's right. That deprived opportunity for many of us, you know, our forefathers you know, yeah.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:09:08

Which ties in some of what Commissioner Bain--

Chris Kui (CK): 1:09:12

Right.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:09:13

Yeah.

Chris Kui (CK): 1:09:29

Or asset as well, you know. Maybe that's part of the generational wealth, asset, financial assets.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:09:34

Uh huh. So, are there other comments, considerations?

Phil Thompson (PT): 1:09:57

Yeah. In the second paragraph and I'm okay with this. I just want to check that everyone else is okay with this, where it says that unwavering standards to which we are held accountable in all aspects of governance, business, and service delivery. Now for a City Charter, I could see governance and service delivery because that's the City. Are we saying we're going to hold business accountable? Because that's not the City. That is private companies and corporations. I'm just raising that as an issue.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:10:47

Yeah. I would ask Anusha and Melanie to jump in here. But my thinking here is that what you are really centering on is, you know, how do we speak to those who do business in the City? Do those who do business in the City get off the hook because they're not, you know, part of the government structure?

Phil Thompson (PT): 1:11:11

Right.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 1:11:13

Is there distinction being made between those who do business in the City and those who do business with the City?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:11:22

I'm speaking for them, but I think the intention was both.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 1:11:29

That would be my preference. I can imagine some of the challenges that might come for the inclusion of both. But I can eagerly imagine the joy that would come from having to litigate and argue about that at some later time. But that might be a distinction that later becomes more of a discussion.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:11:51

But I guess if we think about it, and (garbled) more familiar with you know, some of the the agencies that exist today or the mayor's office that's go from consumer protection to human rights, Small Business Services, MWBE. I'm just thinking about business, the business sector, the private sector. And, you know, we as a City do regulate you know, with respect to certain-- there are regulations in place and there are terms by which businesses must abide to do business in and/or with the City. So we're already doing it. I mean, you can't be a business with 100 employees and engage in wage discrimination.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:13:00

Right. If I'm remembering correctly, you know, this is in the values portion of the charter because this is a standard. This is a value that we want to set across sectors. It's not intended to be a specific legal limitation on businesses but rather the broadly articulated value.

Lurie Daniel Favors (LDF): 1:13:30

That works for me in abundance.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:13:45

So I guess just to that point, maybe we need to just put a note there that maybe do we need more words there that make more explicit, more descriptive what is we're talking about.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:14:04

This is also where we use "WE" but in the instance of "WE" in the last section right there by my initials, I'm wondering if that's where we want to specify who those standards apply to. Or Melanie, was that the purpose of saying in all aspects of governance, business, and service delivery?

Melanie Ash (MA): 1:14:37

Um, as I recall, this was a comment that came from Commissioner-- so I think we'll have to go back and just get a little better sense of what was intended, but your general statement about this being a broad rather articulated value statement was also my understanding.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 1:15:05

Forgive me, but I was under the impression we wanted to have an actual vote today on the preamble. Is that not the case?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:15:16

It was determined that we don't necessarily have to vote on it today. We're now going to include it in the interim staff report. And if there is some additional noodling-- we want to put it to bed, no doubt. And essentially, we would take it offline, or take it-- not take it offline. Have this basis from which we're working, make some additional adjustments as necessary. And then we can bring it back for a final vote if we're not ready to vote today. Is that correct, Anusha?

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:15:52

That sounds right. You know, the goal is that we do want to get a draft out to the public for review and for comment. But it doesn't have to be in the interim report. So we don't need the vote today. But we do want to aim to have a more complete draft that the Commission feels good with to get out. You know, in the coming weeks and months, we can consider it at our October meeting. I think it has yet to be determined when exactly makes sense, but we do have time.

Fred Davie (FD): 1:16:24

Madam Chair, if I can, I would raise one other thing that I was also hesitant to bring out but I'll bring it up. And it is the section that begins WE condemn. I just worry a little bit about condemning things as atrocious and as horrible as they are and a document like this is the only place where we use a verb like that. And I just wondered if there's another way to approach this and get the same message across without that particular language.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:17:32

I see what you're saying. And this speaks a little bit more to what-- I think Phil was speaking to this in a certain respect, the language. Okay. Do you have any suggestions? Or is there something maybe we should noodle a little more?

Fred Davie (FD): 1:17:55

I don't know. So yeah, so let me try this. I mean, it pales in comparison to a word like condemn, but you know, something-- I hate to even say it, but we recognize the profound harms or the legacies of racism, et cetera, enslavement, and we can do the list, or we can say we recognize the profound harms of those legacies. And we act intentionally to ensure blah, blah, blah. Something like that.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:18:46

Yes, I agree. And then what I'm appreciating is that that last line in paragraph before needs to come down into this paragraph. That's what we're talking about in the line above.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:19:14

At the beginning of this paragraph or?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:19:17

Essentially the legacies that we're referencing here are these very legacies. Now, all of a sudden, that legacies, the word legacies itself I don't know if that is language that would be readily understood. In many communities, legacy is seen as a positive in association. So that's something to keep in mind. I think we've done some very good work here and the contributions are significant. Commissioner Mata, you've kicked us off and I just want to make sure that we have you in here. Then I see Commissioner Yoo and Commissioner Kui want to add more. Is Commissioner Mata still with us? Maybe not in this moment. Commissioner Yoo?

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 1:20:15

Thank you. I'm wondering if we can merge the enduring pain, that sentence into exactly what we're saying. So maybe read like we recognize the profound harm of, profound harm and the enduring pain and trauma, the loss. Maybe we need to marry those two sentences together. I think that serves as an example. Have we already agreed to that? Am I just repeating somebody else's idea?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:21:12

We're on the same page.

Jo-Ann Yoo (JY): 1:21:14

Okay, great

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:21:21

Commissioner Kui?

Chris Kui (CK): 1:21:25

Yeah. Is this way we can maybe add in the thing about proactively to redress these things and how these things-- Things is not the right word but to redress and proactive-- I mean to level the playing field or something and then intentionally to ensure so then there's some kind of potential redress. I'm not sure redress is the right or compensation, whatever, is the right word, but the concept you know, it's like something I thought is important.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:22:09

Remedy?

Chris Kui (CK): 1:22:11

Oh, yeah, maybe. Yeah. I don't know what other Commissioners you know, feel to that because I feel like that this is something that we can help to level that playing field. And then we also proactively, you know, intentionally ensure. So this caveat of something in the middle somewhere there.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:23:05

Are there others? I just want to make sure that I'm not missing people. Okay, um, if there are no further comments or edits at this point, what we will ask our Executive Director and General Counsel to do is to, working with other members of the team, make the edits. There's some work that needs to be done with some of the ideas that were presented that aren't yet thoroughly fleshed out or reflected in the actual sentence structures. And then what I would ask that we try to turn this around, like in the next several days and then come to bed. Do we need a Commission vote to actually share it with the public?

Melanie Ash (MA): 1:24:28

I'm not sure that we need a vote. I'm trying to remember/recall the language from the resolution that was approved, whether it would include this, and I don't have it in front of me. So we might need to give that to you on that.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:24:52

The resolution was specific to the interim report, and this would be outside of the interim report in terms of where we would share and present it. I would venture to say we don't need a vote. The question is we may want one. If we feel like we're at a close enough place, we could consider one with, you know, some revisions to come after this meeting.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:25:37

Commissioner Vice Chair, Garrido?

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 1:25:40
(Garbled).

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:25:44
I'm sorry. You're breaking up.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 1:25:45
I'm sorry. I don't know if you heard what I said?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:25:48
I did not.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 1:25:51
Okay. Hopefully, you're hearing me now?

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:25:56
Yes.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 1:25:57
Okay. What I suggested was I don't believe we could take a vote on an incomplete document.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:26:02
Right.

Henry A. Garrido (HAG): 1:26:04
So perhaps we ought to table this until we have a final document and then do a motion at that point.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:26:14
Good deal. I think we're fine with that. And when is our next meeting?

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:26:22
Our next meeting is October 19.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:26:25
Okay. If need be, we can call it, if we want to move it sooner, we can call a special abbreviated meeting for the purpose of finalizing the preamble to then be released or a resolution. Is that correct?

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:26:46
We can do that or we can do it at the October 19 meeting.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:26:49

Okay, I'm just thinking timeline. Okay, good deal. Um, so I'm going to bring this discussion to a close. That does not mean that the Commissioners cannot send additional comments to the staff. And the staff can, of course, follow up directly with you to make sure that they've captured the essence of what you've presented, if we haven't already. And I'm sorry. Seems like we're having some challenges with our interpreters.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:27:27

I think we can remove the screen share at this point.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:27:30

Okay.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:27:31

We can email out what we have at this point in time so that you can provide further input and to inform our discussions.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:27:39

Okay. I'm just going to make sure that there is no further business for this meeting. There being none-- Is there any additional business? Are there any questions or comments, issues that any Commission members would like to present, would like to voice at this time? It seems that all is good. We are ready to close up this meeting. I think that I wanted it to be noted this may be the first time that we've ended with 15 minutes to spare, but I feel we've had a very thoughtful and productive conversation. And I do want to take a minute just to thank the Commissioners for their active and meaningful participation and the staff for the work that they did to produce this draft manual, and to engage with us. And I also just want to commend the staff for the work that they've done to produce the interim staff report. And so there being no additional business, Commissioner Thompson, did you want to say a word?

Phil Thompson (PT): 1:29:05

I was just gonna ask if you, Chairwoman, would just say a word about Haiti to close us out because I just feel something really relevant to many people in our City and community happen here. I just feel like you should say something, we should say something.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:29:25

I very much appreciate that suggestion. And I just want to personally again, with letting everyone know that I continue to be in fervent prayer for the people of Haiti, those who continue to reside in Haiti, and those who have been displaced for many years now, not just because of the current situation, with respect to the assassination of the last president, the earthquake, and the hurricane that just hit Haiti. But the earthquake that is now I guess, they are now still living out the 11-plus years of devastation from the earthquake that hit in 2010 that essentially caused many Haitians to turn to other lands in South America and in Central America, as well as here in the United States. So I'm praying for everyone. And what we are seeing, at least from my vantage point, as it concerns how Haitians most recently those who turned to the United States and showed up in Del Rio, Texas, at one of the border crossings

between Mexico and the United States. The treatment that they received was inhumane. The denial of basic critical needs, healthcare needs, housing, critical housing supports, and you know, in airport, port, and border, as well as sleeping arrangements as they fled from South America and Central America, through Mexico to the United States border seeking asylum. And then to be essentially just kind of left there until a spotlight was put on them, and then for the nation, for the United States, to invoke Title 42 to essentially, you know, deport many of them. Fighting a COVID pandemic is the reason why but not lifting a finger to provide critical COVID prevention supports, such as COVID testing and vaccinations. I think, you know, from my vantage point, and I'm speaking as Jennifer Jones Austin. But from my vantage point, it's yet another example of how this nation treats people with a darker hue differently than it does others. Over the course of the last several weeks, we've seen many people from Afghanistan be granted asylum here in the United States, but yet we could not find the same compassion for the people of Haiti. And so I'm speaking about this wherever, however I can. I will add that I noticed with people, I traveled with a delegation led by (inaudible 01:32:43) Sharpton to the border this past Thursday. And we just saw the atrocious conditions in which people were being kept. And what I shared with him, and I'll share it with you all is that what I couldn't help but appreciate is that we have patients who are seeking the protection and the support that this nation is very able to provide. Coming here, trying to find a better life, better education, quality healthcare, jobs with livable wages, they're coming here seeking that. And perhaps they don't really appreciate that here in America still today, you know, quality education, and quality healthcare, and jobs with livable maintenance are not in full supply for those of a darker hue, people who look very much like them, so great. Much work to be done. And if ever we should doubt but the nation, you know, we've made some progress with the treatment of Haitians, just in the last few weeks is great evidence, is the most ample evidence of the work that must be done, the work that has to continue. And it's very reflective of the work that we're seeking to do here. Thank you, Commissioner Thompson.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:32:05

Yeah. Thank you.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:34:18

Okay, I'm going to bring this meeting to a close. I thank all who listened in public and again, thanking the Commissioners and the staff for all that we were striving to do together. I wish you all a very good evening.

Anusha Venkataraman (AV): 1:34:39

Thank you so much.

Jennifer Jones Austin (JJA): 1:34:40

Thank you.

Melanie Ash (MA): 1:34:43

Goodnight, everyone.