



Multnomah County Charter Review Committee

January 19, 2022 5:30-7:30pm

COMMITTEE MEETING 7

Purpose: Hear public comment; confirm subcommittee membership and set groundwork for subcommittee work plan going forward.

Attendees

Committee Members

- Ana del Rocío (she/her)
- Annie Kallen (she/her)
- Ana González Muñoz (she/ella)
- Danica Leung (she/her)
- Donovan Scribes (he/him)
- Georgina Miltenberger (she/her)
- J'reyesha Brannon (she/her)
- Jude Perez (they/them)
- Marc Gonzales (he/him)
- Meikelo Cabbage
- Nina Khanjan (she/her)
- Samantha Gladu (she/they)
- Salma Sheikh (she/her)
- Maja Harris (she/her)

Absent:

- *Theresa Mai (she/her)*
- *Timur Ender (he/him)*

Staff:

- Dani Bernstein (they/them), Director of the Office of Community Involvement
- Kali Odell (she/her), Charter Review Committee Program Coordinator
- Katherine Thomas (she/her), Assistant County Attorney
- Allison Brown (she/her), JLA Public Involvement
- Ariella Frishberg (she/her), JLA Public Involvement

In addition, members of the public were welcome to observe the meeting as non-participatory attendees. There was one public attendee during the course of the meeting.

Welcome

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, kicked off the meeting with an overview of Zoom logistics and etiquette. The Zoom chat can be found in Appendix A. She gave a brief overview of the group agreements and asked if any members had questions about them.

Discussion: Public Comment Process

Marc Gonzales facilitated a conversation about how the committee would like to receive public comment during committee meetings. He asked if a three-minute time limit for public comment would be acceptable for members or if there were any other ideas or preferences.

- Donovan Scribes agreed with the three-minute limit and felt it would give people enough time to get to their point while still being manageable for the group.
- Ana del Rocío wrote in the chat that three minutes was standard and she felt it was good.
- Samantha Gladu also agreed.
- Jude Perez asked if this was for oral comment and explained that they had discussed this in the public engagement subcommittee and felt three minutes could be limiting and five might be better.
- Ana González Muñoz mentioned that extended time would be necessary for translation, and they should be mindful of that. Three minutes would be extended to six, and five would be extended to ten.
- J'reyesha Brannon said she was supporting Jude, and that it could be difficult to cut public commentators off, but that she had not thought of the accessibility aspect. She asked if there were translators and closed captioning.
 - Kali: There is information on the website and through email that explains that anyone who needs translation services can contact staff at least 72 hours prior to a meeting, and arrangements will be made for them. Closed captioning is already happening.
- Annie: Three minutes can go by very quickly, and five minutes might be better. If there are multiple people signing up it can be changed back to three minutes.
- Marc asked if it was possible to adjust the times.
 - Katherine Thomas replied that it was legal to do so, but she said the group should be consistent between speakers at a meeting so everyone has the same amount of time.
- Donovan said that after considering accessibility and how it might feel to be cut off, he still felt there should be confines around the time limits. Three and a half minutes could be a compromise.

Allison Brown initiated a Fist of 5 temperature check to see how the group felt about public comment being limited to three and a half minutes per person. The group was generally okay with moving forward with three and a half minutes.

Public Comment

There were no attendees interested in providing public comment during this evening's meeting.

Discussion: Communications

Annie Kallen and Danica Leung asked what the responsibility of committee members is to report back to the full committee when having conversations with people about their interests.

Allison shared that the City of Portland has started using a tracking tool so that people can report on when they have formal meetings with groups, but there were some concerns about the scalability of that. Katherine explained that the bylaws outline that members should engage with the community outside of public meetings

and encourage them to share their thoughts in the public forum. Information from public interest groups or those representing them should be brought back to the full committee for discussion.

- Ana González Muñoz: We decide who we meet with in the community, and in the spirit of trust, what we share with them should be our own opinion. After that conversation, the members can make the judgment on what information, if any, to bring back to the committee. I feel that members should be available to meet with the public.
- Meikelo Cabbage noted in the chat he agreed with Ana.
- Annie: What I'm gathering from discussion is that we could have discussions with the public, but if ideas come from it, we should disclose where they came from.
- Ana Muñoz: If there is an agreement with the person to share what was discussed, it's valuable to disclose it so if we work on the idea, we can give them credit.

Allison said that it sounded like members could use their own discretion when choosing to disclose outside meetings with the full committee, but they should ask for consent from the person to share their ideas and the nature of the conversation.

- Ana del Rocío: Do notes have to be documented from these meetings, and do they become part of the public record? Would they have to be disclosed if there were a public records request?
 - Katherine replied that any document used as a part of responsibilities as a charter member is potentially public record. It would depend on the nature of the request, but they could be the subject of disclosure.

Allison reminded members to be sure to save any written correspondence with the public. If possible, turn into staff so they can do the retention and production requirements.

She initiated a temperature check and the group agreed that these would be good best practices moving forward.

Discussion and Vote: Subcommittee Membership

Kali Odell shared the survey results for the subcommittee membership. Members shared verbally and in the chat their preferred subcommittee(s).

- Ana Muñoz: Would there be a conflict of interest if we have some connections to those offices? I'm involved with the Office of Community Involvement, and we report out to them.
 - Katherine: Conflicts can mean different things in different contexts. If there is a financial benefit to a decision you are making, then there would be an issue. I don't think this will be a huge issue here, but be mindful of any financial issues within the subcommittee that would impact you and we can talk offline about how to mitigate that.
- Salma Sheikh: Can we change subcommittees if we discover we have more interest or knowledge in another subcommittee that we aren't a part of?
 - Allison replied: As per bylaws, this is possible. It would be best not to move around, but if you find you can contribute more meaningful work in a different subcommittee, that can be done.
- Salma added: Can we have more information about the topics so we can better understand them?

- Allison replied: We will go through this in the breakout groups to make sure you're all in the right place.

Allison explained that the group would be put into breakout rooms to discuss what they are interested in and what the topics mean to each of them, and then the group could formally vote at the next meeting.

- Annie: How will the breakout rooms work if we are in multiple subcommittees?
- Ana del Rocío: If we don't vote now, does that preclude us from continuing to meet between now and the next meeting as subcommittees?
 - Katherine: The bylaws say the full committee will establish subcommittees, so that is important, and it might be a challenge to organize things if we don't know who is in what subcommittee. You should be able to still meet, but legally we need to know what a quorum is and publicly notice those meetings.
- Marc: We can resolve questions by looking at the different committees tonight and finding what resonates with us. That will help us stay within a committee instead of moving around.

Katherine recommended that if members do meet in the interim, that they comply with meetings law, and staff can assist with that to mitigate any legal concerns. The group then took a 5-minute break.

Members returned, and Kali explained some difficulties that may arise from not having a formal vote on membership of subcommittees. Marc requested the group discuss so they could determine the best way to move forward in the meeting. Allison asked members if they were reluctant to make a formal vote because they weren't set in their subcommittee choice.

- Ana Muñoz: I was under the impression that once we were in our subcommittees, we could explore different topics that may be different from what was listed and find something we were all passionate about.

Allison asked the group to show a fist of 5 in how they felt about their subcommittee decisions and the group demonstrated they were ready to vote.

Vote:

Allison Brown initiated a vote to confirm membership in the four subcommittees.

All members present voted to confirm the following membership:

Subcommittee 1. Theresa Mai, Maja Harris, Ana González Muñoz, Marc Gonzales, Annie Kallen, Jude Perez

Subcommittee 2. Nina Khanjan, Ana del Rocío, J'reyesha Brannon, Donovan Scribes, Danica Leung, Salma Sheikh

Subcommittee 3. Jude Perez, Maja Harris, Timur Ender, Annie Kallen, Samantha Gladu, Meikelo Cabbage

Public Engagement Subcommittee. Jude Perez, Maja Harris, J'reyesha Brannon, Theresa Mai, Donovan Scribes, Ana González Muñoz, Georgina Miltenberger

Next Steps and Closing

Before the breakout rooms, Allison discussed next steps and asked the co-chairs if they had anything to add.

Ana del Rocío: We should brainstorm who we think will report out to the full group from the subcommittees.

Marc: I am happy we are taking positive steps forward so we can set ourselves up to do good and important work.

Kali reminded members that all subcommittee meetings require seven days for public notice and said she will follow up about ideas for scheduling.

Breakout Rooms:

Breakout Room 1:

Subcommittee Meeting Group 1: Marc Gonzales, Ana Muñoz, Maja Vicklands Harris, Allison Brown (staff support), Carol Chesarek (public observer)

Scheduling

- All folks are pretty flexible on meeting time
 - Maja can make time and block things off
 - Noted that not everyone is there, and may need to circle back
- If we're planning to meet in the next two weeks, what works?
 - Marc: Tuesday evenings don't work for him
 - Are there parameters? Do we need to run it through Kali?
 - Maja to create a Doodle poll of members and include Kali to be sure that she is included in that, as well.
 - Maja will check to see if Kali prefers her to do the Doodle or subcommittee members.
 - This will include polling people who are not virtually in this breakout room.

Why are you interested in this subcommittee?

- Marc: Used to work for Clackamas County. Not a home rule county, but experience included a County manager. The Board was policy-making, and then someone else does the work of making sure the organization's work is done and done well. Has lived in City of Portland and seen the issues with the City's form of government, hopeful that it will change. Feels like some of these issues are not as pressing with Multnomah County, but is interested in exploring a County manager system for Multnomah County.
- Maja: Also interested in government and policy in general. Has not lived here long: moved here in 2019, before that in New York and the Midwest. Worked for a state senator and mayor in Nebraska, has done some consulting in policy areas. Very curious about the County manager question: doesn't have an opinion, but would like to research that topic more. Also interested in the comments about the Auditor's office. Generally likes when something comes from the outside into the committee. Another issue in the Charter was the citizenship requirement to serve on a civil commission. Curious if that citizenship question can be removed for some places where it's not required by law.
- Ana Munoz: Attracted to the idea of having gender neutral language in the Charter. That's a sensitive issue, but we often don't have time or energy to approach it. Especially in the Latino community, labels are used to define who we are, and those can often come from the government. Currently struggling with the terminology 'Latinx,' trying to figure out the reasoning for bringing that up: who is that inclusive of? Does it exclude the indigenous community? Wants to have these conversations in a way that brings community together rather than dividing people. Also curious about learning more about the Office of

Community Involvement. Wants to learn more about what community involvement means to the County. We need to be culturally sensitive and linguistically appropriate. Ana gets approached a lot about coordinating focus groups and government wants opinions and feedback, but communities don't hear back about what's happening with their feedback or how it was used. How is the County considering culturally appropriate practices in making sure communities are involved?

- Marc: Curious to learn more about the terminology of Latinx. Has relevance to his own family and history as a Hispanic person.

Additional Learning Opportunities/Invited Testimony:

- Maja: Is there a way to poll with folks to gauge interest in what we've raised here tonight.
 - Direct ask for staff: is there a way to rank or prioritize topics (especially topics raised here) outside of this meeting, to help focus conversation of the next subcommittee meeting.
- Marc: County auditor questions: would like to hear more about this. Could be the actual county auditor, or someone who knows about those functions, who could speak to us.
 - Agreement from Maja and Ana.
- Ana: The County manager question seems bigger, and that might be a bigger area of research. We would want to be careful about bias: if we hear from someone who is a strong advocate of a County manager, we'd want to hear from someone with an opposing view, especially to show the public that we're interested in a range of ideas.
 - Marc: When I worked in Clackamas County government, I worked with every county manager (6 total). In my experience, we demanded more and more of them. The last county manager I worked with was very talented, and probably knows a lot about county manager positions. He's retired now, but would probably be interested in speaking to us and having a conversation so that we could learn more.
 - I'd be willing to contact them to see if they're interested in talking to us, if that's something we want to do.
- Maja: Curious about the gender neutral language. Does the County have drafts of this language? For Ana, do you have a sense of what might be helpful?
 - Ana: I think the Charter language would be general, not referencing specific groups. For example, sharing pronouns is relatively new in Spanish-speaking communities, and it doesn't quite translate the same way into Spanish. There's sensitivity there with the Spanish-speaking people I have worked with. There hasn't been space to have a conversation about the 'why.' I'd be looking for someone who can facilitate this conversation in Spanish, and I'm having a hard time finding someone. We also have to think about our indigenous communities: even in our Latin American communities, we have indigenous folks with specific pronouns, and they aren't included in those conversations.
 - Does the County have someone who can speak to this topic on pronouns and gender neutral language?
 - Is the City's charter review process considering this shift? Is there any way we can piggyback off their work?

Action Items:

- Survey on topics of interest and scheduling
 - Need to check with Kali and see how to do this.
- Having a check-in question every time we meet so that we can get to know each other (even if it's something simple like your favorite food, hobby, etc.)

Breakout Room 2:

Attendees: J'reyesha (Jay) Brannon, Nina Khanjan, Donovan Scribes, Salma Sheikh, Danica Leung and Ana del Rocío, Georgina Miltenberger (not an official member of the subcommittee), Kali Odell (staff)

Jay: interested in criminal justice. As Black Portlander sees injustice and would like to see it addressed.

Donovan: Born and raised here with deep family lineage. Interested how this document can be used to decriminalize our community.

Nina: Not from Portland area originally. Iranian, Muslim, originally from NY and then grew up in CA. Culture shock moving to Oregon, noticed racism right away. Works with homeless communities and has seen how that community is criminalized. Folks who had encounters with the law at a young age and haven't been able to get a job because of criminal record.

Salma: Somali American, identifies as a woman. Culture shock moving from DC, not having a lot of people of color in Oregon. Has been the only person of color in a lot of groups. Has seen a lot of systemic issues and that led her to get involved with a group like this.

Danica: Chinese American. Lived in Portland whole life. Spent a year studying criminal justice - state and federal reform - would like to explore how to amend the Charter to bring some of those aspects into Portland. Wealth disparities have been evident in her communities and would like to be able to address some of that.

Georgina: Not an official member of this subcommittee. Attorney, but not criminal law. Has practiced in public interest and has seen the legal consequences of some of the inequities people are talking about. From the East Coast and recognizes that Portland is one of the least diverse places she has ever lived.

Ana: Values justice generally; criminal justice system doesn't approximate justice. Would like to lean into Multnomah County Public Health Authority to explore creative ways to effect change in criminal justice. Raising two brown boys and has fears for them.

Jay: Summarized that everyone is passionate about criminal justice and leading with race.

Kali advises that for choosing a meeting time, need at least a week lead time, so maybe early February?

Discussion about meeting day - folks said 31st might work. Salma is not off from school. Decided on the 31st at 4:30 - schedule for an hour.

Ask Katherine to research what the extent of amending authority is in the criminal justice area.

Donovan: Campaign in Minneapolis that had a Charter campaign to replace police department with public safety department. Encompasses public health and other social services for a holistic response. Would like to hear from them about their work, campaign, and what lessons they learned. <https://yes4minneapolis.org/>

Ana: For prior charter amendments that have been successful with voters, I'd like to hear from any proponent organizations involved in those about how they led those campaigns and what interest/capacity they have this year.

Interested in the group Donovan mentioned and any local groups

<https://takeactionminnesota.org/take-action/yes-4-minneapolis/#:~:text=Yes%204%20Minneapolis%20is%20a,new%20Department%20of%20Public%20Safety.>

Folks expressed interest in hearing from past Charter Review Committee members about what was successful with Charter Amendments.

Kali made some clarifications about how the Charter approval process and implementation works.

Kali shared generally what might be included in their first subcommittee meeting: choosing a chair, finding a set meeting time, identifying areas of research or prioritizing what testimony they would like to hear.

Subcommittee members were interested in hearing more from Katherine Thomas about what legal limitations are around the DA and the Sheriff. Kali clarified that Katherine might be able to share general statutes, but that she will also be able to be clearer about their limits as the subcommittee continues to refine what kind of changes it is interested in exploring.

Georgina expressed interest in joining the subcommittee if the other members felt her perspective and experience would add value to the group. Kali clarified that she can attend subcommittee meetings, but in order to vote in the subcommittee, she will need to be formally approved as a member at the next MCCRC meeting.

Breakout room chat:

J'reyesha Brannon (she/her) : <https://www.when2meet.com/>

Ana del Rocío : I vote for during school hours. Can fill out the when2meet!

Nina Khanjan : We said 31st at 4:30 right?

Ana del Rocío : For prior charter amendments that have been successful w voters, I'd like to hear from any proponent organizations involved in those about how they led those campaigns and what interest/capacity they have this year

Donovan Scribes : <https://yes4minneapolis.org/>

Donovan Scribes : <https://takeactionminnesota.org/take-action/yes-4-minneapolis/#:~:text=Yes%204%20Minneapolis%20is%20a,new%20Department%20of%20Public%20Safety.>

Ana del Rocío : Is Rhys Scholes still with the County? I've had amazing convos w him to learn about the history of the county in a super accessible, story-based kind of way

J'reyesha Brannon (she/her) : Judge Melvin Oden Orr was on the charter too

J'reyesha Brannon (she/her) : He works for the County Circuit Court now

Breakout Room 3:

Attendees: Samantha Gladu, Jude Perez, Meikelo Cabbage & Annie Kallen, Dani Bernstein (staff support)

Members introduced themselves with their names, pronouns, backgrounds and interests.

Availability

Jude is available on evenings and weekends. They have some flexibility if there are times that work better for everyone else. They like getting things on their calendar in advance.

Samantha is available all evenings except for the full committee meetings. Also most of the day on Fridays and weekends.

Annie is pretty available on weekends, and is fairly flexible. She works during the day on weekends, but works from home and can accommodate daytime meetings.

For Meikelo, Mondays are the best days. For weekend days, Sundays could work.

The group discussed the possibility of meeting on Mondays. Jude can do between 5-6pm or 7-8:30pm on Mondays, or as late as 9pm if needed. Samantha could do Mondays except February 14th and April 11th.

Anytime on Sundays and any Sunday dates work.

The group agreed to take the feedback of Sundays and Mondays to Kali.

Interest

Jude has always been interested in the elections process, and thinking of different ways this process can look.

Samantha is really interested in this subcommittee because she's fresh off three years being the Executive Director of Next Up which does a lot of work to make voting as open to everyone as possible. She's interested in exploring alternative voting methods, like ranked choice and star voting, and opening up the ballot to people who haven't had access. Exploring how we can open up voting to community members who aren't citizens, lowering the voting age, making sure people awaiting adjudication in jails get a ballot. She's curious to see how the Portland Charter review goes because it would be nice if our processes match - it would be hard to have a ballot where part of it is one way, and part of it is another.

Annie has come to realize that the problem we want to solve can't be solved without fixing the fundamental problems that affect the way we make decisions. She got excited when she learned about ranked choice voting, and is excited to bring what she knows about those things, and there's a lot she doesn't know. Agrees with matching with the City of Portland so people don't fill out a ballot different ways for County and City elections.

Meikelo's interest in elections and voting stems from interest in politics in general. Meikelo thinks that under Oregon state law, political parties can do closed primaries which severely restricts the political process to unaffiliated or non-affiliated voters, which is the largest class of voters in Oregon. Also agreed with matching up with City of Portland's process to address logistical issues with ballots.

Prioritizing for Testimony

Jude said it sounds like talking to the Portland Commission would be nice to see what they're doing and use their experience to help us. It would be helpful to hear from someone who can give a briefing on how the elections process is right now.

Meikelo suggested Tim Scott, the Elections Director for Multnomah County. That's the number one person he'd like to talk with. There are also a lot of great candidates right now who have experience with our political system.

Samantha agreed that Tim has great expertise and is very practical and realistic. She's also eager to hear from More Equitable Democracy, they work on multi-member districts and proportionality. Next Up and APANO are working on rank choice voting in the legislature. There's a ranked choice voting group, a star voting group. She'd also like to hear from organizations that have a stake in election reform who have been advocating at the legislature from a variety of perspectives - League of Women Voters, Common Cause. Also anyone involved in the recent effort on paid postage for ballot. On campaign finance reform, Samantha would like to hear from community based organizations about how the recent disclosure requirements are playing out for them and if they have changes in mind.

Annie said there's the expertise side, and then who is being left out of our current processes. It would be good to hear from people who aren't being served well by the current system, candidates for example. Annie agrees about hearing from ranked choice and star voting advocates. The national group is called Fair Vote for ranked choice, Equal Vote Coalition for star voting. Also the Center for Elections Science - they primarily advocate for approval voting and have good general knowledge about voting methods.

Samantha is curious about past candidates. Like the question of whether we should change whether commissioners can resign to run for a seat - we could talk with past commissioners who have run into that.

Dani clarified that current County commissioners can run for Chair without resigning - that was a change recommended by the last Charter Review Committee.

Samantha also suggested meeting with the legal team at Multnomah County to find out what we can do with voting methods and non-citizens voting. Sightline Institute does elections research. New York City recently opened up the ballot to non-citizens and we could talk with their campaign.

Meieklo was wondering how the subcommittee can stay in touch. For the next meeting, he also wants to make sure there are enough people to make decisions. Annie said we should double check on what quorum means.

Dani clarified the requirements for public records retention and disclosure. Annie also reminded the group to be cautious about serial deliberation.

Jude said it's been challenging organizing ourselves with the public meeting requirements, so that's something we'll have to work through.

Jude said the earliest meeting would be the week of the 31st.

Samantha asked how frequently the group wants to meet. Annie said it's hard because there's so many topics under this topic and it doesn't feel like there is a lot of time.

Jude shared the public engagement subcommittee has a standing monthly meeting, but they have been meeting almost every weekend in January - some very short meetings - to get caught up and make decisions.

Meikelo said if we know our report dates, and spend a few initial meetings figuring out with County Attorneys what is possible, we can choose a few ideas that are possible and move forward.

Samantha heard that City of Portland is working on the voting process in their second stage, so there's a big chance for us to decide and recommend that they follow. Annie said that's why it's a good idea for us to chat with them. We could chat with their elections subcommittee and see where they're at.

Samantha suggested connecting with that subcommittee being a piece of homework for one or two people.

Dani reminded the group to be cautious about making any decisions prior to confirming their quorum requirement.

Zoom Chat:

Jude Perez: yessssss

Jude Perez: State Voices - Oregon also comes to mind

samantha (she/they): Anthony Castaneda, Becca Uherbelau, Bryan William Lewis, Candace Avalos, Debbie Kitchin, Debra Porta, Gloria Cruz, Melanie Billings-Yun, Raahi Reddy, Robin Ye, Salome Chimuku, Vadim Mozyrsky and Yasmin Ibarra

Subcommittee Quorum. The MCCRC will establish membership of each subcommittee and a simple majority (50% + 1) of the subcommittee must be present to conduct business.

Appendix A: Zoom Chat

Jude Perez: Hey! I'm eating and moving around so I'll be off camera for a bit.

Ariella Frishberg: Hi all! I'll be off camera this evening, but I'm here!

Ana del Rocio: Greetings, all! Thanks Allison — here with kiddos in the background :)

Ariella Frishberg: Please remember to set your chat to "Everyone" instead of "Hosts & Panelists" so public attendees can follow along with the conversation.

Ariella Frishberg: Got it!

Samantha Gladu: I'm good - thank you!

Danica Leung: I got a similar question from someone, so I appreciate Annie asking!

Ana Muñoz: That's the standard.

Samantha Gladu: I'm good with 3 min!

J'reyesha Brannon: And, closed captioning is happening now. ha. Sorry!

Ana Muñoz: Getting cut off is not a good feeling. However, when people know the time limit they are more prone to prepare accordantly.

Ana Muñoz: I'm in favor for consistency.

Samantha Gladu: 4

Ana del Rocio: 4

Salma Sheikh: 4

Georgina Miltenberger: 4

Marc Gonzales: 4 is ok

Allison Brown: 5 - I love it!; 4- I'm okay with it; 3 - I want to discuss more; 2 - I don't really like it; 1 - I don't like it

Ana Muñoz: 4

Carol Chesarek (she/her): Not tonight, thanks for asking. Carol

Katherine Thomas: Additional context, here is what your bylaws say: Committee members are encouraged to engage with their own community networks outside of public meetings. When possible, committee members should encourage interested community members to share their ideas and opinions through the public comment process. Information obtained from interest groups or individuals representing interest groups should generally be noted and brought back to the full committee or relevant subcommittee for discussion.

Meikelo Cabbage: I would say that it is up to the discretion of commissioners. I know that city of portland requires lobbying disclosure when someone spends 8hrs/\$1000 meeting with city officials about issues, but I dont think we would qualify if we are meeting with each other, only if we meet with external interest groups.

Donovan Scribes: Will be right back

Danica Leung: Yes, thank you!

Samantha Gladu: thumbs up

Danica Leung: thumbs up!

Meikelo Cabbage: Not sure how to thumbs up on mobile, but thumbs up

Donovan Scribes: back

Jude: Add me to Subcommittee 1 please

Meikelo Cabbage: Could I join subcommittee 3?

Kali Odell: Yes

Annie Kallen: I will be right back

Georgina Miltenberger: public engagement

Salma Sheikh: Can i join subcommittee 2 for now

Danica Leung: here!

Donovan Scribes: Here and eating off camera

Meikelo Cabbage: 🍷

Ana del Rocio: Here

Maja Harris: Can we do a fist of five on moving ahead with a vote today?

Kali Odell: 5 - I love it!; 4- I'm okay with it; 3 - I want to discuss more; 2 - I don't really like it; 1 - I don't like it

Ana del Rocio: 5

Danica Leung: 4

Donovan Scribes: 4

Meikelo Cabbage: Agree w/ Ana M. Even if we cant make "hard" decisions within subcommittees, i think that we need to meet as soon as possible and get a feel for the subcommittees before our next meeting, then vote members on to make fuller decisions

Meikelo Cabbage: Yes

Allison Brown: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5748370439>

- Meeting ID: 574 837 0439