



Multnomah County Charter Review Committee

June 15, 2022 5:30-7:30pm

COMMITTEE MEETING 12

Purpose: Hear public comment; review recommendations forwarded by subcommittees and gauge priorities and levels of group agreement on these recommendations.

Attendees

Committee Members

- Ana del Rocío (she/her)
- Ana González Muñoz (she/ella)
- Annie Kallen (she/her)
- 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)
- Maja Harris (she/her)
- Nina Khanjan (she/her)
- Samantha Gladu (she/they)
- Theresa Mai (she/her)
- Timur Ender (he/him)

Absent:

- Salma Sheikh (she/her)

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
- Jen Winslow (she/her), JLA Public Involvement

In addition, members of the public were welcome to observe the meeting as non-participatory attendees. There were 6 public attendees during the course of the meeting.

Welcome

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, kicked off the meeting with an overview of Zoom logistics and etiquette. She reminded the group to continue to work in accordance with the group agreements. The Zoom chat can be found in the [Appendix](#). Theresa Mai gave an overview of the agenda, which included public comment, recommendations from subcommittee groups, and levels of group agreement for the recommendations.

Public Comment

Theresa introduced the public comment portion of the meeting and expressed the committee's excitement to hear from the community. She reminded attendees that they can submit written testimony at any time. There were three people signed up for verbal comment. Allison overviewed the public comment process.

- **Sol Mora:** I am the Civic Engagement manager of the Coalition of Communities of Color (CCC). CCC is an alliance of culturally specific organizations and service providers working to advance racial justice through cross cultural collective action. For over 20 years, we have worked to address institutional racism within our local government and create viable pathways for communities of color to obtain self-determination, justice, and access to opportunities. Participating in our local elections affects the ability of communities of color, immigrants, and refugees to elect candidates that will champion issues that support their wellness and prosperity, and reflect their values. The decisions of elected representatives impact every resident, regardless of if they are able to vote. Those decisions impact how communities can have access to local services such as housing, community health, and transportation. Many residents feel excluded from our systems of elections. Barriers range from issues with multilingual access to not having the right to vote due to immigration or citizenship. This should not make them less than in the eyes of our local democracy. CCC endorses non-citizen voting in Multnomah County Charter reform. Please ensure that immigrants, refugees, and undocumented residents have a pathway to participate in our local democracy and see themselves represented in leadership. Research shows that civic engagement contributes to wellbeing and positive social and public health outcomes. Expanding our democracy will have a meaningful and lasting impact across communities in Multnomah County and will enfranchise communities that have felt the most underrepresented, ensuring local government works for ALL of us.
- **Carol Chesarek:** I served on the 2015 -16 Charter Review Committee (CRC) and congratulate you on reaching the final phase. I submitted written comment on several topics including the geographic distribution requirement for selecting CRC members. The Office of Community Involvement (OCI) proposed replacing state Senate districts with the four County districts and allowing OCI to select committee members. The Government Accountability subcommittee supported that. One of your shared values is inclusive democracy. Multnomah County's democracy depends on representation of the communities within it. I am concerned that only using the four county districts would mean the committee would have no representatives from smaller cities such as Gresham and Troutdale and rural areas. This ensures the committee isn't focused solely on Portland. Rural residents depend on the county for services city residents get from their cities such as law enforcement, land use, and transportation. There are ten senate districts representing Multnomah County and allowing CRC members to be selected from each district would provide that geographic representation. The current Chart language calls for two members from each Senate district with more than 50% of its residents in the county, and one member from the rest. OCI doesn't typically use geographic distribution as one of their standard diversity measures. If you choose to stay with the four county districts, I hope you would add a diversity statement about CRC including the rural areas within the county.

Of course, any auditor would want a guaranteed, insulated budget, but there are other ways to protect the auditor's budget from potential retaliation. The auditor did not offer alternatives, and the Government Accountability subcommittee did not have time to fully research other options, so they

appropriately left this for the next CRC to explore. Assigning an auditor's budget in the Charter would also tie hands in the case of an emergency, when these funds would be needed for services.

- **Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson:** I am the Commissioner for District 3. Thank you so much, and each of your perspectives are critical to this. If I go over time, I will send my comments in writing. The County's Charter functions as its constitution and contains important rights, responsibilities, and principles. Amending it isn't something to be taken lightly. The Oregon Constitution is now a mess of very specific policies enshrined due to special interests using the initiative process to their own narrow advantage. There are tax limitations that now tie the hands of local and state officials in ways which have serious consequences for how our state is now run. I know you'll consider that. Issues at the City of Portland can also cloud perceptions of Multnomah County, but unlike the city, we don't suffer from a lack of geographical representation because we have districts which make our board more geographically equitable, which includes an all-woman board with the majority of members being women of color. While the city's commissioner system results in a weak mayor system, Multnomah County has a strong executive line of hierarchy, resulting in the county being more effective, functional, and responsive to community need. The County's Charter review process has often been the testing ground for things like campaign finance, which we are learning from. Campaign Finance limitations are intended to level the playing field on who can contribute to campaigns. A limit of \$500 applies to someone running for a district seat, which has less than 15k voters, and to someone running for a county wide seat, which has over 570k voters. It costs more to run for a county-wide seat, but there are no stipulations between each situation and there should be. Campaign finance without public financing makes it more difficult to communicate with voters in the campaign. Wealthy candidates can still self-finance with thousand of dollars in contributions to their own campaigns. Public financing would help make this more equitable. This might be done in the county code.

Commissioner Vega Peterson would send the rest of her written comments to be added to public comment and invited the committee to email her with any questions or follow up.

Kali outlined the written comments received prior to the meeting. Full written comments are available [here](#).

There were no additional verbal comments and Allison closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Subcommittee Recommendations: Process, Review, and Discussion

Marc Gonzales introduced the subcommittee recommendations and noted that there were eight recommendations from subcommittees in addition to the one that had previously been voted on which recommended adopting gender neutral language in the charter. Katherine Thomas, Assistant County Attorney, had clarifying questions about some of the recommendations that would need to be answered before moving forward.

There were four recommendations that the committee chose to focus on in this meeting. Some recommendations may not move forward.

Katherine overviewed the remaining timeline and reminded the group that August 4th was the last day to present to the board. Once presented, the board can refer measures to voters, beginning the ballot title process. There is a seven-business day period for anyone to challenge the ballot title, which must be resolved by September 8th or the measure cannot move forward.

Equitable Representation Subcommittee Recommendations:

Samantha Gladu introduced the recommendation for **expanding voting rights to the furthest extent allowed by law**. The full recommendation form is available [here](#). The recommendation had unanimous support from the subcommittee.

- Multnomah County will extend the vote to the fullest extent allowed by law, including but not limited to, noncitizens.
- This would not alter existing sections of the Charter.
- Intended to increase political power for people currently disenfranchised.
- Intended to reduce taxation without representation.
- Encourages civic engagement and increases sense of belonging.
- Aligns with the values of inclusive democracy, access and belong, and justice.

Additional costs could include:

- Special ballot printing.
- Voter education.
- Updating voter registration.
- Legal costs when going through County processes.

Negative impacts could be:

- Backlash against immigrants and legal ramifications.
- Legal challenges.

There are 14 jurisdictions throughout the country which allow noncitizen voting.

- **Annie:** I'm in support of this, but one thing that may not be completely clear is defining who the vote would be extended to. We decided the recommendation should state to extend the vote to the fullest extent possible per state law, which allows some flexibility.
 - **Samantha:** We had some discussion in the full committee about who this might be, and how we could be as broad as possible. The subcommittee decided we wanted the maximum level of inclusion while allowing for the full amount of legal guidance when pursuing this.

Allison asked if the committee had any questions or if Katherine had additional legal considerations.

- **Katherine:** I don't have any specific legal concerns with this newer recommendation because this allows the county to implement this with some flexibility when taking it through the legal process; aligning with the values of the CRC and the law.
- **Ana GM:** I am in support of this but I'm wondering if there is a plan on how to educate the new voters on how to not be afraid of voting. Have there been any discussions about this?
 - **Samantha:** There have been examples, including driver's licenses, outreach, collaboration with agencies and community members, and who should make rules and design feedback. We don't know what that will look like, but our elections office is among the best and we have a lot of faith in their ability to conduct an inclusive process.

- **Marc:** To what extent does state law address the role of home rule counties and their ability to change a voting law like this as opposed to the general rules that apply to all counties in the state?
 - **Katherine:** That's one of the legal issues we would be looking at. Expanding rights beyond what is enshrined in the constitution is untested, which is why this recommendation seeks to implement this at the board level.

Allison conducted a straw poll to see how the group felt about moving this recommendation forward to a formal vote. Twelve committee members agreed.

Samantha continued by explaining the recommendation of **adopting Ranked Choice Voting**, in which voters rank candidates in order of preference instead of voting for one candidate. The full recommendation form is available [here](#). Within the subcommittee, there were three yes votes, one no vote, and one person absent.

- Multnomah County will adopt Ranked Choice Voting by 2026.
- Intended to give voters more power and more choices.
- Intended to increase voter participation and encourage coalition-building.
- Intended to reward positive campaigning.
- Intended to elect candidates with the broadest possible public support.
- Intended to solve the "spoiler" issue and that no vote will ever be a "wasted" vote.
- Aligns with the values of inclusive democracy and innovation.

Potential fiscal impacts:

- Could potentially share with funds at city and state level.
- Voter education costs.
- Election machine and software certification.
- Additional ballot printing.
- Personnel costs.

Potential negative impacts:

- Opposition to RCV.
- Negative arguments from opponents.
 - Elections are also a hot topic throughout the country.
- Some people may miss out on education and find RCV confusing.

Benton County has already implemented RCV, and more information can be found [here](#).

- **Annie:** I voted "no" on this one. I used to be a huge advocate for RCV, but then I learned more about it. It seems simple on the surface, but the tabulation can be non-intuitive. Sara Wolk of Equal Vote Coalition submitted public comment that was too late to make it to this meeting, and she referenced the recent New York election. Two candidates, Wiley and Garcia, who may have had stronger majority support than the winner, ended up splitting the vote. Because one candidate (Garcia) wasn't eliminated until the last round, those who ranked Garcia as their first choice were unable to have their second choices counted, and those strongly favored Wiley. On average over 10% of ranked choice ballots can't be counted in the final round, even if those voters ranked multiple candidates. RCV is more complex than we think. I support STAR voting but have found RCV to be misleading. Most data does not get counted past the first round, so it is similar to the voting method already being used. We need to ensure

that whatever voting method we choose aligns with Portland and Gresham. Some of the points on Samantha's summary are not true.

- **Samantha:** I think it's important for the committee to know that there has been this longer conversation happening with RCV and STAR voting. Annie is a board member of the Equal Vote Coalition, which promotes STAR voting. RCV has a lot of support, and many organizations believe it will cause more racially just outcomes for the community. Regarding policy disagreement between the two methods, I think it says a lot that so many community groups have supported RCV.

In addition to what is written in the recommendation, we would need full committee support on:

1. Potentially eliminating the primary and having the election be a sole RCV election. This could be aligned with Portland's election in November, along with voter education and ballot styles.
 2. We could leave the current tie breaker method.
- **Katherine:** The primary and tie breaker were the two issues for me. Ties can have a different outcome with RCV. We should make this high level for the charter and leave the details for implementation.
 - **Maja:** A strong argument for putting this on the ballot this time around is because we know it's going to appear on the city ballot. It passed on the Portland Charter with a supermajority last night. The ballots should look the same, and those who oppose can vote no on both if they so choose. Efficiencies also don't happen on a regular basis, so it's great to have outreach and education align with the city.
 - **Marc:** Who is going to be responsible for explaining ranked choice voting to the public? There are fears about fraudulent voting, and so there is already concern about voting in general.
 - **Samantha:** Civic engagement is a team sport. Anyone would have the opportunity to talk about RCV. Our election infrastructure does a good job on pushing back against the voter fraud narrative.
 - **Katherine:** Our elections division would certainly take the lead.

Allison conducted a straw poll to continue exploring RCV as a recommendation and nine members said they were interested. Kali asked the group to email or add questions into the chat so they can be addressed in future meetings.

The group then took a 5-minute break.

Government Accountability:

Jude Perez introduced the recommendation to **make changes to the Charter review process, including extending its timeline**. The full recommendation form is available [here](#).

- Would extend the Charter Review process to 18 months (6 months longer than the current timeline).
- Would codify the language to reflect that MCCRC can choose its own leadership structure.
- Commissioners would be required to budget for a meaningful public engagement process.
 - All of this would ensure a more thorough Charter Review process.
- Aligns with the values of inclusive democracy, access and belonging, and transparency.

Fiscal impacts:

- Would require more funds for staff.

Potential negatives:

- Possible greater workload for county staff.
- May deter applicants due to longer timeline.

Maja noted that there was a slight discrepancy between the recommendation and what the subcommittee voted on in the language “shall take reasonable steps.” This would need to be taken out of the recommendation before the formal vote.

- **Timur:** This is a change to the system, and not a negative on county staff.
- **Katherine:** With Maja’s note, I understand the recommendation on the first bullet point, but want to make sure I understand the intent behind the language. Also, consider reframing the piece about requiring funds for public outreach to a requirement for OCI to conduct public outreach. Appropriating funds doesn’t mean the outreach actually happens.
 - **Maja and Jude:** We are supportive of incorporating those changes.

Allison conducted a straw poll to see if the group wanted to move this forward with the recommendation and 11 people agreed. She reminded the group that the committee could conduct a formal vote on pieces that had consensus, which would help eliminate some work down the line.

Safety and Justice:

Donovan Scribes introduced the recommendation **requiring members of the board of commissioners to inspect jail facilities a minimum of four times per year**. The full recommendation form is available [here](#).

- Require members of the board of commissioners to inspect jail facilities a minimum of four times per year, accompanied by 3 constituents each to document observations and write year-end report.
- This would be intended to increase visibility and transparency.
- Intended to add accountability.
 - Portland has the fifth worst racial arrest disparity in the nation, and Black folks make up 1/3 of the jail’s population while being 5% of Multnomah County population.
- Aligns with justice, inclusive democracy, and transparency values.

Fiscal impacts:

- Compensation for constituents has not been defined.

Potential negatives:

- The method by which constituents are chosen.
- Normalization of current jail conditions and standards.
- Scheduling challenges.
- Administrative requirements.
- **Katherine:** I have a few points to request clarification on and make recommendations on.
- **Samantha:** I noticed Commissioner Jayapal gave some context in public comment on what the jails visits are like, and they seem curated and controlled. She also wasn’t sure more visits would add more value. These visits don’t serve as spot visits. What does the committee feel about this comment?

- **Donovan:** We wanted this to be randomized visits, so the Sheriff's Office didn't have such tight control over the image of what's happening in the jails, but because they are the administrators, they have to know who is coming and when. This has sidestepped some of the things we wanted to achieve. The Commissioner suggested language such as increased contact with incarcerated folks or representatives who act on behalf of people in jail, but we haven't had a chance to talk about the comment yet. I do think there needs to be more contact with the facilities themselves.
- **Ana GM:** I see a similarity with school visits and jail inspections in how they are planned ahead of time for safety purposes and to be the least disruptive. I'm wondering what that entails and if there is any report on previous inspections.
- **Donovan:** Part of this recommendation is the report and asking for it to be publicized.
- **J'reysha:** We don't want to see a staged visit, and with more visits, it's more likely we will see an authentic situation.
- **Annie:** I'm supportive of the idea of having constituents coming along, especially if they are putting together a report. Four might be a better number, so you could have one from each district. But I echo concerns that these tours are curated, and more visits might not yield more information but would still have extra expenses. The intentions are good, and this is an important issue, but we should find a way to make this effective.
 - **Donovan:** Clarification that there would be three constituents for each commissioner, not three total. I am hearing everyone's points. Let's work with Katherine to see if there are some deeper ways of thinking about this.
- **Nina:** It's common for teachers to want those in power to visit and get a real experience regarding public education today. Having the commissioners visit creates a better perspective and understanding of what life is like in a jail. This isn't about having a "gotcha" moment for the sheriff's department, it's about having people come in and see what life is really like in there and thinking about all of this in policy changes.
- **Marc:** In my time working for Clackamas County, I have been on these jail visits, and they are performative and don't reveal a lot of information about conditions in the jail. There are so many aspects, from people awaiting trial, mental health crisis, health issues, so it's impossible to review all of this in one visit. I think the emphasis should be on data collection. There is a lack of positive action, and information is vital.
- **Jude:** What do these tours currently look like?
 - **Donovan:** When we first started exploring this, we didn't know there was already an ordinance that made commissioner's visit once a year. I need to get more information to you, but it seems more like a tour.
- **Katherine:** The issues you are highlighting are not legal issues but policy issues. I'm happy to be involved, but questions about jails need to involve policy folks.

Allison conducted a straw poll to gauge interest on continuing to work and refine this recommendation and 8 people raised hands, which was a majority of committee members present.

- **Donovan:** I have connected with the someone at the county and started conversations about building out programming surrounding changing the sheriff's involvement in the evictions process in a way that meets the spirit of a recommendation our subcommittee was exploring.

Kali reminded the group to please send specific comments and questions about this topic for continued discussion.

Formal Voting

Allison initiated a vote to move forward with sending recommendations for expanding voting rights to noncitizens and changes to the charter review process to Katherine's office for drafting of language and ballot titles. In the interest of time, the group voted on both recommendations at the same time.

All members present unanimously voted yes.

Next Steps and Closing

Theresa congratulated the group for voting to pass two proposals. There were still some needed discussions on RCV and jail visits.

- There are three meetings left, and they may include language for passed proposals. These need to be done before July 5 for any edits.
- The next meeting is on June 28, 2022.
- Subcommittees need to begin working on final reports, with a draft out to full committee by July 5th, in addition to presenting to the board of commissioners.
- Please keep in touch about availability for the next few meetings.

Marc thanked the group for their presentations. Allison wrapped up the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

Zoom chat: Appendix

Danica Leung: Hi y'all!

Danica Leung to Kali Odell (she/her): Kali, I just tested positive for COVID and I need to step away to figure some life things out. Sorry if this interferes with the meeting!

Kali Odell (she/her) to Danica Leung: I'm so sorry to hear that, I hope you're not feeling too poorly. Thanks for letting me know!

Annie Kallen she/her: Thank you Sol!

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thank you!

Annie Kallen she/her: Thanks Carol

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thanks, Carol!

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thanks, Commissioner

Kali Odell (she/her): You can access the public comments submitted in writing on this page:
<https://www.multco.us/crc/mccrc-upcoming-meetings>

Kali Odell (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Charter%20Review%20Committee%20Amendment%20Process%20Timeline.pdf>

Kali Odell (she/her): The link will take you to the timeline document Katherine referenced

Samantha Gladu: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Voting%20Rights%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Donovan Scribes (he/him): My internet is a little bit jumpy just FYI

Kali Odell (she/her) to Donovan Scribes (he/him): Donovan, just wanted to remind you to set your chat messages to send to everyone!

Annie Kallen she/her: Mine too Donovan! Turning off my camera seems to help.

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): You covered it, Samantha and Annie!

Danica Leung to Kali Odell (she/her): Kali, I'm so sorry but I don't think I can continue to be in this meeting. Please let me know what I can do after this meeting to catch up, but for now I am going to head out early.

Kali Odell (she/her) to Danica Leung: That's fine, I hope everything works out okay.

Danica Leung to Kali Odell (she/her): Thank you!

Samantha Gladu: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Ranked%20Choice%20Voting%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Annie Kallen she/her: Exhausted ballots are ballots which are not counted in the final round because all the voter's rankings were eliminated (which can happen even if people rank all the candidates they are able to).

Samantha Gladu: I have a little more to add here, too, about some things we need to land in the full committee if this recommendation moves fwd!

Annie Kallen she/her: Gresham may put a different voting method on the ballot.

Samantha Gladu: <https://bentonbetterballot.com/>

Annie Kallen she/her: RCV is less transparent than better voting methods:
https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1oWK5QA0RZKrZ4c0LWLSNTt-DBkejQH0_i8dijBHKNkU/edit?usp=sharing

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): Hi Kali, I have to go to another meeting in one minute.

Kali Odell (she/her) to Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): Thanks for letting me know.

Annie Kallen she/her: Thanks Samantha!

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thanks, Samantha! Super clear presenting!

Theresa Mai (she/her): Thank you, Samantha!!!

Samantha Gladu: Thanks, Equitable Representation Colleagues for shaping these recs!!!

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): Before we move on to the other subcommittees, I'm wondering if we want to ask committee members about a formal vote on expanding voting rights. It didn't seem like there was a heavy appetite for more discussion on that one, and it would be helpful to move some things off their plate if there's already support.

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): Also, Katherine has a timeline piece to clarify when we have a chance.

Allison Brown (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): I don't know if I want to have folks formally vote today...we're missing a few and we didn't set it up like that

Samantha Gladu: I'm back! (Eating dinner)

Nina Khanjan she/her to Kali Odell (she/her): Im back

Allison Brown (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): Could that be an "easy win" when we get to voting? I hear ya but just feel weird about having folks vote right now...

Theresa Mai (she/her): Quickly turning off camera for low laptop battery. ðŸ˜ˆ~¬

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): The agenda I sent committee members did say that there would be the option of a vote. And unfortunately I'm already anticipating the absence of quite a few committee members at our upcoming meetings.

Allison Brown (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): I see. Could we see if we have time in the next steps part and if there's interest in officially voting yes on things that they had clear consensus on?

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): Sounds good!

J'reyesha Brannon (she/her): It will allow us time for the County's processes too if we decide we need additional support - i.e. outreach contract took a bit long

Annie Kallen she/her: Agreed, the time crunch caused more feelings of burnout for me than I think I would feel with a longer process.

Jude Perez: <https://mail-attachment.googleusercontent.com/attachment/u/1/?ui=2&ik=d521c69c09&attid=0.7&permmsgid=msg->

f:1735123956242611374&th=1814660b8d1c7cae&view=att&disp=inline&realattid=f_l46f5f2q4&sadbat=ANGj
dJ8HCOON--lwVfrKU5skvvrWhBUNzNkFRjaYzb7GCFBGyxXBIBVLDQ70ld-
ammufxc48pgVA_uJ2c0fCy6LijQrD6u91LlobpCGzOymA2aRR4FJjBOTS-
IglMBJtYZoMpm5JMjTIC8hHtsuTmspvxsdPPIFe-
Xu7SsoUGAPV9sWVabG2h9IbOvPlaK9UFgrKLbTjGNwbtd5JFdBOCDPIFIHmYMCOraviUesS6aJky9UtpJTkk
1vg1mnbvesulUilLxk3MI-x2o7hgRrjY-
G0O_83KbW3LNx1Wewi4kt91f0pybV3OcgA1Hd7lpYiyHMVEWxL960ESexIfUONLIjZ3YUiEw5EtOT18dMSX2
dmhv4YhulZj5_zBKo28L1Wfkm7wOILg8n5YyZAXqUliq7JacCYT-
CIYSltzjkLFC5CRy9LF3PiDKXvcTwLppOzWOu_DPgGODO9sm9oENs4xjMTqJV4XNzrpMVKxRU9OnhkXB6j
WoXuFp9MvVA0rJKR7jyr-
HXEUIFaqO5_u_1Htny0LWgzE7Gay1GUmybCR96u4YAvKBIMusIYG46tKDPCP5AhiOLpaprmqKCZ1TqgFkrnt
GaFRL-8jLIFfnvDVfvDZHwMkLwuKpGlTM8fJWdj8ePGpt0KxM-
bdrwNzkqZhMyglM4ou7SsTYL3cr6OMQsT23deZp79Em-zlh-yKA0oQhsXcfQzdOsMxjNL6kkcfiZUPoXMV-
1rSW9JMO3OFN6tFSADjs_zz8J1_0F3DdtjWW19UsiTmkukcE8Qs6M6AZvrSiqnnDk2KgzPzw

Jude Perez: Link to the recommendation form

Donovan Scribes (he/him): ^this didn't work for me

Kali Odell (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Charter%20Review%20Process%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Donovan Scribes (he/him): ^ thanks

Jude Perez: Thanks, Kali! Sorry about that Donovan

Donovan Scribes (he/him): I forgive you

Marc Gonzales (he,him): Very good explanation, Jude! Thank you.

Theresa Mai (she/her): I am supportive of changes as well.

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): I'm supportive of voting now when we know we have a quorum!

Timur Ender (he/they): I do think it is worth voting on expanding voting rights and the one we just talked about while it is fresh on our minds. Just my two cents

Kali Odell (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Inspection%20of%20Jail%20Facilities%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Kali Odell (she/her): Here is the recommendation form

Marc Gonzales (he,him): There is some distracting background noise happening

Samantha Gladu: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Public%20Comment%20by%20Commissioner%20Susheela%20Jayapal%20Submitted%2006.10.22.pdf>

Allison Brown (she/her): Welcome, Ana del Rocio!

Samantha Gladu: Hi Ana!

Annie Kallen she/her: Got it, thanks for the clarification.

Timur Ender (he/they): One key factor for me is that incarcerated ppl can't vote so this is one of the only ways the Board sees this segment of our population, potentially on a more regular basis.

Samantha Gladu: Most people in county facilities can vote - in Oregon people cannot vote while serving time for a felony (which is state facilities)

J'reyesha Brannon (she/her): I forgot to lower it before ha

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Is this a vote on the recommendation that was brought forward? Still 4 visits?

Annie Kallen she/her: I'm interested in enshrining the visit requirement in the charter, but not increasing the number of visits. Also interested in specifying that constituents join and make reports.

Donovan Scribes (he/him): I have a comment before we move on too allison

Donovan Scribes (he/him): Very quickly

Annie Kallen she/her: I do wonder if this is more appropriate for the code than for the charter, but I would be interested to hear people's thoughts on that.

Ana del Rocio (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): Hi! I'll let you and Alison recap what was discussed/agreed on since I missed so much.

Kali Odell (she/her) to Ana del Rocio (she/her): Sure thing.

Samantha Gladu: Thank you, Donovan, and Safety & Justice Subcommittee!

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thank you!

Donovan Scribes (he/him): Thanks everyone

Annie Kallen she/her: Thanks Donovan and Nina!

Annie Kallen she/her: I support that

Nina Khanjan she/her: Happy to be heard thank you!

Samantha Gladu: Yes - can we do them both on the same vote?

Annie Kallen she/her: Expanding voting rights: <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Voting%20Rights%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Kali Odell (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Charter%20Review%20Process%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Ana del Rocio (she/her): Thank you!

Annie Kallen she/her: Great work everyone!

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thank you, Katherine, that's a very important point!

Maja Viklands Harris (she/her): Thanks, tri-chairs!