

Agenda Item 2
Introduction of Parliamentarian



DORAEATHEA JOHNSON

June 27, 2021

Ms. Kamilah Moore, Chairperson
Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation
Proposals for African Americans

Dear Ms. Moore:

Subject: **Letter of Introduction**

Good afternoon.

I hope that in your review of my qualifications, as set forth in my resume and in this letter, you will find that my skill level and experience, with respect to Robert's Rules of Order and Parliamentary Procedure are more than sufficient to ensure with my guidance, the Task Force members will be enabled to conduct their meetings as required pursuant to AB 3121, both efficiently and in compliance with Robert's Rules of Order.

My experience as General Counsel and Deputy Director for the Department of Consumer Affairs, provided me with multiple opportunities to provide supportive services with the numerous public Boards that are under the umbrella of the Department of Consumer Affairs. In my capacity as General Counsel, I attended many public meetings and offered guidance to the Board, either directly or indirectly through the assigned attorneys who were under my supervision, on the manner in which meetings were held.

My position as DCA's General Counsel enabled me to hone my skills with regard to Parliamentary Procedure and provided me with multiple opportunities to provide training and guidance to my staff and to Board members, during training summits held by the Department of Consumer Affairs. During these sessions, particular attention was given to procedural issues that often arose during the meetings. Such issues included quorums, nominations, elections, discussions and voting.

However, in addition to my employment experience, my volunteer commitments furthered my experience and enhanced my knowledge of Parliamentary Procedure. During the past twenty years, I have served as the Parliamentarian for several community based organizations that I am a member. I served as Parliamentarian for over seventeen years for one organization and have also served in that capacity at the local and regional conferences. I have not only taken classes with regular frequency, I have taught Parliamentary Procedure classes and given workshops for several of the organizations that I have affiliated with, including The State Bar of California, the National Coalition of 100 Black Women and Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.

I have no doubt that my experience and knowledge have equipped me to fulfil the requirements and carry out the duties of the Parliamentarian in a manner that will ensure that the members of the Task Force will be assured that their positions, with respect to AB3121, will be heard.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Doreathe Johnson

Doreathe Johnson

Email: dee.jjohnson9036@att.net

DOREATHEA JOHNSON

RESUME

E-mail: dee.johnson9036@att.net | **Phone:** 916-539-3483

EDUCATIONAL TRAINING

JURIS DOCTORATE

Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco, California

BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE - Major: Criminal Justice; Minor: Business Administration
California State University, Sacramento, California

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE Workshop and Training

Alpha Kappa Alpha Far Western Regional Conference,
Parliamentary Procedure Workshop
Alpha Kappa Alpha International Leadership Conference, 2015, 2017, 2019
Parliamentary Procedure Workshop

LICENSES

Member of the California State Bar, License Number: 87550

SKILLS

Governmental Relations, Advocacy, Cultural Awareness, Training re: Parliamentary Procedure and Roberts Rules of Order, Negotiations, Providing Legal Advice and Parliamentary for public Board Meetings, AKA, Eta Gamma Omega Chapter Meetings, National Coalitional of 100 Black Women, and Alpha Kappa Alpha FW Regional Conferences

QUALIFICATIONS

Accomplished legal professional with solid background in administrative law, ;particularly with respect to enforcement actions involving regulatory cases. Support clients by coordinating skilled defensive and offensive strategies for diverse issues. Expert in case analysis, litigation management and appeals An attorney with over 35 years/experience serving in

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

JULY 2000 - JUNE 2017 (Retirement)

Deputy Director of Legal Affairs Division and General Counsel

California Department of Consumer Affairs | Sacramento, CA

Served as a member of the Department's Executive staff, and advised the Director and the Executive staff on legal issues and policy matters concerning the Department, Boards, Bureaus, and Commissions within the Department. Provided legal advice and review with respect to on-going litigation, contracts, proposed legislation and personnel issues. Served as Special Counsel to the Governor, providing advice to the Governor's Legal Affairs team, and to the Oversight Agency with respect to matters concerning the Department and/or the regulatory agencies within the Department. Coordinated rule-making activities and provided oversight with respect to public record requests and discovery processes, including reviewing requests and complying in full with applicable requirements. Managed the activities of the Legal Division, including two Assistant Chief Counsels, Supervising Attorneys, Staff Attorneys, and support staff.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

JULY 1994 - JULY 2000

Senior Staff Attorney III

California Employment Development Department | Sacramento, CA

Performed legal research, drafted legal opinions and other legal memoranda. Represented the Department in administrative hearings before the Administrative Law Judges of the California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and the State Personnel Board. Acted as Special Prosecutor for the San Diego County District Attorney's Office, representing the county in tax fraud matters. Tried cases involving tax assessments imposed against employers and handled appeals from decisions. Assisted Attorney General's Office in Writs of Mandamus actions Negotiated settlements regarding tax assessments.

JULY 1992 - JULY 1994

Administrative Law Judge - Limited Term

California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board | Sacramento, CA

Presided over and conducted hearings in connection with unemployment insurance benefit claims, tax assessments and disability insurance benefit claims. Conducted pre-hearing conferences, administered oaths, issued subpoenas and instructed hearing participants as to their rights. Questioned witnesses, received evidence, ruled on objections, set hearings, ruled on continuances and prepared final written decisions.

FEBRUARY 1980 - JULY 1992

Staff Counsel- Senior Staff Attorney

California Employment Development Department, Legal Office | Sacramento, CA

Legal Research, Drafted Legal Memoranda, including opinions, briefs and appeals. Represented the Department in administrative hearings before the CUIAB, Administrative Law Judges of the CUIAB, State Personnel Board and Labor Department. Tried cases involving tax assessments. Formulated strategies based on in-depth legal research and precedent-setting arguments. Collaboratively coordinated discovery processes, including reviewing requests and complying in full with applicable requirements. Delivered timely, accurate, and actionable legal advice for personnel and tax cases Represented the Department in matters before the US Labor Department concerning issues relevant to allowable costs; Handled appeals from decisions; with actions including preparation of legal briefs, pleadings, and motions. Assisted Attorney General's Office regarding Writs of Mandamus

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

State Bar Conference of Delegates, State Bar Judicial Nominee Evaluation Commission, Sacramento County Bar Judicial Evaluation Committee; Wiley Manual Bar Association, Sacramento County Bar Association, California Assoc. of Black Lawyers; Women Lawyers of Sacramento, NAACP, Life Member; Women Lawyers of Sacramento; Federal Magistrate Selection Committee; Court Appointed Special Advocates Board of Directors; Junior League of Sacramento, National Coalition of 100 Black Women; Links International; Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., Eta Gamma Omega Chapter; NAACP, Life Member

Agenda Item 3
June Meeting Minutes

**AB 3121 TASK FORCE TO STUDY AND DEVELOP REPARATIONS
PROPOSALS FOR AFRICAN AMERICANS**

MEETING MINUTES
June 1, 2021, 10:00 A.M.
<https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121>

The inaugural meeting of the Task Force was conducted via Blue Jeans video and telephone conference at <https://primetime.bluejeans.com/a2m/live-event/wtzpbzcv>.

Members Present: Senator Steven Bradford, Dr. Amos Brown, Dr. Cheryl Grills, Lisa Holder, Assemblymember Reginald Jones-Sawyer, Jovan Scott Lewis, Kamilah V. Moore, Councilmember Monica Montgomery Steppe, Don Tamaki.

- 1. Welcome Remarks were presented by Attorney General Bonta, Secretary of State Weber and Governor Newsom.**
- 2. Task Force Members Oath of Office was administered by Department of Justice staff, Aisha Martin-Walton.**
- 3. DOJ Staff Introductions were made by Michael Newman, Senior Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Enforcement Section in the California Department of Justice.**
- 4. The newly inducted Task Force Members introduced themselves.**
- 5. Bagley-Keene Act and Overview of AB 3121**
 - The Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act was presented by Sarah Belton, Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 - Overview of AB 3121 was presented by Kanwalroop Kaur Singh, Deputy Attorney General
- 6. Chairperson and Vice Chairperson Selection**

The election of the positions of the Chair and Vice Chair was conducted by Ms. Belton.

The Task Force discussed having a gender balance between the Chair and Vice Chair. They also expressed interest in having the positions of Chair and Vice Chair be divided between a member of the Legislature and a member of the civil rights community. Member Bradford asked if by law two individuals may jointly hold the Vice Chairperson position. In response, Ms. Belton stated that by

statute, the Task Force must elect a Chair and Vice Chair, and two individuals jointly holding the Vice Chairperson may risk violating the Bagley Keene Act if they were to meet with the Chair.

MOTION: Member Bradford nominated Member Brown for Chairperson and the motion was second by Member Tamaki.

AYE: Bradford, Brown, Holder, Tamaki

NAE: Grills, Lewis, Steppe, Moore, Jones-Sawyer

The motion failed.

MOTION: Member Lewis nominated Member Moore for Chairperson and the motion was second by Member Steppe.

AYE: Lewis, Grills, Holder, Jones-Sawyer, Steppe, Moore, Tamaki

NAE: Bradford, Brown

The motion passed and Member Moore was elected as the new Chairperson.

MOTION: Member Bradford nominated Member Brown as the Vice Chairperson and it was second by Member Grills.

AYE: Bradford, Brown, Grills, Lewis, Holder, Steppe, Tamaki

NAE:

ABSTAIN: Jones-Sawyer, Moore

The motion passed and Member Brown was elected as the new Vice Chairperson.

7. Expert Testimony

Testimony was presented by A. Kirsten Mullen and William Darity. The presentation provided a general description of what may constitute reparations.

8. BREAK

9. Meeting and Hearing Logistics

Xiyun Yang, Deputy Attorney General of the DOJ presented on a number of Task Force logistics.

Issue 1: the staff recommended that the report be issued in two parts. Part one of the report would be published June 1, 2022. Part 2 of the report would be published by July 1, 2023. The following topics would be included in Part 1:

- Institution of Slavery
- Racial Terror
- Disenfranchisement
- Housing Segregation
- Education Inequality
- Environmental Inequality

- Arts and Culture
- Family
- Health
- Discrimination in Labor
- Criminal Justice
- Gap in Wealth Accumulation

The following topics would be included in Part 2:

- Apology
- International Law Justification
- Economic Rationale
- Eligibility
- Summary of Existing Reparations Schemes
- Recommendations
- How to Educate the California Population

Ms. Yang recommended that the Task Force approve the report in two-parts.

MOTION: Member Steppe moved for approval of the staff recommendation. It was second by Member Holder.

The Task Force discussed whether a two-part report would prevent a sufficient discussion on remedies. Certain members expressed a concern that there may be too much time spent on collecting data. The Task Force generally agreed that extensive efforts must be undertaken to ensure that the information is fulsome and accurate. Members expressed the great need to educate and persuade the public. The Task Force expressed the desire to hear from everyone, generate excitement, but also demonstrate the harm experienced by African Americans. Certain members expressed their belief that if the first part thoroughly articulates the harm, the second part will be easy.

Chair Moore requested that Ms. Belton state the motion. Ms. Belton stated that the motion was to accept the staff recommendation to issue the report in two parts, as presented.

MOTION: Member Steppe moved for approval of the staff recommendation. It was second by Member Holder.

AYE: Steppe, Holder, Brown, Grills, Jones-Sawyer, Lewis, Tamaki, Moore

NAE:

NOT VOTING: Bradford

The motion was adopted.

Ms. Yang presented the overall meeting schedule, which proposed 10 meetings and included the themes that would be covered at each meeting. The proposed meeting schedule was provided as follows:

- Meeting 1 (June 2021): Reparations 101

- Meeting 2 (August 2021): The Roots of Systemic Racism, Institution of Slavery, Political Participation, Racial Terror
- Meeting 3 (October 2021): Government Segregation in Housing and Education; Housing Segregation, Education, Environmental Justice
- Meeting 4 (December 2021): Dehumanization of Black Americans; Arts and Culture, Health and Family
- Meeting 5 (Mid-Feb 2022): One Country, Two Systems; Criminal Justice
- Meeting 6 (Mid-March 2022): The Black and White Wealth Gap; Accumulation of Wealth, Banking, Labor
- Meeting 7 (Summer 2022): Potential Extra Meeting as Needed
- Meeting 8 (August/September 2022): Truth and Reconciliation; Apology and Precedents
- Meeting 9 (October/November 2022): Into the Future of California; Proposals for Reconciliation
- Meeting 10 (Summer 2023): Presentation and Approval of Second Report

Ms. Yang recommended that the Task Force approve the above 10-meeting schedule, including the discussed topics and proposed meeting dates.

There was significant discussion among the Task Force about the themes that were presented in the staff report. Some members were concerned that certain topics were missing. Chair Moore requested that DOJ provide its understanding of the discussion. Ms. Belton indicated that it was her understanding that the Task Force did not want to further consider the DOJ proposal for public hearings.

Member Tamaki hoped that the Task Force could make changes to the staff recommendation and not reject it outright. A similar view was shared by other Task Force members.

Task Force members questioned whether it was possible to hold more than 10 meetings. Ms. Belton indicated that she would have to check this issue internally. She also indicated that she was not prepared to provide an interpretation of the governing statute that the Task Force could hold more than 10 meetings. Member Grills also asked for clarification on per diem for Task Force members versus payment for attending meetings, as there may be misconceptions. Ms. Belton clarified that Task Force members are only entitled to reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem, and do not receive other compensation for their service.

Ms. Yang clarified that the staff public meeting plan included five meetings on systemic racism, four meetings on reparations, and one undesignated meeting. She further stated that one to two hours of discussion on reparations in each meeting is possible, and that the Task Force may vote to hold two-day Task Force meetings. Ms. Yang summarized her understanding of what the Task Force was considering: whether or not to direct staff to analyze whether the Task Force may hold more than 10 meetings and whether or not to adopt the staff recommendation with the understanding that the staff would work with Chair Moore on witnesses, agenda, and meeting schedules.

After a long discussion, motions were made as follows:

Chair Moore suggested an alternative that the Task Force vote down the timeline suggested by the DOJ. The Task Force could then create its own framework in a public emergency meeting which could happen tomorrow or this week or this weekend. She suggested that the DOJ schedule a public meeting as soon as possible in July for public discussion on the themes and contents of the two-part report and the public hearings.

Ms. Belton advised that there may not be a strong legal basis for an emergency meeting under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. She reminded the Task Force that the schedule presented was not cast in stone.

MOTION: Member Tamaki moved that the Task Force approve the proposed schedule presented by DOJ knowing that there is flexibility to modify as we go along which would in turn allow a future meeting for additional discussion.

Member Grills proposed an amendment to the motion that the next meeting of the Task Force should be used to create an agreed understanding of what the essential issues are.

The motion by Member Tamaki was not voted upon.

MOTION: Member Lewis moved that the unplanned meeting be scheduled for the August as a plenary meeting and the rest of the meetings be pushed back.

The motion by Member Lewis was not voted upon.

Member Holder suggested that in order to be efficient, the themes be reviewed and decided upon by the Task Force in sufficient time for additional staff being hired by DOJ in July to have an opportunity to get started working on the Task Force themes right away.

Ms. Belton advised the Task Force that while hiring is currently underway, it is unlikely that the process and the selection of DOJ staff would occur by July 1.

Chair Moore summarized that she felt there were two motions that could be voted upon. One motion was to leave the themes as is and the second motion was to hold a public meeting prior to August and restructure the themes.

Member Tamaki expressed that he made his motion based on the flexibility in the DOJ recommendation and did not want to slow the process down. He further stated that if the consensus of the Task Force was to have a meeting prior to August, then he would withdraw his motion.

MOTION: Member Holder moved that the meeting currently scheduled for August be moved up to July, with sufficient time for public notice. The purpose of that meeting would be to review and modify the themes and categories presented thus far. The motion was second by Member Grills.

AYE: Holder, Grills, Tamaki, Lewis, Brown, Steppe, Moore

NAE:

NOT VOTING: Jones-Sawyer, Bradford

The motion was adopted.

Ms. Yang asked whether the July meeting would be plenary, and Member Holder confirmed. Ms. Yang presented a list of the expert witnesses with whom the DOJ staff has been working requested that the Task Force ratify their work. The following is a list of the experts was presented:

- Professor Darity and Ms. Mullen will provide general guidance.
- Professor Stacey L. Smith will provide guidance on the institution of slavery, including California.
- Professor Marne L. Campbell will provide guidance on all discriminatory laws, policies and practices of discrimination in California and at the federal level.

Members Lewis and Grills stated that as academicians they had no problems with the experts proposed by DOJ, provided that the Task Force could add experts if desired.

MOTION: Member Holder moved that the three sets of scholars that DOJ has currently contracted to work on these issues continue with their work. The motion was second by Member Grills.

AYE: Holder, Grills, Tamaki, Lewis, Brown, Jones-Sawyer, Moore.

NAE:

NOT VOTING: Bradford, Steppe

The motion was adopted.

The Task Force generally discussed other topics that could be examined in the July meeting. Some of the topics included:

- Forms of reparations
- Qualification/eligibility for reparations
- Economic empowerment
- Health
- Restoration of historic Black watering holes
- Classes (scale) of culpability: states/universities/corporations
- Highly symbolic forms of reparations
- Public-facing role of Task Force-messaging
- Dehumanization of Black Americans/Arts and Culture/Health and Family—unpack
- Mental Health
- Repair: identity, community safety net
- Education: revising curriculum
- Infrastructure: food insecurity, broadband

10. Public Comment

There were approximately 21 public comments. Public comments centered around making sure the work of the Task Force includes outreach and listening sessions and that the Task Force is responsive to community voices. Consideration should be given to holding meetings on Saturday. The Task Force should consider the provisions of H.R. 40. There were many expressions that reparation proposals focus on cash payments and eligibility. Commenters pointed to the need to stream meetings on social media platforms, discuss the definition of reparations and include people who bore the brunt of the abuse. Commenters urged the Task Force to consider homelessness, mental health, and corrective justice.

11. Closing Remarks/Adjournment

Chair Moore gave closing remarks that ended at approximately 4:15 p.m.

Agenda Item 4
Open Discussion of Community Engagement
(Summary of Feedback and Ideas from Task Force Members)

- Defining the “community” in the community engagement plan
 - Core constituencies
 - Coalition building
 - Amplification
- Member presentations
- Additional considerations
 - Enlisting external partners
 - Methods of community engagement
 - Listening Sessions
 - Crafting communication and education efforts
 - Additional technical support needed?

Agenda Item 5:
Procedural Options for Weighing Evidence
(Summary of Feedback and Ideas from Task Force Members)

- I. Oral Testimony
- Option 1: Incorporate into written report.
 - Option 2: Post written version of oral testimony on AB 3121 website.
 - Additional Options?
- II. Written Comments (proposals and testimony submitted via Reparations email address)
- Option 1: Summary digest sent to Task Force members for review before each meeting, staff makes preliminary determination of substance.
 - Option 2: All comments, proposals, and testimony sent to Task Force members for review before each meeting, staff makes no preliminary determination of substance.
 - Option 3: Append to written report.
 - Option 4: Post on AB 3121 website.
 - Additional Options?
- III. Public Comment
- Option 1: Task force members receive public comment.
 - Option 2: Task force members receive public comment and staff incorporate a summary into meeting minutes.
 - Additional Options?
- IV. Telephone Calls to DOJ
- Option 1: Summary digest sent to Task Force members for review before each meeting, staff makes preliminary determination of substance.
 - Option 2: All comments sent to Task Force members for review before each meeting, staff makes no preliminary determination of substance.
 - Additional Options?
- V. Task Force Member Input
- Option 1: Forward all emails in reasonable real time
 - Option 2: Summary emails every 1 week? 2 weeks? Month? Before every Task Force meeting?
- VI. Reading Materials (before every meeting)
- Option 1: Staff sends suggested bibliography.
 - Option 2: Staff sends prepared testimony of witnesses.
 - Additional Options?

VII. Synthesis of Evidence (after each hearing)

- Option 1: Staff drafts potential conclusions as a starting point for a discussion of conclusions to be adopted at the end of every public hearing. Conclusions adopted by the Task Force are then included in the respective section of the appropriate written report. For example: Evidence shows that housing segregation in the United States of America and the State of California resulted from the laws and policies of the United States, Californian, and local governments, and continues to contribute to the wealth gap between white and Black Americans.
- Option 2: Staff does not draft potential conclusions for adoption.
- Option 3: Task Force members submit written conclusions to staff by a date certain after each meeting for staff to synthesize and present at the following meeting. Conclusions adopted by the Task Force are then included in the respective section of the appropriate written report.
- Additional Options?

Agenda Item 7
Public Hearing Schedule

I. Public Hearing Limitations

In developing possible themes for meetings, the Task Force should consider the following limitations: 1) 10 public hearings total, with 8 remaining; 2) each hearing lasts one 8-hour work day; and 3) each meeting includes 2 hours of Task Force questions and comments, with a 1-hour break for lunch, 4) one 15-minute break, and one hour of public comment. Additionally, part one of the report, focused on systemic racism, must be published by June 1, 2022. All public hearings pertaining to systemic racism should take place with sufficient time to be incorporated into the first report. Part two of the report, focused on reparations, will be published by July 1, 2023. All public hearings pertaining to reparations should take place with sufficient time to be incorporated into the second report. The Task Force may decide to hold two day meetings.

The following are samples of one- and two-day schedules of a potential public hearing.

II. Sample One-Day Hearing Schedule

- **September 2021 – The Roots of Systemic Racism: Institution of Slavery, Political Participation, Racial Terror**
 - Logistics 9:00 am – 9:20 am
 - i. Approval of July Minutes (10 mins)
 - ii. Task Force approves witness list for October Meeting (10 mins)
 - Witness Panel 9:30 am – 11:30 am
 - i. **Expert Testimony (ET): History Professor (30 mins)**
 - 1. Name: [TBD]
 - 2. Testimony subject: Institution of slavery and slavery as the creation of racist thought and ideas and how that pervades through our nation’s past and present legal, economic, cultural and government systems and personal relationship to slavery.
 - ii. **Personal Testimony (PT) 1 (15 mins)**
 - 1. Name: [TBD]
 - 2. Bio: A California resident with personal or family experience with Klan violence living in Los Angeles or other urban center.
 - 3. Testimony subject: Racial violence in California and personal relationship to slavery.
 - iii. **Personal Testimony (PT) 2 (15 mins)**
 - 1. Name: [TBD]
 - 2. Bio: A California resident who has personally experienced the criminalization of political participation, possibly as it relates to the Black Panther Party.
 - 3. Testimony subject: Criminalization of Black political participation and personal relationship to slavery.
 - iv. Task Force Comments and Questions (1 hr)
 - Lunch 11:30 am – 12:30 pm
 - Witness Panel 12:30 pm – 2:30 pm
 - i. **Expert Testimony (ET): History Professor (20 min)**
 - 1. Testimony subject: the history of racial violence in California, the history of the KKK in law enforcement and personal relationship to slavery.
 - ii. **Expert Testimony (ET): Public Policy Professor (20 min)**
 - 1. Testimony Subject: Legislative policy fixes to address political participation and personal relationship to slavery.
 - iii. **Expert Testimony (ET): Voting Rights Expert Activist (20 min)**
 - 1. Testimony Subject: Practical experience of community organizing to expand the number of Black voters and potential legislative policy

fixes to address political participation and personal relationship to slavery.

iv. Task Force Comments and Questions (1 hr)

- Break 2:30 pm – 2:45 pm
- Public Comment 3:45 pm – 4:45 pm
- Chair/Vice-Chair Closing Remarks 4:45 pm – 5 pm

III. Sample Two-Day Hearing Schedule

- **September 2021 – The Roots of Systemic Racism: Institution of Slavery, Political Participation, Racial Terror (2 Days)**
 - Day 1 Hearing Topic
 - i. Institution of Slavery
 - Day 1 Agenda
 - i. Logistics (20 mins)
 - 1. Approval of July Minutes
 - 2. Task Force approves witness list for October Meeting
 - ii. Personal Testimony Panel (2 hrs)
 - 1. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 1**
 - 2. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 2**
 - 3. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 3**
 - 4. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 4**
 - 5. Task Force Comments and Questions
 - iii. Lunch (1 hr)
 - iv. Expert Testimony Panel (2 hrs)
 - 1. Expert Testimony (ET) Witness 1**
 - 2. Expert Testimony (ET) Witness 2**
 - 3. Expert Testimony (ET) Witness 3**
 - 4. Task Force Comments and Questions
 - v. Public Comment (1 hour)
 - Day 2 Hearing Topics
 - i. Racial Terror
 - ii. Political Participation
 - Day 2 Agenda
 - i. Personal Testimony Panel (2 hrs)
 - 1. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 1**
 - 2. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 2**
 - 3. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 3**
 - 4. Personal Testimony (PT) Witness 4**
 - 5. Task Force Comments and Questions
 - ii. Lunch (1 hr)
 - iii. Expert Testimony Panel (2.5 hrs)
 - 1. Expert Testimony (ET) Witness 1**
 - 2. Expert Testimony (ET) Witness 2**
 - 3. Expert Testimony (ET) Witness 3**
 - 4. Task Force Comments and Questions
 - iv. Public Comment (1 hour)
 - v. Chair/Vice-Chair Closing Remarks (15 min)

ONE DAY MEETING PLANNING WORKSHEET

The following are worksheets to guide the Task Force members in planning and identifying the topic areas you would like Personal Testimony (PT) witnesses and Expert Testimony (ET) witnesses to cover at each hearing, given the time limitations.

Sample Topic: Slavery, Voting, Racial Terror

<i>PT 1 KKK violence</i>	<i>ET 1 history prof. (slavery)</i>	<i>ET 3 public policy prof.</i>
<i>PT 2 voting rights or descendent of slave in CA</i>	<i>ET 2 history prof. (terror)</i>	<i>ET 4 voting rights litigator</i>

Meeting 3 (September 2021) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 4 (October 2021) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 5 (December 2021) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 6 (Mid-Feb. 2022) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 7 (Mid-March 2022) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 8 (August/September 2022) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 9 (October/November 2022) Topic:

PT 1	ET 1	ET 3
PT 2	ET 2	ET 4

Meeting 10 (May 2023)

Presentation and Approval of Second Report

TWO DAY MEETING WORKSHEET

Meeting 3 (September 2021) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 4 (October 2021) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 5 (December 2021) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 6 (Mid-Feb. 2022) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 7 (Mid-March 2022) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 8 (August/September 2022) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 9 (October/November 2022) Topic:

PT 1	PT 3	PT 5	ET 1	ET 3	ET 5	ET 7
PT 2	PT 4	PT 6	ET 2	ET 4	ET 6	ET 8

Meeting 10 (May 2023)

Presentation and Approval of Second Report

Below, the left column lists the topics that the Task Force brainstormed and proposed on June 1, 2021. The right column lists the topics proposed by the DOJ.

Topics Proposed by Task Force on June 1	Written Report Section Topics, Including Those Mandated by AB 3121 (in bold)
Report 1 (Due June 1, 2022)	
Education: revising curriculum	Education
Infrastructure: food insecurity, broadband	Housing Segregation
Dehumanization of Black Americans/Arts and Culture/Health and Family--unpack	Arts and Culture
Health	Health (including Mental health)
Mental Health	Family
Economic empowerment	Gap in Wealth Accumulation (Banking)
	Institution of Slavery
	Criminal Justice
	Racial Terror
	Environmental Justice
	Discrimination in Labor
	Political Participation
Report 2 (Due July 1, 2023)	
Forms of reparations	Examples of Other Reparations Schemes (international and domestic)
Qualification/eligibility for reparations	Eligibility
Highly symbolic forms of reparations	What Form of Reparations and How Will It Be Calculated?
Restoration of historic Black watering holes	Framework of Reparations Scheme – State v. Federal
Repair: identity, community safety net	Framework of Reparations Scheme – Reparations for what?
Classes (scale) of culpability: states/universities/corporations	Economic Rationale of Reparations
Public-facing role of Task Force; messaging	Ways to educate the California public
	Apology
	Legal Justification of Reparations (international protocols)

On June 1, 2021, the Department of Justice AB 3121 Task Force staff proposed the following meeting themes based on background research, including reviews of articles, books, journal publications, empirical studies, and case law; discussions with numerous academic scholars in law, history, economics and public policy; and with the support of the doctorate researchers in the DOJ's Research Center.

- Meeting 3 (September 2021): The Roots of Systemic Racism: Institution of Slavery, Political Participation, Racial Terror
- Meeting 4 (October 2021): Government Segregation in Housing and Education: Housing Segregation, Education, Environmental Justice
- Meeting 5 (December 2021): Dehumanization of Black Americans: Arts & Culture, Health and Family
- Meeting 6 (Mid-Feb. 2022): One Country, Two Systems: Criminal Justice
- Meeting 7 (Mid-March 2022): The Black and White Wealth Gap: Accumulation of Wealth, Banking, Labor
- Meeting 8 (August/September 2022): Truth and Reconciliation: Apology and Precedents
- Meeting 9 (October/November 2022): Into The Future of California: Proposals for Reconciliation (Sacramento)
- Meeting 10 (May 2023): Presentation and Approval of Second Report

These potential meeting themes have been developed to include all twelve sections of the written report while considering time limitations noted above.

These themes were presented in this thematic order to develop the following evidence: The institution of slavery created and maintained a belief system of white supremacy. In order to sustain the institution and the benefits that inured to the United States from slavery even after emancipation, the United States and its government leaders developed and perpetuated racist ideas about the comparative inferiority of African Americans. These ideas were disseminated and amplified by now debunked scientists, medical practitioners, educators and mainstream culture, fueling and, at times, excusing racial terror and violence against African Americans. This racialized terrorism suppressed political participation and intensified government-instituted and government-maintained segregation in housing and education. The public systems and institutions developed by the United States during slavery and the lengthy period of apartheid that followed continues in similar form today, perpetuating racism and inequity in education, health, housing, policing, and criminal justice. These racist systems continue to compound inequities in wealth accumulation originally caused by government systems of slavery, segregation, and discrimination. Fixing one system correctly demands a deep understanding of how all systems fit together.

Quick Reference Sheet: Making a Motion in a Meeting

Often, people are unsure of how to make a motion during a meeting and how to carry it to resolution. Hopefully, this quick reference guide will make this process easier for anyone needing assistance in this area.

Procedure For Handling A Main Motion Vote

Making a Motion is how you introduce a proposal to the body for the purpose of having it approved for action.

If no one has the floor:

- A member raises hand
- The Chair recognizes the member by name
- The member makes the motion: “I move that (or "to") ...
- Another member seconds the motion: “I second the motion” (or) “I second it” (or) “second”.
- The Chair states the motion: “It is moved and seconded that ...”

If someone has the floor:

- A member raises hand
- The Chair will recognize the member by name in the order that hands were raised.
- The member makes the motion: “I move that (or "to") ...
- Another member seconds the motion: “I second the motion” (or) “I second it” (or) “second”.
- The Chair states the motion: “It is moved and seconded that ...” (repeat the exact wording of the motion as made)

Are you ready for discussion? Consideration of the Motion

- Members can discuss or debate the motion.
- Before speaking, member must obtain the floor, by raising hand.
- Normally, the Chair turns to the maker of the motion to ask if he or she wishes to be recognized (speak)
- The Chair will recognize the member by name, in order that hands were raised.
- (except the maker of the motion), who has first right to the floor if she/he claims it properly.
- The discussion/debate must be confined to the merits of the motion.
- In debate, each member has a right to speak, but must be recognized by the Chair.

Quick Reference Sheet: Making a Motion in a Meeting

- The discussion can be closed or ended by a vote of the Task Force members, with a 2/3 vote, with a member moving the previous question (i.e., you think discussion has gone on for too long and you'd like to stop the discussion. See below);
- or by the Chair, if no one seeks the floor for further debate/discussion.

The Chair puts the motion to a vote

- The Chair asks: "Is there any further discussion" OR "Are you ready for the question?" If no one rises to claim the floor (objects), the Chair proceeds to take the vote.
- The Chair says: The question is on the adoption of the motion that ... The vote will be by roll call, when not meeting in person;
- Those who are in favor, say 'Aye'
- Those opposed, say 'Nay'
- Those who are not voting, abstain from voting, and say 'I abstain'
- The Staff person calls the roll and takes down the vote; and, following the vote, provides the vote to the Chair

The Chair announces the result of the vote, saying:

- The ayes have it, the motion carries, and ... (indicating the effect of the vote) or
- The nays have it and the motion fails

Action On A Motion

Before the Task Force can consider a new motion, the Task Force must dispose of the current motion.

- A main motion must be seconded before any action can be taken on that motion. If it is not seconded, it fails, and the Chair moves on to the next agenda item.
- If it is seconded, you handle it as previously discussed.
- Before it is seconded, the maker of the motion can withdraw it or amend it.
- Once it is seconded, it belongs to the body, and the body can:
 - Vote on the motion
 - Withdraw the motion
 - Amend the motion or
 - Table the motion

When the meeting is held virtually, the vote must be by roll call.

Quick Reference Sheet: Making a Motion in a Meeting

How To Accomplish What You Want To Do In Meetings

Main motion

- You want to propose a new idea or action for the group.
- After recognition, make a main motion.
- Member: "Madam Chair, I move that _____."

Amending a motion

- You want to change some of the wording that is being discussed.
- After recognition, "Madam Chair, I move that the motion be amended by adding the following words _____."
- After recognition, "Madam Chair, I move that the motion be amended by striking out the following words _____."
- After recognition, "Madam Chair, I move that the motion be amended by striking out the following words, _____, and adding in their place the following words _____."

Postpone definitely

- You want the membership to have more time to consider the question under discussion and you want to postpone it to a definite time or day, and have it come up for further consideration.
- After recognition, "Madam Chair, I move to postpone the question until _____."

Previous question

- You think discussion has gone on for too long and you want to stop discussion and vote.
- After recognition, "Madam Chair, I move the previous question."
 1. Closes debate immediately
 2. Must be seconded
 3. Must be adopted by a 2/3 vote

Quick Reference Sheet: Making a Motion in a Meeting

Arrival And Departure Announcements

Quorum

The presence of a quorum shall be established by roll call at the beginning of the meeting.

Arrival

Members who participate in a virtual meeting shall announce themselves at the first opportunity after joining the meeting.

Departure

Members who leave the meeting before adjournment, shall announce their departure. Upon their return to the meeting, they shall announce their presence.