

**January Meeting Minutes**

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

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**January 28, 2022, 9:00 A.M.**  
**<https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121>**

15. **Chairperson Kamilah Moore** reconvened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. and welcomed everyone To day two of the January AB 3121 hearing.

**Chair Moore** called for a roll call attendance to establish a quorum. **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll. Members present were Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, and Member Montgomery-Steppe

Five members were needed for a quorum, there were nine members present and a quorum was established.

**Chair Moore** welcomed the Task Force and members of the public to the second day of the January 2022 hearing. Chair Moore reviewed the topics for discussion as a focus on Discrimination in Technology, Physical Health, Mental Health, and Public Health.

Chair Moore then turned the meeting over to Aisha Martin-Walton for the Public Comment.

16. **Public Comment**

**Aisha Martin-Walton** provided directions for public comment. There were 20 comments. Public comments reflected individuals, community organizations, businesses and educators in support of reparations. The comments are summarized as follows: Community Engagement listening should sessions be virtual and that anchor organizations should not charge \$40.00. Reparations were discussed by the National Coalition of Blacks for Reparations in America (NCOBRA) who mentioned that it published a HARM Report in 2021 advising the need to address wealth and poverty, criminal punishment, education and health. Dr. Shirley Weber, the author of AB 3121 made the statute's legislative intent clear. Professor William Darity and Kirsten Mullen are the leading and foremost experts on Reparations and should seriously be considered for the Task Force's Economics Team. John Rochester, the author of the Black Tax should also be considered. More Black mental health therapists are needed to address issues of trauma and self-hatred sometimes due to micro aggressions and mental and physical attacks imposed on Blacks by whites over many years. Blacks are seeking self-governance. The calculation for Reparations should be done by those who have experience in making calculations. One commenter stated that it would be hurtful to not be considered eligible to receive reparation payments because she is an immigrant. Individuals who are not residents of California should refrain from calling in to make public comments. The California Council on Behavioral Health supports the work on Reparations. Trauma from job discrimination is real. Reparations should include compensation, rehabilitation, restitution and no repetition. Reparations should be to correct harms to business, income, housing, debt healthcare and childcare Reparations could be funded in several ways,

such as public and private money with a management that oversees subsidiary funds run by a city or county or capitalized appropriations from tax deductible donations and pledges from corporations like CALPERS and CALSTRS. The funds could be managed by a firm with subsidiary funds and collect 1.2-3% in fees. The funds could be rolling or closed end. The fund would receive 20% on returns and expansion.

**Chair Moore** introduced each panelist prior, preceding their testimony.

## 17. **Witness Panel #3 Mental Health**

### a. **Expert Testimony: Enola Aird**

**ENOLA G. AIRD** (pronounced Air-d) is founder and president of Community Healing Network (CHN), an organization building a global grassroots movement to help black people overcome and overturn the root causes of the devaluing of Black lives, of white superiority, and Black inferiority. CHN has put in place key elements of the movement including Emotional Emancipation Circles and the annual Valuing Black Lives Global Emotional Emancipation Summit. As a former corporate lawyer, Aird has worked at the Children’s Defense Fund, leading its violence prevention initiative and serving as acting director of its Black Community Crusade for Children. She is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Barnard College and earned her law degree from Yale University. She was born in the Republic of Panama, is of Caribbean heritage, and attributes much of her vision and passion for the movement for emotional emancipation to stories passed down in her family about her great-grandfather, Samuel Alleyne, a loyal follower of Marcus Garvey.

**Dr. Aird’s** testimony centered around the origin of the “The Big Lie” of white superiority and Black inferiority that essentially casts Africans out of the circle of humanity allowing the continuous degradation and oppression of Black people for more than 600 years around the world and 400 years in the United States. The seeds of the “The Big Lie” were first planted by the writings of Zarara, a royal scribe in the Portuguese courts. He described Africans as beasts with no knowledge of bread and wine, without covering of clothes and worst of all, with no understanding of good. For many Europeans, this “Lie” helped to resolve the inherent contradictions between Christianity and the enslavement of human beings. For white Americans, this “Lie” resolved the inherent contradictions between enslavement and the idea of equality set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Every institution of the western world supported “The Big Lie” with unspeakable acts of terror and violence. This belief adversely shaped the world’s perception of Black people and often the perception of ourselves. “The Big Lie” of white superiority and Black inferiority is embedded in the culture and psyche of white people and is very much alive today. It continues to promote self-loathing of Black people and undermines the individual and collective sense of self-worth and still permeates harm day after day. “The Big Lie” fosters an environment that contains the human spirit and robs it of possibilities. As a result of the manifestations of racism, Black people have a history of mental and physical trauma. The American Pediatric Association concluded that stress generated by experiences of racism may start in utero and may continue after birth with the potential to create toxic stress resulting in short and long term health impacts with the subsequent development of heart disease, diabetes, and depression. Government needs to develop transformative initiatives that covers the knowledge, depth, and breath of the emotional harm caused by generational racism. Black people need emotional emancipation and emotional reparations to repair the emotional damage caused by the harm of “The Big Lie”

**b. Expert Testimony: Dr Theopia Jackson**

**DR. THEOPIA JACKSON (pronounced Thee-O-pia)** is a licensed clinical psychologist who received her master's degree in clinical psychology from Howard University, Washington DC, and her doctorate from the Wright Institute in Berkeley, California. Dr. Jackson is a past president for The Association of Black Psychologists, Inc. (ABPsi) and for the Bay Area chapter. She is currently the Chair of the Clinical Psychology degree program at Saybrook University, Pasadena, California. Dr. Jackson has a long history of providing child, adolescent, and family therapy services, specializing in serving populations coping with chronic illness and complex trauma. Dr. Jackson is a co-founder for the Therapist-in-Residency Program (TnRP) in Oakland, CA; an African-centered program dedicated to supervising Black clinicians-in-training in providing services grounded in Black psychology for persons of African ancestry. Additionally, she provides training for persons of African ancestry in Emotional Emancipation Circles SM a community-defined practice that is a collaboration between the Community Healing Network, Inc.

**Dr. Jackson** shared the thought provoking message that the field of mental health is rooted in racism and its system serves as a source of discrimination for people of color. The historic admission and apology from the APA (American Psychiatric Association) for its past action of early psychological practices that laid the groundwork for the appalling inequities in clinical treatment are ingrained in the structure of the practice and continue to do harm. People of African descent are still being victimized by these harmful effects today. The systems of oppression within the health industry provide fuel to trauma and ethnic identity. Dr. Jackson also discusses the impacts of Cultural Trauma, Historical Trauma, Inter-Generational Trauma, and Racial Trauma as well as the atrocities that occurred during enslavement. Even though it happened in the past, it is still living in our DNA and our spirit. This trauma is awakened, and the transfer of that pain can create what is considered to be a mental health issue. Medical and academic institutions can do their part to raise awareness of the negative impacts of racial discrimination, systemic racism, and health disparities through didactics and training that focus on diversity and cultural awareness. However, more specifically the ones who are leading the discourse must be the people themselves and our own communities. Professionals in this field should listen to the voice of the people. “Historically psychology has accepted whiteness as a standard or a norm and presented other modes of being as marginal, unnatural, or in some way straying from the norm”. Therefore, we must come together to leverage our authority in the decision-making during this historical moment to target the systems that do harm and to seek a general transformation of the mental health field.

**c. Expert Testimony: Dr Shawn O. Utsey**

**DR. SHAWN O. UTSEY (pronounced yout-see)** is a Professor of Psychology and Chair of African American Studies at Virginia Commonwealth University. His research interests are primarily in two areas, both of which are related to the psychology of the African-American experience. First is his interest in understanding how race-related stress impacts the physical, psychological, and social well-being of African-Americans. More recently, he has sought to examine how trauma is manifested in the victims of racial violence. Other areas of interest include examining the influence of African-American culture on indicators of health and well-being. Dr. Utsey has been recognized by the American Psychological Association, Division 45 and APAGS, for his work in the area of ethnic minority psychology and for his dedication and commitment as a mentor to students of African descent.

**Dr. Utsey** shared a model of historical trauma and its intergenerational transmission by citing that it is real and is based on the following: four hundred years of history of anti-Black racial violence; five Thousand African Americans lynched between 1865-1968 and most cases unsolved; few, if any prosecutions and even fewer convictions; African Americans remain the primary target of racial violence; the scarcity of research examining psychological trauma in relation to historical racial violence among African Americans; implications for individual and collective healing.

The legacy of slavery, through the collective lens of a shared traumatic experience continues to exact a heavy psychological and emotional toll on contemporary African Americans. The unrelenting terror and violence associated with slavery and Jim Crow segregation is part of the collective psyche of African Americans. Dr. Utsey also talked about the intergenerational transmission of racial trauma and its conceptional framework along with the resilience of African Americans who stayed and rebuilt their community after the Tulsa raid.

**d. Expert Testimony: Dr. Joy De Gruy**

**DR. JOY ANGELA DEGRUY** (pronounced de-groo) holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Communication, a Master's degree in Social Work (MSW), a Master's degree in Clinical Psychology, and a PhD in Social Work Research. Dr. DeGruy is a nationally and internationally renowned researcher and educator. For over two decades, she served as an Assistant Professor at Portland State University's School of Social Work and now serves as President and Chief Executive Officer of Joy DeGruy Publications Inc. (JPD).

**Dr. DeGruy's** research focuses on the intersection of racism, trauma, violence, and American chattel slavery. She has over thirty years of practical experience as a professional in the field of social work. She conducts workshops and trainings in the areas of intergenerational/historical trauma, mental health, social justice, improvement strategies and evidence based model development.

**Dr. DeGruy** shared the relationship between the current mental health status of people of African descent in America based on the impacts of historical events: After slavery officially ended, came peonage (a form of chattel slavery which is the unlawful selling of people back into slavery. This was happening until 1945. After peonage, came the Black Codes or Sundown laws and exclusionary acts. Everyone was free but you could not go just anywhere. Those Sundown laws and Sundown towns still exist today (Jena, Louisiana). Then came convict leasing (forced labor) which was disproportionately happening to Blacks. For example, Blacks were being charged with vagrancy, staring or looking menacingly at a white woman, which could carry a term of 15 years. 25% of the Blacks charged died while under the convict lease. Then came Jim Crow – Separate but Equal laws. Black lives were always separate but never equal. Everyone knows you are in the Black community when you start seeing check cashing establishments instead of banks. At the same time as Jim Crow, we also had Anti-Blackness organizations, there were lynching, and beatings of Black people and we still see that today. Then came Civil Rights (1954 – 1968) however, Anti-Blackness and racial terrorism did not stop. From there, Black people endured Serial Forced Displacement. Same premise discrimination was just given a new name. The initial names were unpleasant, so they changed the discrimination and segregation efforts to names like Redlining, Urban Renewal, and Curing Urban Blight. The newest term is called gentrification which is nothing but Serial Force Displacement. The data shows that when people are displaced over and over again, it results in

interpersonal and structural violence (you break my leg and then complain that I limp).

The physical difference between Black people and white people was used to justify slavery and are still believed by doctors today. A 2016 survey of 222 white medical students and residents published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences showed at least half of them endorsed the myth about the physiological differences between Black people and white people for example, Black people's nerve endings are less sensitive than white peoples. When asked to imagine how much pain Black or white people experienced in a hypothetical situation, the medical students and residents insisted that Blacks felt less pain. This gave license to providers to less likely recommend appropriate treatment for Blacks.

Additionally, there are myths being socialized that Blacks require less sleep, are dumb, are cowards, and are incapable of feeling grief. We see these beliefs in contemporary society, and it causes mental, emotional, and physical harm to Black people every day.

e. **Expert Testimony: Kristee Haggins**

**DR. KRISTEE HAGGINS (pronounced hay-gens)** has had a multifaceted career as a clinician, educator, consultant, trainer and university administrator. Currently, Dr. Haggins is an Associate Professor at California Northstate University and an Adjunct Professor at Alliant International University, Sacramento. Dr. Haggins has expertise in racial stress and trauma; African American mental health; multicultural psychology; and training and supervision. In addition to teaching graduate level courses, she provides workshops, training, and consultations in these areas nationally. Dr. Haggins serves on the Board of Directors for the California Black Health Network. Additionally, she has been appointed as the Association of Black Psychologists (ABPsi) representative to the Leadership Development Institute Advisory Board for the American Psychological Association (APA) Council of National Psychological Associations for the Advancement of Ethnic Minority Interests (CNPAAEMI).

**Dr. Kristee Haggins** opened her discussion by providing some historical facts regarding that state of America as it relates to racism:

- 40 out of 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence owned slaves.
- Under the Constitution, a slave was only counted as 3/5 of a free person.
- 10 of the first 12 Presidents of the United States owned slaves

Racism is a pandemic in itself. PTSS (Post Traumatic Slave Syndrome) along with the ongoing and never ending assault on Black people leaves a legacy of historical Black Racial Trauma. Dr. Erlanger Turner's specific definition the Black Racial Trauma includes experiencing psychological symptoms such as anxiety, hypervigilance, a threat, or lack of hopelessness for your future as a result of repeated exposure to racism or discrimination. PTSS is a condition that exists as a consequence of centuries of Chattel Slavery followed by institutional oppression, which results in a multi-generational adaptive behavior. There is some positive reflecting and resilience, and others that are harmful and destructive.

We need to understand the roots of slavery, the historical oppression, and being ripped from our homeland that resulted in:

- Generational Trauma
- Disrupted Family Systems
- Self-Hatred and Internalized Oppression
- Mistrust of Systems

The harm didn't end just because enslavement did. Reparations is about repairing the harm, correcting the historical wrongs, and realizing they exist in contemporary times.

In order to heal and repair from our perspective, we must reclaim our dignity and humanity as people of African ancestry and address the trauma directly.

**f. Expert Testimony: Dr. Howard Stevenson**

**DR. HOWARD C. STEVENSON** is a clinical and consulting psychologist and the Constance E. Clayton Professor of Urban Education and Professor of Africana Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. He is a nationally sought expert on how racial stress and racial trauma can affect every stage of life. His work focuses on how educators, community leaders, and parents can emotionally resolve face-to-face racially stressful encounters that reflect racial profiling in public spaces, fuel social conflicts in neighborhoods, and undermine student emotional well-being and academic achievement in the classroom. Dr. Stevenson has served for 30 years as a clinical and consulting psychologist working in impoverished rural and urban neighborhoods across the country.

**Dr. Stevenson** discussed his work on the ever pressing need for African Americans to be racially socialized. This means providing students and parents with the coping skills and strategies to be more prepared for racial hostilities they may encounter during the average school day or even throughout their lives.

Being prepared for racial hostility improves the self-regulation of racial stress, which improves racial confidence. The benefits of racial socialization have been linked to:

- Improved thinking and behavioral confidence in preschoolers.
- Greater youth self-esteem, anger management, racial identity, and academic achievement in both youths and adults.
- Increased parenting competence equates to a reduction in parenting racial worries (i.e., Racial Profiling).
- Better family racial communication.

This mindful approach to teach racial coping strategies to Read, Recast, and Resolve, racially motivated confrontations that will help to reframe the threats that often comes with unpredictable fear of racial hostility.

**g. Task Force Comments and Questions**

The question and answer session followed the witness testimony. The witnesses' oral/ written and or oral testimony can be found on <http://oag.ca.gov/ab3121>

## 18. Lunch

### Meeting Reconvened

**Chair Moore** called for a roll call attendance to re-establish a quorum. Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll: Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Grills, Member Scott-Lewis, Member Tamaki, and Member Montgomery-Steppe. Six members were present. Five members were needed for a quorum and a quorum was established.

## 19. Witness Panel #4 Physical Health

**Chair Moore** introduced each panelist prior to their testimony.

### a. Expert Testimony: Dr. Joan Kaufman

**DR. JOAN KAUFMAN** is Director of Research at the Center for Child and Family Traumatic Stress at Kennedy Krieger Institute. She also holds appointments in the Department of Psychiatry and the School of Public Health at Johns Hopkins. Dr. Kaufman received her Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from Yale University where she served on faculty in the Department of Psychiatry from 1998-2015. In 2015, she was recruited to Baltimore to serve as Director of Research at the Center for Child and Family Traumatic Stress at Kennedy Krieger Institute. She also holds an appointment as a Professor of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine and in the division of Mental Health at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Dr. Kaufman's research is in the area of child abuse and neglect, spans from neurobiology to social policy, and uses tools from psychology, genetics, and neuroscience to understand resilience and mechanisms of disease risk associated with early adversity. She has received consistent funding from the National Institute of Health for her research and has published over 100 peer-reviewed professional articles and book chapters.

**Dr. Kaufman** stated that it has already been established that personal experiences of trauma, adversity, and discrimination can get under the skin and increase the risk for a whole host of negative mental and physical outcomes. However, emerging research now also confirms the negative exposure in one generation can be passed down to affect the health and wellbeing of future generations through Transgenerational Epigenetic inheritance. The key concepts of Epigenetic modification is not gene mutation. It turns the off and on of how experiencing trauma can get under the skin. Grandchildren and Great Grandchildren can be negatively impacted by ancestral traumas even when they have not been directly exposed to a harm themselves.

Experiments show that offspring of prenatally multigenerational and transgenerational stressed mothers had developmental delays. For African Americans, adequate prenatal care does not reduce the disparities.

While most of the research to date has been conducted in animals, studies in humans have shown ancestors exposure to trauma, poor nutrition, and toxic chemicals can impact the health of descendants across several generations and some of the epigenetic modifications noted in animal studies have also been reported in humans.

Preliminary data suggest that the negative impact of ancestral traumas can be prevented with the assistance of trauma-informed services. However, true change and healing will require acknowledgment of the harms that were done and broader systemic policy change.

**b. Expert Testimony: Dr. Chris Kuzawa**

**Dr. CHRISTOPHER KUZAWA** (pronounced koo-za-wa) is a biological anthropologist with training in epidemiology. His research focuses on the role that the intrauterine and early postnatal environments have on development and long-term health. The premise of this research, supported by studies in both human populations and animal models, is that what a mother eats during pregnancy, her access to adequate prenatal care, or her level of stress, may permanently affect offspring biology in a fashion that influences risk for the most common causes of adult morbidity and mortality, including hypertension, diabetes, and heart attacks. This is a novel example of what is known as ‘developmental plasticity’, or the sensitivity of the developing body to the environment experienced during early stages of development. Dr. Kuzawa graduated from the University of Colorado at Boulder with a BA in anthropology, from Emory University with a PhD in anthropology and a MSPH in epidemiology. After conducting post-doctoral research in cardiovascular epidemiology at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Kuzawa joined the faculty of anthropology at Northwestern University in 2003, where he is also a Fellow of the Institute for Policy Research. He has long-standing interests in how social inequality affects biology and health, and he co-directs the Health Inequality Network of the Human Capital and Economic Opportunity Working Group.

**Dr. Kuzawa** began his testimony by saying that “Genes are not the cause of race-based health inequality in the United States”. This is because studies of genetic data verify that European and Asian generic data is a smaller subset of the original African variability. The European and Asian populations harbor subsets of the original genetic diversity that evolved from Africa 200 thousand years ago. Approximately 50-60 thousand years ago people migrated up the Nile and coast to Europe and Asia taking pockets of that gene variability with them. In other countries, people are categorized into groups. In the United States however, people are categorized into races. These groups or races are a product of local historical, political, and social forces and are not based on genetics. Therefore, race is a social construct not based on genetics. Although genes influence our traits, there is no evidence that they contribute to the race-based health inequality in the United States. However, one’s health and equality can be traced to:

- Income,
- Educational Opportunities
- Experiences of discrimination and Racism
- Health Care Access
- Neighborhood segregation
- Exposure to Pollution and Toxins
- Mass Incarceration

The chronic difference in experiences such as stress, opportunity, wages, health care, lead to race-based health disparities.

New evidence that experiences early in life (Intra utero infancy) can lead to durable biological



change that can also influence health across the life cycle.

Nutrition and exposure to prenatal psychosocial stress has similar effects on the fetus as being undernourished

In summary, maternal psychosocial and nutritional stressors lead to durable biological changes in offspring that elevate future risk for cardiovascular and other common diseases. The implication is that mothers' experiences of environmental stressors can have lingering impacts on adults' health and in their offspring. Nutrition and stress in pregnancy contribute to the United States race-related health inequality. The major health disparities in the United States are:

- **Disproportionate burden that occurs among African Americans:**
  - **In Early Life:**
    - Prematurity
    - Low Birth Weight
    - IUGR (Intrauterine Growth Rate)
  - **In Adulthood:**
    - Heart Attack
    - Stroke
    - Diabetes
    - Hypertension
    - Central Obesity

Evidence shows that Social and Economic factors such as education, residential segregation in neighborhoods, poverty, racism, and discrimination cause health disparities including low birth rates for African Americans in the United States.

**c. Expert Testimony: Nkem Ndefo**

**NKEM NDEFO** (pronounced **n-kim n-day-foe**) is the founder and president of Lumos Transforms and creator of The Resilience Toolkit, a model that promotes embodied self-awareness and self-regulation in an ecologically sensitive framework and social justice context. Licensed as a nurse midwife, Nkem also has extensive post-graduate training in complementary health modalities and emotional therapies. She brings an abundance of experience as a clinician, educator, consultant, and community strategist to innovative programs that address stress and trauma and build resilience for individuals, organizations, and communities across sectors, both in her home country (USA) and internationally. Nkem is particularly interested in working alongside people most impacted by violence and marginalization.

**Ms. Ndefo** focused her discussion regarding the racial trauma of Black people as it relates to the phenomenon of appeasement. Appeasement is any relational behavior designed to pacify an interpersonal threat. Appeasement is a culturally conditioned response to social hierarchy. It generally comes into play when there is a significant power difference. The person with less power is in survival mode and the stress defense response of Fight, Flight, or Freeze mode. Case in point, the ability of a white person who is pulled over by law enforcement for speeding and then arguing their case on site is not afforded to a Black person in this country. Even the latitude to simply run away is not given to African Americans. These cases are a cautionary tale of the damage done when expressing the biological driven Fight/Flight

response defense. In this context, we can see appeasement as a trauma response and survival strategy. Black people face racialized social and power hierarchies in the workplace, the classroom, and in the community. Racially based threats, intimidation, and negative assumptions are felt by Black people that go far beyond feeling hassled or irritated on a daily basis. This racialized trauma creates ongoing secretion of stress hormones, adrenaline, cortisol with the attendant rise of blood pressure and blood sugar leads to hypertension and diabetes. Appeasement can produce the physiological and dysregulation and dysfunction of widespread pathological changes in the immune system. As a result, we see excessive inflammatory cytokines autoimmunity and immune suppression. In the brain, there is decreased memory of all types of genetically accelerated cellular aging and life expectancy is shortened. Appeasement is compounded by the fact that escape is impossible. However, it is critical to understand when Black people engage in appeasement, it is because of the continued threat, trauma and abuse. For African Americans, the expressions of modesty, politeness, shyness, uncertainty, and deference may instead be an attempt to deflect or prevent aggression from white people. Essentially, these behaviors in the context of intergroup relations with the power of hierarchy associated with the privilege of white skin are expressions of appeasement and leads to exhaustion, chronic ill health across generations, demoralization, and the erosion of one's sense of dignity, and self-worth.

#### d. Task Force Comments and Questions

The question and answer session followed the witness testimony. The witnesses' written/oral testimony can be found on <http://oag.ca.gov/ab3121>

#### 20. Break

##### Meeting Reconvened

**Chair Moore** called for a roll call attendance to re-establish a quorum. **Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll: Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, and Member Montgomery-Steppe. Eight members were present. Five members were needed for a quorum and a quorum was established.

#### 21. Potential Action Item: Subpoena Request – Members Holder and Tamaki

**Members Holder and Tamaki** provided the following report on their continued research into the relevance of the Task Force using its subpoena power provided in AB 3121. They reported that they came up with a way to increase the impact of the Racial Justice Act effective January 1, 2022, by compelling courts and district attorney's offices to provide more data, transparency, and to have a more systematic collection of data around disparities, charging, sentencing, setting bail amounts, etc. This effort will reveal information that is relevant to the Task Force and will highlight historic and current examples of systemic racism in California.

After **Members Holder and Tamaki** selected the Racial Justice Act for this scope of work, part of their inquiry was to solicit experienced researchers and experts to determine what kinds of research data was already being collected and what could be done to assist in their current data collection efforts. **Members Holder and Tamaki** highlighted the Task Force's power under the legislation to subpoena and use other powers to compel the production of information from government entities and private parties and further shared the Task Force's mission with research

data collectors and asked for ideas on how they might be able to team on this work effort. They also reached out to the ACLU in the Public Defender's Office who was already working to effectuate the California's Racial Justice Act. They stated that this Act goes to the heart of mass incarceration. The Act states that "We can no longer accept racial discrimination and racial disparities as inevitable in our criminal justice system and we must act to make clear that this discrimination and these disparities are illegal and will not be tolerated in California".

The legislative intent of the Act is to ensure that individuals have access to all relevant evidence including statistical data in order to track disparities based upon race and ethnicity data. However, the data is tracked without tracking race or ethnicity data. This renders the Racial Justice Act meaningless and there would be no way to prove racial bias except in extreme blatant instances. As a result, District Attorneys have varied in their approaches to data collection and how the data can be accessed. Superior Courts are also collecting race and ethnicity data and two courts have refused to turn the data over.

**Members Holder and Tamaki** suggested that the next steps to move this effort forward will be to work with the DOJ Research Center to survey District Attorney's offices and the Courts of all 58 Counties in California and require them to disclose the data points that are tracked and not tracked in connection with arrests, bail charges, reductions, diversions, plea offers, dismissals of charges, strikes, convictions, acquittals, sentencing, etc. They will require the production of data that is being tracked and if they are not tracking the data, they will require responses from the District Attorney and the court as to whether they plan to track such data and if the answer is no, they will make that information public as part of the public record of the Task Force and available for researchers, policy makers and advocates so that this information will be around long after the Task Force term ends. They will work with communication consultants to educate the public and inform the press of the importance of the data collection. This is a feature of AB 3121 which allows the Task Force to compel this kind of evidence and under the guidance of the Department of Justice, not only are subpoenas available, but surveys are also available. With respect to state agencies such as County and Judicial Councils, which oversee the courts, they are required to respond to surveys.

Their first round of inquiry is to find out who is collecting the data and if they are not, why not. This can be a first step and is required to effectuate the Racial Justice Act and its meaning to then educate the public on issues of disparities, sentencing, and charging, etc.

One of the core missions of the Task Force is to disrupt mass criminalization and incarceration and to elevate the existence of the Racial Justice Act. This project also allows us to leverage our power to give the Racial Justice Act more teeth to legislation that seeks to disrupt mass incarceration and mass criminalization. This is an opportunity for the Task force will also be able to publicize a win for the community and to highlights some of the work the Task Force is doing. For example:

- Task Force First Report will be issued in June 2022
- **Member Grills'** leadership role on the Community Engagement Project on behalf of the Task Force
- The issuance of the Racial Justice Act Survey to the District Attorney's and Courts in 58 Counties
- The Task Force Final Report of 2023

**Next Steps:**

- **Member Jones Sawyer** and **Member Bradford** pledged to assist with the survey and to investigate. Their Legislative staff can assist as well.
- **Member Tamaki** added that **DOJ Attorney Michael Newman** will investigate ways to have the DOJ staff work with the Task Force to support the Racial Justice Act work effort. **Mr. Newman** will also look into and clarify ways that the Task Force can work with the legislative staffs, and work with those Task Force members who wish to be involved in a way that would comply with Bagley Keene, including the utilization of a subcommittee.
- **Member Tamaki** suggested continued work with **Member Grills** and the Communication Consultants of Community Engagement Project.

The Task Force approved this work to go forward at the December 8, 2021, Task Force meeting. The authority was placed with **Member Holder** to move forward. This concluded the report of the Advisory Committee's work to date. No action was taken on this item

**Chair Moore** moved **Agenda #25 Potential Action Item: Unfinished Business – 4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.** to follow Agenda item #21.

#### **Potential Action Item: Unfinished Business – 2 items for Discussion**

##### **Item 1- New Task Force Media Consultant**

To date, DOJ has been passing press inquiries to Chair Moore who either fielded them herself or tried to filter them to other Task force members. Two media consultant firms were recently hired as part of the Community Engagement agreement with the Bunche Center. Chair Moore asked the Task Force for a motion to move the media and press responsibility from herself to the newly hired Task Force Media Consultants. The Consultants would serve as the media resource for the Task Force and handle all press inquiries.

**MOTION: Vice Chair Brown** moved that all media inquiries be handled by the newly-hired Media Consultants who will coordinate the inquiries on behalf of the Task Force. **Member Tamaki** seconded the motion.

**Chair Moore** then called for the discussion:

**Member Grills** asked for clarification that does handling media requests mean they are going to manage and triage the requests to different Task Force members as well as give insights to the Task force members about the particular background information about the outlet seeking the interview? Will they not be the spokespersons for the Task Force because they feel it is better for Task force members to be the face? Will they help determine which is the best member to respond?

**Member Montgomery Steppe** asked if the Task Force members receive media requests outside of DOJ then it should be forwarded to the consultants and then they will disburse it? **Member Grills** suggested that she pose this question and find out from the media firms the best process. She will forward this information to DOJ who can then share it with the Task Force.

**Member Holder** asked if **Member Grills** could also ask the firms whether they will develop a set of talking points for the Task Force to use when speaking to the media and whether members should be speaking as an individual or in a collective body capacity using the talking points they

formulate?

**Member Grills** agreed to ask and added that the media consultant firms will be preparing packets of materials and information for consistency of message by the Community Engagement Plan Anchor organizations to use. **Member Grills** will ask if this package can also be used by the Task Force members or would they need a different package which they will prepare.

**Member Tamaki** reminded members that the talking points may need to vary depending on the topic or issue which could require input from members to help frame them.

Chair Moore asked member Grills if the Media Consultant representatives could attend a future Task Force meeting for introduction purposes and provide a report of their plan. **Member Grills** requested that it be placed on the agenda.

There were no more questions or discussion.

**Chair Moore** then called for **Parliamentarian Johnson** to take the vote:

**AYEs:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, Member Montgomery Steppe

**NAYs:** 0

**Not Voting:** Member Jones-Sawyer

There were 8 members present, 8 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Not Voting. **The motion passed.**

**Item 2 - Review and Discuss the Current Motion on the selection of the potential Five Panel of Scholars presented to the Task Force by DOJ.**

**Chair Moore** asked **Member Holder** to restate her motion. **Member Holder** stated that after the discussion with the Secretary of State, Dr. Weber, she would like to withdraw her motion unless there is some objection. Member Holder then made the following statement for the record: after hearing the testimonies on mental health, the experience of trauma that all Black people in the United States are facing and the way trauma of racism experienced by all Black people, it is landing on us physically and changing our physiology. Therefore the Task Force and public helping to buttress this needs to recognize how much trauma we have all experienced and that this process we are engaging in is a traumatic experience and we need to take care of each other, tread lightly with one another and treat one another with dignity. Also, as an educator, scholar and trained attorney who has been litigating over 20 years, it is so important that we think critically, that when we bring our lived experience and education, when we are engaging in a process like this of such monumental historical importance, to the extent we bring that experience, that background to bear in terms of undertaking this process, and challenging one another and thinking critically about how to create the instruments for reparations, that that not be deemed as a threat, or a form of paralysis, because in the end, that level of engagement, that level of interrogation and that democratic process we are engaging in by thinking critically around these issues of such importance is what's going to make our recommendations stronger, better and more viable, and with that stated, I withdraw my motion. **Parliamentarian Johnson** reminded **Chair Moore** that there was a second, so whoever made the second will need to also withdraw the second. **Member Grills** stated that she seconded the motion.

**Member Grills** stated that she was not prepared to withdraw her second so will be thinking out

loud now. She stated that she appreciated what **Member Holder** shared and fully embraced it. **Member Grills** added that to raise questions, Task Force members are simply doing their due diligence. Members then should not have to be attacked or character assassinated or suggested that we should withdraw from the Task force or be called anything but a child of God because we are trying to do our due diligence. Members were brought onto this Task Force to do a job we are trying to do that job and we don't need 100 percent agreement, but that should not mean you are a villain. She explained what her vote was about. She stated that she had nothing against Kirsten Mullen. She is gifted, talented and had a one-on-one with she and Professor Darity and found it and enjoyable and engaging conversation, However the Task Force is dealing with a very complicated thing that it has to accomplish in terms of the two tasks for the economists. If the Task force is going to get the results it needs, **Member Grills** advised it should be looking for people who are bringing a particular expertise, whether that is in economics or a field closely related to economics where one has the skill sets to create the models to do the calculations. Also, to understand the way to communicate both technically to other economists who are going to pick the calculations apart and to the general public. When **Member Grills** began thinking about those things it made her wonder if Ms. Mullen was not associated with Professor Darity would the Task Force be considering her on the panel of economists or would they be trying to bring in additional talent with the background and technical expertise for that role. **Member Grills** stated that the reason she seconded the motion was because it is still not clear to her how this panel of economists and others are going to function and operate and as a Task Force, she feels it has a responsibility to know what it is about to support and authorize. **Member Grills** advised that she has led enough research teams over her 30 to 40 years of doing research to know, that you just don't throw a group of people together and say produce a product. There has to be some kind of strategy and structure that they're following. She has no clue what that is and so she wanted to understand this before co-signing something, and again it was only out of her responsibility to do the due diligence. So with that all being said **Member Grills** stated that if other task force members are comfortable with having someone on that panel of economists who does not have the technical background, and comfortable not knowing how they are going to organize themselves then Ase. She also stated that it would be helpful if the public would stop and listen for a moment before reacting.

**Chair Moore** stated that she heard both **Members Holder** and **Grills** and agreed that no one's character should be assassinated or put into question. People have legitimate questions, and members are doing the work for free and putting in massive amounts of time and labor.

**Member Lewis** stated that he wanted to add context, perhaps because he is close to the discipline of economics. At UC Berkeley he coaches an economic disparities research cluster, populated with some of the world's top economists and a few have won Nobel prizes in economics. Professor Robert Reich is a part of this cluster that he leads. When dealing with economics there is a disciplinary challenge. The issue is that the qualitative component of the lived experience of people oftentimes gets filtered out through the mechanism by which economic analysis is conducted and today's testimony alone shows us the power of narrative. A couple of speakers today talked about the lie that was told about Black people and the way that the lie has perpetuated and becomes structural and has led to the centuries of inequality disparity and violence that Black people in this country have faced. **Member Lewis** stated that he was trying to find economists or individuals who could be qualified to take the place of Professor Hamilton and that there is big challenge with the job itself. He explained that there is a great deal of conservatism in the economic discipline and that what the Task Force is asking is perhaps the bravest task in economics that perhaps has existed. The Task Force is asking an economist or a team of economists to quantify centuries of injury and the truth is that regardless of the skill set of the various economists, he sent many emails and

received very few or actually no responses from the people he reached out to. There is a lack of bravery to put it plainly. Regardless of the skill set people do not want to be the individual responsible for putting that number out into the world. Therefore when we're looking at people like professor Darity Ms. Mullen and Professor Kramer you have to also consider just the sheer commitment that these individuals have to the kind of justice oriented purpose of that task even though it might ultimately feel like it's a mathematical project, it is so much more than just that. With Ms. Mullen in particular, given her role as a folklorist, what is the injury or are the injuries that we might be trying to account for. We need as much of a mathematical model as we need a qualitative sense of the history. The complicated ways that history has played out are necessary in order to factor that into the actual economic modeling and so **Member Lewis** thinks the people who are being proposed are very well suited because of these exact issues that he was raising now. So he has a lot of appreciation for the position as a member of the economic disparities research cluster. He personally often struggles to communicate this simple fact to colleagues. When someone is trying to explain that poverty is not just how much money they bring in and how much they spend on a monthly basis or however regular but the quality of money what it means to have and what it means to spend it. Those kinds of things have to be incorporated into these calculations and so we do need a team that is representative enough from a disciplinary standpoint but also more importantly from the standpoint of a commitment. Who would be willing to put themselves out to make a brave choice of making a claim and that's what we are here to deal with. We are all here engaged in a very brave way trying to make claims on behalf of people for whom claims have been denied for centuries and so he thinks the Task Force needs to make sure that the economist team is inclined to do the same work as the Task Force.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** advised **Chair Moore** that she did not hear **Member Grills** withdraw her second. She reminded the members that the discussion is still based on **Member Holder's** motion that is still on the floor.

**Member Montgomery –Steppe** stated that she appreciated the discussion, having very little knowledge about economists. She assumed some of what **Member Lewis** stated. The challenge is not like members would have an open market of folks that would be willing to do this, so that is where my thought process was but I will also say that not having discussed the scope of work, but having the names, she agrees with **Member Grills** that members don't know what the next steps are or expectations, however they know they need a number. There was not much presented on process. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** recalls that DOJ's first recommendation was to send out letters of retention that are not contracts and then discuss the scope of work, which she would be ok with. She understands all of the members points of views, and that the way it was presented, unintentionally may have cause some confusion.

**Member Grills** stated this is why we have conversations and discussions and that's a good thing. It does not mean we are the enemy and so as **Member Grills** stated that she appreciated **Member Lewis's** argument so that has moved her position, so she wholeheartedly agreed. She also agreed with **Member Montgomery –Steppe** that members need to know about the proposed panel's process. **Member Grills** stated she is willing to withdraw the second on **Member Holder's** motion based on the comments by **Member Lewis and Montgomery-Steppe**, with the caveat that at the next meeting there should be an agenda item that discusses what their process will entail.

**Mr. Newman** stated that the discussion is helpful to DOJ in handling the process of coordinating the experts. It is a complicated question of what the process is going to be because the Task Force has to make all of the ultimate decisions as to who should get reparations, what form reparations should take place and how those reparations should be allocated. These are all decisions exclusively of the task force as a whole and they are not going to be decisions of the experts no matter who the experts are or no matter what the positions of the experts may be. They have

opinions that are their own, but the Task Force's opinion is what governs. The Task Force alone is in charge of what ultimately becomes the recommendation to the legislature provided for under the law. The process will be complicated and unlike most retention processes because in order to provide the Task Force with all of the information they need to make the decisions, you need the advice of the experts, then you make the decisions and then the experts need to go do the calculations and make their final recommendations to you about what your recommendations should be. It is a two part process. The answers are not in the statute, they are in your ultimate decision making. Discussions need to occur before the scope of work is presented to the Task force to be voted upon. To accomplish this, DOJ's guidance includes designating someone to work with the experts to develop a scope of work that includes this sort of three part process where the experts present options to the Task force, the Task Force makes a decision about what their direction should be and the experts carry out that direction. You could also have an advisory committee that works with the experts, but everything comes back to the Task Force for discussion and a final vote for direction. You can also take it up as a Task Force of the whole, where these discussions would happen in open meetings between all of the members and the members of the expert group. This approach will affect your future meeting schedule because you will want to dedicate sufficient time for these discussions. This is the process for developing the scope of work and then you must figure out how the process would work for executing that scope of work meaning when things will come back to the Task force, when the Task Force will make a decision and keeping everyone in mind of the ultimate deadline that all of this needs to take place in a way that it allows the experts enough time to actually craft their recommendations for you for the final report that will be done July 1, 2023.

**Vice Chair Brown** called for the orders of the day, asking **Chair Moore** to clarify where the Task force is on the agenda. Parliamentarian Johnson advised that is agenda item #21 which is now being discussed. **Chair Moore** added that it is Unfinished Business.

**Chair Moore** summarized what **Mr. Newman** explained. Specifically at the next meeting the Task Force could invite all of the experts, learn more about them, which could take a lot of time. Alternatively set up an advisory committee of two, to work with the DOJ Research Center to work with the consultants to develop the scope of work for approval for a vote. **Chair Moore** gave a brief background of each consultant including Professor Darity, Ms. Mullen, Professor Spriggs, Kaycea Campbell and Thomas Kramer. Three are economists, one is a public policy professor and one is a folklorist. The Task Force previously sent a retention letter to Economist Darrick Hamilton prior to approving the scope of work, so this process is similar except it involves more than one person. To recap **Chair Moore** stated create an advisory committee and work with the DOJ Research Center and with the consultants to develop a scope of work to be presented at the next meeting or vote to hear about the consultants qualifications at the next meeting, then approve the scope of work as a committee of the whole.

Member Brown suggested a subcommittee of three. **Parliamentarian Johnson** clarified that a this would be subject to the Bagley Keene Act. An advisory committee of two would not be subject to the Bagley Keene Act. She further clarified that her understanding is that the two person advisory committee would work with the DOJ Research Center and the consultants to develop a scope of work which will then be presented to the full Task Force.

.

**Chair Moore asked for a motion.**



**MOTION: Vice Chair Brown** moved that a two member Advisory Committee be established to work alongside the DOJ Research Center to assist with the development of the SOW (Scope of Work) with the five individuals named to bring back to the Task Force for further discussion. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** Seconded the motion.

**Chair Moore called for the discussion:** Members expressed the need to provide formal guidance on the issue of eligibility, the SOW to be the collective work of the entire Task Force and that a public meeting with the economist as well as vote on the SOW should be required by the Task Force.

**Member Holder** stated that she will vote no because this issue is the most fundamental undertakings of the Task force and the Task force should decide the scope of work as a collective body with total transparency.

**Member Lewis** stated he agreed with member holder because there are issues not yet decided in principle, without first deciding on the terms eligibility. Dr. Weber testified and made things clear however the bill gives the authority to decide eligibility to the Task Force, so with her guidance in mind the task Force needs to vote on the terms of eligibility clearly first. Then the scope of work can be determined.

**Member Tamaki** agreed with Member Lewis that the consultants will need to know the universe of eligibility before they can determine the scope of work. He shared that the Task Force should meet with experts. He suggested that they meet the experts, ask questions, then discuss and vote on eligibility. Then perhaps an advisory committee could work with experts to map out the scope of work, then the experts do the work.

**Vice Chair Brown** asked when will the Task Force place eligibility on the agenda?

**Member Montgomery-Steppe** stated that she is trying to understand what decision the Task force must make and what will the advisory committee will do. She did not see establishing an advisory committee as a hindrance to any decisions that the Task force needed to make. She also did not understand the advisory committee making any decisions at all. Therefore she would like clarification on the functions of the advisory committee and what decisions does the Task Force need to make based on information we have now.

**Vice Chair Brown** asked again his question about eligibility.

**Member Lewis** stated that the consultants will ask the Task Force questions, and expect guidance.

**Mr. Newman** clarified that the advisory committee cannot make decisions.

Chair Moore restated the motion and asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to take the vote on vice Chair Brown's motion

**AYEs:** Vice Chair Brown, Member Montgomery-Steppe, Member Lewis

**NAYs:** Member Grills, Member Holder,

**ABSTENTIONS:** Chair Moore, Member Bradford, Jones-Sawyer, Member Tamaki

There were **3 Ayes, 2 Nays, and 4 Abstentions** **The motion was passed.**

**Chair Moore** called for a motion to elect the Task force members to be assigned to the Advisory Committee.

**MOTION: Member Lewis** moved that Chair Moore and Member Lewis compose the Advisory committee to work alongside the DOJ Research Center and the 5 Individual Panelist named to develop the Scope of Work for the consultant panel. **Vice Chair Brown** Seconded the motion

**Chair Moore** Called for the discussion

Task Force members were still concerned about a conflict of interest on the selected panel and that this motion helped to move forward with the five individuals on the panel, however, the Advisory Committee should bring back all information to the Task Force.

Chair Moore asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to take the vote:

**AYEs:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, Montgomery-Steppe

**NAYs:** 0

**ABSTENTIONS:** 0

There were 9 Ayes, 0 Nays, and 0 Abstentions. **The motion passed.**

**22. Potential Action Item: Schedule for Future Meetings of the Task Force – Chair Moore and Member Scott-Lewis**

The Advisory committee **Chair Moore** and **Member Lewis** presented the proposed public hearing schedule and topics with the Task Force. The Task Force decided that it would begin counting its 10 meeting requirement in the statute with the first in-person meeting. April would be the first meeting if the Governor lifts the virtual requirement. The Task Force needs to decide the meeting location, dates and subjects of future in person meetings. He recommended that eligibility be discussed at the February meeting. The full hearing schedule for all of the meetings can be found on the website at <https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121>

**Mr. Newman** indicated that the quorum dates are February 22, 23, 24, 25 and Saturday the 26. Professor Chemerinsky is available on February 23 and 24. The March quorum dates are 22, 23, 28, 29 and 30. **Chair Moore** asks if February should be a one day meeting?

Member Lewis suggest that it be two days provide a Black History celebration, the discussion of Report 1 and to discuss eligibility. Member Holder asked about messaging in April and the future of messaging in June around Juneteenth.

After Task Force member discussion and clarifications about the February, March and April meetings. **Chair Moore** called for a motion to finalize the hearing meetings for February, March, and April.

**MOTION: Member Grills** moved that the Task Force approve the February and March and April meetings meeting as proposed by Chair Moore and Member Lewis and the April meeting will be virtual if the Governor’s Executive Order is not lifted.

**Member Jones-Sawyer** Seconded the motion.

**Chair Moore** called for the discussion – No Discussion

**Chair Moore** then called for **Parliamentarian Johnson** to take the vote.

**AYEs:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones- Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, Member Montgomery Steppe

**NAYs:** 0

**ABSTENTIONS:** 0

There were 9 members present, 9 Ayes, 0 Nays, **the motion passed.**

**Chair Moore moved the order of agenda item #24 to follow agenda item # 22**

**The Task Force Discussed Agenda dates and topics for discussion for the February and March Hearings:**

**Chair Moore** called for a motion to approve the February 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24 meeting.

**MOTION: Member Tamaki** moved that the February meeting will be a two day meeting on February 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> honoring Black History month, by honoring reparations advocates from past and present, having Chemerinsky speak, having discussion of Part 1 of the First Report, and having discussion and vote on the Community of Eligibility,

**Member Montgomery Steppe** Seconded the motion

**Chair Moore** called for the discussion – No Discussion

**Chair Moore** asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to take the vote:

**AYEs:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, Member Montgomery-Steppe

**NAYs:** 0

**ABSTENTIONS:** 0

There were nine members present. 9 Ayes, 0 Nays and 0 Abstentions. The motion passed

The March meeting agenda will be presented by Member Lewis and Chair Moore.

**Chair Moore** called for a motion as to the hearing dates:

**MOTION: Member Holder** moved that the March meeting be held on March 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>, Our March meeting should be held on March 29<sup>th</sup> and March 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Member Tamaki** Seconded the motion

**Chair Moore** called for the discussion – No Discussion

Chair Moore asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to take the vote:

**AYEs:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder,

Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, Member Montgomery-Steppe  
**NAYs: 0**  
**ABSTENTIONS: 0**

There were nine members present. 9 Ayes, 0 Nays and 0 Abstentions. **The motion passed**

**23. Potential Action Item: Continuation of Chat Function**

**Attorney Newman** reminded that this a technical clean up. The previous motion authorizing the Chat function had expired and a new motion was needed to extend the Chat function for virtual meetings.

**Chair Moore** call for the motion to extend the Chat function.

**MOTION: Member Holder** moved to continue the use of the Chat function for virtual Task Force meetings for so long as the Task Force has virtual meetings.

**Member Bradford** Seconded the motion.

**Chair Moore** called for the Discussion: No Discussion

**Chair Moore** asked Parliamentarian Johnson to take the vote

**AYEs:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki, Member Steppe

**NAYs: 0**

**ABSTENTIONS: 0**

There were nine members present. AYES, 0 Nays and 0 Abstentions. **The motion passed**

**24. Chair Moore moved Agenda item # 24 to follow Agenda item #22**

**25. Chair Moore moved Agenda Item # 25 to follow Agenda item # 21**

**26. Closing Remarks and Adjournment**

**Chair Moore** thanked everyone for all of their hard work and adjourned the meeting at 5:36 PM.