

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**May 6, 2023, 9:00 A.M.**  
**<https://oag.ca.gov/ab3121>**

**Lisser Hall**  
**Mills College at Northeastern University**  
**500 MacArthur Blvd.**  
**Oakland, CA 94613**

**Members Present:** Chairperson Kamilah V. Moore, Vice-Chair Amos Brown, Member Cheryl Grills, Member Steven Bradford, Member Reginald Jones-Sawyer, Member. Jovan Lewis, Member Monica Montgomery-Steppe, and Member Don Tamaki.  
**Members Absent:** Member Lisa Holder

**1. Chairperson Call to Order**

**Chairperson Moore** called the May 6, 2023 AB 3121 Reparations Task Force meeting to order at approximately 9:04 a.m., on May 6, 2023, at Northeastern University's Lisser Hall in Oakland California. **Chair Moore** welcomed everyone to the California Reparations Task Force's 15<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing.

**Chair Moore** asked **Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson** to call the roll to determine whether a quorum was established. **Parliamentarian Doreathea Johnson** called the roll.

**Members present, at the time the Roll was called:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Grills, Member Bradford, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe, and Member Tamaki.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 members on the Task Force and 5 members were needed for a quorum and there were 7 members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was established.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** noted that Member Jones-Sawyer joined the meeting following the roll call, and that there were eight Task Force Members present at the meeting.

Member Holder also joined the meeting following roll call bringing the number of Task Force members present to nine.

**Chair Moore** moved to Agenda Item #3, Public Comment, and stated that following Public Comment, we would move to Agenda Item #2, Welcome Remarks by Elected Officials

**2. Welcome Remarks by Elected Officials**

Chair Moore acknowledged Elaine Brown, Chairwoman Elaine Brown, Black Panther Party, for her attendance.

### 3. Public Comment

**Public Comments were given for two hours, beginning at 9:30 a.m., to 10:30 a.m., with comments from the phone line participants and from 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., from participants who were “in-person”.**

The first speakers gave welcoming remarks from Mills College, representing “The Black Reparations’ Project. **Mills College at Northeastern University Black Reparation Project Co-founders and Co-directors Dr. Ashley Adams, IfeTayo Walker, Dr. Erika Weissinger, and Dr. Darcelle Lahr** spoke of the vast and proud history the campus has of advocating for social justice and equity for Black lives dating back to the late 1950s. Throughout time, the campus rallied for changes that led to increased Black enrollment; protested racial discrimination; established of Black studies, courses and programs; and engendered support for the hiring of Black faculty and staff members. Through their work they continue to honor and respect Black leaders who have walked these same spaces before them and remain committed to continuing their legacy of leading change in partnership with other leaders in the Reparations movement through their dedication to social justice, equity, and solidarity. As educators, the Black Reparation Project would like to lift the Task Force’s recommendations around educating the public through a truthful telling of our shared history. They also commended the Task Force’s recommendation for a multi-intervention approach to addressing the historic atrocities and informed that they will be present to support the Task Force’s efforts in the next phases of its work. .

Ms. Aisha Martin-Walton expressed that as public officials would be recognized as they appeared.

#### **Public Official:**

**Oakland District 6 Councilmember Kevin Jenkins** welcomed the Task Force to the city of Oakland and was honored to share in this crucial event as it gathered a diverse group of individuals from various disciplines whom are passionate and dedicated to addressing the issues of Black Reparations. He stated that the Black Reparations project is a powerful example of what can be achieved when dedicated people join forces and was confident that through collective effort significant strides in advancing Reparations in California and ultimately the country could be made. He thanked all for their attendance and wished the Task Force a productive and inspiring meeting.

Chair Moore introduced **U.S. Congresswoman Barbara Lee**, who represents Californians in the 12<sup>th</sup> District. She is the highest-ranking African-American woman appointed to the democratic leadership and has served as a representative in both the California State Senate and California State Assembly. Congresswoman Lee thanked everyone for their attendance and welcomed them to her congressional district. She thanked the Task Force for their continued efforts for their descendants and noted that it was a privilege to have people from all backgrounds discuss and promote education and research on Black Reparation policies and initiatives. She stated that Reparations is not a luxury but a long overdue human right for millions of Americans as the promise of 40 acres a mule made to formally enslaved people over 150 years ago has yet to be fulfilled. She stated that keeping the promise would

be a tangible route to acknowledging and making amends glaring disparate economic and social generational impacts of slavery and systematic racism. She acknowledged the late Congressman John Conyers for his introduction of H.R. 40, a congressional bill that proposed the creation of a commission to study and develop reparations for African Americans, in Washington and was proud to be its second co-sponsor. She thanked the Task Force and California for taking the lead on this endeavor and becoming a model that can be followed.

Following comments from **Congresswoman Barbara Lee**, Ms. Martin-Walton returned to Public Comment.

Aisha Martin-Walton moderated the public comment portion of the meeting agenda. The Task Force approved an additional hour for public comment, for a total of two hours. There was a hybrid audience, virtually and in-person. California Department of Justice staff implemented a new procedure to accommodate additional in-person speakers. There were approximately 51 comments, 24 comments provided via the phone line and 27 comments made in-person. Public comments reflected individuals, businesses, and community organizations in support of reparations. Many commenters thanked the Task Force for their work and expressed support for the decision to recommend lineage-based reparations. Several commenters also voiced their support for direct cash payments and urged the Task Force to make their recommendations specific to the descendant community, not universal or race-based. Other recommendations included specifying the community of eligibility, creating curriculum for schools to preserve Black heritage, the use of facial recognition technology to identify perpetrators of historic atrocities, making Black Americans a protected class, land, an increased effort to educate the public, and an anti-Black hate crime bill.

Following the Public Comments, Chair Moore thanked those who participated, for their comments and moved to Agenda Item #4.

#### **4. Action Item: Approval of the March 29-30, 2023 Meeting Minutes.**

**Chair Moore** stated that the March 29 and 30, 2023 minutes were sent to the Task Force members in advance for review. She asked if Task Force members had any questions, comments, or corrections. **Chair Moore** entertained a motion to approve the March 29th and 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023 minutes as is or as amended.

#### **MOTION:**

**Vice-Chair Brown** moved to approve the March 29 and 30, 2023 meeting minutes as amended. **Member Bradford Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** opened the floor to the Task Force for discussion regarding any potential amendments that needed to be made. Member Tamaki identified that the names of the curriculum professors Dr. Travis Bristol and Tolani Britton were incorrectly spelled, on page 14 and asked for it to be corrected. Hearing no other amendments, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on approving the meeting minutes

as amended.

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery Steppe, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 8 Task Force members present and voting: **8 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions**

**The Motion Passed** and the March 29th and 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting minutes were approved as corrected.

Chair Moore commenced a short 10-minute break.

Chair Moore, announced that the lunch break would commence and the Task Force would resume at 1:30 pm.

## 7. **Lunch Break**

**Chair Moore** reconvened the meeting following the lunch break and asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll to re-establish a quorum.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** called the roll.

**Members present during roll call were:** Chair Moore, Vice Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Lewis, Montgomery-Steppe, and Member Tamaki. (9)

Members absent: 0

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated there are **9** Task Force members and the number needed to establish a quorum is **5**. There were **9** members present, and a quorum was re-established.

**Chair Moore** returned the meeting to business and moved to the next agenda item, #5.

## 5. **Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part I: Detail of Historical Atrocities**

Chair Moore asked for additional discussion on action item #5.

**Vice Chair Brown** was recognized to make a comment. He shared an anecdote about the time he was arrested for justly speaking out and unjustly charged for using profanity in public. He would like to put on record that he supports free speech but discourages and

opposes what he felt was the uncivilized and uncouth speech made during public comment. He closed his remark reminding all to be kind.

**Member Bradford** thanked the Task Force and the DOJ for the work they have performed. He stated that the final report will include 95 recommendations that will serve as the basis for deciding what Reparations may ultimately be once interpreted and approved by the Legislature and Governor; and highlighted the importance that the Task Force's recommendations be as clear to all, just as it is clear to the DOJ and Task Force.

**MOTION:**

**Member Bradford moved a procedural motion** that he, Member Jones-Sawyer, their staff, and the DOJ be given discretion to edit the final report within the same scope as it did in the interim report. **Member Tamaki Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** opened the floor to the Task Force for discussion on Member Bradford's motion. Member Bradford informed that the process would be similar to what was performed with the Interim Report and would ensure that the recommendations would be succinct and move through the legislative process. Senator Bradford described the process that would be used to edit the final report. Hearing no additional discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions**

**The Motion Passed**

**Chair Moore** resumed discussion of agenda item #5. She asked that the Task Force to consider removal of the following sentence on page 39:

*"Name changes, destruction of culture, inaccurate records, forced family separation, and other consequences of 400 years of racial oppression make it extremely difficult to trace which Black individuals living today are American descendants of people who were enslaved."*

She noted that a great number of African Americans can trace their lineage to the period of enslavement or to an ancestor living in the period in the South prior to 1900 with technology easily accessible today. She raised concerns that the aforementioned text may be found particularly offensive and culturally insensitive to African American readers of

the report as it goes against the majority of expert testimony the Task Force received. She also noted that correspondence with DOJ indicated that the sentence was to be removed as early as April 2023 as the reference was removed in page 453 of the report, however did not present the correspondence. **Chair Moore** also stated that an additional section to the report should be added which chronicles the discussion had on the community of eligibility which would contain the background of eligibility and a description of the Task Force's decision and rationale. **Chair Moore** then entertained a motion to delete the aforementioned text out of the report and that an additional section on the community of eligibility be created.

**Member Grills** suggested that the language be softened, rather than outright removal of the sentence. She stated that tracing lineage for a large portion of African Americans was never performed therefore it is unknown how difficult or easy the process truly is. She also shared that some people would find it difficult to substantiate their lineage as the destruction of records can bar those eligible. She stated that because there are some people who would find it difficult to trace their lineage that the language be modified to reflect that reality.

Following further discussion introduced by Members Bradford and Jones-Sawyer, Chair Moore again entertained a motion to delete the identified sentence in its entirety.

**MOTION:**

**Member Lewis** moved that the aforementioned sentence to be deleted. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** Seconded the motion.

**Chair Moore** called for discussion on Member Lewis' motion. Member Bradford asked the DOJ whether retaining the sentence would create conflict in the report and the Task Force's intentions. **Special Assistant Attorney General (SAAG) Damon Brown** stated that there is nothing in the report that contradicts the aforementioned text. **Member Jones-Sawyer** shared **Member Grills'** position on the sentence as he reminded the Task Force of their discussion which recognized that some individuals in the foster care system, who are homeless, or lack the financial capacity may find it difficult to trace their lineage. He stated that by leaving the sentence in, it would express the challenge posed to some members of the community of eligibility and can assist **Member Bradford** and him to provide funding to assist those who experience this difficulty.

**Member Lewis** acknowledged the gravity of the statement as it could affect sense of identity of African Americans who descended from slavery as well as the Task Force's recommendation to create an agency. He shared concern that the sentence is ineffective as embedded in the section's context and could subtly perpetuate the myth that people cannot establish from where and from whom they came from. Additionally, he raised concerns that the text and its placement in the section could undermine one of the Task Force's underlying task of creating a basis of recognition for the community of eligibility. Member Lewis also recognized there could be an appropriate place to speak on the challenges of tracing lineage outside of this section of the report. Hearing no additional discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll for the vote:

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Grills, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery Steppe, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** Member Grills, Member Jones-Sawyer

**Abstentions:** Member Bradford, Member Holder,

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **5 Ayes, 2 Nays, 2 Abstentions**

### **The Motion Passed**

Chair Moore then entertained a motion to vote on the approval Part I of the report as amended.

### **MOTION:**

**Member Montgomery-Steppe** moved to approve Part I: Detail of Historical Atrocities. **Member Bradford** Seconded the motion.

**Chair Moore** opened the floor to the Task Force for discussion on Member Montgomery-Steppe's motion. After hearing no discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery Steppe, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Member Jones-Sawyer

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **8 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstentions**

**The Motion Passed** and Chair Moore then moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

## **6. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part II: International Reparations Framework and Examples of Other Reparations Schemes**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item by thanking the DOJ for its comprehensive section on genocide. She stated that upon review of the chapter 14, she found that the domestic history of the Reparations movement as it relates to African Americans misplaced as the section's coverage is on international reparations frameworks. She asked the Task Force to entertain a motion for chapter 14 to only include the international reparation framework and examples of other international reparations schemes taking out the section on the

history of reparations movements for African Americans descended from slavery. She then proposed that domestic history of the reparations movement be moved as the introductory portion of a new chapter regarding the community of eligibility.

**Member Bradford** raised that a motion to establish a new chapter on eligibility would be needed prior to entertaining **Chair Moore's** proposal on chapter 14. **Chair Moore** then asked the Task Force to entertain a motion to make a new chapter on eligibility first prior to her proposal on chapter 14 changes. She reminded the Task Force that it voted on the report's structure on June 2021 which entailed that a section on eligibility was to be included and identified that all sections except for the eligibility section was not in the final report draft presented. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** also shared concerns as the June 2021 meeting minutes imply that the topic of eligibility would be treated as its own chapter. She inquired whether a vote may be needed as the proposed eligibility section was to be included as voted on in the June 2021 hearing. **SAAG Brown** stated that the June 2021 vote established topics, not sections, which were to be included in the report and stated that the topic of eligibility was covered throughout the report. He also reminded the Task Force that the DOJ took its instructions from the Task Force's direction via the three times it voted on the report's structure. As the Task Force had already voted on the structure of the report, should they seek to change it, a majority vote of rescission is needed before voting on whether to add a chapter on eligibility. **Parliamentarian Johnson** also added that logistically, the motion to approve the chapter on eligibility would have to be conducted at a later date as a substantive document must be available for the Task Force and public to review.

**Member Tamaki** stated that upon review of the report that the topic of eligibility is infused throughout the report and its recommendations. He raised concern on timing as the proposed chapter would require additional time that may not be available given the Task Force's deadline to deliver its report at the end of June.

**Member Lewis** stated that the Task Force's procedural history on the matter could explain the absence of an eligibility chapter. Throughout its work, the Task Force was continually determining the community of eligibility. Although there was no eligibility chapter, he stated that as the Task Force explicitly answered who would be eligible in instances where eligibility was a concern (i.e., for proposed compensation and benefits) which ultimately satisfy the Task Force's mandate to address eligibility as it relates to compensation. **Member Lewis**, understood the current concern regarding eligibility and asked the DOJ and the Task Force to explore an alternative solution which would further clarify who the community of eligibility is within the deadline given.

**Senior Assistant Attorney General (SAAG) Michael Newman** stated that the changes to the report would emphasize that the community of eligibility, as defined by the Task Force's vote on March 29, 2022, will be given special consideration for particular compensation and benefits. He stated that some proposals would only be applicable to descendants of U.S. chattel slavery whereas policies which are applicable to the entire general public will directly benefit the community of eligibility first.

**SAAG Newman** stated that in light of the Task Force’s conversation today, the policy section regarding financial compensation in chapter 17 has further opportunity to clarify its intended beneficiaries. He asked the Task Force to consider the drafted language that can be used as a conclusion to chapter 17, which clarified the eligible class for monetary compensation:

As set forth in this chapter, even limited to the relatively few categories of harms that the Task Force found to be calculable, the immense nature of the loss is significant. This loss must be compensated with monetary payments as set forth in this chapter to those who suffered the loss. The Task Force reiterates its recommendation that, however the legislature ultimately determines to make monetary payments for these losses, that those monetary payments should be restricted to the African-American descendants of a chattel enslaved person or descendants of free Black person living in the United States prior to the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century members of the eligible class as defined by the Task Force.

**Chair Moore** stated that an independent chapter is still preferred but that the language **SAAG Newman** drafted could be the basis of the conclusion for the proposed chapter. She also asked the Task Force to consider deleting the following sentence as represented in the motion that failed as listed in the March 22, 2022 meeting minutes:

While recommending that monetary reparations be limited to the eligible class, the Task Force recognizes that the five pillars of reparations and AB 3121 require that it also endeavor to ensure cumulative harms of the past four centuries do not continue to be visited upon living African Americans and on society in California and the United States. At the same time many recommendations cannot be implemented only for Descendants and must instead be framed to benefit the larger community of African-American Californians or even all Californians.

She stated that the Task Force’s vote in March 22, 2022, aimed all forms of reparations under international law (i.e., compensation, restitution, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition) toward the Descendants. She clarified that although the proposed public policies are good; “policies” are not synonymous with reparations.

**Chair Moore** entertained a motion that clarified that Chapter 14 would only include the international reparations framework and not include the examples of other international reparations framework schemes or the domestic history of the reparations movement as it relates to African Americans. **Member Bradford** expressed concerns that the proposed amendment expressed by **Chair Moore** presumed the existence of an ‘eligibility chapter’ and no vote to include a separate chapter on eligibility had been taken. Chair Moore entertained a motion to have a chapter on eligibility, but no motion was made. The discussion therefore returned to the original question.

**MOTION:**

**Member Lewis** moved to approve Part II: International Reparations Framework and Examples of Other Reparations Schemes, as originally presented. **Member Holder** **Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** stated that the motion was properly moved and seconded and called for discussion on **Member Lewis'** motion. **Member Lewis** clarified that his motion would not include changes proposed to eligibility as following the agenda item that houses chapter 17 may be more appropriate to continue that discussion. **Chair Moore** inquired as to the rationale of keeping the domestic history of the Reparations movement in the United States in this section. **Member Lewis** further stated that keeping the African-American reparations movement lodged in the chapter would provide a logic of continuity between the Task Force's efforts and reparation efforts that have already existed and have been legitimately recognized. After hearing no further discussion, **Chair Moore** called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** 0

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays,**

**The Motion Passed**

**Chair Moore** recognized and thanked **Oakland Councilwoman Treva Reid** for attending the meeting today before moving on to Agenda Item #8, Communications Advisory Committee Comments and Communications Firm Implementation Plan Updates and Outcomes.

- 8. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Communications Advisory Committee Comments and Communications Firm Implementation Plan Updates and Outcomes. Advisory Member Participants: Members Lewis and Bradford presented their updates.**

**Member Lewis** informed that the Charles Communications Group sends their apologies for their absence and relayed their report of notable activities conducted since the last public meeting:

Charles Communication Group (CCG) reported that media requests have substantially increased and that this trend will likely continue to through June 30<sup>th</sup> when the Task Force

delivers its final report. They noted that interview requests and published articles have focused on reparation compensation amounts despite the Task Force's decision to not deliver a sum; there is a particular interest to get Task Force member opinion on reported reparation amounts of 1.2 million dollars. The Charles Communication Group has coordinated with the Communications Subcommittee and the DOJ to approve responses to these inquiries on behalf of the Task Force and comments attributed to Task Force members are being discussed with Task Force members for approval by subcommittee members, Bradford and Lewis prior to sharing them with the media. CCG also reported that they continue to pitch the Task Force for media opportunities on a statewide and national level.

CCG has also begun distribution of two Reparation Task Force flyers to organizations, government entities, and elected officials which the Task Force will receive following the conclusion of today's meeting. They also reported that a public service announcement, narrated by Senator Bradford, has been created and broadcasted. The CCG has also provided updates to elected officials across the state.

CCG also reported its April activities which included:

- Booking and coordinated media interviews for the Task Force members;
- Conducting media outreach for the May 6 Public Hearing at Mills' College
- Providing media coaching, talking points, and messaging for Task Force members; and
- Writing and coordinating production of Reparations Task Force commercials

**Member Lewis** closed CCG's report noting that they continue to look forward to coordinating, planning and managing media efforts.

**Chair Moore** opened the floor for Task Force member discussion. Hearing none, she moved to the next agenda item.

9. **Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part III: Recommendation of the Task Force as to how the State of California will Offer a Formal Apology on Behalf of the People of California for the Perpetration of Gross Human Rights Violations and Crimes Against Humanity on African Slaves and Their Descendants**

**MOTION:**

**Member Tamaki** moved to approve Part III: Recommendation of the Task Force as to how the State of California will Offer a Formal Apology on Behalf of the People of California for the Perpetration of Gross Human Rights Violations and Crimes Against Humanity on African Slaves and Their Descendants as presented. **Vice-Chair Brown** **Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** stated that the motion was properly moved and seconded and called for discussion on **Member Tamaki's** motion. **Member Grills** offered three friendly amendments to the motion in the form of minor edits on pages 2: the paragraph, beginning with "in June 2019, at the last line, it should be 'or' any other form of reparations, instead

of ‘of’; at page 9:, where it provides that African American physicians are underrepresented in California; it should be expanded to state: “African American Physicians, psychologists and psychiatrists are underrepresented in California’s health and medical field and at page 9 or 10, it was suggested that a statement or clause be added stating that an intensive community education strategy for the state, related to the apology be included because most people were unaware of the federal apology. Hearing no further discussion, **Chair Moore** called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion with the minor edits moved by Member Grills.

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

**Ayes:** 9

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

### **The Motion Passed**

Chair Moore then moved to the next agenda item.

#### **10. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part IV: Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Reparations and Forms of Compensation and Restitution**

**Chair Moore** initiated discussion and asked the Task Force to consider moving Part V’s section on the Freedmen Affairs Agency to Part IV of the report. She explained that the Freedmen Affairs Agency content would be apt in Part IV of the report, as the agency will be fielding inquiries and eligibility for reparations in its various forms. Chair Moore also re-raised the question of a separate eligibility chapter.

**Member Lewis** reiterated his position from the earlier discussion on eligibility and restated his position that in view of the impracticality and feasibility of drafting, reviewing and voting on a new chapter in a matter of weeks, consideration for feasible alternatives apart from drafting an additional chapter should be explored to satisfy the need to define eligibility robustly, respectfully, and adequately within Part IV of the report (i.e., chapter 17).

**SAAG Brown** shared that **SAAG Newman’s** drafted language could provide the framework that elevates the issue of eligibility and can be worked on with legislative staff as they finalize the report. He also raised concern that the proposal to draft a new chapter

would jeopardize the DOJ's ability to timely submit the report to the Legislature, on or before July 1. **Member Lewis** asked the Task Force to consider whether adequate language around eligibility in Part IV, Chapter 17 can be expanded on to meet address concerns.

**SAAG Brown** stated that the Task Force could expand upon Chapter 17 provided that they discuss and approve it today. Further, he mentioned that due to the lateness of the hour and the need to end the meeting by 5PM, the Task Force would need to expedite discussions of any proposed language, or defer this task to Members Jones-Sawyer and Bradford, as there would not be a future opportunity for the Task Force to meet to approve language before the report would need to go to print.

**Member Bradford** asked the Task Force to reconsider whether **SAAG Newman's** language adequately captured the Task Force's discussion today. **Chair Moore** expressed that the language proposed was not adequate as it infers that the community of eligibility would only exclusively receive monetary benefits and that all other forms of benefits and compensation would include others. She asked that the language be modified to align with her interpretation that the Task Force's decision in March 2022 meant that all forms of reparations, including but not limited to monetary reparations, go exclusively to the community of eligibility.

**Chair Moore** asked the Task Force to consider the following motion:

- Change the title of Chapter 17 to Final Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Losses to African-American Descendants of a Chattel Enslaved Person or Descendants of a Free Black Person Living in the United States Prior to the End of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century and Forms of Compensation, Restitution, Satisfaction, Rehabilitation, and Guarantees of Non-repetition;
- To include **SAAG Newman's** proposed language but modify it to include that all forms of reparations, including monetary reparations, goes to the community of eligibility; and
- Move the section on the Freedmen Affair Agency from Part V to Part IV

**MOTION:**

**Vice-Chair Brown** moved to amend Part IV, Chapter 17 as follows:

- Change the title of Chapter 17 to Final Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Losses to African-American Descendants of a Chattel Enslaved Person or Descendants of a Free Black Person Living in the United States Prior to the End of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century and Forms of Compensation, Restitution, Satisfaction, Rehabilitation, and Guarantees of Non-repetition;
- To include SAAG Newman's proposed language but modify it to include that all forms of reparations, including monetary reparations, goes to the community of eligibility; and
- Move the section on the Freedmen Affair Agency from Part V to Part IV

**Member Lewis** asked the Task Force to consider another alternative that would include a

restatement on eligibility in Part V to better define to whom direct compensation and reparations would be for. He also reminded the Task Force in addition to direct compensation and beneficiary programs for the community of eligibility, that the Task Force has found additional recommendations that would also positively impact people outside of the community of eligibility as well.

**Member Montgomery-Steppe** asked for the rationale for the motion to move the section on the Freedmen Affair Agency to Part IV. **Chair Moore** explained that the portions go hand-in-hand as the Freedmen Affairs Agency would make direct payments to eligible recipients and aid them with establishing eligibility. Additionally, she stated that the aforementioned agency is a form of restitution under international law as the Freedmen's Bureau once existed in this country and provided services to the community of eligibility until it was dismantled. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** stated that because the Freedmen Affairs Agency would do more than provide direct compensation and aiding individuals with establishing eligibility, it may be best to keep the section in its original position. She asked the Task Force to consider the removal of this portion of the motion as it would also eliminate the need for the motion to be a motion for rescission/reconsideration.

**Chair Moore** reframed the motion she wanted the Task Force to entertain as having Part IV cover reparations for the community of eligibility and Part V to cover the good public policies the Task Force recommends. She stated that through this frame of reference, the Task Force would also have to consider whether to add to the entertained motion to move descendant specific policies in Part V to Part IV.

**Member Lewis** again stated that his intent was to work out the terms of 'eligibility' definition by declaratively stating, in Chapter 17. He clarified that what Chair Moore is asking for is clarification around what we are calling 'reparations' and for whom these reparations are being provided. He further stated that Chair Moore was asking for that to be done through restructuring of the Chapter, moving things from one chapter to another. **Member Holder** stated that the procedure requires motion to rescind, which is what **Parliamentarian Johnson** stated was the procedure that is applicable.

**Member Lewis** suggested another way, to restate the terms of eligibility: it could be talked about in the compensation chapter, Part IV in chapter 17 and specify eligibility in Part V.

**Member Lewis** expressed that recommendations for reparations are explicitly identified for the community of eligibility and that reparations should be understood as direct compensation and beneficiary driven policies and programs. There are other policies that we are recommending because AB 3121 asks the Task Force to identify bad policies in California and propose fixes.

**Member Tamaki** raised concern as to how certain policies directed to the community of eligibility would perform in practice as medical and educational recommendations would be difficult to implement if delineation between the community of eligibility and others is required. As an example, he asked the Task Force to consider how the entertained motion would impact San Francisco infant mortality rate.

**Member Holder called for the question** and asked the Task Force to put the discussion into a vote. She expressed concern that the motion entertained would substantially rescind the Task Force's decisions and votes. She further stated that the motion must be in the form of a rescission of the former motion.

**SAAG Newman** informed that in light of the Task Force's direction received at the last meeting, the DOJ has increased focus on the fact that recommendations throughout the public policy section are intended to benefit the community of eligibility first and foremost, even if there are benefits to others that could follow. The DOJ has also reformatted language to state that in implementing policy recommendations, the Legislature should give specific considerations for the community of eligibility.

**Member Montgomery-Steppe Seconded** the Vice-Chair Brown's motion.

**Member Jones-Sawyer** called for a point of order and inquired with Parliamentarian Johnson how the motion would be voted on procedurally. **Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that procedurally the motion would be a motion of rescission. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** inquired whether a motion for rescission was appropriate given that the text in question (i.e., the Freedmen Affairs Agency section) was properly noticed to the public and the motion is only asking for it to be moved to another section. Additionally, she stated that the other portions of the motion were discussed in public at the meeting.

**SAAG Brown** requested the Task Force to make a new motion as Vice-Chair Brown's motion died on the floor for lack of a second. Although **Member Montgomery-Steppe** seconded the motion, Parliamentarian Johnson stated that the motion was out of order as a motion for rescission was required first. Parliamentarian Johnson assisted the Task Force and stated that because the Freedmen Affairs Agency portion of Vice-Chair Brown's motion had been voted on in a prior meeting, a motion for rescission is needed for it. The other portions of his motion can be voted on as normal procedure dictates.

**Vice-Chair Brown** called for the question and **Member (inaudible) Seconded**. **Chair Moore** called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Montgomery Steppe

**Nays:** Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki

**Abstentions:** Member Bradford, Member Jones-Sawyer

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **3 Ayes, 4 Nays, 2 Abstentions**.

**The Motion failed.**

**MOTION:**

**Member Jones-Sawyer** moved to approve Part IV: Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Reparations and Forms of Compensation and Restitution as presented. **Member Grills Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** opened the floor to the Task Force for discussion. **Chair Moore** inquired whether the **SAAG Newman's** proposed language would be included.

**MOTION:**

**Member Jones-Sawyer** moved to make a friendly amendment to add the proposed language, written by SAAG Newman into Part IV, which was **Seconded by Member Grills**. Chair Moore reiterated her feeling that the proposed language does not accurately reflect her interpretation of what the Task Force decided regarding eligibility. Member Jones-Sawyer called for the question which was Seconded by Member Holder. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

**Ayes:** Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Montgomery-Steppe

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **6 Ayes, 3 Nays, 0 Abstentions**.

**The Motion Passed to approve the motion to call the question and end debate on the motion to approve the full report, Part IV: Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Reparations and Forms of Compensation and Restitution as amended to add the proposed language, written by Attorney Newman into Part IV**

The debate ended. The Task Force moved on to the vote on the main motion.

**Chair Moore** then inquired whether a motion of rescission is warranted given her interpretation that the approved Part IV conflicts with the Task Force's vote on eligibility.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** indicated that following the vote on the amendment, the Task Force had to vote on the main motion, as amended.

**Chair Moore** asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on Member Jones-Sawyer's original motion to approve of Part IV, as amended. Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll.

**Ayes:** Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays, 2 Abstentions.**

**The Motion Passed to Approve of Part IV, Recommendations of Task Force Regarding Calculations of Reparations and Forms of Compensation and Restitution as amended.**

**11. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part V: Policy Recommendations to the Legislature as to the Appropriate Policies, Programs, Projects, and Recommendations for the Purpose of Reversing the Injuries**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for the Task Force to discuss any added changes or additions to Part V. Hearing no discussion, Chair Moore asked the Task Force to entertain a motion.

**MOTION:**

**Member Bradford** moved to approve Part V: Policy Recommendations to the Legislature as to the Appropriate Policies, Programs, Projects, and Recommendations for the Purpose of Reversing the Injuries, as presented. **Vice-Chair Brown Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** opened the floor to the Task Force for discussion on Member Bradford's motion. **Chair Moore** stated that the following sentences should be deleted:

While recommending that monetary reparations be limited to the eligible class, the Task Force recognizes that the five pillars of reparations and AB 3121 require that it also endeavors to ensure cumulative harms of the past four centuries do not continue to be visited upon living African Americans and on society in California and the United States. At the same time many recommendations cannot be implemented only for Descendants and must instead be framed to benefit the larger community of African-American Californians or even all Californians.

**Chair Moore** stated that as written, the aforementioned sentence has the potential to confuse legislators and members of the public as to who constitutes the eligible class. She also stated that the second sentence makes an assertion about what can or cannot be implemented by the Legislature and that it was unwise for the Task Force to make such an insertion in the final report especially as part of the policy recommendations because it has a dangerous potential to limit and negatively influence upcoming legislation. In addition, the statements and decisions of what can or cannot be implemented are best left to the

Legislature.

**MOTION:**

**Member Montgomery-Steppe** moved to remove the aforementioned sentences from Part V of the Report. **Member Bradford** **Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** stated that the motion was properly moved and seconded and called for discussion on **Member Montgomery-Steppe's** motion.

**Member Holder** asked the Task Force to entertain a friendly amendment to **Member Montgomery-Steppe's** motion retain the first sentence in **Member Montgomery-Steppe's** motion. She stated that in doing so, it would emphasize the importance of guarantees of non-repetition.

**MOTION:**

**Member Holder** moved to make an amendment to Member Montgomery-Steppe's motion only remove the following sentence: At the same time many recommendations cannot be implemented only for Descendants and must instead be framed to benefit the larger community of African-American Californians or even all Californians. **Member Grills** **Seconded** the motion.

**Parliamentarian Johnson** facilitated the procedure by stating that Member Holder's amendment to **Member Montgomery-Steppe's** amendment would need to be resolved prior to proceeding with **Member Montgomery-Steppe's motion to amend. This action would be followed with a vote on the main motion made by member Bradford.** **On discussion of Member Holder's amendment to Member Montgomery-Steppe's amendment, Member Montgomery-Steppe** stated that she interprets both sentences to be misaligned with language put forth by AB 3121. Hearing no further discussion, **Chair Moore** called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the last amendment to the main motion.

**Ayes:** Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **5 Ayes, 4 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion Passed** to Amend Member Montgomery-Steppe's Amendment

**Chair Moore** stated that the motion passed does not reflect the decisions the Task Force has made over the years nor does it reflect the AB 3121 statute. She stated that the sentence

retained is a reflection of California DOJ opinion and that the DOJ has editorialized the report.

**SAAG Brown** responded that as the Task Force voted to retain the sentence, that it was not a DOJ decision but the Task Force's decision. **SAAG Brown** added that there was no editorializing by DOJ.

**Chair Moore** asked the Task Force to entertain a motion to include a footnote which references the community of eligibility as clarified by the author of the bill, **Secretary of State Shirley Weber**.

**MOTION:**

**Member Bradford** moved to make a friendly amendment to add a footnote which references the community of eligibility into Part V, as clarified by the Secretary of State Shirley Weber when she provided expert testimony in February, 2022. **Member Montgomery-Steppe Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** called for discussion. **Vice Chair Brown** provided comment, stating that the burden is on this state Assembly and Senate to show that it has some integrity, compassion and sense of justice to do the right thing. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion. Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll:

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** Member Grills

**Abstentions:** Member Holder,

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 1 Nay, 1 Abstention**.

**The Motion Passed.**

**Chair Moore** then entertained a motion for to approve action item #11, Part V as amended by Member Holder's and Member Bradford's motions.

**MOTION:**

**Member Lewis** moved to approve Part V: Policy Recommendations to the Legislature as to the Appropriate Policies, Programs, Projects, and Recommendations for the Purpose of Reversing the Injuries as amended by Members Holder's and Bradford's amendments. **Member Holder Seconded** the motion. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Grills, Member

Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion to approve Part V, as amended passed.**

Chair Moore then moved the meeting to the next agenda item

**12. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part VI: Report on Racial Justice Act Implementation**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for the Task Force to discuss any added changes or additions to Part VI. Hearing no discussion, **Chair Moore** asked the Task Force to entertain a motion.

**MOTION:**

**Member Tamaki** moved to approve Part VI: Report on Racial Justice Act Implementation as presented. Member Lewis **Seconded** the motion. Hearing no further discussion, **Chair Moore** called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion to approve Part VI, as presented, passed.**

Chair Moore then moved the meeting to the next agenda item

**13. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part VII: Bunche Center Report on Community Engagement and Input through Community Listening Sessions**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for the Task Force to discuss any added changes or

additions to Part VII. Hearing no discussion, Chair Moore asked the Task Force to entertain a motion.

**MOTION:**

**Member Grills** moved to approve Part VII: Bunche Center Report on Community Engagement and Input through Community Listening Sessions as presented. **Member Lewis Seconded** the motion. Chair Moore then opened the floor for discussion on the matter.

Chair Moore asked the Task Force to consider including the total cost of the Bunche Center Report as well as sources who contributed funding as a special thanks for their contributions and for transparency. **Member Grills** did not feel that there was a need for the total costs of the Bunche Center Report to be displayed, as it did not add anything substantive to the report. She also stated that to add acknowledgements germane to the Bunche Center Report would require the Bunche Center's approval. When Chair Moore also inquired whether the Task Force had editorial power over the Bunche Report, **SAAG Newman** noted that the report had already been completed, submitted, voted on in its final form, and incorporated as delivered, and that logistically this would not be feasible as it would require the Bunche Center to make the changes and for them to be approved, which could not happen in time. **Members Bradford and Montgomery-Steppe** pointed out that the anchor organizations and the private organizations that provided funding are already acknowledged. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion to approve Part VII as presented passed.**

**14. Break (No break was taken)**

In consideration of time, no break was taken and Chair Moore moved to the next agenda item.

**15. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part VIII: Task Force's Recommendations for Educating the Public**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for the Task Force to discuss any added changes or additions to Part VIII.

**Chair Moore** stated that any references to a docuseries needs to be deleted and would entertain a motion to approve Part VIII as amended.

**MOTION:**

**Member Lewis** moved to approve Part VIII: Task Force’s Recommendations for Educating the Public as amended and to delete any explicit references to a docuseries. **Vice Chair Brown Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** then opened the floor for discussion on the matter. Hearing no discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion. Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll:

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Bradford, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Member Grills, Member Holder

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays, 2 Abstentions.**

**The Motion to approve Part VIII, as amended, passed.**

**Chair Moore** then moved the meeting to the next agenda item

**16. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Part IX: Compendium of Statutes and Case Law that Contributed to an Unjust Legal System**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for the Task Force to discuss any added changes or additions to Part IX and entertained a motion to approve Part IX.

**MOTION:**

**Member Bradford** moved to approve Part IX: Compendium of Statutes and Case Law that Contributed to an Unjust Legal System as presented. **Vice-Chair Brown Seconded** the motion. Chair Moore then opened the floor for discussion on the matter. Hearing no discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion to approve Part VIII as amended passed.**

Chair Moore then moved to the next agenda item.

**17. Action Item: Final Discussion and Vote on the Full Final Report, Executive Summary**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for the Task Force to discuss any added changes or additions to the Executive Summary.

**Chair Moore** also asked the Task Force to entertain a motion to include the eligibility footnote, as approved in Agenda Item 11, in the executive summary anytime the community of eligibility is referenced.

**MOTION:**

**Member Grills** moved to approve the Executive Summary as presented, without amendment. Member (inaudible) **Seconded** the motion. Chair Moore then opened the floor for discussion on the matter and asked Member Grills if she would entertain a friendly amendment to include the footnote voted in Agenda Item 11 to the Executive Summary. Hearing no discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Chair Moore

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **8 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention.**

**The Motion to approve the Executive Summary as presented passed.**

**Chair Moore** asked the Task Force to entertain a motion to incorporate the footnote approved in Agenda Item 11 throughout the final report whenever the community of eligibility is referenced.

**MOTION:**

**Member Montgomery-Steppe** moved to incorporate the footnote approved in Agenda

Item 11 throughout the final report whenever the community of eligibility is referenced. **Vice-Chair Brown Seconded** the motion. Chair Moore then opened the floor for discussion.

**Member Bradford** recommended that instead of an explicit reference to **Secretary of State Shirley Weber**, that the footnotes reference the AB 3121 statute.

**Chair Moore** stated that it may be appropriate to reference **SOS Weber** as she provided additional clarification when invited to one of the Task Force's public meetings.

**Member Lewis** stated that he appreciated the intent behind the motion but stated that the motion would infer that the Task Force is not confident in its own work product. He stated that the AB 3121 legislation could have decided on eligibility but that AB 3121 tasked the Task Force to make that decision. **Member Lewis** expressed that he wanted to advance the authority of the Task Force and further explained that the explanation of the footnote, which is set forth at the first instance the community of eligibility is mentioned, is carried forward to each instance where the community of eligibility is mentioned.

**Chair Moore** then asked **Member Montgomery-Steppe** whether a friendly amendment to the motion can be made to place the approved footnote at the first instance the community of eligibility is referenced. **Member Montgomery-Steppe** accepted the friendly amendment.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion. Parliamentarian Johnson called for the vote:

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

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion Passed.**

## **18. Discussion and Action Item: June 30, 2023 Meeting Location and Agenda**

**Chair Moore** opened the agenda item for discussion and noted that the location and substance of the meeting has not yet been chosen. **Member Jones-Sawyer** stated that June 30, 2023 would be the day that the California State Assembly will have a change in speakership from Speaker Rendon to Speaker Rivas. As the change in speakership may draw media attention; he and Member Bradford asked the Task Force to consider moving

the final meeting to June 29, 2023 in Sacramento. **Member Jones-Sawyer** also recommended that the final meeting be held at the Secretary of State's auditorium to pay homage to SOS Weber as the original author. He stated that the proposed venue and date would allow for press, legislators, and SOS Weber to appear, if possible.

**Chair Moore** then asked the Task Force to entertain a motion in consideration of Member Jones-Sawyer's statement.

**MOTION:**

**Vice-Chair Brown** moved that the Task Force accept Member Jones-Sawyer's suggestion that the June 2023 meeting be held in Sacramento on June 29, 2023. **Member Lewis** **Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** then opened the floor for discussion on the matter.

Chair Moore inquired when the final report would be published and released and raised concern that the community of eligibility may not be able to attend in Sacramento relative to other locations. SAAG Brown stated that the report would be published on June 29, 2023.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Holder, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 9 Task Force members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions.**

**The Motion Passed.**

**After being recognized by Chair Moore, SAAG Brown** asked the Task Force to set the agenda of the June 2023 meeting, which was the second part of agenda item # 18.

**Chair Moore** asked the Task Force to consider adding an evening testimonial event where the community of eligibility would share testimonials that correspond to each chapter of the report. **Chair Moore** stated that the event would engender public support just as similar events did for the Japanese-American redress movement.

**Member Tamaki** agreed, stating that it would humanize the report from being abstract policy for the members of the public. He shared that having 13 speakers may be too long but that the Communications Advisory Subcommittee and other supporting Task Force

members could make it feasible.

**MOTION:**

**Vice-Chair Brown** moved that the Task Force invite particular people to provide personal testimony on some atrocities identified in the interim report. **Member Tamaki** **Seconded** the motion.

**Chair Moore** then opened the floor for discussion on the matter.

**Chair Moore** stated that this event was initially slated to be had in February 2023 and that CCG was supposed to help organize it. **Member Tamaki** stated that the delay may have worked in the Task Force's favor as maximum coverage of the Task Force would be on the day they release the report. **Members Lewis** and **Bradford** expressed that they would provide the appropriate and necessary support as the Communications Advisory Subcommittee. Member Lewis sought clarification on the scope of the event, as limitations in funding and capacity may affect its success. He shared that the publicity of the event is within CCG's scope of work but that the actual organization of the event is a separate issue. To alleviate that concern, **Chair Moore** and **Vice-Chair Brown** agreed to coordinate the speakers for the event. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Moore called on **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll for the vote on the motion.

**Ayes:** Chair Moore, Vice-Chair Brown, Member Jones-Sawyer, Member Lewis, Member Montgomery-Steppe, Member Tamaki.

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Member Holder

**Parliamentarian Johnson** stated that there were 7 Task Force members present and voting: **6 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstentions.**

**The Motion Passed.**

Chair Moore then moved the meeting to the next agenda item

**19. Discussion and Potential Action Item: Unfinished Business**

**SAAG Brown** sought clarification on the previous motion that Chair Moore and Vice-Chair Brown would work directly with CCG on planning this event. He stated that if the Task Force's Communications Advisory Subcommittee, Chair Moore, and Vice-Chair Brown work with CCG, it would create a Bagley-Keene violation. **Chair Moore** stated that she and **Vice-Chair Brown** would only be indirectly working with CCG; CCG would only be tasked with providing publicity to the event and augment her publicity.

**SAAG Brown** expressed that he wanted it to be made clear that **Chair Moore** and **Vice Chair Brown** would not be working with the Communications Advisory Committee and

that DOJ would not have a substantive role in preparing or coordinating the witness testimony for the final hearing.

Chair Moore moved to the next agenda item, #20.

**20. Task Force Member Closing Remarks and Meeting Adjourn**

**Member Tamaki** thanked the DOJ for their monumental effort working on the report. **Chair Moore** also thanked Mills College for hosting the event and thanked the community of eligibility. In closing, she asked the community of eligibility to remain encouraged.

Chair Moore officially adjourned the meeting.