

**Human Right Commission Minutes
Regular Meeting**

Meeting Date: May 16, 2019

Location: City Space, 100 5th Street N.E.

Shantell Bingham called the meeting to order at 7:17 PM.

Roll Call: (Names of members present)

Jeanette Abi-Nader, Idil Aktan, Shantell Bingham, Elliot Brown, Pheobe Brown, Earnest Chambers (arrived after roll call), Melvin Grady, Kathryn Laughon, Andy Orban (arrived after roll call), Lyndelle Von Schill, Ann Smith, Catherine Spear, Matthew Tenant, Susi Wilbur, and Rob Woodside.

Note Taker: Transcription from audio recording by Claudia Gohn (OHR Intern) with edits by Todd Niemeier

**Please note, the summarized notes presented below are recorded in real time and are not concise quotes from the correlated speaker. Please review the posted audio recording for specific language. The HRC intends to get word-for-word transcript meeting notes for accessibility purposes in the future.*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Charlene: Called attention to the handout for Unity Days. Mentioned some of the Unity Days events, including talks and presentations. She mentioned presentations led by Lewis Nelson on slavery and blackface at UVA. On May 25th, there will be a Monticello to Main Street tour by people at Monticello discussing freed slaves from Monticello who owned businesses on the Downtown Mall Street, starting at the Court Square slave auction block and onto 5th Street. The June calendar for Unity Days is not completed yet, but there will be a film at Vinegar Hill Theater about toxic masculinity. There will be an exhibit at the Heritage Center at the Jefferson School through July 13th.

Catherine: Community partnership with University of Virginia, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Civil Rights, and Office of the Provost to send a group of 15 people to American Association of Colleges and Universities Institute at Villanova this summer on June 25th-29th talking about transformation and racial healing. She will be attending with Shantell, Charlene, Lewis Nelson, and Frank Dukes.

Charlene: Stated that there is a new ADA compliance officer, James Woods.

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

None

COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

None

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Not presented.

BUSINESS MATTER 1: Communication

Charlene: Talked about proper speaking and communication etiquette during meetings, especially so that the meeting can be clearly heard over the recording. Susi's system is important. No side conversations. Speak loudly and clearly. State name before speaking during the meeting. People should be able to feel heard in the meeting. She reminded commissioners that decision-making needs to happen as a group and that Shantell, as Chair, is the spokesperson for the HRC, unless she designates someone else.

Ann: Agreed with Charlene.

Shantell: Spoke with Susi and discussed the last meeting and the outcome of the elections. She opened the floor for discussion around any tension or worries held by the group.

Susi: Clarified the challenge of being a deaf woman in Charlottesville. Acknowledged tension and communication in the group and the sense that some members may come to the group with their own agendas. Encouraged members to speak from the heart and be authentic. Rather than coming with the focus on helping the community, take the time to get to know the community. Reflect on why you are part of the commission.

Shantell: Mentioned that she talked to Susi about the election. It was a surprise for both of them. She encourages members to share why they are still members of the commission and their contribution perspectives, worries, etc. Appreciates diversity within the commission.

Ann: Talks about her experience on the commission. Been part of the commission since it started. She understands that typically the Vice Chair would move to the Chair, given the experience and institutional knowledge of the Vice Chair. She was shocked that Susi did not know that Shantell wanted to run for Chair. Wants the commission to be clear on protocol in the future, even if it takes writing it out.

Phoebe: Proposes an idea for there to be a two-minute, per person limit for comments on agenda items. To keep the agenda moving forward. Volunteers to put together a one-page guide for meeting protocol.

Melvin: Agrees with Ann and Phoebe. There should be protocol.

Catherine: Recalled that originally it was just Susi who was considered to be running. She likes that anyone can be nominated and does not like the idea of an automatic move from Vice-Chair to Chair. This should be considered when developing protocol.

Elliot: She was against speaking-time limits. Stated that she is willing to stay late if that is what it takes to make sure that everyone can be heard. State that she believed that assuming that the Vice Chair goes directly to Chair is not beneficial to the commission.

Charlene: Added that, as Director of the Human Rights Commission, she does not expect the members of the commission to develop close personal relationships, but commissioners need to be able to talk to

each other about hard topics. Said that it is her job to facilitate the meetings and she is committed to walking the talk.

Shantell: Thanked everyone for speaking. She said that she encourages collaborative leadership and will work to make sure everyone can speak and be heard. Called for a moment of silence before moving on in the agenda.

Jeanette: Wanted to revisit the idea of timing how long people can speak during the meeting. She was also not comfortable with a time limit on individual speech and in favor of people using their own judgement.

Matthew: Supported the idea of a time limit for when people speak because it will force members to think about what they want to say before speaking it. Thought that it would keep things moving in the meeting. Asked what percentage of the commission participated in the election.

Shantell: Said that there was 10 people who participated, more than half.

Jeannette: Said that she had numbers.

Charlene: Stated the results of the election: 6 for Shantell, 4 for Susi in the vote for Chair. Susi got the majority of the votes of people who came in late, 11 votes.

Kathryn: Pointed out that the minutes from the last meeting had not been approved.

Charlene: Apologized and said that it was supposed to happen after the commission response by the public.

Shantell: Said that the commission could do that at the end.

Charlene: Said that commission could do it at the end of the meeting.

Shantell: Added to the agenda to cover minutes from the last meeting.

BUSINESS MATTER 2: Richmond HRC Update

Ann: Gave a positive review of her experience. Riqia Taylor is the Chair. They have 13 commissioners altogether. Richmond HRC is doing a lot of research, looking at discrimination in the community, how to establish intake and investigation process, and looking at the policies in Richmond. They talked about how to establish a rapid response team that, in the case of an important issue that needed immediate action, would decide whether the commission or the executives would handle it. They are considering becoming a FEPA. They are also considering alternatives to Robert's Rules: Martha's Rules or Modified Consequences Rules. Ann also talked about how appointments for the commission are different in Richmond: some appointed by Mayor, some submitted applications. Their liaison is a City Attorney within the HR department.

Shantell: Asked if they talked about the scope of their ordinance.

Ann: Said that they did not talk about the ordinance.

Kathryn: Asked if the potential rapid response team would be an Ad Hoc committee.

Ann: She replied that they did not specify whether they would or would not. Ann also said that the Richmond HRC meets twice a month, on the second and fourth Thursdays, and they meet earlier in the day.

Shantell: Shantell asked for any more comments on the Richmond HRC. She shared her thoughts on the Richmond HRC, and thought that they do things differently, sometimes better.

Ann: The head of the Richmond HRC is Riqia Taylor, and Ann talked a little about her background. They were still waiting for budget approval in Richmond.

Shantell: Asked for any more comments on the Richmond HRC and then moved on to item 3.

BUSINESS MATTER 3: UVA Student Representation Update

Kathryn Laughon: She did not have any updates. She has not had any replies to emails. Said that the Minority Rights Coalition is not a sanctioned student group of UVA.

Charlene: Stated that she was aware that they were not a CIO but they still had a strong presence.

Catherine Spear: Recommended trying a different way to connect with the UVA students because it is important to have a relationship with the students as a committee. She works closely with the Minority Rights Coalition through her role at UVA.

Charlene: Mentioned that Carolyn Dillard (from the Community Outreach Office) expressed interest in the Human Rights Commission's relationship with UVA. Charlene said that she talked to her about the history of HRC's relationship with students. Ms. Dillard said she could contact others to see if there could be more consistent participation by students in the HRC. Charlene described the difference between an appointed an HRC member appointed by Council vs. a liaison.

Catherine Spear: Said that she and Kathryn Laughon could contact Carolyn Dillard and see what they could work out to promote student representation in the future.

Charlene: Specified that the student representative would not necessarily need to be a member of the Minority Rights Coalition.

Jeannette: Said that she would like to hear more about the purpose of the relationship and asked if the HRC would also like a representative from PVCC, CHS, etc.

Charlene: Asked for that discussion to be added to the next meeting's agenda.

Action Item: Catherine Spear and Kathryn Laughon will contact Carolyn Dillard to see how they can promote student representation in the HRC in the future.

Action Item: Add discussion of including liaisons from PVCC and CHS to a future agenda.

Business Matter 4: OHR Staff Report

Charlene: Said that there were no specific numbers to report on in terms of office activity. However, there was an increase in concern over specific issues, including public accommodation, issues with the regional jail and access to services and acts of discrimination there, and housing voucher rejections (because of criminal background). OHR will be in contact with other agencies to see what they can do for the housing voucher discrimination based on criminal background.

Phoebe: Asked if people are being rejected by landlords after they have a voucher or being rejected for the voucher program.

Charlene: Charlene said that those who receive a voucher will go out and try to find housing and then the property owner or landlord says that since that person with the voucher has a criminal background, they will not give them housing. She said that having a criminal background is not a protected class, but since there is a disproportionality around race, there are some ways that they could make a discrimination claim.

Phoebe: Clarified that since the criminal justice system disproportionately affects people of color, even though criminal background is not a protected class, it can also be considered discrimination on the basis of race.

Catherine Spear: Stated that legal theory supports for this.

Charlene: Agreed. The OHR would work with Legal Aid to do this. The OHR was still collecting data to see if they can address and tackle this issue. Also talked about different ways and issues that the members could help with at the OHR:

- Re-entry: Re-entry council and work with individuals
 - Commissioners are encouraged to attend Re-entry Council Meetings
- Housing: Resident Advisory Committee
 - Commissioners are encouraged to attend meetings and help schedule provider visits (SARA, DSS, Region Ten, and others) to housing sites
- Education: Equity dialogue
 - Commissioners are welcome to work with Charlene on this
- Statues: Ongoing conversations about the Lee, Jackson, and Lewis and Clark statues
 - Commissioners are encouraged to attend meetings regarding this dialogue
- Truth Commission Group: Exploring the idea of truth and reconciliation for the city
 - Some of the people who are going to the institute Catherine Spear mentioned are part of the group.
 - This came out of the pilgrimage of the lynching memorial.
 - Frank dukes from the Racial Equity Group talked about this and now has energy and money to make things happen.
- Dialogue on race: Media accountability group
 - The creation of this group was based on votes that came out of dialogue on race.

- Talks about how media spreads news about people in community and has no accountability.
- The group is a diverse group of people who meet on regular basis.
- Commissioners can also attend.

****BREAK**** [Susi Wilbur was experiencing difficulties with her online interpretation services.)

Charlene: Talked about the Accountability Group for Media and the media report card they are creating with local media. No local example currently exists. This would be created with the purpose to keep local media accountable. The group will partner with UVA and other student publications for input. The above are ways members could get involved without having to create an ad hoc committee to do so.

Handed out slips of papers to put their name on and go into a pot. She received money that she cannot accept and is auctioning them off in gift cards.

Elliott: Asked if the committee has an influence in the statues.

Charlene: Asked for clarification.

Elliott: Can being on the committee prevent the statue from going back up once it is taken down.

Charlene: Did not know. Said that attending the meetings where those conversations are happening would mean that there would be more than one voice in the room which is important and to make sure that if something happens then there is a procedure around it so that it can't happen again or that no one can put that statue back up again.

Lyndele: Thanked Charlene for offering the gift cards but thought that it might not be appropriate for the members of the HRC to be accepting the gifts. Asked if there is a way to pass some of those gifts on to community groups or people who would benefit more than members of HRC.

Charlene: Said that she mentioned these opportunities because she thought that the members might want to participate in the drawing since they are unpaid volunteers. Was willing to direct the gift cards somewhere else.

Ann: Said that the drawing is a good idea, given that we don't know the economic status of everyone around the table. Said that the HRC should be accepting of a gift if Charlene is offering.

Susi: Agrees and suggests whoever gets it can give it to a group who really needs it or use it for themselves.

Charlene: Said that if anyone is interested in the drawing that they should put their name on the paper and put it in the cup.

Catherine: While the cup was going around, asked Charlene about the opportunities the HRC members can participate in and asked how they could let Charlene know that they want to participate.

Charlene: She said that the best way to contact her and let her know would be via email.

Charlene: Asked again for everyone's slips of paper one last time.

Shantell: Thanked Charlene and moved meeting to the work session.

WORK SESSION: Ad hoc committee

Shantell: Started a conversation to go over the Ad hoc committees and reviewed what they did at the last working group. Mentioned that it was only a draft. Asked for Charlene's input.

Charlene: Talked about a group that met and went over this process. Said there are minutes from the meeting but said that anyone could ask questions or share takeaways. Said that during the discussion about what they want the Ad hoc committees to do over next 6 months, she can write down any questions.

Kathryn: Offered to give a brief summary. Mentioned that Shantell had a good process for the meeting and that there was a lot of discussion around a few ideas. Said the big take away was why we spent a lot of time thinking about the ordinance, how things are done and what power the group has to get things done. Said that they have the power of the people and that they need to seize that power and wield it. She sees two specific ways to do this:

1. There should be a policy group that includes some content experts. Having people discuss the policies that the HRC reviews before meetings would help streamline HRC meetings.
2. There should be more community engagement so that people in the community will start bringing their issues to the commission and so that people will see the HRC as a resource. More presentations at community events might help this.

Shantell: Asked if anyone else had comments about the meeting minutes from the April 29th working group. Said that the handouts include information about the data, the way OHR was able to collect the data, and how the community engagement group (as Kathryn described) can be an avenue for people to the office (and how to get their feedback). Mentioned that other topics that came up were living wage, healing, and leading with values. Thinks that HRC should break out into Ad hoc meetings and that they should use the one-page handout (shared during meeting?) to help guide them to lead and organize ad hoc committees. Said that the community engagement piece needs structure.

Ann: Asked Kathryn about the statement she made about the ordinance. Asked if she was suggesting the commission should do things outside of the scope of the ordinance.

Kathryn: Clarified that the statement did not imply that the commission go rogue and do things that they don't have authorization to do. Rather, tackle issues such as education, that do not fall under the human rights protections and create reports for city council, etc. Said that they could do some things outside of committee mandates because they feel like it's important.

Catherine: She mentioned that she was also at the working group meeting and talked about an example. She said that the HRC works with the LGBTQ community, but that the commission could begin to do things they are not mandated to do. They could do lobbying in Richmond [note: implying General Assembly] for the LGBTQ community. She also added that the Ad hoc meeting talked about how the HRC is really focused on ending white supremacy and to be anti-systems of oppression and how they can best do that. They could do this by creating ad hoc committees because those are more flexible. For example, the policy committee could be a standing committee since they have more responsibility. Said

that for now they should pilot it as an ad hoc policy committee. She also commented on the community engagement committee and said that they talked about different aspects of the community including LGBTQ, race, disability, and that because of these many different groups, there could be smaller ad hoc committees branched off of the community engagement committee. Said that these committees could be great because people could join committees that they are really passionate about and they bring those discussions back to the commission so that everyone can work together.

Jeannette: Gave feedback on the documents. Suggested that it's not just the policy ad hoc committee that receives policy review. For the community engagement committee, she mentioned that they talked about community listening sessions, which would be a good way to receive feedback. She said that there should be a process that helps the engagement committee track what they discuss so that there is a record of those conversations (that they could bring back to discuss at the commission).

Shantell: Asked Jeannette to talk more about the listening sessions, or if that just meant commissioners being present at community events and bringing back reflections, etc.

Jeannette: She said that those sessions would have members sit at a table and tell people what we do informally and that we would host something (event) and also advertise that the commission will be there and encourage people to bring their thoughts, feedback, etc. She said that she may have misunderstood that but that she thinks it would be good to do that and bring back some of those ideas.

Shantell: Talking to Charlene, asked that if they do the listening sessions to bring information back to meetings how would they do so in a way that does not breach the confidentiality line or break any other rules.

Charlene: Said that they could be purposeful in how they set up the session. Staff could be present at events to redirect people from explaining personal situations. However, it can be difficult to encourage people who are expressing themselves to stop and save their conversation for an appointment with the OHR. Before having these sessions, they should be thoroughly planned out.

Catherine: Went back to the policy committee. Had question about the context expert (in the flow chart). Asked if by "department head" if that meant they would be going to them before going to the full commission since the HRC has their own experts. Suggests that HRC would discuss it first, then go to the City department head or expert.

Charlene: Her expectation is that the department head or designee would meet with commissioners as often as needed. She suggested the following process:

1. HRC would review policy and come up with questions.
2. The Policy Ad Hoc would then meet with the department representative or expert and go over the questions.
3. The Ad Hoc reviews the responses to the questions, and drafts a set of recommendations.
4. The HRC invites the expert to a regular HRC meeting.
5. During that meeting, they resolve unanswered questions before moving forward with final recommendations to Council.

Catherine: Restated to make sure she understood: HRC would consult and dialogue with the City expert (or department head) to review and clarify the policy. This would be a process oriented approach, as opposed to coming to the department with a tone of finality. We would then bring the information back

to the HRC and loop back with the City expert as needed before making official recommendations to Council. She notes that the HRC is still acting as an independent body that can get input from the City expert without feeling beholden to them When making their final recommendations.

Charlene: Said that the expert would be there to answer any questions. There is no expectation that there be 100% agreement (between the City expert/department head) and the HRC regarding what the HRC wants to recommend to Council. That is part of the process. The expert is there to provide context and answer questions, so that the HRC can make informed decisions. Likewise, the HRC can demonstrate that it is not blindsiding a department with recommendations because they were involved in the process.

Jeannette: Suggested that city expert/department consultation be “as needed.” But she interpreted from Charlene that it be required.

Charlene: Clarified that complete buy-in is not expected but it is important that the expert meets with the commission at some point, even if they aren’t in total agreement. Emails are not enough. There should be face-to-face conversation.

Shantell: Suggested reframing “content expert” as “point of contact.” We should be having conversations with the people who will be implementing the policies and controlling the outcomes, even if we don’t agree. This is just good practice.

Catherine: Agrees that there should be a City point of contact and that there should be face-to-face discussions.

Elliot: Said that HRC should seek feedback not just from the people who enforce a policy but also from the people who are affected by the policy.

Shantell: Asked Elliot to talk more about that. Suggested that public comment at HRC meetings might be a venue for this feedback.

Charlene: Suggested that listening sessions on particular policies might be an alternative to expecting people to come to regular HRC meetings to make public comment. The HRC would instead go out into the community and ask how a particular policy affects their day-to-day lives. The HRC can decide where in the process to include an opportunity for public feedback.

Elliot: Feels that every policy touches many people. Considering the police policies: there is the police chief, the officers, and the people on the street who are affected. She would appreciate getting feedback from all angles.

Jeanette: Suggested that they include (for people to review the policy) “meets with content expert, department head, affected individuals” with “*at any point in the process” This would address various perspectives.

Charlene: Reflected back Jeanette’s suggestion: “HRC will meet with content experts, department heads, and affected individuals at any point during the policy review process.”

Catherine Spear: Suggested “meets with University points of contact, subject matter experts, affected individuals, as needed.” This gives a broader scope for seeking input. Clarified that when she said “University” she meant “City.”

Charlene: Said that she will go back to the tape and get the exact terminology and wording.

Melvin: Agreed with the above. Also noted that it is important that the full HRC gets the policy before it goes to the Ad Hoc for further review.

Shantell: Clarified that all policies will come to the commission first. Any commissioner can then participate in the Ad Hoc committee of their choice if a particular policy is of interest to do further work.

Moved the conversation to leadership of the Policy Ad Hoc Committee. Catherine Spear emerged as a potential candidate. Notes that she uses the term candidate loosely and that she means that the policy committee needs a point person to keep things moving. Suggests also potential for rotational leadership. Notes that the Policy Ad Hoc will always be open to anyone that wants to join, but needs a core leadership group.

Ann: Suggested that we ask for volunteers.

Shantell: Asked for volunteers. Volunteers included Catherine.

Elliot: Said that she wasn't a leader for that but that she wanted to be a follower and a committed participant.

Catherine Spear informally selected as leader

Catherine: Happy to be the initial chair. Her pitch for others to join was that even if someone thinks that policy isn't their thing, they should participate to challenge white supremacy and oppressive systems. It will take more than two people to work on complex policies.

Phoebe: Reminded that commissioners do not have to join the policy ad hoc committee if a particular policy is not of interest.

Melvin: Agreed that he would feel more motivated to participate if he knew what particular policy was going to be reviewed.

Shantell: Noted that police policies are currently on the docket to review. The ADA policy is another that is in process, especially since there is a new ADA policy coordinator. We can also work on the recommendations we already made for the statues. The goal is to establish leadership for the committee so that leaders can communicate to the HRC what the committee will be doing. Not everyone needs to be on the leadership end, but a mechanism to coordinate the work is important.

Phoebe: Said that that sounded more like a standing committee rather than an ad hoc committee.

Shantell: Clarified that it is being organized as an ad hoc committee because it will be more flexible. Standing committees are more formal and require the HRC to commit to a particular focus.

Charlene: Acknowledged concern. Said that the policies that they will work on are the 3 policies from police department. The question is how long it will take and how many questions will arise. The same thing can be said for the community engagement ad hoc. A community member raised a concern around disability awareness proposed ideas. This could be the first thing that the community engagement ad hoc focuses on. Now it is a matter of having a process and having leadership within the ad hoc committees to shepherd the process. You could have more than one person in leadership to make sure the work gets done.

Andy: Agrees with Pheobe that this sounds like a hybrid between stand and ad hoc. Agrees with the need for structure, though we should be accurate in what we call it.

Charlene: If you want it to be a standing committee, then there is a voting process that needs to happen. If you want it to be an ad hoc for flexibility, call it an ad hoc, and we can move on.

Catherine: Would like the group to pick a policy and start the ad hoc working on it. Then we know what we will be doing and commissioners can decide whether to participate.

Kathryn: Agrees that forward momentum would be great. Said she will be on the policy committee.

Shantell: Agreed to move forward, though acknowledges that she wants to make sure everyone understands what is going on and that we are moving at a pace that works for the group. Summarized that they could start with an ad hoc committee focusing on the police policies, with Catherine in a leadership role.

Jeanette: Voiced her support for starting with the police policies and having Catherine organize the committee.

Melvin: Agrees.

Shantell: The commission received a request to host an event honoring people who live with disabilities in the community. We made a commitment to support this idea. It makes sense for that to be the first community engagement piece. Asked for input.

Melvin: Expressed interest in the committee. Did not want to lead.

Phoebe: Expressed interest in the committee. Expressed willingness to lead.

Ann: Asked Shantell about the scope of the term disability (physical, communication, etc.) in the event.

Charlene: Encouraged the group not to think about the content at this point and to rather decide if they would be interested in participating on the committee.

Jeannette: Also interested in community engagement. Talked about an email she had received saying that she had agreed to support something and that she had been confused. She asked for a clarification on what they agreed to.

Kathryn: Said she had the same feeling at that meeting with him there. (This is the same man who first created this idea) Suggested that the commission should not commit to something like that before discussion together as a commission.

Charlene: Agreed. Said that the event size and style would be left to the community engagement committee. Could be a community fair or an ad campaign on community access. Committee should meet and discuss.

Catherine: Said that she was not there at that meeting. However she looked at the minutes and offered herself as a resource to that committee in their planning since she works with the University and in access to those with disability in the community.

Shantell: Said to add herself to the policy committee. Said that everyone should try to be active. Said that if people do not feel connected immediately that's okay but that they are part of the HRC and should be active and supportive.

Charlene: Asked who is taking the lead on the community engagement ad hoc.

Phoebe: Volunteered to be a leader in the community engagement committee.

Melvin: Said that people should feel free to participate play the role in which they feel comfortable.

Charlene: Asked for time people can meet or suggested they meet at the end of the evening to establish a time.

Catherine: Asked if ad hoc committee leaders can email potential dates for meetings.

Charlene: Said yes.

(Concern over hours and work schedules.)

Charlene: Offered her office at any time.

Shantell: Suggested that groups use the one-pager as a guide and to document what is happening in their processes and reminded everyone that the policy committee is open to more members. Directed ideas for community engagement committee to Phoebe.

OTHER BUSINESS: SUPPORT STATEMENTS FOR AFFINITY GROUPS

Shantell: Asked Charlene to clarify the support statement for affinity groups.

Charlene: Said that there had already been some opportunities to issue statements of support. Last few requests have come from CLIHC (Charlottesville Low-income Housing Coalition). The commission can make statements of support for any group they choose. If they do not make a statement (assuming one is requested), then they need to agree that they will not make a statement.

As an example, regarding the recent housing march (from Belmont Apts. to City Hall), a group reached out to the OHR for a statement of support. The OHR issued a statement of support. The OHR will always

support access to safe and affordable housing. Charlene passed the request on to Shantell for the HRC's consideration. Shantell reached out to Susi. They agreed as Chair and Vice-Chair to show support. Several commissioners went to the march, some wore their HRC name badges. The OHR did get some hassle from some community members for participating. When the office puts out a statement, it does not necessarily mean that the statement is also coming from the HRC. That can be confusing, but she will always share these opportunities with the Chair and Vice-Chair. For timeliness, the decision regarding support statements is made by the Chair and Vice-Chair, unless there is a publicly-noticed emergency meeting to discuss that involves more than two commissioners.

Phoebe: Understands but says that she would still like to be informed if the commission is making a statement of support before it happens. This gives commissioners the opportunity to call an emergency meeting if they feel strongly about the issue.

Charlene: Agrees. That sounds reasonable.

Shantell: Thinks that it is worth considering, though not every situation may allow for advance notice.

Kathryn: Felt that the rapid response by Shantell and Susi was warranted. She supports that process.

Melvin: Agrees with Kathryn, but, when possible, statements should be discussed/approved by the HRC members first. Still supports the leaders to make decisions in that regard.

Charlene: Heard the concerns and agrees that prior to any statement going out to the press, HRC members will receive notification first.

Phoebe: Agreed. An email would be adequate. Just notification and ability to see content before the statement goes out or before public stance is taken.

General discussion about notifying the members of statements from the HRC before being sent.

Elliot: Asked how to get her HRC name badge.

Charlene: New members should get their new badges in the office.

Shantell: Talked about HRC representation at the meeting. Reassured that HRC members can always say no comment if they do not agree or are not comfortable with public statements. She and Susi had lots of discussion before issuing the statement. Kathryn and Olivia went to the march. However, the Human Rights Commission, by nature of its mission, will face scrutiny and often be on the side of the underdog. It is important for commissioners to build trust and share feedback. There will be differences of opinion among commissioners, and she and Susi will make efforts to listen and take different opinions into account. She hopes that the commission can trust her and Susi as Chair and Vice-Chair to represent the Commission.

Susi: Suggested to look up today's Daily progress article about Belmont Apartments

Shantell: Asked for anything to share.

Kathryn: Went to the Belmont Apartments rally but neither she nor Olivia spoke. She also noted that she is on the truth commission.

MOTION:

Called by: Jeanette

Motion Language: Approve the minutes from the last meeting.

Discussion:

- **Andy:** suggested an amendment
 - **Amendment:** Amend the minutes to show a change from 10 to 11 votes for Vice Chair.

Seconded by: Lyndelle

Vote called by: Shantell

In Favor: 15

Opposed: 0

Abstained: 0

MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC:

None.

DRAWING:

- \$30 gift card to Pearl Island: Ann's name was drawn.
- Movie tickets: Shantell's name was drawn.

Meeting adjourned at 9:37 PM