
This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

Realtime captions will be displayed here.

Civic Engagement Commission 8/7/25.

SARAH SAYEED: Good morning. I'm calling the public meeting to order. Welcome to anyone here and anyone online with the live stream. Thanks so much for taking time. Commissioners and members of the public and also thank you to Abby, Abdul and members of our team for helping to arrange this meeting.

In preparation for the meeting I'll take attendance. I do want to note that we have a newly appointed commissioner from the Mayor who is replacing is HRA. Their name is Joshua Ocampo. Honors college majoring in political science and international studies. Joshua is abroad traveling right now. However was kind enough to join us virtually. Joshua, if you could unmute and introduce yourself that would be awesome.

JOSHUA OCAMPO: Are you able to see me? My name is Joshua Ocampo. Thank you so much Dr. Sayeed for that introduction. I am a rising senior at Long Island university, political science. Hello from Ireland here for the summer with a fellowship teaching creative writing and

community engagement. Civic engagement is super important to me as someone who spends time on how the community who has stepped up for me that makes civic engagement so important. I'm extremely happy to be here today and very grateful for the time.

(Applause).

SARAH SAYEED: I will take attendance. Murad.

MURAD AWAWDEH: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Gio.

GIOVANNI BARCENES: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Eve Baron.

EVE BARON: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Holly Bonner. Amy Breedlove.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Present.

SARAH SAYEED: Natalie DeVito.

NATALIE DEVITO: Present.

SARAH SAYEED: Mark Diller.

MARK DILLER: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Donna Gill.

DONNA GILL: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Edwin Maxwell. Joshua Ocampo. Lilliam Perez, Mitchell Wu. I'm Sarah Sayeed, I'm the Director, one of the 15 directors.

I also want to thank our partners Sight and Sound and also our captionist, thank you so much for supporting our meeting. Always like to

think more about public meetings and open meetings, and the intention behind these meetings is to have a more transparent government. So residents better understand how government operates and I think we need to start re-thinking about how to bring more people in the room into our public meetings. It will be great to talk with you all more about that.

And to run -- we could go on to the deck. Of course if you're here -- hi, Edwin. If you're here as a member of the public we'd love for you to sign in and also for people online whenever you're watching this either now or later, please visit [NYC.gov/civic engagement](https://nyc.gov/civic-engagement) civic engagement and go to the **PAB** to get involved and sign up for our newsletter so we can stay in touch with you and you can stay in touch with us on what we are doing. On the tech and housekeeping rules, refresher for everybody, we do ask that commissioners please mute your mics, and if you're online as well when you are ready to speak you can unmute. For anyone who -- we do have the opportunity in this public meeting though I want to say not all public meetings do this, we create a space at the end of the meeting for members of the public to make comment. If you want to make a comment, you can sign up in advance of the meeting via email. You can also sign up when you come into the room. And so since we started at 11 today you can sign up until 12.

You can also sign up via email or text. Instructions are on the slide.

Email info@civicengagement.NYC.gov. I should read the number out loud. 917/587/9103.

We are going to begin with review and approving the minutes. Does everyone have the minutes?

MARK DILLER: Motion to approve.

NATALIE DEVITO: Second.

SARAH SAYEED: All in favor, please say aye. Any opposed? Say nay? Any abstaining? The motion to approve the minutes passed. Thank you so much.

We have a bunch of updates for you, and we are -- we may potentially have a vote. Really depends on where you all land. The first thing on the agenda as I said last time would be to go through the updated value statement.

In order to do that, there are different ways to approach this. I wasn't sure how much to show you all the track changes and iterations of edits. It was a lot because -- just to explain a process a little bit more, I shared the value statement with the commissioners online and people commented on it. Hand in hand with that our team was also looking at it for greater alignment with our participatory budgeting principles that PB -- participatory budgeting advisory committee came up with and staff also looked at edits. There were a bunch of different things and edits made. What I want to share also is what is the value statement that we have now, what are some high level things we have done to it in addition to the process of editing.

One thing we did was added the mission that's noted in the city charter at the top. If you recall, they were in our value statements, some values that were paired. For example, I think we had transparent on ability was one example. There was accessibility and justice. The team felt it would be easier and more helpful to have just one label on the top though we can interpret the principles into a statement. That was another thing

we did.

There was also an instance -- we did plain language review on it to make sure it was readable at what grade level?

>> 8 or above.

SARAH SAYEED: 8th grade or above was our goal. To also shorten sentences, just making it easier for everyone to read. And we integrated language to commit x, y and z to show action that we would take to live out the value. Managed ways of working we changed to creativity. Language about the arts. There's also -- Mark, you suggested adding respect as a value instead of adding it separately we integrated it to dignity. There was one called dynamic learning. We integrated principles under that into other values. These are some changes that it went through. I would love to as we've been doing with the staff, I'd love to have us go around and read the value statement out loud because I think that helps us gel with it, and see how it lands for us.

So I would love to just ask the people on the phone to start us off. The way we've been doing it, hopefully I don't have to repeat the instructions again because we struggled with it as a team. We're going to have everyone read one sentence and pass to the next person. If you're on the phone, just popcorn it to the next person you see online and then we'll come to the people in the room. Are my instructions clear? Awesome. Let's start with -- who wants to start us off? Someone on the phone? Natalie, would you like to start us off?

NATALIE DEVITO: Sure. Okay. I'm going to zoom in on this, with my poor eyesight. All right. The Civic Engagement Commission's

purpose is to promote participation in civic life, enhance civic trust, and strengthen democracy in New York City. Our programs provide education and support to residents so they can take part in civic life.

SARAH SAYEED: You want to popcorn it.

>> The CEC believes that active listening is central to building relationships, understanding and trust with New Yorkers. We affirm our responsibility to lift the power and the voices of under served and under represented New York City communities. Joshua.

JOSHUA OCAMPO: To build a more inclusive, fair and just city for all New Yorkers, we ground this work in the following core values: Dignity. We affirm the equal worth of human beings regardless of identity or ability.

SARAH SAYEED: Anyone else on the phone?

JOSHUA OCAMPO: We commit to being responsive to residents' needs and concerns and to deliver our programs with respect and care.

SARAH SAYEED: Murad?

MURAD AWAWDEH: Accountability. We commit to being transparent and regularly sharing information with New Yorkers about our processes and decisions. We commit to improving our programs based on feedback from the communities we serve.

EDWIN MAXWELL: Collaboration. We commit to working with communities and prioritizing their lived experiences. This is essential to solve our collective challenges. We commit to fostering spaces for dialogue and amplifying the voices and stories of community partners.

>> Accessibility. We commit to work towards removing barriers to information and resources for our communities.

GIOVANNI BARCENES: We will promote justice for marginalized and under served communities. We will communicate keeping in mind plain language.

MARK DILLER: Creativity. We commit to inviting New Yorkers into spaces filled with beauty, joy and hope. We honor everyone's story by using art, music and story telling to bring people together. We believe creativity, play, and imagination are essential for a thriving democracy.

DONNA GILL: Manifesting community power. We commit to supporting community leadership. We will provide education about government systems, and processes. These actions will allow communities to exercise power over decisions affecting their lives.

EVE BARON: Next time.

SARAH SAYEED: Opening the floor for comments. Questions? Things that you think are missing from this that we should include?

MARK DILLER: An easy one is we need some sort of adjective and academic accountability. We commit to improving our program based on feedback from communities. Not all feedback. Some of the ideas I proposed were not ready for inclusion. Some adjective like appropriate or relevant, or useful.

SARAH SAYEED: I think you're raising -- I think you're raising a really important question that we can have a very deep and long conversation about which is something that we talk about in the team as well. The responsibility of government to take in feedback often stops at

the feedback. I think we're not always clear as government about what we're doing with the feedback, how we are processing it, how we're choosing from it, and being transparent about that. And that's part of why I think communities come into rooms, they give feedback and they go away and then they don't know what happened. So what you're raising is a really important point.

I'm wondering if an adjective would -- is enough for that. But I hear why you're feeling the need.

MARK DILLER: Because you added, as you highlighted, you're adding an action to it. We commit to doing something. And I am happy for us to commit to hearing feedback, and to considering it seriously. But it's different than saying we're going to improve our programs based on feedback.

MURAD AWAWDEH: Is my mic on? Is it on now? I don't disagree with your argument. I think the pieces -- feedback -- the way you process feedback is subjective sometimes. I think part -- I don't disagree about appropriate feedback. But I think putting that in would then insinuate we're already at the forefront determining what we think is appropriate versus not. I don't want people being turned off thinking if they share anything it's not going to be listened to. But I do think at the end of the day people coming to the Civic Engagement Commission know the feedback they give should be relevant to the commission's mission and the work that it takes up. I think it's fine as is. Just so that we're not using language that then gets manipulated down the road by others not seeing us but others who may not have the same intent.

SARAH SAYEED: Anyone else want to comment on that particular issue? I have a suggestion. I would like to hear from other commissioners if you have any thoughts including anyone online.

>> I have a thought but it's not the same as what has been expressed.

SARAH SAYEED: A different thought about this particular issue of feedback, Amy?

AMY BREEDLOVE: No. A different thought about the values.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. About this particular idea of feedback, one of the things I've been encouraging internally in different meetings I've been in is to create a way for us to -- being government to share some kind of report, documentation that says here is the feedback we received. Here is what we took from it. Here is why. And here is what we didn't take from the feedback and here is why. Which gives the public a better understanding of how we take feedback and process it. Is that something we want to commit ourselves to doing? In other words, if we're inviting people into a public meeting or a public hearing, they provide ideas and suggestions and then we explain to them what we took and what we didn't take and why. Is that something we want to put into the value statement? It would be something like we commit to collect and review feedback and share information with the public about that review. And then to improve our programs based on it. Something like that.

MARK DILLER: That's something the department of city planning does often times with public hearings. The department of education will do that. Or something like it.

SARAH SAYEED: That's great.

MARK DILLER: That strikes me as more -- to Murad's point, absolutely there's subjectivity to it. Absolutely someone is deciding what is and is not relevant to include. That's not us, usually it's the staff. And the leadership. So to acknowledge that is I think a step in the right direction.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Maybe my comment is relevant to the discussion. Part of what happens in government is you make different communities and different organizations fight for resources. And often there is a sense of hierarchy. Right? My needs are greater than this other group's needs and I should be recognized. So I think some language around the fact that we are recognizing the needs of all communities and peoples or however we want to say that, and yet we need to allocate resources based on whatever. I think there needs to be some recognition of this, as you're talking about, subjectivity. But in recognition that the needs are great by everyone.

NATALIE DEVITO: Is it that we are committed to selecting and considering the feedback? And that we apply it with the first priority being our mission? And apply it at every point that it is applicable, and in keeping with the intentions, the spirit and the requirements of our charge.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I think that you're hitting on that we need some sort of metrics or matrix in which the guiding principles of how we are using this feedback and deriving a decision based on what we have.

NATALIE DEVITO: Right. So public feedback could be thousands of people tell us to change our logo to blue or something, and that's just not

a thing. We welcome feedback. It doesn't -- it doesn't then -- to remain flexible doesn't necessarily mean that we now change our whole mission and our legal duties to the city and its residents. Or expend resources without deep, conscientious application.

EVE BARON: Is it working? I made a note about feedback point as well in reviewing this. And I actually would be okay with it as it is written because I think this is a value statement. A value statement has to be met by implementation guide or plan. One thing that occurs to me is if we're seeking feedback and we're going to improve our programs based on that feedback we need to make sure to specify and delineate where we're asking for feedback when we publicize our programs. I think the CEC actually does a really good job of getting feedback for everything it does. We just need to make sure of that. I would separate out the value from the implementation part.

SARAH SAYEED: So I guess we need to decide about whether we want to modify the language. That seems to be the first thing. Second thing would be what does the language need to be? Which I don't know if we need to do that -- maybe we need to work on it.

Actually maybe we should just go through the other values and see if there is anything in addition to this idea we've been discussing where commissioners see the need to modify the language and maybe we can vote on it about whether we want to modify the language as a first step. Are there other values you'd like to edit? Mark.

MARK DILLER: Might as well start with me. Second and third sentences I think say everything we want to say. First sentence I'm not

sure if it's meant to be rhetorical than practical in all possible respects. This is not a space filled with beauty, joy and hope other than the people in front of us. I'm not sure what we're driving at with that sentence and I don't think we need it because the rest expresses it.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. You're saying we should -- we're not -- over promising.

MARK DILLER: I can't offer an edit because I don't know what the purpose of that sentence is. I would just lose it. But if there is a purpose to that sentence I'm happy to consider how to rephrase it.

SARAH SAYEED: Any other thoughts? Beauty, joy, hope. Is there a need to evoke those values? Esoteric?

GIOVANNI BARCENES: As a value I think it can also serve as aspiration. To your point about implementation, actually implement something -- as a commission we value these things and we love to see these things. Who doesn't love to see beauty and joy and hope in spaces? I think there's a beauty in that. I'm okay leaving it as is.

DONNA GILL: How about if you put it at the end as opposed to as a result as opposed to being at the beginning. Because when you read it at the beginning, maybe it is good but what does it really mean? But if you say we're committed to stories and things like that, and then we say to foster beauty, joy, and hope -- which brings it to exactly where we want it.

MARK DILLER: Maybe we can do that by doing what I heard you say. But since this is a value judgment why don't we say value? We commit to values -- my problem is, as we were talking earlier about implementation versus values, committing to doing something is an

implementation phrase as far as I'm concerned or as I read it. So if this is a pure expression of value why not say that? We value spaces with beauty, joy and hope. We honor it.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I agree. I agree with the last. Go back at the end and frame it as Mark's edit.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I'd like to throw in remove spaces and we're committed to promoting beauty, joy and hope for all New Yorkers.

MARK DILLER: Nice.

SARAH SAYEED: To promoting beauty, joy and hope to all New Yorkers. And remove spaces because if we're talking about implementation, spaces has a sense of implementation. We'd have to do something in those spaces.

AMY BREEDLOVE: But we're promoting wherever we are for all New Yorkers, they should have access to beauty, hope and joy.

NATALIE DEVITO: I love the positivity and I'm trying to be objective on the outside looking in. We're not the happiness committee. But our board is to provide and foster the environment that allows New Yorkers to have life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in this city. If I'm being corny about it, again we're not the happiness committee. But life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, we can't really promote joy but we could allow the conditions to be optimized for that by carefully considering the voices of New Yorkers in everything we do. I hope that's not too negative. I certainly don't mean it. Again, I don't want to go too far afield. We are a commission and we have official business. And our core values and mission aren't about the mood of New York City. If that makes sense.

SARAH SAYEED: Anyone agree with that? Natalie, is your proposal to take out the beauty, joy and hope from the language?

NATALIE DEVITO: No. No. Just -- I don't want to overly promise that just by engaging with us we're going to be your everything. Hey, I'm not a happy New Yorker. It's the Civic Engagement Commission's fault. You know?

SARAH SAYEED: Any other comments on that particular one? Or any other one?

MURAD AWAWDEH: I think the essence of what Civic Engagement Commission is supposed to do is build community. And in building community, it strives to do those things. Right? So I don't think that we have to -- this is not an absolute moment either. It's just what we want in our value statement to invoke. I don't consider Natalie's point but also it was funny. It is the Civic Engagement Commission's fault I'm not happy right now.

SARAH SAYEED: Sorry, Murad.
(Laughter).

MURAD AWAWDEH: Just joking. I would revert back to the edit -- I forgot who said it on camera, editing Mark's comment, and going back to Donna's placement.

SARAH SAYEED: To move it to the end. Yeah.

EVE BARON: But I advocate for retaining spaces. Because beauty is a very subjective term, can apply to a lot of different attributes in different situations. So I think having to modify the space --

MARK DILLER: I'm okay with that. We need --

SARAH SAYEED: Public? I think to the point about creating community, building community, how do we do that? Partly through building a space for community to come together. That's just another thought I had out loud. I like the idea of building community as well. And I wonder if Murad you should say a little bit more about that and whether we see this value statement as in a place where it does that.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I think it is. I think these are not the -- it's not an implementation guide. It's a value statement that outlines what we as a commission care about. And I think we have to then actually ensure that we are upholding our value statement. Right? And that goes not just through manifesting community power but what are we doing to bring in more community. Again this is not part of the value statement. It's what we do after, to actually implement this. Each one of these helps see the feel to building that community power and build community. Through dignity, through accountability, collaboration, accessibility, creativity, and the rest of the pillars here. I think each one is a seed that's building the garden for building community.

SARAH SAYEED: So far we have edits -- potential for accountability and creativity. Are there any other values we want to edit?

NATALIE DEVITO: If I may, this will be in part or service to this question or circle back slightly to what we were talking about. What if there's reference to the aspirational in that very hopeful building community statement? That is to say we've already unpacked that -- we are responsive to feedback, we aim towards the beauty, the hope, the joy of

New Yorkers. If we address the aspirational there, that means that New Yorkers have expressed their desire to have a more -- and that our values aim to be responsive to the aspirations, the positive aspirations expressed by New Yorkers. Just a thought. I don't have any problem being wrong here either.

SARAH SAYEED: Of course.

DONNA GILL: I'd like to go back to the very first sentence.

SARAH SAYEED: The top of the value statement.

DONNA GILL: Civic Engagement Commission purpose to promote city life, enhance --... and then to take part in civic life. We're not describing what civic is and we're using a word people may or may not understand. We have to get to a place that tells them what civic -- what being civic means.

MARK DILLER: Using words to define the word.

DONNA GILL: Right. When I heard it, I went oh my gosh. What does this mean? I don't have any -- Mark is the word master, the wordsmith. He may be able to take it. I just thought of that.

SARAH SAYEED: Very fair. We talked about how the word civic engagement means.

EVE BARON: This is a point on the same paragraph. We're allowed to tweak that? That's not part of the charter, correct?

SARAH SAYEED: The first sentence is. Just the first sentence.

EVE BARON: I just want to point out that we are definitely encouraging growing, participation in civic life but I think we're missing the impact. And the impact being that we want people to have a voice in the

future of the city. It's not just the participation; it's what comes about as a result of participation.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. You want to add a statement that says -- maybe so they can take part in civic life is not --

EVE BARON: Have an impact in the future of the city.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. I think if we want to have communities exercise power over the city, are you saying that we bring that up more?

EVE BARON: Yeah. Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. So I think we need to decide or vote on are we editing this? Seems pretty clear to me that we are. Would someone like to.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I make a motion to edit this document.

MARK DILLER: I'll second.

SARAH SAYEED: All in favor? Any opposed? No one wants to take a vote today I guess.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I think we can take it to vote if we're able to verbalize the edits now. But I think folks may want to see it on paper before voting.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. So I have -- I can go through some of the edits that I have in my head and we can also review the recording later just to make sure we capture everything.

MARK DILLER: My decision is on those aspects we discussed and my suggestion. I can't frame repeating the suggestions but I'll give you something to react to.

SARAH SAYEED: That would be awesome. Thank you. In

summary we're saying bring impact -- something about the impact or more -- define more what impact is. We're saying we need to describe what is civic. Make it more accessible to people what we're talking about. We were saying about accountability. The idea of how we deal with feedback is clear here. And we also mentioned that we want to perhaps allude to or write that we are considering feedback based on the commission, our resources, our capacity. Mention some of those things. And then there was some issue of do we want to get into details of implementation here. I'm not sure where we landed on that. I think we're all in agreement to keep it to that language.

MARK DILLER: Except that one place where we talked about changing creativity.

SARAH SAYEED: Isn't that what the other value we wanted to edit, creativity? There was a sense that we may be over committing a little bit in terms of committing ourselves to creating spaces filled with beauty, joy and hope since as an example, government meetings may not always inspire such -- our office is pretty beautiful I think.

(Laughter).

But I think that's fair and we said we may want to change the sentence order here and bring the words of beauty, joy and hope towards the end of that value. Those are some of the big picture things that I noted as far as edits to this. Did I miss someone's point that they made in summarizing?

MURAD AWAWDEH: Not for the edit but I also think after we're done with this coming up with a pathway or road map for implementation

on each of them.

SARAH SAYEED: I'm curious for all the spaces you all are in, is there active discussion about values and creating a road map for implementation? Like you said -- I think it's a very good idea. I'm just curious if there are models out there we can look to.

MURAD AWAWDEH: Yeah. I'll be very short. Values then actually determine how you do your work moving forward. So when you have them, you're always referencing back to are we living up to our values. And are we meeting our values? But because these are going to be relatively new, making sure that there is a way in which you reflect back on is that actually happening. I apologize but I have to step out and go to court. It was a pleasure seeing everyone.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you, Murad.

MARK DILLER: Good to see you.

SARAH SAYEED: Keep up the good fight.

AMY BREEDLOVE: We're proud of you.

MURAD AWAWDEH: Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: Anyone else -- someone on the call had a comment -- I'm not sure who it was. Raising your hand. About the models of implementing values, or road maps.

LILLIAM PEREZ: Sorry. It's me. I wanted to add -- I'm here. I always advocated for the work that we do and the work we all do to protect our democracy and enhance civic engagement. To define it, we have to -- (inaudible) New York City are happy to have in our constituency. Often times -- coming from a government experience, a person like myself,

we tend to govern from very central locations, and the communities we represent. And we fail to go to where the communities are, the real leaders, real partners that do the work to make sure the communities have access to everything. Resources, civil rights, everything -- health care, everything. I continue to advocate to centralize the work we do and to go to the communities. I get the value, everything that has been said but in the implementation we have to invest more resources and time to get out there. I know we do some of this but I really have to say we can do more. Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you for that feedback, Lilliam. It would be great to hear your thoughts on how we can do that as well. Just keeping ourselves to time, I think what we will do is try to integrate some of this feedback into another round of edits.

GIOVANNI BARCENES: Just real quick about using the values as a road map, I think something we can do is add this to the section in our website. That way it's out to the commission and you see the values. You can see the values that we have as a commission and this helps inform the work that we do but also support our mission. I think adding it to our website is a good reference point as Murad was saying earlier.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you. Okay. Amazing. I'm moving us along to the next part of the agenda, program updates. We'll start out with Anila on the voter language assistance and things to share with you about participatory budgeting as well as some requests for information, RFIs that we have out to get your help to promote to community-based organizations. I'm going to start us off with Anila.

ANILA COBO: Good morning, all. With the primary, voter language assistance services happened as planned. We were able to deliver a hundred percent of services, a hundred percent of the poll sites. Based on selected methodology and available resources. We served 26 unique early voting poll sites. The last days of the early voting period with a total of 46 language services. On Election Day, June 24th, we provided services at 90 poll sites with a total of 94 language services.

In terms of utilization of voter language assistance services, we assisted a total of 569 voters. 551 of these people received language assistance, while 18 received general assistance.

In terms of voter education, as you all know, we piloted a program with the June primary. We were able to conduct -- community-based organizations conducted 13 workshops on rank choice voting and voting rights. They were held -- there was one workshop held in the Bronx for Bengali speakers in park chester, one for Bengali speakers in Cypress hills, two for Haitian Creole in Brooklyn, one for Polish speaking voters in green point, Brooklyn, Arabic speakers in Bay Ridge. Two sessions for Russian speaking voters in Brighton beach and Coney Island. Three for Urdu speakers in Brooklyn, and one Korean in Willowbrook, Staten Island, and one for Arabic speakers in Astoria. We provided pictures. Community members were engaged, those who participated in workshops and we're hoping to build on this pilot for future elections and work with community-based organizations to educate limited English proficient voters. People who are more comfortable receiving information in their preferred language -- in a language other than English. Out of the program eligible

languages.

We also worked with the advisory committee and the outreach team at the CEC to conduct outreach. We held a canvassing event in Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, targeting Russian speakers. Three events targeting Arabic speakers, one event targeting Bangla and French speakers in the Bronx, one event held in flatlands Brooklyn targeting Haitian speakers, and two canvassing events in Brighton Beach and Bath Beach, Brooklyn, targeting Urdu speakers.

SARAH SAYEED: Questions or comments?

MARK DILLER: How long in advance of the primary were the rank voice voting workshops -- how long in advance of voting were they held?

ANILA COBO: Because the RFI and campaign came together very last minute, about a month before the voting started, we gave the community-based organizations the ability to host these workshops up until June 23rd which is the day before Election Day. We also think that these events should not be held too far in advance of an election because people might just lose track and lose interest. The idea is the closer it happens to the actual voting period the more likely it is that people are engaged in these workshops actually show up to vote and make use of the information they received in the workshops.

MARK DILLER: Thanks.

DONNA GILL: That's very good. I really like that. The rank choice voting. My question is there were other things on the ballot in addition -- on the whole other side of the ballot. Judges, and -- and I knew that people had no idea what was going on. Did we think about trying to

educate people on voting as a whole as opposed to just rank choice voting?

ANILA COBO: Yes. We had one slide that was translated -- all the content was translated and made available to the community-based organizations. It was standard. We included what will for sure be on the ballot and what potentially might be on your ballot depending on the election district where the voters lived because it's not the same across the board. Also in our FAQs and guidance, we included information as to if they received specific questions so they could look up sample ballots online, it could help voters look up their actual registration status or their early voting and Election Day poll sites. We gave the facilitators the tools to be as thorough as possible for the voters.

DONNA GILL: Thank you. It's actually very important. Thank you. I appreciate it.

SARAH SAYEED: Anyone else have questions? We will have charter revision measures on the ballot for November. We'll be sure to include those in our training materials going in the fall as well.

ANILA COBO: Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you, Anila. Benjamin.

We promise to include songs!

(Laughter).

BENJAMIN SOLOTAIRE: I am writing up everything that we've done in the last year. That page turner comes out in a few weeks. I wanted to focus on some stuff we're going to be looking at as we go into the next cycle, season.

We've done a little bit in the last few months but also continuing to build our relationships with the borough offices. Outreach and building up trust with boards. We send stuff out -- I know some boards don't forward it on. Most do but there are still some, when it comes to the Borough Presidents they get a little more attention. They have a good idea what they're looking for with training the boroughs. At the end of the last spring we started off with more customized workshops. We didn't have enough obviously to cover all boards but we offered five trainings and procedure to the first boards to talk about their specific needs. We've been doing outreach over the whole city. Anybody can come to training on a topic that we offer. I was getting bored with that. You can choose what and when we offered them. I noticed the number is 1111. I don't know how that happened. That's very weird. For the four things. Then we also offered the deescalation training to the Borough Presidents for their Chairs and district managers. Those went well and we'll continue to offer something like that as long as they want. We'll still do some general attendance, citywide Zoom ones. We'll continue to work with the future of community boards working group getting ready for term limit preparedness. We talked about government structure, government 101 trainings for new board members, leadership trainings for people who want to become part of executive teams of boards. We'll continue to work with them.

Then I'm sure you all know the deal -- people in government at least know DCAS has a new learning platform for trainings, NYCcitylearns for all board members. There's new legislation 472 which last I looked, it wasn't a administrative code yet but it requires all trainings for new board

members. We've been working with DCAS -- we encourage them to get this out there. They were rolling it out yesterday. I reached out to board members to have a meeting. It's a little complicated process. We want to make it easy for the Borough Presidents and members to access these trainings because they're important. We're trying to get everybody on the same page to register. We can't of course do the enforcement on the BP side but we can make it as easy as possible for the Borough Presidents to manage that process. That's what we're going to look at in the coming months. I met with three Presidents so far. I'll meet with other ones. I know Manhattan does a lot of EEO stuff already but hopefully they can benefit from this new DCAS training.

SARAH SAYEED: Questions?

MARK DILLER: If I could follow up on that. The more we collaborate with the Borough Presidents better off we'll be. With consistent feedback I get from other district managers and community boards is the trainings that we offer are not specific enough to community board processes, which are very different than this body or the city council or others. So the general trainings for things like Parliamentary procedure, Robert's rules and things like that, and for writing resolutions and the back office if you will part of that need to be tailored to what a community board is and does in order both to be useful on one hand and to draw the audience you want to draw, on the other. With respect to trainings in the EEO requirements, the NYCcitylearns removes some of the firewall, not all of it. One of the concerns I've raised so far in vain in city council testimony on this, some Borough Presidents, Manhattan for sure, requires board

members to take EEO training and I think it's implicit bias training which is very, very similar, not exactly the same content about the same presentation as what DCAS provides. My board is going to be -- now in the process of being slapped by the equal employment practices commission because our Chair took the Borough President's EEO training and not the DCAS training which by the way she couldn't have taken. So while you coordinate with Borough Presidents it would be great to coordinate with DCAS because if there are programs to support the trainings, EEO, implicit bias, avoiding sexual harassment in the work place is another one. There should be one stop shopping. Everybody has got their little thing here and wants to keep hold of what they have.

Remember, when we're talking about the office, I'm talking about three people and I can get my staff to do these things. We're talking about 50 volunteers, many are working full time jobs. They're filled with people my age and older. You want to attract parents, singles, everything across the spectrum and composition of community boards will be further skewed if you make it too hard for folks to participate. Those are my thoughts. You're on the right direction but we need to be even further in terms of how we get folks to get on one page.

BENJAMIN SOLOTAIRE: I want to address those points. We had a focus group with a half dozen or so board members or staff at the beginning of the year just so that she could start to tailor -- I heard the same thing. They need to tailor it. Instead of saying President she said Chair. Just using the terminology to try to make it fit better. We did that with deescalation training too. She did that with a focus group of

community and staff. We'll continue to do that and more as we need to.

I'm interested what kind of fire walls you're talking about. Part of opening up the entire DCAS catalog is some require fees, registration and different versions of things that we do that we can take to get the training. But it's not same for community board members. When a board member signs up, the only thing they have access to is the required trainings they need. They're not going to get a huge catalog to look at. There's three required but there's another three that are mandated in different ways. DCAS can structure it that that's what they get. If they want to consider expanding past that they can do that. I think hopefully that will make one step easier.

MARK DILLER: My understanding is that last point still requires a New York City government website to register. OTI -- email. I'm sorry. Thank you. But OTI will only give a government email address to the chair of the board, not to everybody else. Now, putting that together with the audit, the EEPC, is auditing things without giving instructions in advance as to what it is you are supposed to have done. It is criticize later rather than construct in advance. Very familiar to me. They are implying in the current round of audits that not just the Chair, but anybody involved and higher. If you have a personnel or executive committee that does those things, those people should be trained on implicit bias and EEO. Again, hard to argue against that but if they can't take the training, some of these are four and six hour training -- yeah. So making sure that the requirements of DCAS, the requirements of the Borough President's office and the requirements of the EEPC who want this every four years and

change the requirements without notice, that's I think the brief -- if we're going to be useful, that's the way to be useful.

>> Benjamin: I heard about the email. DCAS hasn't brought that up. They said they would register all board members.

MARK DILLER: Not to add to your burden, that may require a conversation with OTI as well.

>> Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you, Benjamin. Next up we have Hillary Carelli Donnell. I think you have not presented. Director of participatory budget. Hillary has been part of the team in Brooklyn and recently promoted to the role of Director.

HILLARY CARELLI-DONNELL: Good afternoon, everyone. Glad to be here to speak with you all about both project implementation and the vote results. Super exciting stuff. We'll go through project implementation and speak about the previous cycles, implementing projects, talk about the winning projects in the cycle and then discuss the vote results and talk about some survey respondent data which is also pretty interesting. Let's dive in.

One thing that the team has been working on along with the vacations team is to create videos that talk about and highlight the 20 projects implemented last cycle. There's a play list on YouTube of these videos. We would love your support, I'd love your input on how you all could help us amplify the reach of these videos because they're really amazing and being rolled out on YouTube and on our social media at the rate of I think two per week. I'm not sure how many are left to be

previewed or posted, but we've got a lot up there already. We're going to watch one here, the kings bridge community heights center video on college and career readiness in the Bronx. Without further ado, we'll watch that.

HILLARY CARELLI-DONNELL: Okay.

(Applause).

That's just one of the 20. The play list is on YouTube and we can share it with you all. During the questions and comments section I'd love to hear how you feel. Now the vote results. To the point about creativity and joy, beauty, I feel like the vote phase is one of our most beautiful, creative and joyful phases of all, the four phases. We put in some photos here so you can see the giant puppets. This is us, our different flagship events. Our staff went to Queens pride, family fun day over at the beach on Staten Island. We went to Bronx parade in the Bronx, museum mile in upper Manhattan, and dance Africa in Brooklyn. You can see the puppets. We had a great time.

In terms of just data, we did a great job collecting votes with our 82 +

community partners across the three library systems. And with our own efforts through the digital and flagship events we were able to collect 1341,537 votes. That's our big total. About 8,000 fewer than last year which we believe is due to personally just the atmosphere of fear, and concern around giving out -- being out in public. Part of our vote phase was during a lot of the ICE raids happening across the city and our partners were reporting there was a lot of reticence to engage with surveys and that stuff out in the streets. Definitely that's one thing that might have hindered the collection and partners vote collection. The other thing was lack of free ad space that was pulled because of the mayoral primary, and leading into the mayoral race in the fall. So we didn't have the access to link NYC free ad space and those kinds of outlets. But I think we did really well. I'm really proud of that number and staff is too. I'm not going to read out all the numbers there. But as we can see, the borough totals are there for you.

I think that's all for that slide. The projects per borough are listed out. In the Bronx we have five projects. Performing arts program, healthy food, STEAM program, housing support program -- everyone should be able to swim, and vocational training. In Manhattan the project implemented in collaboration with the design studio, cocollaborate and design that with community members. Learn to grow and cook your own food, swimming program and vocational training program. For Brooklyn we have two job training and employment programs at the top of the list. Another one, job training for single parents, community cooking, and support program for young parents.

Queens we have the five which are pathways to professions for youth, saving and financial education program, housing workshops for older adults, career prep program for high school students, and I can't actually remember what the empowered with opportunity program is. I need to get back to you on that.

And then on Staten Island one is youth internships, specifically in health care.

Just jumping directly into the survey data -- I think there's a couple before this slide. Oh -- well, there's the one that just has the blue chart. Race and ethnicity. -- I guess it's not there.

SARAH SAYEED: We have it in our --

HILLARY CARELLI-DONNELL: Basically we've got pretty good survey response rate this year. Slightly lower than last year. 77 percent response rate. The survey is on the back of the ballot. It's been really beneficial for the survey results. This year we had 73 percent response rate which is great. As you can see that blue bar chart, majority of folks preferred not to answer the question about race and ethnicity. White, biracial, two or more races, followed by African, native American, and finally Pacific islander.

Jumping to Hispanic or Latino question, here again folks chose not to answer this question in large part. But of those who did, 28.7 percent did say they identify as Hispanic or Latino. That is pretty much right around the New York City rate of folks who identify that way which is 28.3. We're right on par with the demographics of the city with that one.

Next is gender identity. Here we've got the great majority -- I would

say majority of our respondents identify as women about 50 percent followed by men who are under represented at about 30 percent with respect to people identifying as men in New York City, more like 48 percent. We're undershooting in terms of reaching men out there. Then we've got folks identifying as nonbinary, about 1.2 percent, and trans gender under one percent. An impressive percentage, 1.2 percent of people identifying as other genders. That's not percentage of people actually I'm realizing. That's thousands.

Moving on to age distribution. This pie chart shows the color wheel gives the sense that we're pretty well spread out among the age groups we reached in the vote phase. But a large portion are from 11 to 17 which is not surprising to us given that we do a lot of work in the schools, a lot of our partnerships are youth serving partners. So with respect to the overall voter demographic we've got a really big portion of young people. About 18 percent. Just to give you an idea in New York 14 percent of people are 11 to 19 so we're over represented here in terms of how many youth we're reaching.

On the older adult side, we're actually a little bit under reaching in terms of older adults. About 12 percent of people we reached were over 65 and I believe the percentage in New York is a bit higher than that. The yellow piece of the pie there, about 15.9 percent -- almost 16 percent of people, I guess the biggest percentage were 35 to 44. Again not surprising, folks who are engaged in that age group but I'm proud of our reach, a significant portion of elders as well.

Here is a slide on household income. The big pink slice of the pie is

people who don't want to answer that question which is fair enough. It's our least responded to survey question. But as we know household income is diligently asked on every survey. Percentage of folks who responded who make under \$50,000 a year is sizable. Adding those categories up, the 10 to 24, 25 to 49, is about 31 percent of people who make under 50,000. Again we're reaching a lot of low income New Yorkers which is definitely a good thing.

Just thought this was interesting to share. We have a big percentage of our survey respondents who never interacted with people's money previously. So we are a growing program and a lot of people don't know about it yet but we continue to reach more people every year. This is a slightly lower percentage than last year of people who never heard of us. That's a good thing. Reaching more people and many never heard of us before. That's good.

Okay. Before moving on to the RFIs I'm happy to take questions. That's all.

DONNA GILL: Not having the response, do we ever think about going to senior citizen centers specifically to do that? And the reason I'm asking is because on my community board I'm actually in charge of the senior task force. And I invited the seniors to fill out surveys online. I gave them information. That's because I had an organization -- I had a task force and I had a forum that I brought them in. So if you were to think about getting organizations that seniors are in -- because you know, most of your outreach is on the streets, at festivals and things like that. You don't find a lot of seniors. I mean, I'm out there but typically. We just go

to them as opposed to having them come to us.

HILLARY CARELLI-DONNELL: Absolutely. Yeah. We actually partnered this year to go out to a number of older adult centers across the five boroughs. To send a facilitator from our cohort to do a session in these senior centers. There were a number in each borough that we made it out to. As a part of the initiative, as a new deliverable we didn't do last year, at least one center was hit in the new TRIE neighborhoods, and one with our contact being Charlie Anderson, Director of public affairs. We do intend -- point well taken. Absolutely folks are not out there as much after 65. Definitely heard.

DONNA GILL: I'm happy to help. Because like I said with my senior task force I'm connected to a lot of the senior centers in central Harlem and community board 9 which is west Harlem. I'm getting over to the east side. I haven't gotten there yet but I'm going.

HILLARY CARELLI-DONNELL: Absolutely. We should talk.

DONNA GILL: Thank you.

EVE BARON: I have a quick question. Thanks for that information. It's kind of striking how many paper ballots you receive. 18,000 -- can you tell us what accounts for that? How we might use digital forms to boost that number?

HILLARY CARELLI-DONNELL: That's great. Thanks. Well, our partners primarily prefer paper ballots because at those festivals or street fairs we can't really determine if someone has voted. You hand them something and get it back. Whereas our palm cards -- new thing we tried this year was to have a QR code that linked to the partner specifically so

that we could understand where that vote came from. Because we pay our partners based on the outreach they do and the votes they collect. So in order for them to feel confident that we're going to count their vote, the paper is really the way they feel most confident because we get it physically and say one. Whereas if we hand someone with a palm card with a QR code, they take it and walk away, they don't necessarily vote. So one thing we did differently this year was to create personalized QR codes for each organization so that if somebody scanned that code and went to the vote site and then voted, that organization could then get counted, could get that vote counted for them. We did it last year in a less specific way but this year we had specific QR codes that link to the partner. That's one reason why I think the partners favor paper because it's really clear that it's their vote and we collected it.

Another reason is, that accountability piece. Another reason is I think people are skeptical to give their phone number to us, or random entities they're not familiar with. So when you try to vote online there's a verification process, you get texted and then that's your phone number. We made clear and we strove this year to be really clear about data and privacy, and we train our partners on talking points around what does the CEC do with our data and assuring people we weren't going to use it beyond this one verification. But it deters people, and me included, if I go out and scan a QR code and it asks me for my phone number, I don't want to do that. That's another deterrent, I believe, that verification.

Finally, we're just not super well known. So I think when you're on the subway and you see the Civic Engagement Commission or an

advertisement, what is that? People aren't necessarily on the subway scanning QR codes for something they're not fully aware of what it is. We can always do better and we're striving to grow our digital reach. Our Instagram platform has 4,000 followers on it. The reach there is quite limited. But we do ask -- I will say too, we work closely to figure out the ways to encourage partners to leverage partners to help us grow our digital footprint in that way. To be smarter about how we capture people's emails if they want to give them to us, allow them to opt in to our newsletter to get them that way. There's a lot of room on the digital side but those are some reasons why I think paper is primary.

Then of course we also emphasize paper because we're aware of the digital divide that not everyone has Internet access on their phone even if they have a phone. If you have a QR code and they can't scan it on their phone, it's then incumbent for them to go online on their home computer if they have one. But I'm very conscious that there's a lot of room for improvement with digital and open for suggestions.

SARAH SAYEED: Any other comments? Before we go to Haydon, I want to ask were there any --

>> One person texted me a few days ago but when I followed up there wasn't a response.

SARAH SAYEED: Haydon, you can come.

>> Good afternoon. I believe I know everyone in person, I'm Haydon, special projects manager and I'm on the training initiative. Today I'll talk about all the various RFI opportunities. As I go through what each look like and the details and logistics of these applications, definitely open

to suggestions for organizations, specific partners to reach out to that you think might be a good fit for any of these opportunities.

First up we have the project implementation RFI. We'll attach that application. We just launched that this week. We are looking for organizations, nonprofits to implement the winning project when it's announced. The funding raises between 150,000 and 250,000 depending on the borough.

Time line for the partnership is from October of this year to October of next year. And the high level expectations for deliverables for this partnership opportunity include attending project cycle management workshops at the new school. They are in person and set our organizations up with the necessary tools to plan, design, and implement and evaluate their projects that they're doing through people's money.

Second piece is engagement with our TRIE neighborhood stakeholders. As you might recall in the first year of the people's money we ran two processes. A neighborhood level process and a borough level process and it resulted in 46 projects. 33 at the neighborhood level and 13 at the borough. We consolidated due to budget constraints. And TRIE neighborhoods. To try to facilitate this transition from these neighborhood and borough to just a borough project, a larger borough project with neighborhoods we want to design into the program a requirement to engage TRIE neighborhood residents including the partners I'll be working with with the initiative to work with the dialogue around what TRIE neighborhoods needs and what would benefit. Third piece is actually implementing the project, outreach to do the project and reporting on

impact and results.

This is an exciting new pilot that we are launching related to project implementation called the people's DxC, design by community which we are partnering with the studio to do. Essentially this RFI is going to be open and looking for an organization that is interested there implementing the youth entrepreneurship program which is a specific project designated for this pilot, selected by the service design studio.

The partnership time line will actually take place just under two years. Versus the one-year project implementation for the people's money. It will include in the first year the participation in the people's DXC fellowship program and the second year with the one out of the people's money. As part of the fellowship program DXC will support the people selected for this pilot to recruit and hire six community fellows who are residents based in the neighborhood and have deep roots within the neighborhood and help to use their lived experience to inform the design of the project.

And they will provide support to codesign the fellowship itself with the host organization selected for this pilot. The service design studio will provide and deliver community centered design curriculum to inform how they will design this project in partnership with the community fellows. And of course coaching and support throughout the two years of participating in the fellowship and the project. Funding is \$80,000 addition to the funding provided by the CEC to implement the project itself.

SARAH SAYEED: Can I ask a question. Voted on in cycle two? Is that -- does that mean it was implemented this year or is that a typo?

>> I think it's a typo. It was voted on in cycle 3. The youth entrepreneurship program is out of the most recent cycle.

Next slide please. We also have opened our PB idea generation partnership. This is the partnership application we have open every year to -- for partners to host idea generation sessions in October and November of this year. This application has been open since July 22 and will be closed August 18th. We're specifically looking for six nonprofit organizations, or MWEs, groups, to host idea generation sessions in three of the five boroughs. In other words, we're looking for larger organizations with capacity to host sessions over multiple boroughs rather than just one. The reason we're looking for specifically six nonprofit partners, we typically recruit in the summer, we extended organizations that we typically work with to host sessions a number of years in a row. We'll continue to maintain the total partnership of around 80 organizations overall but this year we're looking at 6. The funding will range from 9 to 15,000 depending on the number of sessions they are able to host. Again this will be from September to November of this year. Deliverables being hosting 6 to 10 one hour long idea generation sessions that we will provide training for. Using social media and email networks to promote the people's money and recruiting a minimum of 20 participants to attend each idea generation session they host. Next slide please.

Last but not least we have our TRIE neighborhood initiative from July 22 to August 19th. We're looking for 11 nonprofits, or MWBEs operating in New York City to build a neighborhood coalition and lead civic engagement efforts. Time line being September of this year to July of next year. Just

a note on the number of neighborhoods we're recruiting for, similar to idea generation numbers. We've extended partnership contracts for about two thirds of our TRIE neighborhoods with the understanding that participation and strength of the coalition increases over time, over multiple years of partnership. So we've extended two thirds of the partnerships for another year and we made those decisions based on assessment of their participation over the past year. And also considering how they evaluate themselves and their interest to continue partnering with the CEC through TRIE niche activities. We have a couple in every borough. They're the neighborhoods we have gaps in the basic deliverables is building and sustaining a neighborhood coalition that is diverse in membership. Individuals, organizations, leaders, facilitating a minimum of four coalition meetings throughout the year. Participating in people's money phases one through four. Hosting idea generating sessions in the fall, attending and supporting the borough's assemblies in the winter, supporting the get out the vote efforts in the spring and how they support phase four is collaborating with the organizations selected to implement a winning project to help connect them to the TRIE neighborhood residents. Finally facilitating a civic engagement workshop.

Those are our five we'll send out the links if you have not received them already. We are really looking to see any suggestions for organizations to reach out to. Don't need to put you on the spot. Just keep in mind for the next week as we have our application open for about a week and a half left.

After this, I just wanted to announce a new logo for the TRIE

neighborhood initiative. Worked with our partners at time of day. They worked with us to produce our other sublogos, subbrands for all the other TRIE CEC programs. A sweet look up of a tree. We came up with this imagery from conversations with partners, members. When you hear the word tree everyone assumes a tree but also the analogy of growing fruit, working together to thrive, to have a community thrive. That's how we came to this logo. Any questions on logo or the RFIs?

SARAH SAYEED: Amazing. Thank you, Haydon. Just to wrap up on the last piece, I wanted to bring commissioners up-to-date on some strategic planning we've been doing in the commission. We had some engagement with an MWBE called hyphens in spaces and they were helping us think through how to define our priorities for the past year. There were a few came up with, most of this work was with senior leadership at the commission though there were surveys done with everybody. The workshops were held with the program directors and team members. But the priorities that we identified have also been shared and we are now in the process of having all the teams review the priorities, give feedback on the priorities and propose ideas for how to implement these priorities.

The three priorities we came to agree on was discontinuing to think about increasing our impact, getting out there. As we know we still need to expand our footprint, have a lot more touch points with New Yorkers, and participatory budgeting is our largest platform. Largest in the sense of the number of people or the types of people it can reach since it's open to anyone 11 years and older. Our program audiences are smaller and the

type of audience they can reach.

So we've been thinking about how we build this on ramp and also it is a program that receives a larger share of funding in the budget.

Continuing to really bring the team to work together to support this program. And that's something we've been doing and just looking to continue to build in that way. That's priority for the coming year and years.

And then also that's not to say that -- we also want to think about how we are leveraging and building up our other programs including the TRIE neighborhood initiative as well as the other languages program which also after good amount of funding. However, they're under resourced in terms of staffing primarily. And we could do a lot more with funding. We want to think about how we work across teams to support engagement in these programs as well. And finally, continuing to really intentionally build team culture. Because if we don't do it intentionally and consciously, it's habit and it's not necessarily what happens or emerges from an unintentional, unconscious process isn't always nurturing or suitable for the growth and the engagement that we want to have with the public. Continuing to really build that into priorities.

These are -- this is where we landed in terms of the planning. As I said we're continuing to talk with the team about how to actually implement these and also you're very welcome to share your feedback with us on how we can improve in these areas.

That's all I have. Any questions on strategic priorities?

DONNA GILL: I do. When Hillary was speaking, I wanted to say to her with PB if we spoke about it, not when we're doing the idea generation

or doing the voting phase but if we spoke about it all the time, people would get used to the idea, it doesn't come as a strange thing for us. It says right here, because that is our largest engagement platform, if we talk about it year round, it lets people know that it's available and then they're excited about voting, and building the excitement because you're building up to something rather than just once it's time to vote or to generate ideas, people see it and they're like what is this? Where is the trust? That type of thing.

SARAH SAYEED: I think that's a really great point and we have been thinking about how we do year round engagement. I think now that we have the first two years of projects implemented and also these great videos we've developed it allows us this opportunity to circulate news about impact year round. Because I think people also want to see what does my coming to an idea generation session come to? I think building out a year round campaign. We are upgrading the participate platform, and we would want people to connect with that platform, to find strategies that year round. I think that's great. Hoping to develop that in the next year. Thank you for that. Anyone else?

I think we reached the end of our updates section. I'm not sure if you have any other business to discuss. Anyone want to raise anything? Anyone online have any comments or questions? They're still there. I do want to share one piece of good news. I'll give you more information. Someone just talked about civic trust. We've been engaging with NYU for about over a year now to really try to better understand what does civic trust mean. Because if we are supposed to impact it we need to know

how we measure it. We work with gov lab to look into what does it say about the field, civic trust? It's fuzzy content. There's actually now a paper that is coauthored between the lab and Civic Engagement Commission that is online and available. Actually includes strategies for government agencies to start thinking about trust. Because everyone in theory should care about trust with their civic engagement work. So I will share that with you and we'll also try to build out time to talk about that more. For awareness, at the next meeting in October we'll probably focus a lot on the annual report. Because that will be due -- that is due at the end of September actually to the Mayor and City Hall. However our cadence for meetings didn't quite align. Plus writing the report. We're meeting early October and we definitely need a quorum in that meeting because we need to vote on that to get that to you in advance.

>> We're meeting October 9th, based on a survey.

SARAH SAYEED: October 9th is the next public meeting. Same time? 11 to 1. Okay. Same place. So thank you so much to the commissioners online and commissioners who are here with us today and to members of the public who may be watching now or may watch later. I think we can do more to publicize our meetings and content. We've been talking about how to do that as well. More to come. Lots of work to do. Thank you again, everybody. Can I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MARK DILLER: So moved.

DONNA GILL: Second.

SARAH SAYEED: All in favor? Any opposed? No one is

opposed. Great. We are now going to officially adjourn the meeting. See you all in October. Thank you so much. (Meeting adjourned at 12:52).