

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

Captions will be displayed here.

>> Hello, everyone. This is Jose.

SARAH SAYEED: Great. Francis, you are logged in. When we get to that point -- --

SARAH SAYEED: Would anyone like water? I did attempt to bring you some candies, however they fell on the floor. The dish also broke.

>> So the agenda for the next meeting will include repairing the dish.

SARAH SAYEED: What's the Japanese art -- I'm going to Google it.

MARK DILLER: You can actually see the repair. It's done in a different color.

SARAH SAYEED: Done with gold. It's called kinsugi. I actually have repaired a dish like that using that. It's very therapeutic.

We're going to get started. Our meeting is come to order. Welcome to everybody who is here. And anyone -- I think Jose you're on the line. I'm not sure if anyone else is. We are supposed to have a couple of people on the line. Welcome to everyone who is here. If anyone is here from the public, if we'd like to ask if you could please sign in

to today's meeting. There's a sign in sheet.

I'm really excited that you're all here. This is where we are housed. The civic engagement commission has a desk in this building on this floor down the hallway. It's not such a great space for a large public meeting but it's great when we don't have any other place, which happened today. We weren't able to find another room.

We are being live streamed, and we also have captioning today. We also have Spanish interpreters if anyone needs interpreters. Please do let us know. And we are supposed to have public comment in the last half hour. The dramatist guild of America asked to offer comment today. They will arrive.

Just to go through -- we have a lot of internal business to talk through today. I'm going to start with just updating you on where things are with the commission. And also take you through the bylaws and program updates. But first we need to review and approve the minutes. I'm also going to pass around an attendance sheet for everyone to sign in.

>> Hi Sarah. I just dialled in. Who is that?

MARK DILLER: If now is a good time I offer a motion to approve the minutes.

SARAH SAYEED: Yes, now is a good time. Is there a second?

DONNA GILL: Second.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. All in favor of approving the minutes? Opposed? The minutes are approved.

Turning next to the hiring update, I would love to introduce you to folks who are here. You know mostly everybody here. We on boarded

Francis, our civic engagement support specialist, and Gulan Carr, the language access community board advisor. Francis will be helping liaise with you. She'll help me keep track of things that way, and also helping us with creating a language access plan. She has a lot of experience with language access. Worked for the DOE previously doing language access for schools. She'll be helping craft the CEC language access plans for our service and programs. And Gulan will be responsible for interpretation, as well as helping community -- who is that? Who is on the line?

>> Sylvia -- Lillian.

SARAH SAYEED: Welcome. And we have --

MARK DILLER: Could you go back over -- her responsibilities?

SARAH SAYEED: Poll site interpretation program, language access advisory committee. Sort of overseeing the community board work though we do have more members of the team involved in that area as well. You previously met Lydia, our Americore service member working on community boards. She'll be working on needs assessment of community boards and also needs assessment of communities and their relationship to community boards. Andy Toledo, our community engagement specialist will be liaising with CEOs and partner organizations while also helping with community board work. We now have a team of six people. You also met Wendy, our senior advisor. She's doing a lot of work on participatory budgeting and other initiatives, helping with operations. She's coming to us from MOCS so has experience with procurement.

MARK DILLER: Is there a place where the org chart is laid out online or some other way?

SARAH SAYEED: We can share it with you. It's been a work in progress. And hopefully we would like to continue to expand but we will certainly share with you the version we're at now.

MARK DILLER: That would be great. It's exciting to see all these new faces and it would be great to know them by name.

SARAH SAYEED: Just a few months ago it was only me.

(Laughter).

So it's really exciting that now we're a team of six. I have people around me that I can interact with and they can help support each other. It's nice to also be able to delegate work as we're going along.

I wanted to check on just the email issue before we go into the bylaws. Does everyone now have access to their emails, their CEC emails?

>> I still prefer g mail. I have difficulty with the office.

SARAH SAYEED: I've been emailing everyone's personal email plus the CEC one but for your own privacy and protection it's probably better to email me and everyone in the CEC account.

MARK DILLER: I agree and do my best with that. The problem is the CEC email account does not marry up with g mail on a phone. At least with my core skills in that area. So if I'm replying to you it may end up coming from a different email address because you copied another address. I'm doing my best initiating emails using the account given. But it's just the reality if you're catching me in between times I'm at a desk.

SARAH SAYEED: I completely understand. It's really to help you and whatever is easier for you. I did ask about --

>> It's Linda. Sorry.

SARAH SAYEED: Hi, Linda. Sorry. I did ask DoITT about how to merge these accounts. Like if you want to have your email coming into your personal account from the CEC. So I'm not sure what they've replied. I have to follow up. The next big thing is to look through the bylaws. There were a bunch of things that we talked about last week, last month. Sorry. The version I'm putting forth before you, there were things we talked about in the last meetings that based on input from the Law Department, I actually created a separate hand out with those particular additions that you wanted to see if we really want them in there. So this version that you're looking at doesn't have these sections in there. We'll talk about why we're treating them on a separate hand out as we go through it. I thought we'd go through it from the beginning. And we will talk through the questions that people had raised, and the suggestions from you all, and responses from law if that's okay with everyone.

The first thing I wanted to point to you in the purpose and powers, the only addition that's there is Chuck had suggested we add something about the language access and poll site because that's also from the charter. So I put that little language in there, approving language access for LEP New Yorkers and poll site interpretation. That's the change in that.

And then the next section we spoke about was under membership. We had a good conversation about the importance of attendance for commission meetings. I think some people wanted to make attendance -- create some kind of guidance about the minimum number of meetings that someone could miss before they got kind of a warning or

notice or potentially be considered for leaving the commission. We had added, or I'd asked -- Mark had suggested some language which is on this hand out, which initially --

CHARLES APELIAN: There are three different colors. What do they indicate?

SARAH SAYEED: In the first, in section two on the suggestion, Mark had put forward a suggestion that if somebody was not physically present at three meetings, or fails to be physically present at a total of five meetings in any 12 month period the Chair should provide written notice of such member's attendance to the appointing authority. That was a suggestion that Mark had made.

MARK DILLER: Actually somebody else around the table made and I recorded it and drafted it for you.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you. The Law Department thought that that would really sort of damage interpersonal relationships. And thought it was better if we developed kind of an internal process. But didn't go to the appointing authority. If we really want to have something in here about attendance, they thought we need to come up with another way to deal with it rather than going to the appointing authority. So they said you should just talk to the person, whoever is missing meetings to try to figure out what's going on and work it out. Just rely on interpersonal relationships and negotiations to sort this out. You don't need to have it in the bylaws. It's really up to you all whether you want to specify attendance, what that looks like. And whether we should -- what's the remedy for it. So as a suggestion, I said we can schedule discussion with the member to

determine whether the member wishes to continue in their current role. Just notify them in writing. You have missed x number of meetings and we should talk. Part of the reason for why the Law Department is making its recommendations is it's trying to keep us from having to do a lot of tracking and trying to reduce bureaucracy, I guess, and who is going to keep track of attendance, how notifications will be made. They're trying to keep us lean and flexible and efficient. So I understand the general reasoning for why they're doing that. It's really up to you whether you want to include something on attendance and how.

DONNA GILL: I think it's necessary. Just from being on various committees. And if you don't spell it out for attendance, the membership tends to be lax about it. So I feel like it's a necessary evil. I don't think that it's necessary to talk to the person that has appointed them. But your suggestion with sending them a letter and speaking to the members to find out if there's a situation, do they want to continue, because sometimes people don't attend for various reasons. They may be -- it may be a job, it could be that they're moving, family. Something may have come up. And rather than let you know what's going on, they just don't show up. So in this instance it gives them and you an out.

MARK DILLER: My view is -- I think I'm in agreement with Donna. But I'll let Donna be the judge of that. My view is that the only thing to be accomplished in a bylaw with respect to attendance is an automatic kill. If it isn't an automatic elimination then you end up with what you already have, which is the power of the Chair and the power of the appointing authority to make whatever changes she, they are inclined to make. And

you don't -- I agree with the Law Department there. Anything less than an automatic nondiscretionary -- because the reality in all the boards that I've served on all these years is that no one ever really wants to be the guy to say I'm sorry you're off the board because you missed too many meetings. So if it's not automatic, the reality of being a person is going to interfere with that, and it's just not going to happen. If that is not -- so my view is unless we're going to go all the way, because no sense pussyfooting around with some kind of interim range approach, and so if we're not going to -- it's a very harsh thing and I completely get that it's a harsh thing. I wrote this because I was asked to, not because it was something I was burning to put into the bylaws. So I guess my recommendation is that rather than be harsh right off the bat, eliminate it all together from the bylaws at this time, see how it goes, and then this body can amend the bylaws going forward if this becomes a problem that occupies a lot of either your time or the Commissioner's time. If that ends up being the case, then we can revisit whether we need some automatic process. That's my thought.

CHARLES APELIAN: Right now the way it stands is there's no call to action other than you saying Chuck, you missed three meetings, five meetings, and I explain it all. And then we have another discussion. There's no call to action. There's nothing wrong with this. No reason to go to the pointer -- the only question is if you want to do anything and put any kind of call to action on it, there has to be a means -- we don't have it in here -- a means of removing. If you want to make that internal for cause, you could give notice to a particular board member and then they have 30



days for a hearing and then come to the hearing. They're allowed to participate. And then you need the process. It is. But other than that this whole phrase is meaningless. You can do this without this being in the bylaws.

LORI FIOROTO: I think you need to find out the cause of why they're not showing up.

CHARLES APELIAN: I've been on the board a long time. It's a joke but I think a lot of people like to wear a pin. They like to say I'm on the board. 90 percent of the work gets done by ten percent. But you still have to do the job. If you're not then it becomes frustrating over a period of time. We've had members on the community board that literally missed every meeting for the year and the Borough President had every right to remove them and didn't and that person was worthless to the community board other than the fact that they told everybody they were a member of the community board. The question is this does nothing other than the fact that you have this power already. Do you want to put into the bylaws removal for cause. It could be for whatever reason, attendance, defamation. It could be for whatever. That's the only question.

AMY BREEDLOVE: We have removal, Chuck.

MARK DILLER: Article 4, section 5 on the second page.

CHARLES APELIAN: Resignation. Oh, removal six.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Without cause --

MARK DILLER: Which is super majority. That gives the body an opportunity -- it's just not automatic. So it does mean that you have to actually put your hand up and say I vote to eliminate Mark and that's how it

goes.

CHARLES APELIAN: If that's the case then this paragraph for membership is fine. It's just going to be a notice that the Chair will be -- there will be a point where it's not going to happen over a couple of meetings. It will happen over a couple of years where we'll say why is this person still on the commission? That will have to be an internal discussion. There's nothing illegal about it. Part of the bylaws. If that's the case I don't have a problem supporting it this way and leaving it internal. There's no reason it has to go back to the appointor, whether the Borough President.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I think the only reason we put in about the appointor is if there is a dead kill you miss three meetings and you're out, the appointing body needs to know because they're missing a Commissioner. But that wasn't the language that was in here.

CHARLES APELIAN: Got you. Then I have no problem with the way it is right now. I couldn't -- I didn't see the other part there. The articles.

AMY BREEDLOVE: But it's not actionable here. Right?

DONNA GILL: That's the problem.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Without teeth I wonder why it would be in the bylaws. Where the Chair can adopt this rule as the Chair, and tell the Commissioners that this is what you are expecting. And hold people to it. But without the teeth of you miss three and you're out or you miss five and you're out, whatever, it doesn't seem to me that it should be in the bylaws.

CHARLES APELIAN: Now if you have the removal clause in there

that is the precedent to say in 2019 we had this discussion. 2020 I contacted you again. Here we are now at the end of the year and I'm going to make a motion to the board to ask for your resignation or remove you. Now there's paperwork. That is what this provides.

DONNA GILL: My thought is the bylaw is more than Sarah. It's a document for the group. So if Sarah is not there, and we're not there, we're putting this in the executives' hands and not putting it in the bylaws. If the executive changed this change may not go with them. That was my only concern about having it in writing. Because it's a living document.

CHARLES APELIAN: If the Chair changed next year, the next Chair would have continuation?

SARAH SAYEED: But it's not in the current draft you have.

CHARLES APELIAN: But there's a suggestion to put it in.

DONNA GILL: But they're suggesting to take it out.

CHARLES APELIAN: I'm sorry. I said based on what we said I support it.

MURAD AWAWDEH: To move the conversation forward, since there is a section on removal already, can we just say add this pink section, I would change to any 12 month period to calendar year so there's a marker. And then put it down as the first -- this is the first instance where there will be a discussion. First shot is discussion with the Chair, if the member continues to stay in their current role. Second is like probationary period, third is removal by the entire commission. Does that seem right? There are different action steps that lead to the final step that folks are getting towards here?

DONNA GILL: Mark wants teeth.

MARK DILLER: No I don't. I either want real teeth -- my concern is this. The pink section as written actually lists the power of the Chair rather than expanding it. In the event that these conditions occur, the Chair would have to have a discussion, whatever that means. Would have to have a discussion. Couldn't do it by email, for example. Would be potentially constrained from reporting this to the member before the fifth meeting. And so there is an argument, albeit a specific one, that this limits the power of the Chair. So if we're not going to have an automatic termination then my vote is the Chair should have plenary authority to do whatever he or she is led to do in the event of bad participation. And the only way to remove somebody is the one that already exists in the bylaws which is to get ten people to agree.

CHARLES APELIAN: I have to interrupt. Removal is for an officer only though. It has to be changed.

MARK DILLER: Oops. Let's fix that.

SARAH SAYEED: Let's stick with this for a second. The removal is for an officer. I see what you're saying.

CHARLES APELIAN: We'll get to that in a minute.

MARK DILLER: What I'd propose is to take removal in section five and make that the new section two and replace the word officer with member.

SARAH SAYEED: I think the issue here also is the way you all got here, was an appointing authority. I think part of the question is how does that appointing authority continue to have its say in your ongoing presence

here?

CHARLES APELIAN: Community boards work the same way. Borough Presidents appoint -- many boards allow membership to remove on their own.

MARK DILLER: And every community board reports to the Borough President the attendance of every member every year, not just the members who have had a spotty record.

CHARLES APELIAN: I understand. Basically you have to let the appointor know the person was removed and reappoint. Other than that the commission still has the ability to take matters into their own hands.

MARK DILLER: That raises the question of duly. If I'm duly appointed by in my case the Borough President does this body have the legal authority to undo a Borough President appointment?

CHARLES APELIAN: Yes.

DONNA GILL: If we put it in the bylaws.

MARK DILLER: You can put stuff in the bylaws that are not permissible by law. Just because we said it does doesn't mean I feel very powerful today.

(Laughter).

AMY BREEDLOVE: Does the Chair have that right?

DONNA GILL: Yes.

MARK DILLER: I want to distinguish between should and does because I think it should.

>> From the phone: This is Annetta. Can I ask a question?

(Inaudible) even though I'm not there in person. I think for me I want to step back a little bit. For me the bigger question, or goal with this conversation is how do we create a culture of accountability? I think some of you have made the point earlier. Folks aren't just appointed and then they can sort of coast. I don't necessarily feel like it needs to be in the bylaws. But I think to me it's a question of practice. I think it would be good to have a conversation around that. The issue that was just raised, if the Borough President would have the authority to appoint somebody to the commission, the Borough President and the Mayor, I'm not sure how the Chair can override that authority.

CHARLES APELIAN: I'm not suggesting the Chair. I'm suggesting the commission.

AMY BREEDLOVE: The Borough President and different appointing bodies have the authority to appoint someone to the Commission but then the commission runs as a commission. And they hold that seat, of which they fill. So I don't know that you're overriding the decision of the appointor.

MARK DILLER: Well, clearly you are because if you're kicking somebody out, that person was selected by the appointor.

AMY BREEDLOVE: But they have to obey by the rules of the commission.

MARK DILLER: To be sure. I wonder --

>> From the phone: Do we have how other commissions handle this issue?

SARAH SAYEED: We can look into it.

>> This is a regular problem with the boards. Right? As somebody said earlier, a handful of folks are engaged and do the work and often others are not. I'm observing that we're still sort of early in the process, and already we're starting to feel like there were folks who were super engaged and folks who for whatever reason are having trouble making it there.

SARAH SAYEED: I wanted to make a note that one thing I learned through my conversations with you all, and I guess from a legal perspective, any time we put anything into the bylaws, it means we have to abide by it. Right? So wherever -- for me I feel like a shorthand is, if there is nuance and differences on how to approach this, it's better for us not to codify it because then we can have a conversation about it. Right? But if it's in the rules, we have to follow the rules. To me that's like a great advantage of leaving it open. And I think to Annetta's point and what we're talking about here and who we are as a body, we're about civic engagement. So the people who are the best exemplars of that are you all. Right? And we have to be that. We don't have a choice about it. This is what we stand for to the public. And so I think part of it is for us to really look at ourselves. I've said this to the team also. I'm a great believer that whatever is in the outside world and all the dynamics that are shaping the way people engage are in here amongst us. Right? How people relate to each other, what their communities mean, the logistical barriers they encounter in getting to meetings. Whether it's they have too much work to do or their own personal work or they have child care issues or the transportation is an issue. They live far away. All those things are

here. And they will impact attendance. Not just at meetings here but in public hearings and in anything that we're trying to do. So maybe this is an opportunity for us to really grapple with that, and think about how do we create a culture of accountability in a larger society that relies on public participation to create laws? How do we help ourselves and help other people be accountable? I guess that's my long way to say maybe we don't need to put that in there.

(Laughter).

EVE BARON: I agree with everything you just said. To my mind this is not so much about codifying the number of absences we have but it's about creating the sense of expectation for a new group that is going to be very reliant on volunteerism, and our partnerships with other organizations. To my mind that's like a new kind of commission. It's not like this commission. It's very different. We're being a very reactive body. We're going to have to do some very proactive work. I would be much more inclined to not put this in the bylaws but also simultaneously to do some work about coming up with shared principles for our approach to the work; what our responsibilities are.

SARAH SAYEED: That's a great idea.

ANTHONY HARMON: I like the sound of it.

SARAH SAYEED: So that wouldn't -- it's not like a bylaws thing. But it's like a shared --

MARK DILLER: It might lead into one. You never know. What I was going to propose actually was instead of a negative statement about



how many meetings do you get to miss before you're in Dutch is a positive statement that says that the work of the commission is best achieved by the totality of the commissioners around the table and the expectation and anticipation is that every member will attend all the meetings to which they are invited or something like that. Even there you don't need that.

SARAH SAYEED: Is that practicable?

MARK DILLER: I wouldn't say that. They're invited to participate. But you don't need it. It's simply an affirmative statement instead of a negative one that can be accomplished the same way by simply deleting what was asked to be drafted about this, and we now spent 25 minutes on people who aren't here.

(Laughter).

>> I want to echo the statement that was just made by I don't know who it is.

MARK DILLER: It's Mark.

SARAH SAYEED: Are you saying we should add some kind of language to that effect in here?

MARK DILLER: I'm saying leave it alone.

>> I think it's a good idea to add some language. But make it more positive.

AMY BREEDLOVE: It could potentially help those who appoint as well. I think all of us who went through the interview process, one of the questions we had was what will be expected of us. And because it was a new commission that was difficult to answer. But I think laying out some

guiding principles, some expectation of appearing at the monthly meetings, because we have set it up as monthly meetings, and then we're going to get into the public meetings as well. If there are some expectations that can then be relayed I think that would be important.

SARAH SAYEED: For the work of this body we have to have a quorum. If we don't have a quorum at a meeting we can't take any action.

LORI FIOROTO: A quorum is 8? Because what if we start eliminating people for not showing up, do we have people knocking down the door to join?

MARK DILLER: Let's assume yes.

(Laughter).

Otherwise we're going to feel very, very sad.

AMY BREEDLOVE: They had the largest number of applications for this. Yeah. It was an open call which they don't always do for commissions. But they had over 400 or something applications.

LORI FIOROTO: Not in Staten Island.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Yeah. So should one of us have to leave, they have a stack of resumés they can go back to.

SARAH SAYEED: Are we all in agreement that we don't want to include this paragraph on attendance?

LORI FIOROTO: I agree.

DONNA GILL: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: So now the question is do we want to have some additional language?

MARK DILLER: How about this? The work of the commission is

best achieved by the participation of all commissioners. It is therefore the goal and expectation that all commissioners attend and participate in each meeting. Has no teeth but it's a statement.

LORI FIOROTO: We can add teeth as time goes on.

SARAH SAYEED: Put it under membership?

MARK DILLER: Right.

AMY BREEDLOVE: It has gums though.

(Laughter).

>> Linda: This is Linda on the phone as well. I'm so sorry I couldn't make it in person either. I feel like Annetta, I have no right to say anything because I'm not there. My only worry -- not really worry -- I think it's a good idea to put some positive language in there. My only thing is it's kind of like a slippery slope because there is a lot of work that happens in committees outside of the actual meetings. To really put an emphasis on meetings or make it more general? I think it's okay to actually leave it alone as is. With the expectation hopefully that all the commissioners will participate. Because also I feel like a lot of the nitty-gritty happens in the committee work. Like outside the actual meetings. Although I do agree that participating in meetings is important, I feel like we haven't even gotten off the ground yet in terms of the listening tours and all the other things we're trying to do, which I think would probably be a lot more work outside of that as well. I just wanted to put it out there. Not saying I have a strong suggestion either way. But I do think obviously the monthly meetings are super important. And I think we had discussed very early on

in the beginning that may also taper off so it's not necessarily monthly depending on what the scope of work looks like based on what we decide. I just wanted to put that out there too.

SARAH SAYEED: Any responses to that?

DONNA GILL: I agree with Linda. I feel like if we don't put anything in there, positive or negative, it would probably be better. Because you were saying that you wanted to keep it as vague -- not vague but open --

SARAH SAYEED: The ability to be open -- flexible.

DONNA GILL: To be as flexible as possible. Legally the less you have, it's all up to interpretation. So I think not putting anything about it in there would be better than if we try to be nice and put in nice words in there. What does that really do? Making people feel good. Are we talking about a document or talking about people's feelings? That's my opinion. I'm thinking take it out.

>> This is Lillian. I have one being challenged with the location since I'm so far north, obviously by The Bronx. For me to really participate in meetings in person will require about six hours of my time. I have a very demanding job and I'm wondering how we can have a real conversation about what we're doing here. Can we move the meetings? Can we accommodate -- it's tough. We all have different schedules. But it's not like we signed -- we signed up because we really want to do this work. I'm on the phone. I'm present. I'm listening. I want to do as much as I can for my borough. But I agree the language discourages individuals from coming in the future. We're here because we have something (inaudible).

LORI FIOROTO: I actually had that problem as you know if we were

doing it during the day. When they were during the day I was about to step down because I did not think it was fair to hold my seat if I knew I couldn't make the 11 o'clock meetings. And then they switched. So I think there's always someone that it's not going to be conducive.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. This was a time that I thought was in between the people who couldn't today, some people couldn't do evenings for family so I thought we'd make everyone -- and put it in the middle. But when you have 15 people to schedule, it's very challenging.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Just for clarification we're talking about habitually being absent. We're not talking about a couple of times where things come up. I just want to make that point.

SARAH SAYEED: Good point.

AMY BREEDLOVE: We all understand that things happen.

MARK DILLER: It occurs to me the only consensus around the table and on the phone is to take out the proposed highlighting and replace it with nothing.

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. That sounds good. Let's move this along. Thank you.

The next addition in here under officers, there was a minor tweak that was made at Chuck's suggestion under vice chair. Before it said the Chair shall nominate a member, and we added in here in consultation with the commission. Under vice chair.

CHARLES APELIAN: Article four, section two.

MARK DILLER: Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: That would allow you all as commissioners to

suggest a vice chair.

DONNA GILL: I like that.

CHARLES APELIAN: But still doesn't allow for multiples the way it's written.

MARK DILLER: Right.

CHARLES APELIAN: Doesn't allow for multiple nominations. This is just one nomination. The Chair shall consult with the commission and shall nominate a member. So doesn't allow for multiple members to be or for someone to say I'd like to nominate so and so on the floor or put themselves in.

DONNA GILL: Wouldn't that be consultation? The process.

CHARLES APELIAN: But if someone disagrees with that.

DONNA GILL: But consultation meaning the process if the Chair nominates someone and someone else at the table, another Commissioner, wanted to nominate someone else, and then we would vote because --

CHARLES APELIAN: That's not what it says though. Just says she consults with the commission and then she nominates.

SARAH SAYEED: But the nomination can be confirmed or not.

MARK DILLER: In effect a confirmation by majority vote is the consultation. I actually litigated a case once on the word consultation. And a federal court said consultation is more than just notice.

DONNA GILL: Exactly.

MARK DILLER: It said you have to take seriously what the consulting body refers to you. If you don't agree with them you have to

have a cogent reason why. Doesn't mean you have to agree with them but you have to have a reason why. I'll spare the details. I'm not certain we need the consultation, especially if there's only going to be one nominee because the vote of the 8 members is the most meaningful consultation. We either agree or disagree. If there's even only one nomination and you don't get 8 votes around the table then we have to find somebody else. So I don't object to the consultation but I think it's redundant.

CHARLES APELIAN: That was my objection.

SARAH SAYEED: If we do that, let's say I nominate somebody and you all don't agree to it, you have the opportunity to vote no and then we'd start again and try someone else. That's how it would work.

MARK DILLER: Maybe this is nothing especially for this commission, the act of consultation would give you a heads up that the person you're about to nominate might not get the confirmation you're looking for. It would be a friendly way to influence the process, suggest an alternative and so forth. I guess a consultation might have some additional input that the vote wouldn't.

SARAH SAYEED: Would it be binding then if you add it? Would it be binding to do it?

MARK DILLER: The binding is the vote. The consultation wouldn't be binding. But like I said it is more than just notice. It's more than just saying I'm putting up Ms. Smith, and then now we know that you're going to be putting up Ms. Smith and go straight to a vote. Consultation would be I'm putting up Ms. Smith, what do you think, and you hear what everybody

says around the table and if that leads you to rethink Ms. Smith that has some value to you so you don't have a negative vote.

DONNA GILL: Or even ask for suggestions from the body. That's the consultation part.

MARK DILLER: Could be. You're right. It could be.

DONNA GILL: That's the way I see it.

MARK DILLER: I would leave it.

SARAH SAYEED: We're going to leave that.

AMY BREEDLOVE: We've adopted in consultation with the commission.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. And it's parallel to the language in the next one which is to add other officers. That's also in consultation with the commission.

MARK DILLER: Same thing.

SARAH SAYEED: There was a question, and Chuck had asked it, just about the requirement for quorum and voting. We have to have 8 in order to make a valid meeting. And your question was if there are 8 people at the table, and we're trying to take an action on something, do all 8 have to agree? Because you were asking about whether it be the majority or two thirds of the eight. According to the charter, and our laws' interpretation of it it has to be in agreement.

CHARLES APELIAN: So you have a minimum quorum it has to be unanimous.

MARK DILLER: Yes. It has parallels in other bodies.

SARAH SAYEED: Under removal, Chuck you had a question about



adding some language about the Chair's removal. There is the public officers law which governs the resignation of the Chair. We don't need to put it in here. It's a separate law.

The next section is about hearings and meetings. Last time we had a conversation about notifying the public in a timely way. Here as you'll note on the hand out with the highlights, we said we heard law said meetings and hearings are both subject to open meeting law. The bylaws are helping us set a floor and a minimum standard. And we don't -- they recommended we don't add additional requirements that we will then have to follow. But that does not stop us from having good practice, just like the principles of attendance and such, that we would have a system of notifying the public about hearings and meetings in a timely way. The minimum days is three -- we wouldn't do a public hearing notice in a three day window. We'd try to do it for longer because we'd want people to attend obviously. That was their recommendation on that.

MARK DILLER: I looked up the open meetings law text and that's where they get the three days from. It's actually 72 hours, not even three days. Theoretically you could give notice at five o'clock on a Friday afternoon and hold your meeting at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon and that would comply. If you want to play games you could always play games. Obviously the goal is to do a whole lot better, and I'm okay with that.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I have an issue, I have to say, that we went around and around about membership with the commissioners and absenteeism, and yet we're okay to accept three days to serve the public for a meeting by the civic engagement commission. I understand that

there is the open meeting laws. But the fact that we would put in here that we only have to do it within three days is a little troubling to me. I just want to state for the record. I think that we should -- I understand that we may come out with guidelines and principles that would ask us to do better and more. But that is troubling to have three days.

MARK DILLER: There are two different places where we talk about it. One is notice to the other members. That's the first thing under number four. I didn't label these -- I didn't enumerate these.

AMY BREEDLOVE: That's standard, right, within a board. If you have to call on a meeting, to have a very short timeframe because we may have to pivot on an issue. But I'm talking specifically about a public hearing.

MARK DILLER: If you turn the page on page four there's a separate section that talks about notice to the public as opposed to notice to all of us. It also has three days because we were asked to look at what the open meetings law requires. And that's what we put in. But that one is one I would be more persuaded for the need for longer notice even though we'd be held accountable to it and we'd be prevented from holding a public meeting on short notice regardless of the exigency.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I guess I wonder why we wouldn't want to be held accountable --

MARK DILLER: Only thing I can think of is if there's something on fire, and it's hard to tell what that would be for this commission, but if something is literally burning down as we're speaking and you have to wait three days in order to have a meeting about it, that might limit the options

one has in order to get around to hearing it. Hard to contemplate what that would be sitting here right now --

AMY BREEDLOVE: Understood. That's a good point. I guess the use of hearing and meeting. A hearing and a meeting too can be defined as two different things. So a meeting to me would be much more -- I would like to see more than three days. A hearing I can understand if this is something that needs immediate action of some sort; that we would act within three days. But a meeting is something that you're opening it up, you want more people there. I would think that we would want to be longer timeframe. But I understand that we don't want to lock ourselves in or out.

MARK DILLER: Understood. Take the opposite tack though, and not really devil's advocate but just making sure we're doing this intentionally. If for example we say you need ten business days notice before you can convene either a meeting or a hearing. I might parse that differently than you. But if you say that and we have an exigency and we call a meeting on three days notice whatever action we take technically speaking would not be authorized to be taken. That's the problem.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I agree with you. I understand that point now. What I'm saying is I'm trying to differentiate meeting and hearing maybe. So that when we have a meeting --

>> I have a question. This is Lillian. Do we have to have language to require meeting notice? Because I agree with both sides. You don't know if there's an emergency, you don't know if you want 30 days, two months notice so you can get the best outreach done. Do we need this

requirement?

MARK DILLER: Yes. You need something because otherwise you can call a meeting on five minutes notice and that obviously is not in the spirit or intention of anybody around this table. But technically speaking it would be true.

SARAH SAYEED: The open meeting law requires us to have at least three days.

AMY BREEDLOVE: So I think we should leave it as is, three days, but I think when we do our principles and guidelines for the commission, that we should set a longer timeframe to shoot for.

MARK DILLER: Correct.

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. Eve.

EVE BARON: Very quick point here. If we're doing that, I just wanted to point out that you probably need to give the public more advanced time in terms of notification for a hearing than a meeting I think just because when people are going to be testifying, they need time.

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. For example on that point, when we post the poll site methodology we're required to have it up for 30 days. And then the hearing would be after that 30 day period, for example.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I agree making sure we give as much time as possible to be informed about meetings and hearings. I think a couple of months ago I asked how often are we going to meet as a commission, some commissions meet I think twice a year, some meet four times a year. I think because of how new we are, I think we said we're going to do as many meetings as possible to get us up and off the ground. So once

we -- at some point we should figure out when are we off the ground, and then have -- ensure that we have a public calendar of our stated meetings, hopefully with a year of meetings and hopefully that falls in line with some of the other commissions or bodies' schedules. So if it's going to be four meetings a year, or four hearings a year with three meetings in between, or four meetings in between, whatever it is that we're making that public as well. Then that issue of the open meeting law isn't really a thing. And we should only really be having -- giving notice or three day issues if there's let's say a special election that gets scheduled and we're not prepared as a city to have a special-- I don't know what a special meeting would come to this body for. But in the interest of just being honest and fair right now, I think we should actually have a year calendar, hopefully by after the first or second quarter of next year.

SARAH SAYEED: We're going to remove that. The minimum will be three days. We'll also create some aspirational statements. We're removing the section about giving notice.

MARK DILLER: Right now you've got notice by first class mail, electronic mail.

SARAH SAYEED: The highlighted section was added. That also -- there was mention in here about including reference to topic. Again, I think there's no requirement in the open meeting law about that.

MARK DILLER: It's true.

I'm concerned -- the reason I drafted this the way I did, verbose and obscure as it is, relying on mail, email and delivery in person are all imprecise ways to get messages to people especially on three days' notice.

So I was trying to find a formulation that would ensure delivery on notice especially on short notice. In the means most likely to be effective, given those circumstances. First class mail obviously ain't going to do it on three days notice. Email, the only problem is you often cannot confirm it was actually received. And delivery in person there's no record of it being received.

SARAH SAYEED: So you're saying modes in media. Just general --

MARK DILLER: The word media escaped my notice at that time. Should be given using means practical under is circumstances. Such notice shall be given using means that are reasonable and practicable under the circumstances.

CHARLES APELIAN: What does that mean?

(Laughter).

You really dummed it down.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Scream from the roof tops.

MARK DILLER: If the guy is standing right next to you, that might be better than email.

SARAH SAYEED: I think in these other forms of notification it's written down. So there's a written record of it.

MARK DILLER: There is.

SARAH SAYEED: And it doesn't stop us from in addition to that doing other things. Like for example, I can call -- we can call people. Or we can text people in addition to emailing them. Or mailing them, or delivering to them a written notice. If we see them in person we don't have

to then text or call them back. I think we're going to leave it.

There was another question about under quorum, what happens if there is less than a quorum present. We were talking about -- sorry, under article 7, section 7, quorum. If there's less than a quorum we were talking about potentially moving to adjourn the meeting. And the only thing that was added on that, the Law Department said the Chair shall rule on the motion. So it allows us to be more flexible.

MARK DILLER: That's fine.

AMY BREEDLOVE: We don't vote in every meeting.

SARAH SAYEED: It wouldn't be voting anyway because it's less than a quorum.

MARK DILLER: That's fine.

SARAH SAYEED: And okay -- the last article 8 --

CHARLES APELIAN: Back to 7 for a second. Article 7, section 10. There's still an issue here with this voting. I'll explain. Any vote that we take is going to require 8 members to make it inactive. So if you have a minimum of 8 members and you have a quorum, that means you need a majority -- not majority. You need a unanimous vote at that point. Literally meaning the minutes may not be approved because technically if someone missed the last meeting they could abstain from voting on the minutes because they don't know whether the minutes are accurate or not. This is saying 8 is the magic number no matter whether you have 8 people as a minimum quorum or 15 people as a majority, if that's the way it's going to stay there might be a lot of inactions.

MARK DILLER: Absolutely correct.

SARAH SAYEED: We sort of encountered that a little bit last meeting as well.

MARK DILLER: Panel for educational policy works that way. Community education councils work that way. I'm pretty sure the landmarks preservation commission works that way. There are times in which they can't take action. You're absolutely right.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I don't know where it is in here but we discussed that our minutes have to be published within x amount of time after each meeting.

CHARLES APELIAN: I was using that as an example.

AMY BREEDLOVE: But the one vote we do take every meeting is the minutes -- vote on the minutes, but that information is made available. So each Commissioner should be reviewing those.

DONNA GILL: Even if they're not at the meeting.

CHARLES APELIAN: But I wasn't at the last meeting so technically I should abstain. I have no idea whether the minutes were accurate as posted. But that's not the issue.

SARAH SAYEED: We might have a situation where we're not able to take action.

CHARLES APELIAN: That's what I'm saying. If it stays with 8 everybody should recognize at that point even if you have a quorum, you need a unanimous vote otherwise inaction has to be laid out.

SARAH SAYEED: Personally, I'm comfortable with that because we are a body of 15. Given that, I think I'd like it to be 8 to take action.

CHARLES APELIAN: I'm just pointing it out. Was there something



stipulated by the Law Department that it's required to have 8 --

SARAH SAYEED: I think it's the language of the charter that talks about the quorum.

CHARLES APELIAN: They stipulate that it has to be 8? If it's in the charter it's a different story. I know a quorum, but that's different from a vote. Quorum I understand.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I'm on a number of boards where the quorum is the majority -- gives you the majority of members. And then the vote has to be by that number. I'm on a board of 7. Four is the quorum, we have to have four to approve anything. So I have to get all four members --

CHARLES APELIAN: So you do --

SARAH SAYEED: The charter says majority of the whole number of members in the commission then in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business. Commissioner shall have the power to act by majority of its members.

CHARLES APELIAN: By majority of its members.

SARAH SAYEED: Then in office.

MARK DILLER: Let me distinguish two scenarios, one is if there are only 8 that show up in a meeting you'd need 8. Distinguish that from there were 13 members of the board because two have resigned or been removed or whatever, and 7 show up, that would be a quorum.

CHARLES APELIAN: Correct but no action would be taken.

MARK DILLER: But according to this you couldn't take action so you'd have a quorum but no vote. That technically could happen.

CHARLES APELIAN: Correct. I'm just pointing it out. If everybody

says that's the way we do it, so be it. I'm just pointing out that it's a unique situation that could happen.

AMY BREEDLOVE: It does dove tail to attendance because you want to have attendance in order to have the quorum to have a full body here. So that you are able to take action. So it goes unfortunately right back to the attendance issue.

DONNA GILL: Exactly, where we started to begin with.

MARK DILLER: Yes. And raises the problem they have in the California state Senate where a majority of folks walked out and prevented the rest of them from taking action. It can happen. I don't think it's going to happen here but it can happen.

DONNA GILL: If we added language that spoke with the 8 members yes, but language that says the current composition of the Board, which if it goes to 13, that would change the 8. Because that would change the total amount of people --

MARK DILLER: My recollection is that we raised that. And Sarah took it back to the Law Department and they came back with what you see in front of you. I don't think any of us wrote what's here.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I asked that last time.

SARAH SAYEED: In the section, article 7 section 7, quorum is defined the way it is in the charter. It says members of the commission then in office shall constitute a quorum.

DONNA GILL: Right. So then I think we should just add language to that, which speaks to that also. If necessary.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Then are you going to change the removal too

which is ten, which is super majority?

MARK DILLER: Having already raised this issue and having it sent back to us as is, if we're going to pick up by the Law Department, I'm not sure this is it.

LORI FIOROTO: Choose the battles.

CHARLES APELIAN: Going back to ten and two thirds -- that can be simplified by saying two thirds.

AMY BREEDLOVE: No, the Law Department didn't want that.

MARK DILLER: I think this was the provision we went back to them on and they came back and said no, it needs to be 8. That is consistent with the other commissions including the ones I mentioned. Chuck is exactly right, it could lead to problems. But that seems to be the practice. And having already gone through the exercise of having this go back to the Law Department and have them send it back to us in the form that we see it here, as I said, I disagree with it. But it may be that I don't want to die on that hill.

CHARLES APELIAN: Not dying on a hill. Amy brings up a good point though. I think they got too specific with the ten number, based on the two thirds when they articulated the number.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I'm only saying that because you said last meeting it did say two thirds and you said that was my internal note. That's to be taken -- you said that's to be taken out.

MARK DILLER: Right.

AMY BREEDLOVE: So it was ten. And the two thirds language was removed. I thought that was under advisement of the Law

Department.

MARK DILLER: It was. Originally I and I think others had recommended the language that Chuck is talking about. And it was sent back to us. So I just don't want to go around and around on this.

SARAH SAYEED: I think they're specifying the number given the composition of the commission is 15. Expected composition. So if we don't have 15 or -- the priority would be to fill that seat.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Okay.

CHARLES APELIAN: That still doesn't solve the issue. I'm sorry. I think they got a little too specific and they put a number in instead of two thirds based upon expected composition. If the number does change it still should be two thirds. I would ask them again on that one because I think it's a good point. If they say 8 is the number, then 8 is the number and we live with that.

SARAH SAYEED: You're talking specifically about the voting.

CHARLES APELIAN: Right.

MARK DILLER: It would carry over to every place --

SARAH SAYEED: Every place 8 or 10 is mentioned.

EVE BARON: Why not use the same language that they have here, then in office.

MARK DILLER: We know how to do it. The problem is we suggested that and they sent back a number instead of that phrase.

DONNA GILL: But why can't we add that phrase to where they have the number?

MARK DILLER: Because they would be changing what they told us

to do. If the will of the board is to ask them again, then let's ask them again. Point them to the phrase.

DONNA GILL: Approximate if the numbers --

SARAH SAYEED: Just to paraphrase, so I relay the concern correctly, we are concerned about a situation in which we are unable to take action.

MARK DILLER: Correct.

SARAH SAYEED: Because we do not have the 15 members in office, or because what else?

MARK DILLER: That's it. That's it. Because the other one is there's a failure to attend but that doesn't -- in that situation is not the problem. The problem is fewer than a full complement of Commissioners, then a majority -- to use Chuck's example, you could have a valid quorum, and not be able to take action. That's in a nutshell the problem.

CHARLES APELIAN: Right but that's one question to reconfirm with them. The other is the two thirds language based on the office.

MARK DILLER: It's majority --

CHARLES APELIAN: I disagree but not really.

SARAH SAYEED: I'll talk more with you off line so I frame it correctly.

CHARLES APELIAN: I have to remember to litigate with him before we get here.

(Laughter).

SARAH SAYEED: We have about 20 minutes left before the

comment period.

MARK DILLER: The lightning round?

SARAH SAYEED: Article 8, there were a bunch of things -- on your highlighted sheet, they thought that the first sentence on here, the commission may appoint under section one, the commission may appoint by majority vote such committees of members and Madell gave such powers and duties to them as the commission may deem advisable, they thought that sentence was broad and encompassing and included everything we wanted to add. It allows us to create working groups or committees, and call them whatever we want. It didn't necessarily -- again it would add more things that we needed to do.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Again, the language isn't consistent because here it says by majority vote.

SARAH SAYEED: By majority vote of the committee.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Yeah, but --

SARAH SAYEED: Which is different from the commission.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Oh, okay, by committee. Sorry.

SARAH SAYEED: The commission may appoint by majority vote of the commission committees -- committees. And designate powers and duties. The Chair will serve as a member of the committees and each committee will include at least three members. If you want to make officers you can. By majority vote of the committee. It's a much leaner section than including section 2, 3 and 4.

MARK DILLER: Their proposal is to take out all of that.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. Because they're saying all these things

are covered by the first sentence.

MARK DILLER: I completely disagree.

SARAH SAYEED: Number four, the recording -- research and investigations, again I think it's a difference with shall -- just requiring someone to do it. Whereas they should do it I guess. That was their comment. Again they left it up to you all. They said if you really want it, you can. But they think a lot of this is covered. Doesn't seem like we're going to take this to vote today?

CHARLES APELIAN: Close but we're not there yet.

SARAH SAYEED: We can pause the conversation here.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Took out the language -- no, you kept in the 72 hours. You kept in on the commission's website article 9, section 1, 72 hours after the adjournment that this will be live on the website.

MARK DILLER: I think we inserted where reasonably practicable. Just above, the middle line.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Oh, okay.

SARAH SAYEED: The things we need to revisit are the issue of the quorum and voting numbers, and then also the working groups and committees.

Thank you for your input on all of that.

To quickly go through the program updates, one big thing we all can share forward is we have selected and notified people of their appointment to the participatory budgeting advisory committee. As you know that's mandated for us to do. I want to thank everyone for helping to circulate the application, and also in your packets there's a list of people we've

notified that they're part of the advisory -- we tried to pay attention to age, diversity, borough, language, tried get representation from groups that are typically not engaged like veterans, people with disabilities, seniors, other groups with language barriers, et cetera. We tried to create an inclusive committee. However, there is one gap that we need to fill which is that we do not have anyone from Staten Island. So we are going to work to try to get people who might be interested in applying.

Are there any questions about the advisory committee?

CHARLES APELIAN: This is not a subcommittee?

SARAH SAYEED: It's a separate advisory. We're looking to hold the meeting hopefully midDecember, hopefully it works out the timing of the hiring of our the advisor, or the on boarding of the person. It could be early January.

LORI FIOROTO: Can I post that application and responsibilities on social media?

SARAH SAYEED: Most of the positions have been filled.

LORI FIOROTO: You said you needed someone for Staten Island.

SARAH SAYEED: I think it's probably better for us to think together about who could potentially be good candidates. For that committee, we're mostly built. We don't want to lead people to have an impression that there are a lot of openings.

CHARLES APELIAN: So the advisory committee would be under your direction?

SARAH SAYEED: Under the civic engagement commission. Under our direction.



CHARLES APELIAN: There's no Chair?

SARAH SAYEED: It's staffed by a staff member of the commission.

CHARLES APELIAN: Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: Poll site interpretation. We are almost ready to notify the people selected. We had a smaller group of applicants for that. There are about ten people who have been selected. We're still finalizing this. But one thing to note is the language access advisory committee is required to have members who are fluent in the local law 30 languages so we have a couple of gaps there. We are missing people speaking Arabic, Haitian, Korean, Polish, and Russian. I'll get back with you about how to get more people applying for speaking these languages and to speak to the topic of advising work.

Community boards, really quick updates there, we had a phone call with The Bronx Borough President's office to learn more about their trainings. We also did a meeting with beta NYC doing work with community boards, technological tools. And we wanted to learn more about their tech trainings to community boards. DCP is actually holding a board leadership forum tomorrow. There are two sessions. They're going to be sharing planning tools with community boards. I don't know if anyone here is attending that. But they'll be talking about store front vacancy study they've been doing. There's another geography of jobs online tool that will allow people to look at housing and employment trends. Zoning applications. Et cetera. So they're going -- we're going to hopefully attend that tomorrow to learn more.

And then we are looking to talk with each Borough President's office

to learn about their trainings but then also working with the community affairs unit to convene community boards by borough. The district managers and chairs to bring them together and talk more about their needs.

And then we also invited department of city planning to come present to us at the next meeting which they will be doing.

We don't have time to really go through the presentation. But I was going to show it to you. We can put that on the next meeting's agenda. I can also email it to you. I've emailed it to the people who are not here. So you see where the current version is. There is a one pager -- at some point you said it would be great to have a one pager about the civic engagement commission. That is in your packet that the team developed. This is very quick overview of what the CEC does. It can be translated into different languages. Again, if you would like to take that and look at it and bring -- maybe we can talk about it at the next meeting.

The last I guess area I wanted to cover is the listening sessions that has sort of fallen off our radar a little bit. I wanted to bring that back. We are going to need to put forward a strategy for participatory budgeting in July. Trying to think of how these listening sessions can dove tail with some of our other mandates, we didn't -- the way that we're thinking about it now, and would love to get your input on this, is that all of the mandates of the commission are requiring us to pay attention to communities that are less engaged. Some of those communities have been explicitly named in the charter language. So for instance, immigrant communities, or people with language access needs, seniors, youth, veterans, people with

disabilities, there's also the community of people who are -- the criminal justice community. Justice involved community. And so there are these different segments.

We are thinking that we could do listening sessions starting with these communities. For example, start with the veterans group, or youth convening to get their thoughts about civic engagement broadly but also to talk specifically about the mandates of the commission including participatory budgeting. And we could try to do this in a citywide way and try to get diversity within each group, within each issue area. Because before we were talking about borough based. This is changing that. Doesn't have to be either or. But I think we need to start somewhere. I'm just trying to figure out what would help --

MURAD AWAWDEH: You said by July. For what specifically?

SARAH SAYEED: Participatory budgeting. We need to be ready to roll by July.

MURAD AWAWDEH: How does that fit into the city budget process? Historically it's been wrapped up historically by the first of June. Would we be ought in the upcoming city budget?

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. We're trying to have those conversations now so that the advisory committee hopefully has an amount to work with. Yeah.

EVE BARON: I'm sorry. The money would be earmarked in this next fiscal year's budget?

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. Yes.

MARK DILLER: Would it be the work of the PB advisory

committee -- there's a parallel, as I see it, to what you were offering about the participation of folks on the PB advisory committee. And paying attention to those communities and groups who are not traditionally having the greatest access to power and being heard. There's a parallel that the actual allocation of money ought to follow that same protocol. And folks who have other opportunities to secure funding from whatever other sources of government may come available, would not be the first votes approached and/or listened to with respect to this new pile of money that would be in the budget. It would be -- I guess the question I'm trying to ask is, a, am I correct that is a goal? And B, would it be the work of the PB advisory committee to try to devise strategies to meet that goal?

SARAH SAYEED: I think we need to talk about whether that's a -- I mean, the charter specifies that we must include these people. And actually report on how those communities were involved. So we're going to have to determine a strategy that allows us to do that for sure. So I think we can't really -- we do need to collect the input of the advisory committee of this.

EVE BARON: (Inaudible) it's about a community engagement event aimed at youth in bush wick. It lays out a very specific event targeted at that population but also tries to derive what could be relevant in a number of different situations.

SARAH SAYEED: That's amazing. Amazing. That's great. That could be a great starting point for us.

EVE BARON: It will be a resource.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. Thank you.

MURAD AWAWDEH: One follow up question. Will we be taking a recommendation from this advisory committee on the amount that PB -- this commission will be recommending or is that something you will be doing? I'm trying to understand where that amount comes from. How much is going to be --

SARAH SAYEED: I think the amount is determined by our fiscal reality on one level. And we have to -- I don't think that we can say this is what we want and we'll get it is what I mean. Is that what you're asking?

MURAD AWAWDEH: I'm thinking about what is the process we're taking to get to that number. Is it going to be from an advisory committee we're putting together these 20 plus votes to come together and think about this process. Or is it going to be something that we say or is it going to be something that we're going to -- I know we're doing an intake of every citywide PB process. I don't think that gets counted into that aspect of what I'm talking about right now. What DOT does now with their budgeting process --

SARAH SAYEED: That's part of council's process.

MURAD AWAWDEH: NYCHA has a process too. Community boards have their own processes. This is something separate that would be new under this commission, so that number I'm talking about, something like 9 billion dollars, is going to come from us? The advisory committee, or them -- I'm not sure --

SARAH SAYEED: I think that what we can do as a commission is put on the table what the asks are. From stakeholders, from you all, from whatever we think. But the administration is going to have to make a

determination what that amount will be in actuality.

MURAD AWAWDEH: Would we pick up a recommendation from the advisory committee and then discuss that? And then move that forward to the admin? Or are we going to discuss a number and then float it down to them? I'm not sure how that would happen.

SARAH SAYEED: The way it is working in actuality is we were presented with recommendations from a group of stakeholders who have been instrumental in creating the civic engagement commission and pushing for participatory budgeting and we know how different cities are allocating money. We know what's happening here locally with the council and their process. So we're trying to look at all of these different things, and put that on the table for conversation with OMB and with the administration. They will let us know what they've determined is feasible for us going forward.

MURAD AWAWDEH: So that one stakeholder group that helped create this commission, and has been helpful in recruiting people, that is not the only body that we're taking recommendations from, right? There is an advisory group that we're going to look at and ask them for their thoughts on what should be --

SARAH SAYEED: I think the work of the advisory group is to help draft the citywide strategy. Given the resources.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I just don't want us to have -- I don't know who else is in that group that has put forward a PB strategy for the city. I think that should be a discussion here as well, of what we think we should be doing. Of course it won't be a 9 billion dollars request but I think we

should talk about it more so that we have a better understanding of what we could do versus limiting ourselves. Maybe an aspirational initiative that we say year one we want to see x, year two we want to see y, year three -- and go down that road.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. We can talk more about that at the next meeting. Though I think by then we might have a better sense as to what's feasible.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I think we should as a commission commit to doing at least a meeting on that so that we can have folks who are interested in this topic able to come to that meeting and also over time for comments on that.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay.

CHARLES APELIAN: Are we limited just to poll site interpretation or can we get involved more with the process? Ie -- we just had early voting, I'm sure everybody has feelings about that. Maybe there are some recommendations. I would like to see that. I just don't know whether or not we're stepping out or that's okay.

SARAH SAYEED: About early voting in particular?

CHARLES APELIAN: The process, how it was, the amount of time, amount of days, what the reach was.

ANTHONY HARMON: Polling sites.

SARAH SAYEED: How about we put both these things -- we can't spend a lot of time on bylaws next time if we want to engage on program but we can spend time talking about participatory budgeting and early voting interpretations.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I was thinking about the census. And the work they're doing, and how this commission could interact in terms of going out at least listening when the census team is out. Because I know they're going to do very grass roots community based organization work. If we can somehow participate in that, at least from a listening standpoint, to hear what many of the communities have to say, and how that might inform us.

SARAH SAYEED: That's a good question. I'll try to learn more about what they are doing -- I'm not sure if they're doing any kind of listening tour. I was thinking it would be great for us to team up with them, and with democracy, and other folks who might be interested in doing New York City civic engagement, on all these different topics.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I know at the moment they're reaching out to individual community groups and community boards. They're going very grass roots.

MARK DILLER: They're also recruiting people to do the actual jobs which is apparently not going as well as it might in some communities.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Right.

SARAH SAYEED: All right. It is now 5:32. We're going to turn to the public comment section of the meeting. Is someone here from the dramatists guild of America? No?

AMY BREEDLOVE: Maybe they'll come in in a very theatrical entrance.

(Laughter).



CHARLES APELIAN: I love it.

SARAH SAYEED: No one here. Jenna Chrisphonte? I spoke to her earlier today.

EVE BARON: Maybe she's just late.

SARAH SAYEED: Possibly. We've gone through everything -- we can go back to talking about the PowerPoint if you'd like to see it. The PowerPoint that provides an overview of the CEC that potentially people could use if they were asked to give talks. Would you like to do that?

DONNA GILL: Absolutely.

SARAH SAYEED: Murad is suggesting something about the one pager. Can you repeat?

MURAD AWAWDEH: I am asking if we can get this a little better graphically designed. Also if we were able to use text that's here to make our own material. Add on --

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. We definitely want to translate it. Any suggestions that people have, if we send it to you as a Word document do you want to give us changes? Is that what you're thinking? Anyone else interested in that?

MARK DILLER: I nominate Murad.

MURAD AWAWDEH: For design -- I just think the way it's right now it's not very accessible for folks who have very limited capacity, and even if it gets translated into other languages it's still not very accessible.

SARAH SAYEED: I think one of the toughest things that we don't often talk about is literacy. How do we really make our materials understandable for people who have low literacy, including in other

languages? They might not be literate -- they might not necessarily be literate in their own language.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Also pictures are very important. Now that I'm looking at it a little closer, the first one, there's money going into one person's hand.

(Laughter).

Maybe that's not the image we want.

MURAD AWAWDEH: As I'm translating it in my head into Arabic, it's not accessible.

SARAH SAYEED: Actually it would be really helpful if we -- we will email you the one pager. Please feel free to mark it up and send it back to us. I have a feeling you will say the same thing about the PowerPoint. You got to start somewhere.

This is the PowerPoint that we have. I'll just take you through it. I'm not going to deliver it to you but I'll just give you -- you'll see what each slide sort of covers. At the beginning we're really talking about how this came into existence. And why the people who are part of the charter revision commission process felt the CEC was necessary. They really wanted to see a centralized mechanism -- there's nothing currently or before this -- there was nothing in the charter that -- there was no body that allowed government to sort of work on these issues of trust, confidence, and increase participation. They wanted to see a clearinghouse of information that would help connect people to a variety of opportunities on civic engagement. And then also to have a space where you could launch initiatives that would help strengthen civic engagement. This was created

as a ballot measure in November 2018, last year, a year ago, and passed 65 to 35. And the charter was amended as a result.

Then there's different sections of the charter that talk about the overview of the commission, membership, powers and duties, assistance to community boards, cooperation of mayoral agencies, and the rest of the presentation is really sort of built around these areas.

This slide just tells you again the purpose. And then there's membership. Goes over the different members and who they're appointed by. And then this talks about the defined duties, mandates of the commission. There are five areas that have been defined in the charter. Participatory budgeting, strengthening community partnerships to promote civic engagement, language access, making sure that our materials are accessible in a variety of languages; poll site assistance, and partnering with city agencies to strengthen civic engagement. The next series of slides goes into the mandate more. Citywide participatory budgeting is one of those mandates. More than 1500 cities participate worldwide. Gives a little bit of history what we've been doing in New York City. Including the council process, and then the addition of 2 thousand dollars per school in 2018. We are tasked with actually coordinating with various bodies in implementing participatory budgeting, including Borough Presidents, community boards and agencies, and then tasked with doing an advisory committee.

The charter also talks about the age of people who will participate. It's above 16. I think their council actually allows 13 and above. That's something for us to -- 12?

>> 11.

SARAH SAYEED: 11. There we go. And then consulting with different agencies. This is the piece that I was just talking about. If we're going to do listening sessions, starting to work with these agencies, and creating sort of issue focused or community focused listening sessions.

Again, strengthening existing civic engagement initiatives, partnering with existing CPOs is another area. And then language access, making sure that we are accessible. Poll site assistance, approximately 23 percent of New Yorkers and 49 percent of immigrants are limited English proficient. We're looking -- the stakeholders wanted us to build on MOIA's pilot and establish a citywide program for poll site interpretation. We are adding to the work of the board of elections. We're not replacing it. We want to help expand more people being served, particularly local people speaking local law 30 languages and also we're tasked with doing a language assistance advisory committee.

As we mentioned, we are going to be on track to publish this poll site interpretation methodology on January 1. We should have this up on our website. We will have public comment on this. We will have a public hearing, and publish the final methodology by April, and be ready to implement this by November 2020.

And then we are also tasked with reviewing on an ongoing basis this methodology. So on or before September 1, 2022 and every five years thereafter we need to review the poll site methodology and revise it. And then also think about the standards for who is acting as an interpreter, and how they should be trained. Think about that. We also have to not only

do we need to develop the interpretation program but we have to make sure the word gets out about it. It's not enough to provide interpreters. We need to make sure people know that this service exists. And continue to monitor how the service is being used. Again, the charter is very specific. We are not replacing anything the BOE is doing because they're servicing languages covered under the voting rights act. So we're adding to that service.

The last part is just working with city agencies. We know that city agencies have opportunities, and are engaging with community members on their programs. We want to get a better handle of what those opportunities are. Help centralize them in a portal. And then also work with agencies to develop additional opportunities they might not be doing. Help them strategize, think about reaching out, creating opportunities for community engagement. And the charter does have a directive to city agency collaborates with city engagement. One thing we haven't covered yet is community boards. There are 59 community boards. Their capacity is limited. So the CEC is charged with improving their access to urban planning resources, helping community boards connect better with their communities through translation services. And then training on technological tools, improving their websites, for example, developing uniform meeting procedures, et cetera. This is part of why we're trying to do the needs assessment, to have a better handle on how to implement these mandates.

And then the reporting requirements are also spelled out in the charter. So we need to, as I mentioned already, we need to look

at -- report on who has participated, the number of people who have participated in PB. Demographic break downs, projects selected for recommendation, how we're reaching out to the public. That needs to be recorded. And similarly for language access, where the poll sites are located, the languages we provide interpretation in, and the number of people who are using the services. And any other information we think is relevant.

For community boards also we need to provide the resources that we are offering to community boards, and the number of community boards that take advantage of these resources.

That's it.

DONNA GILL: That's good.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Who is it meant for? The audience?

SARAH SAYEED: It was meant as a tool to help you when you are asked to come and speak about your work. If you wanted to do a PowerPoint. Gives you some talking points. You don't need to put up the PowerPoint. You should take this and use it to structure your talk if you want to.

DONNA GILL: I just have one thing. In slide one, the first slide, item three -- the first one, where it says civic engagement innovation, and it says participatory budgeting, poll site interpretation, it's actually missing the community board or the other aspect -- there are three things we have to do --

SARAH SAYEED: Yes, we can add that. Okay.

DONNA GILL: Because later on we start talking about it. They're

like why are you doing this if you didn't have to do this.

SARAH SAYEED: Got it. Yes.

DONNA GILL: Other than that it's wonderful. Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: You can see that it's for a specific audience. Not everyone can necessarily sit through that presentation. And if you want to translate it into Arabic, it might not go over so well.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Pretty insider.

MURAD AWAWDEH: I think it's more so for organizational leadership, community boards, not necessarily general community. I think the flier should be more so for the community than the presentation.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah.

MURAD AWAWDEH: If it's that audience --

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. But you're right that we need something for the general public that is understandable, and that also gets people excited.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Just one thing, even though we've said it is more for people who know what's going on, I think that laying out what all the acronyms are is important because I've found in meetings people don't ask because they think everybody else knows but them. Meanwhile, more than half the people have no idea what was being referenced.

MARK DILLER: For example we're not on the community education council.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Right. We're not CEC district 15 or whatever.

MURAD AWAWDEH: (Inaudible).

MARK DILLER: I've been using NYC CEC for us.

MURAD AWAWDEH: It's a little bit --

DONNA GILL: It gets confused with the community education committee.

SARAH SAYEED: Right.

CHARLES APELIAN: So what's MOIA? Mayor's office of?

SARAH SAYEED: Immigrant affairs.

CHARLES APELIAN: When you first said it I thought you were talking about the Council Member. Exactly like you said, if you don't ask.

SARAH SAYEED: I'm going to ask one more time, is the dramatists guild of America here? Okay.

We are going to be in touch with you about creating a calendar of meetings for after December. Our next meeting is on December 18th from 4 to 6. We've already talked about a couple of things that are going to be on the agenda there, including we'll have DCP presenting. Is there any other item that you want to talk about today like in the next ten minutes or things you want to put on the agenda for next meeting?

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: I have a question. If we talked about it before, I apologize. I don't remember. But why does it only count as attendance if you're here? Like in terms of if people are able to call in, why doesn't that count as attendance? I'm just curious because like we were talking about, from an accessibility perspective I haven't had trouble yet but it's not a question of will I, it's a question of when will I in terms of an accessibility -- and I know Holly who is also on the commission, who has a disability, after our very first meeting she said I'm not so sure that I can -- that I want to do this but I'm not so sure how possible it's going to be.



She talked to me off line about it because of her commute and her family situation, and the accessibility challenges. So I'm just curious why do you have to be here for it to count as attendance?

SARAH SAYEED: That's a good question.

MARK DILLER: I'm looking for it on my phone but of course can't find it. I know as a matter of course that again lots of agencies operate that way. What I don't know is whether it's actually in the administrative code. My guess is that it is but I'll look for it.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. We can bring that back.

DONNA GILL: My understanding was if you're on the phone, you're in attendance but you can't vote. That's my understanding.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: So if you're counted as attending why can't --

DONNA GILL: You can't vote over the phone.

AMY BREEDLOVE: It's called phoning in a vote.

>> Is that our policy? I'm sorry, this is Annetta. I'm wanting to clarify. Is that our policy? I'm so sorry:

MURAD AWAWDEH: I was going to ask that earlier.

SARAH SAYEED: It doesn't count towards -- really it doesn't count towards attendance even. It doesn't count towards quorum.

MURAD AWAWDEH: Because there's no vote attached to it. If there were a vote would that change it?

SARAH SAYEED: It's really only when we're voting on things. That's when it becomes important to be there in person. For other business of the commission we're just having a conversation, not voting on

anything, then -- doesn't matter.

EVE BARON: Would the technology make any difference? If it was a zoom meeting or Skype -- like a video conference as opposed to a phone call, would that have any impact?

SARAH SAYEED: It's a really good question. I suspect that our code doesn't necessarily reflect the temporary technology --

CHARLES APELIAN: For the general public there's different forms. A, if you're not physically here you're not here and you're not voting. Yes you're here and you can't vote. Or yes you're here and you can vote. All three are being used in different realms based upon the company, whether it be a public or private company. Some will let someone be on the phone or on the screen and say you're here and you can vote. Others like you just said say you're here for the meeting but you can't vote. Seems kind of silly.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: I guess my question is what determines which --

CHARLES APELIAN: Organizations normally make that decision. It could be either internal or whether or not we have to abide by something with the Law Department.

MARK DILLER: I can't find it.

CHARLES APELIAN: All versions are acceptable in today's society. It's a good question to ask the Law Department whether or not we can make that determination or whether they have a steadfast rule that we have to abide by. But she only gets one vote. Her daughter can't vote.

(Laughter).

>> Sorry about that.

AMY BREEDLOVE: No. Don't apologize.

CHARLES APELIAN: Best part of the meeting!

(Laughter).

AMY BREEDLOVE: We needed that.

SARAH SAYEED: You're already inculcating the value of civic engagement.

>> Absolutely. Doing my very best!

SARAH SAYEED: So okay. Great. If there are no additions, may I hear a motion to adjourn the meeting? Second the motion?

AMY BREEDLOVE: I'll second.

SARAH SAYEED: The motion to adjourn has been seconded. All in favor say aye. Thank you. We call the meeting to adjourn. Thank you so much.