

**Human Right Commission Minutes
Regular Meeting**

Date: April 18, 2019

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

Roll Call: (Names of members present)

Kathryn Laughon, Olivia Patton, Andrew Orban, Susi Wilbur, Ann Smith, Matthew Tennant, Pheobe Brown, Lyndele von Schill, Robert Woodside, Catherine Spear, Todd Neirmeier, Charlene Green, Shantell Bingham, and Jeannette Abi-Nabar.

Notetaker: Catherine Spear.

Charlene Green called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:13 PM.

AGENDA ITEM	CONTENT
ELECTIONS	<p>Charlene opened floor for nominations.</p> <p><u>CHAIR</u></p> <p>From the Nomination Committee, one nomination for Chair for Susi Wilber. Olivia Patton nominated Shantell Bingham.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on form of voting. Consistent with FOIA training, voting will be done by show of hands.</p> <p>Pheobe asked for each candidate to indicate why interested in the position, which recommendation was approved by Charlene. Both Shantell and Susi gave brief comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shantell: Thanked Olivia for nominating her. Leaned in as a result of the nomination because means something to her. Would like to bring more formality and structure to the HRC. More we can do and execute. Some opportunity over the past several weeks to speak one on one with Commissioners, Charlene, and Todd. Some things of importance are the subcommittees, especially with large number and several mandates. Interested in dedicated work groups. Also would like to reform mandate to broaden scope, including with more public schools, not just private. She brings to the project her Food Justice Director leadership for healthy, just food system. Systems thinker, around ways to be effective. The heart of Charlottesville has a lot of good intentions. As Chair of HRC, she would like to take some of the knowledge she has out to Charlottesville community. She will be responsive to what we would like to do as a collective. • Susi: Acknowledged that new members on the board come with high hopes. She is excited about seeing a large group. They (HRC) have been through a lot in the past and have not been able to move forward when fewer people. She has experience and is willing to lead but follow the group as to what needs to be done.

	<p>Vote for Chair: Six votes for Shantell; four votes for Susi. By a show of votes, Shantell is the new chair for the HRC.</p> <p><u>VICE CHAIR</u></p> <p>Shantell nominated Susi for Vice Chair. Nominations from the last meeting were Anne Smith, Melvin Grady, and Pheobe Brown. Pheobe withdrew her nomination. Melvin was not present due to a personal family matter but still interested, so left his name in. Charlene called the vote.</p> <p>Vote for Vice Chair: 11 votes for Susi; 0 votes for Melvin; 0 for Anne Smith. Susi will be Vice Chair.</p> <p>HRC will vote again at the end of the calendar year.</p> <p>Charlene turned over the remainder of the meeting to the new chair, Shantell.</p>
ANNOUNCEMENTS	<p>Charlene: discussed the Unity Days calendar, which once up-to-date (it is not yet) will be a four-month long summer of events. Charlene is City staff person responsible for organizing events for May and June 2019, such as Jewish history, Monacan Indian Nation history, African American history, general history, Irish and enslaved history, Queen Charlotte on May 19, tour from Monticello to Main street (highlighting black-owned business), day of remembrance (at Zion cemetery), pop-ups at York’s Place for art exhibits, Fralin (Signs for Change), couple of movies, etc. Most events will be free (with exception of play about Sally Hemmings, for which the funds will contribute to Music Resource Center).</p> <p>Todd: indicated that R. Taylor from the Richmond HRC, asked if someone from our commission could attend their next meeting on April 25, 2019. If want to go, please let Todd know. Can also call in, video, etc. – they would just love to see someone there. Ann Smith indicated she could go.</p> <p>Catherine: announced that UVA’s Vice President for Diversity Equity and Inclusion (to replace Dr. Martin who is retiring) will be announced soon. HRC’s prior connection to that role primarily was through MLK events and other equity activities/initiatives.</p> <p>Charlene: mentioned that part of UVA’s Community Group recommendations include how to be a better neighbor, i.e., UVA and Charlottesville.</p> <p>Olivia: On April 27, JSAAHC will be showing movie Rigged, about voter suppression. Kathryn chimed in that there also will be one on policing and violence on May 7; Olivia noted the speaker is Flint Taylor.</p>
MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC	<p>Craig Chapman, US Army Veteran retired, attended the meeting. He lives in Charlottesville and works to support Charlene and Todd.</p> <p>Charlene noted Mr. Chapman is a huge volunteer for race and equity issues in support of HRC’s work.</p>
COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC	<p>Applause for Mr. Chapman.</p>

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES	<p>Motion to accept: (Not presented)</p> <p>Seconded by: (N/A)</p>
<p>BUSINESS MATTER 1:</p> <p>Councilor Wes Bellamy and Police Chief Brackney</p>	<p>Charlene: – noted that Councilor Wes Bellamy was supposed to be here, but he’s not, and she has no message indicating why he is not here.</p> <p>Chief Brackney initially was going to be here, but unexpectedly had to drive to Baltimore. The Chief advised Charlene that some City policies that HRC has requested an interest in reviewing are still under review by City attorneys. However, she would like us to review the following three policies: (1) biased-based policing; (2) use of force; and (3) constitutional matters. The first is the shortest. She recommended to start there – look through and if anything sounds questionable, let her know, and she would like to sit down with us and the City attorney as to what can be legally addressed.</p> <p>What is process for doing this? Charlene – checklist on thumb drive is what typically would use to review the policies and then come back together as a large group and discuss as part of a work session portion of the group.</p> <p>Catherine: can we do more quickly? What about ad hoc groups?</p> <p>Charlene: the City did not express a sense of urgency; not sure what City’s policy process is for review of policy. Noted that there also is a structural question about subgroups.</p> <p>Lyndele: would like to get them feedback as soon as possible – be proactive; these are important policies.</p> <p>Matt asked if there is anything that prevents us from having subgroups, and Charlene responded no.</p> <p>Ann: noted that even if have subgroups, need to read all three policies</p> <p>Charlene: While noting that Wes Bellamy could have shared information clarifying the naming issue, she can confirm that there is no process or procedure. Do we want to share our notes from the retreat on this issue?</p> <p><i>A discussion ensued among the group, with some indicating do not want to limit in a way that not naming after people, while others want to move away from naming people and focus on naming after trees, geography, etc. It was noted that while some are not against naming for people, it becomes much more complicated when named for a person and when time moves on perceptions change; who we revered at one time can change.</i></p> <p><i>Discussion landed as follows in terms of agreement: naming a public space should be weighed for its alignment with City values, and in particular those of equity and inclusion.</i></p>
<p>BUSINESS MATTER 2:</p> <p>UVA Updates</p>	<p>Charlene: The student representative of UVA Minority Rights Coalition (MRC), Shally, was not able to attend this evening. As a reminder, we agreed to have an MRC representative be a part of the Commission. As MRC has not been able to consistently follow through, perhaps suggest a representative from a different student group, given there is an expectation that there would be a representative who would attend.</p> <p>Kathryn: volunteered to be the MRC envoy to find out what is going on.</p>
<p>BUSINESS MATTER 3:</p> <p>OHR Staff Report</p>	<p>Todd: provided overview of data happening in the office. Total office contacts in March 2019 (e.g., people calling and response) = 78 contacts (with 43 still missing). Contacts coming in only – an additional 24. So total=114, which is an average of three new contacts per day. Of those, five inquiries (outside jurisdiction) and one complaint (within jurisdiction). Other announcements: City has approved a budget for housing proposal, Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program. Going to be meeting with Acting</p>

	<p>City Manager, etc. re: implementation. Discussion ensued. Now instead of just promising one-year subsidy, will do a 24-month subsidy. Currently 33 people on waiting list, but no commitment to serve waiting list. Currently serving 88 families with the voucher. Todd raised issue of exclusion for certain types of housing (e.g., shared housing), and pushed back a little there, so applies to other than just persons with disabilities. Housing remains the primary reason people contact HRC.</p> <p>Kathryn and Ann: noted that HRC meetings were not listed on the City website, and Charlene stated that she will follow up.</p> <p>Kathryn asked about the complaint in Region X that received a lot of interest.</p> <p>Charlene responded that our group (HRC) gets confused with Local Human Rights Committee that meets at UVA hospital – very public case where individual won her decision against Region X, Respondent (under VA Department of Health and Human Services). State issue, and this HRC had nothing to do with that. Could have something to do with HRC if asked to investigate or take some other action in the future, or receives a complaint.</p> <p>Kathryn: so what role does this body have for a complaint?</p> <p>Charlene: if file with HRC, consider whether within an ordinance/jurisdiction; if an individual comes to this meeting, Charlene will caution that this is a public body. Here, before Commission likely to be more systemic. If individual issue, Todd and Charlene investigate. Charlene explained the investigatory process. Should we become a Fair Employment Practice Agency (FEPA), then our responsibilities would bump up, as HRC would become the jury. But Federal government needs to make that determination.</p> <p>Kathryn: this body only becomes involved at the appeal level?</p> <p>Charlene: if a finding is made that discrimination has occurred, and the accused agency does not want to get involved, then HRC might get involved in reviewing the evidence and referral to City attorney. Typically how done with HRCs that have enforcement function; HRC</p>
<p>WORK SESSION</p>	<p>Charlene: The City values are creativity, leadership, trust, respect, and excellence.</p> <p>Olivia: noted recently added their five goals to that – shared with HRC, stating more recent.</p> <p>Charlene: work plan from Commission in the past would be tied into those goals. As consider what we would like to do for the rest of the year, we can think of the goals in a couple of different ways – i.e., five activities: housing, employment, education, credit, and public education or eight protected classes (race, sex, national origin, religion, disability, medical status/pregnancy, marital status, age). In the past, the Commission considered subcommittees, which worked until the larger Commission got too small—was a combination of activities and protected classes. At last meeting, suggested stay as large group and review policies, but still be able to do the other work through ad hoc committees.</p> <p>Pheobe: if any kind of committee meeting, then it has to be public so some level of coordination and space. She personally would like to focus on activity rather than a protected class.</p> <p>Charlene: any other thoughts around preference?</p> <p>Olivia: also agreed that would like to focus on issue rather than class. Could work better within that structure.</p> <p>Lyndele: seeking clarification, and thinking that five ordinance issues may not be sufficiently broad.</p>

Kathryn: by mandate, we are required to look at issues. For example, pick housing, and then create subcommittees that look at different aspects.

Lyndele: where does review of police policies fall?

Charlene: we are required to review policies from different City departments regardless, even if do not focus on the five activities. Reviewing to ensure equitable, implemented, and understood by the community. Another aspect is to hear from the public, either by people attending our meetings, us hosting forums, etc.

Olivia: changed and said focus on class

Kathryn: suggested a third way – need a group to take on public education and community engagement and bring information back and that cuts across everything – perhaps need to be a policy committee that takes the lead on that. Not sure how else would divide up the work.

Shantell: inquired why subcommittees did not work before

Ann: got to such small numbers and were on two subcommittees – a lot of work and got burned out; just didn't have the numbers. Thinks they are ok, but only if the subcommittee brings back recommendations to the larger body to have input. Opportunity to be heard if not on subcommittee.

Susi: would be much more productive to be able to pick on a few issues and work on them together. We also can get more recognition from the City. Need to avoid spreading ourselves so thin. Then maybe eventually create some subcommittees.

Pheobe: thinks Susi made some excellent points; agree with Susi. Rather focus on two issues and make a difference.

Shantell: what was size of last commission?

Ann: 11

Lyndele: can we decide we might need a subcommittee?

Kathryn: Agree with Lyndele – want subcommittees, or won't get anything done meeting just once per month

Olivia: Literally meeting Ann's concern about meeting four times per month. Pick ways of engaging – so only one extra meeting.

Rob: echo Susi's concern, we are missing six people right now – what will happen with subcommittees

Catherine: do we have to be in same room for subcommittee?

Matt: have to be in same room, yes, Jefferson's town

Kathryn: do you need a quorum for a subcommittee or ad hoc committee?

Charlene: no, provided not seeking to speak for the entire group. For standing committees, will have to have by-laws; however, if just ad hoc committee, and temporary, then that's ok. If you are passionate about something and think you need more attention, then can form an ad hoc group. The by-laws require three people on committee. And if more than two, must be noticed and open to the public.

Jeannette: can you gather and host a focus group?

Pheobe: didn't think so

Charlene: said, yes, you can

Andrew: for the policy details, how share feedback or tasks in between meetings?

Charlene: be careful not to cross that fuzzy line – in that circumstance, send to Charlene and she can send out to the group, "For your consideration." Yes, can examine any policies on your own time and send feedback.

Shantell: she would like to hear more about ad hoc committees.

Ann: have a goal in mind and work together until you have a recommendation – again, only temporary.

	<p>Shantell: and we can have multiple ad hoc committees running at the same time?</p> <p>Ann: yes, but when we gather, whatever you call it, have to let public know. Ann prefers ad hoc committees.</p> <p>[Kathryn Laughon had to depart at 8:44 PM].</p> <p>Rob: question on standing subcommittees, we must all vote to create and dissolve?</p> <p>Shantell: Confirmed yes.</p> <p>Ann: Do not have to vote on ad hoc committee. Someone just recommends to chair that would like to look at one issue. Chair then asks who would like to work on committee.</p> <p>Olivia: recommended ad hoc committees until we know how we will work as new commission and as issues arise</p> <p>Pheobe: motioned to create ad hoc committees</p> <p>Matt: seconded the motion</p> <p>Andrew: no subcommittees but having ad hoc committees as needed.</p> <p>Catherine: concerned about an absolute saying no subcommittees ever</p> <p>Olivia: shared concern and suggested creating ad hoc committee on how to structure our work on an annual basis</p> <p>Rob: agrees with Olivia’s suggestion</p> <p>Andrew: initially no subcommittees</p> <p>Pheobe: accepted</p> <p>Charlene: strongly encourages everyone to read Rules and Procedures for HRC so understand how formed and roles and responsibilities. On page five, it discusses the standing committees when this Commission was initially formed. It later was amended to create standing committees: 1) Administrative Matters; 2) Community Engagement; 3) Age/Disability/Religion; 4) Race; and 5) Sex. Thinks great idea to focus on ad hoc committees until end of the year. So what do you want ad hoc committees to focus on – one committee per one issue?</p> <p>Charlene: do you want to go home and think about this or do you want to decide now?</p>
MOTION	<p>Charlene, confirming motion: the HRC’s initial structure will temporarily use ad hoc committees to complete roles and responsibilities as appointed members of the HRC through 2019</p> <p>Matt: second</p> <p>Shantell: called the vote. All in favor; No abstentions.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>
WORK SESSION, con’t.	<p>Shantell: can we form an ad hoc committee that scouts issues prior to the next committee?</p> <p>Charlene: you are the chair</p> <p>Shantell: anyone want to be a part of that?</p> <p>Olivia: volunteered herself and Kathryn Laughon, who had to leave early</p> <p>Catherine: volunteered.</p> <p>Pheobe: Todd has offered data, and she proposes that housing and employment are our issues.</p> <p>Rob: he said that Todd 100 percent sees housing and employment. For protected classes, what are the highest forms?</p> <p>Ann: disability has come to the attention of the office.</p> <p>Susi: someone came to last meeting – need to bring disability to the forefront for communication access. Think need to consider.</p> <p>Olivia: could explore practical recommendations on what we might consider.</p>

Shantell: can clarify ideas of what need to do; this group could aggregate that information and make recommendations.

Lyndele: we can send the recommendations to Charlene and Todd

Shantell: take care of it ourselves; Todd and Charlene too over-extended.

Todd: answering Rob’s question, so far this year, race is the one hear about most, followed by sex/disability, and then national origin.

Charlene: would appreciate greatly if a few people would talk not just about particular issues, but why, and how could we insert HRC to address issues that are not otherwise being addressed across the City. For instance, what would we do differently for housing than already being done? Would like engagement with Todd and Charlene for two cents, so we can figure out how best to move forward.

Shantell: thank you. Let’s call it Preliminary Scoping Ad Hoc Committee. Does that make sense?

Lyndele: also wants to be on committee.

Todd: Elliott Brown not present but may be interested.

Charlene will send out information about the ad hoc committee if want to come.

Pheobe: University Baptist Church available for public meeting.

Charlene: stated happy to host meeting at HRC office.

Decision to meet in two weeks made.

Rob: asked about how no support given to CLIHC – raised by Elliott Brown

Olivia: voted to support it HRC at the last meeting; it was responsibility of Commission to formally announce that support and CLIHC never received official confirmation. Did not happen.

Charlene: for next time, need to determine how move forward with official actions so that no one feels rushed or gets disappointed.

Ann: need to have included on agenda that review past minutes and approve.

Charlene: will do.

Ann: thank you to Todd for the minutes from the last meeting.

Jeannette: thanked Shantell and Susi for their leadership, and volunteered to take minutes next time.