



**Human Rights Commission
Regular Meeting
October 21, 2021
Virtual/Electronic Meeting
6:30pm**

Agenda Packet Attachments

1. Agenda
2. 09-09-2021 DRAFT HRC Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes
3. 09-16-2021 DRAFT HRC Regular Meeting Minutes
4. OHR Staff Report – October 2021
5. Deputy City Manager for Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion memo regarding 2017 remembrance & FY23 commemorative dates
6. DRAFT Resolution HR21-1
7. DRAFT Resolution A21-1
8. DRAFT Plain Language Resolution A21-1
9. DRAFT Graphic Resolution A21-1
10. DRAFT HRC Public Statement Template

Attachment 1



**Human Rights Commission
AGENDA
Regular Meeting
October 21, 2021
Virtual/Electronic Meeting
6:30pm**

Please take Notice that this virtual meeting of the Human Rights Commission is for the purposes of planning, developing and drafting management and administration documents for the Human Rights Commission. For the purpose of addressing issues during the quarantine, this virtual meeting will be a limited public forum to discuss the agenda items designated under Section 5 below and to ensure the continuity of services provided by the Commission. The Commission Chair may limit public comments or discussion points that are unrelated to agenda items under Section 5 or that pertain to topics outside the scope of this Agenda. Members of the public are limited to three minutes of comment time per person related to the Agenda below. A maximum of sixteen public comment time slots are allotted per meeting. This will be a virtual/electronic meeting open to the public and registration information is available at www.charlottesville.gov/zoom.

Link to Human Rights Commission shared Box folder: <https://app.box.com/s/xty3wnn2s1tj8h7trkknvd79bipyxezy>

1. WELCOME

- a. CALL TO ORDER
- b. ROLL CALL
- c. MISSION (recited by all): *Act as a strong advocate to justice and equal opportunity by providing citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights.*

2. MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

- a. PUBLIC COMMENT (Webinar attendees use the "raise hand" function, phone attendees use *9)
- b. COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

3. MINUTES (Role call vote recommendation)

- a. 09-09-2021 HRC Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes*
- b. 09-16-2021 HRC Regular Meeting Minutes*

4. BUSINESS MATTERS

- a. CHAIR UPDATE
- b. OHR STAFF REPORT

5. WORK SESSION

- a. Deputy City Manager memo: Remembrance of 2017 & FY23 Commemorative Dates
- b. Commissioner discussion regarding Black leadership in City government
- c. AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES
 - i. Accessibility Committee
 - ii. Community Engagement Committee
 - iii. Housing Committee
 - iv. Legal Representation Committee

6. MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

- a. PUBLIC COMMENT (Webinar attendees use the "raise hand" function, phone attendees use *9)
- b. COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

7. COMMISSIONER UPDATES

8. NEXT STEPS & ADJOURN

* ACTION NEEDED

Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator at (434) 970-3182 or submit a request via email to ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48 hour notice so that proper arrangements may be made.

Attachment 2



**Human Rights Commission
Meeting Minutes
Legislative Agenda Committee Meeting
September 9, 2021
Virtual/Electronic Meeting
7:30 pm**

Public link to meeting rebroadcasts on Boxcast: <https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzeuyv3iclkx1a>

Public link to HRC documents on Box: <https://app.box.com/s/xy3wnn2s1tj8h7trkknvd79bipyxezy>

1. WELCOME

- a. CALL TO ORDER
 - i. No Chair. Meeting called to order at 7:36 pm
- b. ROLL CALL
 - i. Mary Bauer
- c. MISSION (recited by all): *Act as a strong advocate to justice and equal opportunity by providing citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights.*

2. MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

- a. PUBLIC COMMENT
 - i. None
- b. COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC
 - i. None

3. MINUTES

- a. None

4. BUSINESS MATTERS

- a. None

5. WORK SESSION

- a. Support for right to counsel in evictions ordinance
 - i. OHR staff says he requested extra information from Council, but has received no updates yet
 - ii. Commissioner asks what HRC's role would be, whether that would be recommending any changes based in racial equity, or if recommendations should be more specific to Charlottesville
 1. There are some states that have adopted statewide right to counsel in evictions proceedings laws, though the City may not be very interested in this kind of law seeing as it has not been pushing forward these proceedings
 - iii. OHR staff does not think Council remembers that it is one of the Commission's duties in the ordinance to provide recommendations, so it does not ask
 - iv. HRC can review things Council is considering to propose
 1. They approve a slate of recommendations then hand it to TJPDC, which combines that with other regional recommendations and presents them to the General Assembly

- a. TJPDC's website has recommendations Council has brought forward
 - b. Last year, the Commission made one or two recommendations because they didn't know what Council was proposing at that point
 - v. Mary believes there will be cases coming up at the General Assembly regarding racial justice and equity
 - 1. Ex. Voting Rights Bill that will restore voting rights to those with felonies—is this something having to do with HRC?
 - 2. Last year, Catherine suggested one about expungement of criminal record
 - 3. Or proposing legislation to allow municipalities to create rental registries so that municipality was not held back by Dylan's Rules
 - 4. OHR staff says landlords could be required to register all rental properties with the City to inspect them and keep better track of them
 - vi. OHR staff recommends if there are things related to equity rights municipalities are not currently authorized to do, this could be a good thing to pursue for HRC recommendations
 - 1. Mary says it would be useful to get the view of the City Attorney about whether a locality can enact a right to counsel ordinance
 - 2. If it cannot, then HRC could suggest it be changed
 - 3. Similarly, there are issues with providing counsel in the complainant system
 - vii. City Attorney was not at the last HRC meeting, so HRC did not ask for her view then, but it would be very useful
 - 1. OHR staff says he could also ask to get a meeting with Allyson and whoever else is relevant to ask these kinds of questions
 - a. **Todd can ask for the meeting; may occur next week**
 - b. Allison and Mary should be available Monday around 11:30-12:30pm to meet
 - 2. Lisa is advising Council on their part around the legislative agenda, so Allyson can check with her
 - b. Mary talked to Ashley about having a closed session to discuss Director hiring
 - i. She said this is happening and was going to run it by Allyson
 - ii. **Mary will follow up with her**

6. MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

- a. PUBLIC COMMENT
 - i. None
- b. COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC
 - i. None

7. COMMISSIONER UPDATES

- a. None

8. NEXT STEPS

- a. **Mary**
 - i. **Will follow up with Ashley about closed HRC session to discuss hiring**
- b. **Todd**
 - i. **Will ask Allyson to meet with Mary and him 11:30am-12:30pm on**

Monday 9/13

9. ADJOURN

- a. Meeting adjourned at 7:41 pm

Pending HRC Approval

Attachment 3



**Human Rights Commission
Meeting Minutes
Regular Meeting
September 16, 2021
Virtual/Electronic Meeting
6:30 pm**

Public link to meeting rebroadcasts on Boxcast: <https://boxcast.tv/channel/vabajtzeuyv3iclqx1a>

Public link to HRC documents on Box: <https://app.box.com/s/xy3wnn2s1tj8h7trkknvd79bipyxezy>

1. WELCOME

- a. CALL TO ORDER
 - i. Chair, Mary Bauer, called the meeting to order at 6:28 pm
- b. ROLL CALL
 - i. Mary Bauer
 - ii. Kathryn Laughon
 - iii. Jeanette Abi-Nader
 - iv. Jessica Harris
 - v. Wolfgang Keppley
 - vi. Sue Lewis
 - vii. Lyndele Von Schill
 - viii. Ernest Chambers (arrived later)
- c. MISSION (recited by all): *Act as a strong advocate to justice and equal opportunity by providing citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights.*

2. MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

- a. PUBLIC COMMENT
 - i. None
- b. COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC
 - i. None

3. MINUTES

- a. Review of minutes from 08/19/21
 - i. Bullet point 4.a.iii.3.a.i: there is a typo; "Civil Right to Council" should be "Civil Right to Counsel"
 - ii. Bullet point 4.a.iv: should be about land use proposals, not zoning proposals
 - iii. **Todd will fix these**
 - iv. Vote
 1. In favor: 6
 2. Can live with: 0
 3. Opposed: 0
 4. Abstained: 1

4. BUSINESS MATTERS (1)

- a. Closed session
 - i. Chair proposes to move open session to closed session as per section

2.2-3711 and 2.2-3712 of the Virginia Code for the “Discussion, consideration, and/or promotion of a prospective candidate for the position of the Director of the Human Rights Commission as authorized by Virginia Code sec. 2.2-3711 (A) (1).”

1. Motion to approve
 - a. Kathryn Laughon
 2. Second
 - a. Sue Lewis
 3. Vote
 - a. In favor: 7
 - b. Opposed: 0
- ii. Commission moves to a closed session
- iii. Certification of Closed Meeting
1. Motion to approve
 - a. Sue Lewis
 2. Second
 - a. Lyndele Von Schill
 3. Vote
 - a. In favor: 7
 - b. Opposed: 0
- iv. Motion passed

5. WORK SESSION (1)

- a. Land use plan overview and panel discussion with speakers Rory Stolzenberg (Charlottesville Planning Commission), Dan Rosensweig (Habitat for Humanity), and Sunshine Mathon (Piedmont Housing Alliance)
 - i. Rory Stolzenberg
 1. Comprehensive plan
 - a. VA says each locality must update its comprehensive plan every 5 years to serve as an overarching guide for land use, housing, and commercial growth, as well as guide city decisions
 - b. Charlottesville updates its plan to reflect anticipation of city changes and what strategies will be necessary
 - c. Started the planning for this particular comprehensive plan in January 2017
 2. Future land use map
 - a. Not a zoning map; more of a high-level vision to guide the zoning map that will be created later
 3. Public feedback process
 - a. Phase I: kicked off May and June 2017 with community engagement tabling events at meetings, libraries, schools
 - i. Re-evaluation was necessary after the events of August 2017
 - b. Phase II: Planning Commissioners went around to local community events to get feelings about housing, land use, and the city
 - c. Phase III: survey distributed online in 2018 to get as many responses as possible

- i. Also received a housing needs assessment analyzing census data and housing availability from a consultant in 2018
 - ii. After adjusting for students
 - iii. 1,740 households <30% AMI were extremely low income, 810 households were very low income
 - iv. Shortage of affordable housing units with 3,318 and expected to grow
4. Draft of Planning Commission's land use map presented to Council from 2018
 - a. Increase in intensity contemplated across the city with particular focus near parks, schools, UVA housing, commercial corridors
 - b. Decrease in intensity around single-family townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes to break cycle of exclusion
5. Op-ed in Cville Tomorrow by Carmelita Wood discusses how housing land use restrictions were driven by Jim Crow era of segregation
 - a. Zoning began as a way to keep noxious industry fumes away from housing, but quickly turned into a way to racially separate housing
 - b. Racial zoning was deemed unconstitutional, so density zoning along class lines (and, therefore, race) began to occur
 - c. Harland Bartholomew was commissioned for the housing plan that excluded non-whites
6. 5-year maps followed this original pattern of development restricted whitest and wealthiest areas of the city to two-family zoning
7. 2018's draft land use map showed Council what a big change the Planning Commission was proposing, to distribute housing across the city (especially in formerly exclusionary areas)
8. Cville Plans Together phase
 - a. Council brought in consultants for the modern Cville Plans Together process in early 2019 to finish Affordable Housing Plan and Comprehensive Plan, as well as rewrite the zoning ordinance
 - b. Details \$10 million per year funding commitment for affordable housing for the next 10 years, subsidies, tenant rights, etc.
9. Future land use map iterations were created over time, which have created much feedback from the community
 - a. There is some talk about Affordable Housing Plan requiring some percentage of affordable housing as part of the zoning ordinance
10. In regard to homelessness, single-occupancy housing and more expensive homes have contributed to the current situation; the

Crossings project was just enabled a few years ago, but it is still restricted and not really covered in this project

11. Go to cvilleplanstogether.com to look at all documents

ii. Dan Rosensweig

1. The current zoning map is the law, unlike the future land use map
2. Comprehensive Plan wanted multiple things at once, but not often worked through
 - a. Idea of neighborhood preservation vs an equitable Charlottesville
3. Zoning was intentionally exclusive; many lots designated R1 in Charlottesville were restricted to only whites, backed by federal policy
 - a. FAJ started guaranteeing loans to developers of larger subdivisions; financing was exclusively for whites
4. Harland Bartholomew came through and decided which neighborhoods were worth preserving and which were not
 - a. The ones torn down were Black neighborhoods where the city did not extend public amenities like water and sewer
5. The city took away wealth and ownership from the Black communities in Charlottesville and replaced their neighborhoods with public housing
 - a. At the time was decent housing, but not decent enough to last
 - b. Harland Bartholomew's intentionally racist map is the same as the current zoning map; Charlottesville zoning still features racism and inequity
6. Habitat for Humanity was invigorated by consultants' work in bettering the housing plan, but also witnessed the beginning of a "civil war" in Charlottesville over the future land use map
 - a. Some say there is too much change too fast; others say upping density across the city will just quicken gentrification in largely African-American neighborhoods
 - b. Everyone wants affordable housing; there is just disagreement as to whether the current plan was going to get it
7. Solution piloted in Cambridge, MA: you can please everyone and get greater density if and only if what you build, in addition to base density, is affordable

iii. Sunshine Mathon

1. Comments apply to an older land use map, but are still relevant
2. Charlottesville is not unique in its exclusionary zoning practices—this is the case across the nation, though some cities are beginning to experiment
 - a. Minneapolis was one of the first to experiment by taking R1-equivalent zoning and allowing four units of housing on all
 - b. Portland, OR, Charlotte, and Cambridge did something

similar

- c. Cambridge did “affordable housing overlay” which puts affordable housing into a special category to get additional density and make it more economically viable to build affordable housing on any given lot
 3. Transitioning from Affordable Housing Plan into Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map into rezoning
 - a. A rarity; most cities do not link the three together
 4. Nationwide, there is a common conception that affordable housing is a supply/demand issue, but it is not just that; there are kernels of truth, but it is important to realize that essentially all cities are “behind” in terms of housing
 5. Planning Commission – Future Land Use Map alternative framework document
 - a. First key concept: creating a low-intensity residential land use category
 - i. Consultants call them “sensitive areas/neighborhoods”
 - b. Second key concept: all other residential portions of the city would have a base land use of the currently proposed general residential land use category
 - i. Would shift growth patterns to higher-income areas
 - c. In effect, all residential areas of the city would have a base land use of either low-intensity residential or general residential
 - d. There would be a base level of allowable density across the entire city, and if you want more, affordable housing would have to be a part of it
 - e. Need for gradations of middle-intensity or high-intensity residential allowances in different parts of the city
 - f. Still need to work through the specifics of affordability; this proposal does not yet address these details
 - i. Must strike balance between affordability and impact
 - g. Proposal recognizes that good land use and zoning policies are necessary, but still insufficient in making the city wholly equitable; other interventions like adequate funding, rapid development approval processes, and tenant protections are still necessary
 6. There is no county or city in the nation where a person making minimum wage can afford a two-bedroom apartment market rate
 7. Current land use map proposal highlights low-intensity residential and general residential as the primary land uses
- b. Q&A session
 - i. Chair asks what specific tenant plans Sunshine was referring to
 1. Everything from capitalizing access to lawyers for eviction prevention to potentially rent control (must be enabled by state

- legislature)
2. Other two are that any development with city assistance must push for extra rights not given by the state, as well as just cause eviction (must also have approval from the state)
 3. A couple jurisdictions have growing movements to do the first right of refusal in which tenants have the first right to buy a rental building when it goes up for sale
- ii. Commissioner asks what it means to add a fourplex when adding affordable housing to medium-density corridors
1. The new draft that came out today says that the general residential category (majority of the city) allows for triplexes and fourplexes
 2. New change that should be in the new draft is that when adding to a single home on a site, the first unit would be market rate while the next would be the affordable one; then up to two more would be market rate
 - a. This way, affordability is built in at the front end
 3. Commissioner says that the Commission would probably prefer a fourplex over a triplex for accessibility (FHA/ADA regulations kick in after the fourth unit in a building)
 - a. Cost would bump up after four, but at least two units would be accessible
 4. In the new draft, the second-unit affordability piece applies to sensitive areas, while non-sensitive areas allows for three units, then unspecified affordability bonuses beyond this; there is talk of making it so that the affordability bonus program kicks in after four units to incentivize accessible units
 5. Dan predicts that formerly-exclusionary areas will get single homes turned into three or four units; it will be difficult to get accessibility because few have zero-step energy
 - a. The strongest mechanism for creating accessibility are public funding mechanisms, stronger than the FHA regulations
- iii. Commissioner asks about when developers say they are going to make affordable units, but decide halfway through to pay a fine instead to build whatever they want—does the plan take this loophole away?
1. They can get a certificate of occupancy, meaning they would not be able to complete their project without compliance
 2. Until last year, there was limited authority from the state to require affordable units
- iv. Commissioner confirms that the initial recommendation was to require second-unit affordability housing in both sensitive areas and non-sensitive areas, but the plan that came out today only required it in sensitive areas
1. Encouraged consultants to bring forth some consistency during meetings a few days ago
 2. Commissioner says that HRC could support this through a letter to the Cville Plans Together team
 3. Making every neighborhood more accessible to more families at

- a lower rate than now is the motivation to allowing a few units by right to those
4. Big change in the new draft is that more than four units would be allowed if affordability was included in those
 5. Council recently gave funding to make sure inclusionary zoning works
 6. Idea that market-rate units cross-subsidize affordable units despite high cost of land so that the change actually happens
 7. Level of affordability is important—fair-market rent is about 60% AMI, which is the target to be able to apply housing vouchers; then, subsidies could be layered on top
- v. Commissioner confirms that the current plan prevents developers from paying a fine instead of constructing affordable housing
1. Currently, it is required for all units above a single-family house in sensitive areas and all units larger than a triplex in non-sensitive areas
 - a. Mostly required in medium areas
- vi. OHR staff says HRC provides recommendations to City Council for the annual legislative agenda that then get taken to the General Assembly by the TJPDC; asks about enabling legislation at the state level that would allow municipalities to set rent control, particularly in alignment with HUD payment standards for vouchers; many times, rent is being raise beyond payment standards to exclude those with vouchers; also wonders what the Commission could do to lift enabling legislation recommendations to Council such that some of these protections might be set in place
1. It is worth looking at the Affordable Housing Plan again to see what legislation would be helpful from their perspective
 2. VA Housing Alliance has been impactful in getting change in terms of funding and other measures; there will be some new bills that VA Housing Alliance will support coming up
- vii. Commissioner asks what specific actions HRC could take to ensure that there is a solid plan moving forward
1. Money
 2. Charlottesville has been doing well with redevelopment of some areas, but fallen down in support for affordable homeownership
 3. Affordable Housing Plan explicitly calls for a list of things to be funded; these are necessary for the plan to work
 - a. A few weeks ago, Charlottesville Affordable Housing Coalition submitted an email to City Council highlighting potential projects and their positive impacts over the next three years, but they are not possible without funding
 4. This platform is important and relevant now because the CIP process is underway—city affordable housing money is allocated via the capital improvement program
 - a. There is a lot of federal money out there, but most sources require a local match
 - b. Could receive \$10 million

- c. Not focusing on this will possibly make the project lose billions of dollars in stimulus money
 - c. Follow-up discussion to panel
 - i. Chair asks what steps the Commission should take—there is general support for taking action
 - ii. Commissioner says HRC should support the second-unit model they proposed, as well as the \$10 million from real estate tax by funding writing a letter or going to Council or Planning Commission
 - iii. Commissioner feels that HRC should take special care to be prepared to provide recommendations to City Council about state legislation
 - iv. Commissioner expresses support for pushing Council to go after the stimulus money
 - v. Commissioner would like to see some of materials that Rory, Dan, and Sunshine presented before deciding exactly what to do about the land use plan; feels all HRC can do at the moment is follow up with Council on all of the monies possible
 - 1. Chair is concerned about the public discourse surrounding the future land use map and the neighborhood preservation rhetoric
 - 2. HRC can help frame this discussion in terms of commitment to equity and racial justice
 - vi. Commissioner says HRC has a prime opportunity to disrupt structural racism, so Commissioners can be showing up at meetings, sending in written comments, having discussion about how to represent the Commission, etc.
 - 1. Both City Council and the Planning Commission
 - vii. Chair suggests having a small group come together to form some written comments
 - 1. Housing committee could do this?
 - 2. People who are not just on the Housing committee have expertise in this area
 - 3. Could do it through the Housing committee and make the drafting process available to everyone
 - viii. Final work session on future land use map is next Tuesday, 9/21; there will be some discussion on the chapters, then another meeting on 10/12 during which the Planning Commission will vote on and approve a final draft
 - 1. Will then go to City Council for a first hearing in November; Council will make any amendments it wants to, then approve it in December
 - ix. Ashley suggests drafting via Google Docs to draft comfortably outside of meetings, so long as no more than 2 Commissioners are in the document at one time
 - x. Housing committee would like to meet at 1pm on 10/7
 - xi. Commissioners work on a Google document before the Tuesday Planning Commission meeting; Mary can make comments as Chair without needing to have a vote
 - 1. Chair would like some help formulating what to say exactly, but she can do this

6. BUSINESS MATTERS (2)

- a. OHR Staff report
 - i. Report is attached; ask Todd if there are any questions
 - ii. Outreach from 9/21 has been rescheduled to 10/1-- let Todd know if interested
- b. Chair update
 - i. Will be discussed during Housing committee updates

7. WORK SESSION (2)

- a. Ad-hoc committee updates
 - i. Accessibility (Chair – Wolfgang)
 - 1. Met last week to draft a proposed resolution (attached in agenda)
 - a. Asks for feedback
 - i. No specific feedback
 - b. Committee Chair would like to clarify with Allyson legal requirements
 - c. Committee Chair asks if full Commission is ready to vote
 - i. Vote would be to take resolution to Council as written, with changes subtracting the “above and beyond” legal requirement part (not waiting will get the resolution to Council faster)
 - d. Motion to approve (with legal requirement caveat)
 - i. Vote
 - 1. In favor: 6
 - 2. Opposed: 0
 - 2. There is a new temporary ADA Coordinator
 - 3. Next committee meeting: 10/14 at 6:30pm
 - ii. Community Engagement (Chair – Jessica)
 - 1. No one present at the committee meeting is present at this meeting
 - 2. Next committee meeting: 10/14 at 7pm
 - iii. Housing
 - 1. Mary updates (right to counsel)
 - a. Explored what the city is prepared to do in terms of funding; looks like there will be a contract with LAJC to pay \$300,000 over the course of three years (\$100,000 per year)
 - i. Much lower from what was originally proposed
 - b. Believes Commission should continue to advocate for a more robust plan in the form of a letter and presentation to Council
 - i. Mary is willing to draft something
 - 2. Todd and Mary met with Allyson Davies to request a review of state law to determine whether or not any enabling legislation was needed to pass an ordinance regarding right to counsel
 - a. There has been discussion over whether the city has the authority to adopt an ordinance giving people this right; the Commission can recommend the city adopt the ordinance or that the city have it part of its

- legislative agenda to push the state to allow it the authority to adopt the ordinance
- 3. Not anything new, just follow-up advocacy
- 4. Also talked about working on messaging—getting statements out about increased density and increased support for affordable housing
 - a. Could draft letter to the editor from HRC that squarely talks about housing as a human right to counter other narratives
 - i. Kathryn is willing to take lead on drafting and editing letter; Wolfgang can help
 - ii. *Daily Progress* is not always prompt in publishing letters to the editor; Kathryn and Wolfgang will talk offline about how to go about getting letter published
- iv. Legal Representation
 - 1. Mary and Todd talked to Allyson about what legal representation might look like in regard to complainants vs tenants of eviction proceedings
 - a. Looked at draft resolution and continue thinking about it
 - 2. OHR staff talked to people in Procurement about how it would work as a pilot program
 - a. RFQ (request for quotes) from local attorneys and have them apply as vendors vs a reimbursement program for people who sought service
 - b. There is still work to do; currently waiting on data
 - 3. **Next committee meeting: 10/7 at 1:30pm**
- v. Legislative Agenda
 - 1. Only Mary was there; decided to explore what recommendations have been made in the past and bring those requests to the full Commission
 - 2. Believes the presentations from this meeting were helpful in framing the Commission's legislative agenda
 - 3. OHR staff says to think about timelines—want to get something to Council to get in recommendations for this year
 - a. There is probably not time to have another meeting to draft and submit recommendations to raise them up to Council
 - 4. General agreement to draft recommendations for other housing concerns like rent control, just-cause evictions, rental registry, etc., as part of legislative agenda
 - a. **Mary will work on this and circulate it**

8. MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC

a. PUBLIC COMMENT

i. Ang Conn

- 1. Asks for a brief overview for new public attendees of what the Commission does
- 2. Says there are big problems in the city with landlords raising rent, discriminating against household size, property

management, etc.

- a. Discriminatory practices are even written in policies
3. Housing applications are often discriminatory, making it difficult to find housing with a voucher
- ii. Adrienne Dent
 1. Asks that Commission clearly endorses the affordable housing overtly and affirm intention to do so
 2. Would also like to advocate for consistency in language over Affordable Housing Plan
 3. Concerned that two members of the Planning Commission will not be present at the next meeting, so asks if HRC can do whatever they can to ensure the meeting goes well
 - a. Timing of statements would be very helpful
 4. Sam Sanders shared there will be a new Department of Community Solutions for Adrienne—language is intentionally shaped to prioritize increased capacity to address affordable housing crisis (a positive stated intention)
 5. Believes op-ed piece and whatever else HRC can do to address the affordable housing crisis is necessary and helpful
- b. COMMISSION RESPONSE TO MATTERS BY THE PUBLIC
 - i. OHR staff gives brief explanation of HRC
 1. HRC prioritizes recommendations to City Council regarding systemic concerns in city policy, yearly legislative ideas to be taken to General Assembly, and education and outreach
 2. In conjunction with OHR, HRC also acts as an adjudicating body for complaints with probable cause filed through OHR
 - a. OHR accepts individual complaints of discrimination under Charlottesville's jurisdiction and conducts close investigation
 3. City website has an HRC webpage with descriptions of what the Commission does
 - ii. Chair says the Commission is deeply concerned about the issues the speakers from today raised—housing discrimination is core to HRC's mission, so it is dedicated to doing what it can to address this discrimination

9. COMMISSIONER UPDATES

- a. Jessica
 - i. **Wants to have a discussion at the next meeting about the City's treatment of Black officials, particularly Chief Brackney and the Mayor**
 1. Ernest agrees
- b. Sue
 - i. Next meeting will be her last meeting as a Commissioner
 - ii. Not moving to in-person meetings any time in the near future

10. NEXT STEPS

- a. **General Next Steps**
 - i. **Work on Google document for comments to present at 9/21 Planning Commission meeting**
 - ii. **Outreach from 9/21 has been rescheduled to 10/1-- let Todd know if interested**

- iii. Discussion next meeting about treatment of Black officials in Charlottesville
- b. Mary
 - i. Make comments on Planning Commission document before the 9/21 meeting
 - ii. Begin drafting letter to Council about more funding for right to counsel plan
 - iii. Begin drafting recommendations to Council about other housing concerns like rent control, just-cause evictions, rental registry, etc., as part of legislative agenda
- c. Kathryn and Wolfgang
 - i. Draft and edit letter to the editor talking about housing as a human right
- d. Todd
 - i. Correct minutes from 8/19/21
 - 1. Bullet point 4.a.iii.3.a.i: there is a typo; "Civil Right to Council" should be "Civil Right to Counsel"
 - 2. Bullet point 4.a.iv: should be about land use proposals, not zoning proposals
- e. Committees
 - i. Housing: 10/7 at 1pm
 - ii. Legal Representation: 10/7 at 1:30pm
 - iii. Accessibility: 10/14 at 6:30pm
 - iv. Community Engagement: 10/14 at 7pm

11. ADJOURN

- a. Meeting adjourned at 9:22 pm

Attachment 4

**Office of Human Rights
Todd Niemeier Monthly Staff Report
October 2021**

Service Provision Data:

- Data entered through the end of September 2021
 - Note that data for October is only partially entered
 - Data for open and closed inquiries is still in progress as we need to review the list and update status on ongoing cases
 - As of August, Lily Gates has been our sole data entry warrior – Thanks, Lily!
- Revisiting a secure web-based customized case management system with IT
 - Ongoing effort to move from an Excel-based system to a customized system that would standardize data entry and allow for easier use by multiple staff
 - IT presented a new version of the case management system for testing on 9/14/2021
 - OHR staff and intern reviewed the new system presented by IT and will be providing a summary of feedback
 - At present, the existing Excel-based system has more functionality

Measures	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTALS
<i>Open office days in the month</i>	22	20	21	22	23	20	22	22	20	23	19	18	252
<i>Total Incoming & Outgoing Contacts</i>	171	139	145	133	197	272	307	286	326	34	0	0	2010
<i>Total Incoming Contacts</i>	83	70	71	68	131	176	195	209	235	22	0	0	1260
<i>Average Incoming & Outgoing Contacts/Day</i>	8	7	7	6	9	14	14	13	16	1	0	0	8
<i>Average Incoming Contacts/Day</i>	4	4	3	3	6	9	9	10	12	1	0	0	5
<i>Referrals from Sin Barreras</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Contacts in Spanish</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Total Staff Follow-ups (Outgoing)</i>	49	33	30	30	39	45	48	32	47	1	0	0	354
<i>Total Third-Party Contacts (Outgoing)</i>	39	36	44	35	27	51	64	45	44	11	0	0	396
<i>Total Client Follow-ups (Incoming)</i>	45	34	36	27	64	120	105	128	152	12	0	0	723
<i>Total Third-Party Contacts (Incoming)</i>	28	28	19	30	45	40	73	54	74	8	0	0	399
<i>Total General Contacts (Incoming)</i>	3	4	3	4	6	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	56
<i>Total New Inquiries (Incoming)</i>	6	3	12	7	15	4	6	11	9	2	0	0	75
<i>Total New Complaints (Incoming)</i>	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	7
<i>Total Allegations (Both I&C)</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Total I&C: Locality - Cville</i>	6	3	6	3	13	3	6	9	5	0	0	0	54
<i>Total I&C: Locality - Albemarle</i>	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
<i>Total I&C: Locality - Other or Not Specified</i>	0	1	7	2	3	1	1	4	3	2	0	0	24
<i>Total Inquiries: P.A. - Employment</i>	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	6
<i>Total Inquiries: P.A. - Housing</i>	6	3	8	5	9	1	6	4	4	1	0	0	47
<i>Total Inquiries: P.A. - Public Accommodation</i>	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	5

Measures	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTALS
Total Inquiries: P.A. - Credit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Inquiries: P.A. - Private Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Inquiries: P.A. - Other (Unprotected)	0	0	2	0	4	3	0	4	3	1	0	0	17
Data check: Total Inquiries by P.A. = Total Inquiries	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Total Complaints: P.A. - Employment	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Total Complaints: P.A. - Housing	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Total Complaints: P.A. - Public Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Complaints: P.A. - Credit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Complaints: P.A. - Private Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Complaints: P.A. - Other (Unprotected)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total employment discrimination allegations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employment allegations in Charlottesville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employment allegations in Albemarle Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emp. allegations in Cville referred to EEOC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emp. allegations in Alb. Co. ref. to EEOC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total housing discrimination allegations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing allegations in Charlottesville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Housing allegations in Albemarle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total public accommodation discrimination allegations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public accommodation allegations in Cville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Other (Unprotected) activity allegations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - Age	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - Disability	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total I&C: P.C. - Marital Status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - National Origin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Total I&C: P.C. - Pregnancy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - Childbirth or Related Medical Conditions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - Race	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	7
Total I&C: P.C. - Color	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total I&C: P.C. - Sex	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total I&C: P.C. - Gender Identity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total I&C: P.C. - Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total I&C: P.C. - Source of Funds	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total I&C: P.C. - Not specified	4	3	12	5	13	4	5	8	5	1	0	0	60

Measures	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTALS
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Pregnancy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Childbirth or R.M.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Race	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Color	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Sex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Gender Identity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Source of Funds	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Housing Complaints: P.C. - Other (Unprotected)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Age	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Disability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Marital Status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - National Origin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Pregnancy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Childbirth or R.M.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Color	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Sex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Gender Identity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Sexual Orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Not specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Pub. Accom. Comp.: P.C. - Other (Unprotected)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Open Inquiries													3
Total Closed Inquiries													14
Total Dismissed Inquiries													0
Total Open Complaints													5
Total Closed Complaints													2
Total Dismissed Complaints													0
Primary Service: Appointment Set-up	3	2	1	0	8	19	11	2	3	0	0	0	49
Primary Service: Clerical Assistance	0	5	1	0	3	13	18	3	0	0	0	0	43
Primary Service: Counseling	17	21	16	8	18	20	18	16	6	0	0	0	140
Primary Service: Event Information	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Measures	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTALS
<i>Primary Service: Investigation Activity</i>	7	27	39	33	35	12	22	18	23	9	0	0	225
<i>Primary Service: Information</i>	144	84	87	87	128	206	227	237	288	25	0	0	1513
<i>Primary Service: Mediation Related Services</i>	0	0	0	5	4	0	11	8	6	0	0	0	34
<i>Primary Service: Outreach Coordination</i>	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
<i>Primary Service: Public Hearing</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Primary Service: Volunteer Coordination</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Primary Service: Helpline - COVID Response</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Administrative and Reporting:

- 2020 Departmental Scorecard update completed
 - Link to Scorecard: [Human Rights \(clearpointstrategy.com\)](https://clearpointstrategy.com)
 - Still need to upload data regarding satisfaction surveys
 - Lily has been working on an analysis of the service satisfaction data for 2019 and 2020
 - We should be able to post this on the scorecard in November
 - Need to create and distribute collaborative partner satisfaction surveys
 - This may be a good project for November 2021
- 2020 Annual Report in progress
 - Will use Departmental Scorecard as basis for the annual report
 - No requests from Council yet for annual or quarterly reports
 - No progress made on the report this month, as intake and service provision continue to dominate staff time
- Amendments to Charlottesville Human Rights Ordinance for FHAP substantial equivalence in progress
 - Erik Steinecker provided feedback on the current revisions to the ordinance
 - OHR staff made revisions and sent back to Erik for a final review on 9/30/2021
 - Awaiting feedback from Erik before presenting the clean draft to the HRC
- No new work on FEPA agreement, as FHAP process take precedence
 - Recall that the FHAP agreement provides substantial opportunities and resources to expand and improve the OHR, whereas the FEPA really only just increases workload with insufficient support to increase staffing or training

Active Investigations:

- Case 2020-2
 - Housing discrimination on the basis of race
 - Investigative Report submitted 9/2/2021
 - Under review for determination by Deputy City Manager for Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Case 2021-4
 - Employment discrimination on the basis of sex

- Investigation authorized 05-03-2021
- Investigation in progress

Active Fact-finding Inquiries:

- None.

Active Offers of Mediation:

- Case 2021-2
 - Employment discrimination on the basis of race
 - Mediation in progress
- Case 2021-3
 - Public Accommodation discrimination on the basis of sex and disability
 - Mediation in progress
- Case 2021-5
 - Employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and race
 - Mediation in progress
- Case 2021-7
 - Employment discrimination on the basis of race
 - Mediation in progress

Closed Cases:

- Case 2021-6
 - Housing discrimination on the basis of race
 - Informal conciliation reached
- Case 2021-8
 - Credit discrimination on the basis of color, national origin, race, and sex
 - Complaint was non-jurisdictional because respondent was operating from out of state

Outreach:

- Service Provision
 - Most outreach on hold given staff capacity to address the overwhelming volume of active and incoming inquiries
 - [Next opportunity for Commissioners to participate in outreach](#)
 - [Michie Drive public housing – date and time pending](#)
 - [In partnership with the Region Ten Community Based Recovery and Support Advisory Council](#)
 - [Let OHR staff know if you would like to join](#)

- Education & Awareness
 - On hold due to staff capacity.
- Facilitation & Leadership
 - Outdoor Equity
 - Beginning work on a developing a version of Charlene’s Racial & Ethnic History of Charlottesville presentation that focuses on land and outdoor recreational space use
 - OHR interns are researching historical land use in open spaces in Charlottesville, Albemarle and the Blue Ridge
 - This information will be condensed into a presentation that parallels the Racial and Ethnic History of Charlottesville Presentation
 - The intent is to present this information publicly to community members attempting to take action to make public outdoor spaces more welcoming
 - OHR staff attended a recent mobility summit to follow up with others who are interested in this work.
 - Will build a coalition of cross-organizational members to assist with producing and presenting the information the OHR interns have compiled in conjunction with a workshop on dismantling bias and racism
 - Public Housing Association of Residents – Residents for Respectful Research (RRR)
 - MOU with UVA IRB back to IRB legal counsel for final review
 - OHR staff attended R3 retreat on September 24, 2021, to develop draft standard operating procedures
 - Draft SOP now under review by advisory committee
 - Affordable Housing
 - Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) awarded the Virginia Eviction Reduction Pilot (VERP) planning grant
 - OHR staff asked to serve on VERP advisory committee, as the alternative dispute resolution representative, to provide guidance regarding program development
 - UVA Equity Center presented a study on court eviction data in Charlottesville and Albemarle on 9/15/21
 - The data presented meshes well with the CDSA data and further supports the need for legal defense counsel in evictions
 - Awaiting final approval to share UVA Equity Center data publicly
 - Piedmont Housing Alliance awarded grant to start a Financial Opportunity Center & Housing Hub
 - OHR staff engaged to provide input regarding barriers to affordable housing and perspective on housing navigation
 - The FOC & Housing Hub may serve as the future home of the affordable housing database developed by Code of Charlottesville in partnership with PACEM and the OHR
 - Stakeholder meeting set for 10/26/2021
 - CRHA Resident Services Committee – Neighborhood Crisis Intervention sub committee
 - Continued monthly and sometimes bi-monthly meetings to develop a potential alternative, peer-supported crisis intervention system that can supplement and support clinical services and can intervene in lieu of ECO/TDO system

Attachment 5

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mary Bauer, Esq. - Human Rights Commission Chair
FROM: Ashley Reynolds Marshall, Deputy City Manager for Racial Equity, Diversity & Inclusion
DATE: June 15, 2021
RE: Advice & Guidance on CY22 August Events & FY23 Commemorative Observance Months

Chair Bauer:

Please see the information below inquiring about your Commission's interest and capacity in providing guidance and assistance in the following two matters: the 5th remembrance of the August 2017 Summer of Hate and the City's potential actions to recognize the months that honor and highlight key community groups. I would greatly appreciate knowing if either or both of the below topics may be something the Commission would be willing to investigate and advocate for or against as part of your expert services to the Community.

2017

In August 2022 the Community will move through the fifth year since the 2017 Summer of Hate incidents. While there is no effort to glorify the actions that occurred, the City Manager's office wishes to determine how best to recognize the events and the time that has passed since them or if there should be any events around the date at all.

Previously, Unity Day's were hosted by the City of Charlottesville with support through facilitation of the events by Office of Human Rights, the Human Rights Commission, and in conjunction with other key community groups (in 2018 and 2019 I believe).

The Deputy City Manager for Racial Equity, Diversity & Inclusion would like to ask for the assistance of the Human Rights Commission in determining whether or not events should occur with City sponsorship (be them from the City Managers Office and/or the Office of Human Rights/Human Rights Commission) around August 2022, and whether said events could/should be sponsored and/or organized with the guidance and support of the Human Rights Commission. Events could include, for example, education and outreach on the history of the event, education and outreach on hate groups or how to combat them, education and outreach on systemic racism (e.g. rebooting the Commission's Dialogue on Race), education and outreach on citizen activism to combat inequities in our community, and so on.

As the City budget process will be in swing in November 2021, should the Commission believe that events should occur that may need budgetary support that allocation will need to be requested at that time for FY22 (July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) for consideration and potential approval or denial.

Commented [MA1]: @Niemeier, Todd Does it seem complete and clear for you?

Commented [NT2R1]: This looks good. I added minimal comments below.

Commented [NT3]: Days

Commented [NT4]: I would say the City hosted Unity Days but the OHR facilitated said hosting.

Commemorative Observance Months

The City Manager's office recognizes that there are key recognition months that highlight parts of our community who may find themselves to be historically and/or currently marginalized or oppressed. At this point in time, the City as an organization does not recognize these months, days, or weeks in a systematic and uniform way. While it is important to make sure that we, as an organization whose mission includes promoting equality and an excellent quality of life – it is also equally as important that any actions do not feel out-of-place, subpar, or performative in nature.

By way of example, some of the commemorative observance months include:

- January: Poverty in American Awareness Month
- February: African-American History Month
- March: Women's History Month
- March: Gender Equality Month
- April: Autism Awareness Month
- April: Arab-American Heritage Month
- April: Celebrate Diversity Month
- May: Asian Pacific Heritage Month
- May: Jewish American Heritage Month
- May: Hattian Heritage Month
- May: Older Americans Month
- May: National Mobility Awareness Month
- June: PRIDE Month
- June: National Caribbean American Heritage Month
- September–October: National Hispanic Heritage Month
- October: National Disability Employment Awareness Month
- October: Filipino-American Heritage Month
- October: LGBT History Month [*please note that this is how I found the month listed, it did not include the QIA]
- November: American Indian Heritage Month/Native American Heritage Month
- December: Universal Human Rights Month

Further, there are several commemorative days that may be worthy of observance including but not limited to:

- Juneteenth (June 19th)
- World Day of Social Justice (February 20th)
- International Human Rights Day (December 10th)
- International Day of Non-Violence (October 2nd)
- United Nation's Day for Women's Rights and International Peace (March 8th)
- International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (March 21st)
- Holocaust Remembrance Day (April 20-21)
- International Day of Remembrance of the Victims of Slavery and the Transatlantic Slave Trade (March 25th)

Commented [NT5]: Juneteenth?

- International Wheelchair Day (March 1)
- World Day for Cultural Diversity for Dialogue and Development (May 21st)
- Race Unity Day (June 8th)
- International Day of the World's Indigenous People (August 9th)
- Women's Equality Day (August 26th)
- National Native American Day (September 12th)
- Global Accessibility Awareness Day (May)
- World Mental Health Day (October 10th)
- National Coming Out Day (October 11th)
- International Day for the Eradication of Poverty (October 17th)
- International Week of the Deaf; World Mental Health Day (October)
- International Day of Persons with Disabilities (December 3rd)
- International Day of Peace (September 21st)
- Various Equal Pay Days (main day is March 31st)

The Deputy City Manager for Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion would like to request the assistance of the expertise of the Commission, should the Commissioners be amenable, to determine (a) should the City as an organization engage in celebration/remembrance during months/weeks/days that recognize marginalized groups; (b) if so which months/days/weeks should take priority for FY23 and (c) which would be the best ways for the City as a non-political, local government organization to recognize these selected commemorative months/days/weeks including if there are any actions that the Commission itself would like to engage in for those commemorative occasions that would be outside the scope of the Office of the City Manager (e.g. proclamation requests, press releases of statements about the month from the Commission, community outreach and educational opportunities hosted by the Commission, advocacy around issues impacting those communities by the Commission and/or its subcommittees).

As the City budget process will be in swing in November 2021, should the Commission believe that events should occur that may need budgetary support that allocation will need to be requested at that time for FY22 (July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) for consideration and potential approval or denial. Any observance months occurring during FY22 (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) may or may not be able to have funding allocated to them as unfortunately these observances were not considered during the FY22 budgeting process.

Attachment 6

Resolution to Establish a Citywide Language Access Plan Proposal
CHARLOTTEVILLE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
RESOLUTION #: HR21-1

WHEREAS, the role of the Charlottesville Human Rights Commission, hereinafter “the Commission,” is to act as a strong advocate for justice and equal opportunity by providing citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights (City Code Article XV. Sec. 2-433); and

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville Human Rights Ordinance identifies age, disability, marital status, national origin, pregnancy/childbirth, race/skin color, religion, and sex and protected classes (City Code Article XV. Sec 2-431a); and

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville City Council’s “Welcoming City ~~resolution~~Proclamation” states that advancing equity and inclusion is critical to the success of our community and our nation, that we must strongly reaffirm our commitment to diversity and to fostering an atmosphere of inclusion, and that we believe the public sector has a critical role in ensuring the public good and pledge to continue our working in making our services and programs accessible to all (“Welcoming City” Proclamation on October 5, 2015); and

WHEREAS, the “Welcoming City Update Resolution” on April 17, 2017, tasked the Office of Human Rights to work with appropriate partners in our government and our community to ensure vulnerable populations have access to information about their rights and underlying resources (Welcoming City Update Resolution on April 17, 2017); and

WHEREAS, an estimated 15.7% of Charlottesville’s population speaks a language other than English at home (Characteristics of People by Language Spoken at Home, ACS 5-year estimates); and

WHEREAS, a City Language Access Plan will enable Limited English Proficient (LEP) individuals within Charlottesville to more efficiently engage with local government services, show the City’s commitment to effectively communicate with all members of the public, serve as a citywide policy on how staff will meet the commitment to providing “meaningful access” to individuals who speak a primary language other than English, and further support Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964’ legal requirements for any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance; and

WHEREAS, the City of Charlottesville is committed to providing electronic communication that is accessible to the widest possible audience, regardless of technology or ability (Website Accessibility Statement); and

WHEREAS, while some City departments⁶ have Language Access Plans, ~~but as of yet~~ there is no citywide policy guiding the City to ensure access to City resources and services for LEP residents;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby recommends that the City of Charlottesville develop and implement a city-wide Language Access Plan; ~~above and beyond legal requirement~~, as well as an action-oriented implementation plan to guide the City to establish policies and procedures to ensure access to City resources and services for LEP residents and to support the right of all residents to communicate with the City in the language of in which they preference.

Dated this _____ of _____, 2021.

XX XX, Chair, Human Rights Commission

Commented [A1]: Not sure you need footnotes in your Resolution. Consider deleting.

Attachment 7

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR ADVOCACY AND ACTION
CHARLOTTESVILLE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
RESOLUTION #: A21-1

WHEREAS, the Charlottesville Human Rights Ordinance, hereinafter “the Ordinance,” states that the role of the Charlottesville Human Rights Commission, hereinafter “the Commission,” is to act as a strong advocate for justice and equal opportunity by providing citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights (City code Article XV. Sec. 2-433.); and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance states that the Commission will collaborate with the public and private sectors for the purpose of providing awareness, education and guidance on methods to prevent and eliminate discrimination citywide (City code Article XV. Sec. 2-433.b); and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance states that the Commission will identify and review policies and practices of the City of Charlottesville and its boards and commissions and other public agencies within the City and advise those bodies on issues related to human rights issues City code Article XV. Sec. 2-433.c); and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance states that the Commission will prepare recommendations to City Council as to policies and procedures the Commission believes are necessary for the performance of the roles, duties and responsibilities assigned to the Commission within this article, and for modifications of operating procedures approved by City Council (City code Article XV. Sec. 2-433.f); and

WHEREAS, the Ordinance states that the Commission will be responsible for identifying and reviewing policies, practices and systems of an institutional nature that may not constitute unlawful discriminatory practices but nevertheless which produce disparities that adversely impact or affect individuals on the basis of a status such as their race, color, religion, sex, pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions, national origin, age, marital status, criminal record, income or disability (City code Article XV. Sec. 2-435.a.2); therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby declares its intent to take specific action as a strong advocate for human and civil rights; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission may undertake specific advocacy action following a majority vote of approval during a publicly-noticed regular meeting of the Commission, except in limited situations between regular meetings of the Commission, when a human or civil rights issue requires prompt action that must occur before the Commission can convene in a publicly noticed meeting, in which case the Commission authorizes the Commission Chair to take advocacy action, on behalf of the whole Commission, without a prior majority vote of approval during a publicly-noticed regular meeting; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission Chair, when taking advocacy action on behalf of the Commission between public meetings, shall, whenever possible prior taking action, provide a draft

of the proposed statement or a summary of action to be taken and allow 24 hours for feedback from the Commission, except when a particular situation requires an urgent response, in which case the Commission Chair shall send an email notification to the Commission, with a copy of any public statements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that specific advocacy action, proclaiming the Commission's position on an issue related to human and/or civil rights, may include one or more of the following:

1. Writing and delivering letters to
 - a. City Council
 - b. The City Manager
 - c. Non-profit organizations or other community groups
 - d. State government officials
 - e. Federal government officials
 - f. Local media outlets
2. Adding the Human Rights Commission to online petitions
3. Adding the Human Rights Commission to sign-on letters
4. Creating and publishing Public Service Announcements
5. Attendance and participation in public events including but not limited to
 - a. Protests
 - b. Counterprotests
 - c. Rallies
 - d. Marches
 - e. City Council meetings
6. Managing Human Rights Commission social media accounts

Dated this _____ of _____, 2021.

Mary Bauer, Chair, Human Rights Commission

Attachment 8

CHARLOTTESVILLE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ADVOCACY AND ACTION
RESOLUTION #: A21-1
PLAIN LANGUAGE VERSION

The Charlottesville Human Rights Ordinance says that the Charlottesville Human Rights Commission will:

- support justice and equal opportunity by guiding the City on civil rights issues
- work with the public and organizations to prevent and stop discrimination
- review the City’s policies and practices and advise the City on human rights issues
- make recommendations to City Council about policies and procedures that support justice and equal opportunity
- look for policies and practices that may not be illegal, but that negatively affect people because of their **protected identities**

We commit to being a strong advocate for human and civil rights. Sometimes, a human or civil rights issue will require quick action between regular Commission meetings. When this happens, we give the Commission Chair permission to act on our behalf, as described in the detailed resolution. Examples of action include:

- writing and delivering letters to government officials, to organizations, and to the media
- adding the Human Rights Commission to online petitions and sign-on letters
- writing and publishing Public Service Announcements
- participating in public events like protests, counterprotests, rallies, marches, and government meetings
- managing our social media accounts

We will use plain language because human rights work should be easy to understand.

Mary Bauer, Chair, Human Rights Commission

Date

The Commission is guided by the Charlottesville Human Rights Ordinance: City code Article XV. Sec. 2-433.

Commented [LvS1]: Link to “official” resolution

Commented [NT2R1]: Upon further reflection, it might be challenging to have a link imbedded in the resolution because it would get broken if the City changes web platforms. I would suggest just storing the “official” and plain language versions juxtaposed on the OHR website.

Commented [LvS3]: Provide link to this list?

Commented [NT4R3]: Same concern as above with including links in resolutions.

Commented [NT5]: Rather stating this at the bottom of every resolution, I recommend that the Commission draft a Plain Language Resolution (in plain language) that states the Commission’s intent to craft both “official” and plain language versions of its public documents.

Attachment 9



Charlottesville Human Rights Commission

Advocacy & Action

We commit to being a strong advocate for human and civil rights.

Sometimes, a human or civil rights issue will need quick action between regular Commission meetings.

When this happens, we give the Chair permission to act on our behalf.

Examples of action include:



Writing letters to government officials, to organizations, and to the media.



Adding the HRC to online petitions and sign-on letters



Participating in public events like protests, counterprotests, rallies, marches, and government meetings

[Link to Resolution @ A21-1](#)
[Plain language version](#)

Attachment 10

Charlottesville Human Rights Commission

Community Engagement Committee

Proposed Template for Commission Statements

Revised DRAFT October 20, 2021

- Purpose:** The Charlottesville Human Rights Commission (HRC) would like to have a consistent way of amplifying critical issues in our community in a way that aligns with our values and vision.
- Use:** The proposed template will be used by the HRC to provide public statements to Council and the general public regarding emergent issues and will be kept on record on the Human Rights web page on the City website.
- Aims:** The development of statements from HRC gives the commission a way to speak on critical issues as they emerge and provide leadership and strategic direction recommendations to City Council and the public. We aim to have the language and format of the statement be accessible to all.
- Record:** Statements will be kept in a central location on the Human Rights web page on the City website.
- Format:** The format is designed to be ADA accessible.

Statement of the Charlottesville Human Rights Commission On
[Indicate Issue of Importance HERE]
[DATE]

Submitted by the following Human Rights Commissioners:

[Include list of Commissioners that have signed on to the statement, one on each line]

Mary Bauer (Chair)

Kathryn Laughon (Vice Chair)

Jeanette Abi-Nader

Ernest Chambers

Jessica Harris

Wolfgang Keppley

Susan W. Lewis

Tobiah Mundt

Andrew Orban

Alex Oxford

Lyndele von Schill

The role of the Charlottesville Human Rights Commission, as stated in Ordinance #O-21-021 is to act as a strong advocate for justice and equal opportunity by providing citywide leadership and guidance in the area of civil rights. In alignment of this mission, and in accordance with Resolution A21-1, the Charlottesville Human Rights Commission issues the following statement and stands in....[indicate core issue that we are supporting or decrying].

[THE CONTEXT: Provide supporting contextual information that includes key points such as:

- Historical references to the situation being addressed, highlighting any systemic inequities that are contributing factors;
- The values of the Commission that support our perspective;
- Information on how this issue ties to our overall city strategic values, goals, and priorities as well as specifics on the implications for upholding human rights]

[THE DATA: Provide supporting data that includes key points such as:

- Concise and key data that provides insight into the systemic or specific nature of the issue at the local level;

- Concise and key data that provides insight into the systemic or specific nature of the issue at the regional and/or federal level;
- Concise and key data that provides insight into the recommendations proposed.]

[THE RECOMMENDATIONS: Provide recommendations for action to include key points such as:

- Recommended actions we would like to see City representatives (Council, City Manager, City Staff) take;
- Budget implications if there are any;
- Community action steps that can be taken in support of this effort;
- Any action that the HRC will be taking.]

[WORKS CITED-include references to the works cited throughout our statement]