
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.

5/20/20.

FRANCIS URROZ: I'm going to put you on mute, okay?

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: I can mute myself too.

FRANCIS URROZ: That's great. Remember if you would like to enable the captions, you can click on more options, and it will give you that option right there. On the ellipses, dot dot dot.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: Okay.

SARAH SAYEED: Hi. Can you hear me?

FRANCIS URROZ: Yes, I can hear you. We're just waiting on -- Anastasia is here, Donna is here. We're waiting for the other commissioners to jump on the call.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. We have to wait for a quorum.

FRANCIS URROZ: Right. Do we want to resend the calendar maybe?

FRANCIS URROZ: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: There's 1, 2, 3, 4 -- five I guess including me.

>> Hi, Sarah.

SARAH SAYEED: Hi. Looks like Eve has the same screen as me in

the background.

EVE BARON: It hides a variety of sins I found.

SARAH SAYEED: I was saying exactly the same too.

(Laughter).

>> Sarah, I just want you to know I have the agenda and things on my phone. So I will be referring to my phone but I am not doing other things outside of the meeting.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you. I should get out of my email so it doesn't distract me.

FRANCIS URROZ: Looks like we have a quorum. I'm going to start recording.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you so much, Francis. I'm going to call the meeting to order now. Just a few technical assistance directions for everyone in case you need them again. Can everyone hear me okay? Of course, for all the commissioners, the audio is enabled. We're just asking that to avoid the background noise we'd like you to mute yourself if you're not speaking. When you're not speaking. And then you can also use the raise hand icon next to your name in the participant list, which is in the menu control bar if you want to respond or make a comment. And/or you can just unmute yourself. And everyone else who is on this call who is participating other than commissioners, is going to be muted upon entry. And we'll enable audio for participants during the public comment period of this meeting. And for those who need the closed captioning, if you go to more options, on the screen, you should be able to enable the closed

captioning.

>> Just to clarify the more options is the ellipses on the screen. If you hover your mouse over the screen you should see -- when you click you should see a closed caption option.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you, Francis. That's right next to the -- right to the left of the X that allows you to leave the meeting. The three dots.

For the public comments we'll call on enable audio for participants who have contacted us before. And if you would like to offer public comments during this meeting, you can click on the icon that outlines a person at the bottom of the screen. Which is again three buttons to the left of the X. Next to your own name on the participant list, you will be able to see -- you'll see a raise hand icon and then you can click on that icon and send a chat message saying that you'd like to offer comment. Please include your name and affiliation and we will enable the audio for participants as they're selected to offer comments.

For those who are dialling in via phone during the meeting and don't have access to a computer monitor please text your name and affiliation to this number: 646-763-2189. Again that number is 646-763-2189 to offer public comment. The meeting host will enable the audio and call on the dial in participant by name to offer public comment in the order that the text was received.

So I'm going to begin by doing an attendance call. Since we can't pass around a sign in sheet. So if you just indicate that you're here, when I call your name, Chuck Apelian. Murad a way did he.

>>

MURAD AWAWDEH: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Eve Baron.

EVE BARON: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Holly Bonner Amy Breedlove.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Mark Diller.

MARK DILLER: I'm here.

SARAH SAYEED: Lori fee or it owe.

LORI FIOROTO: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Donna Gill was that a here? Donna?

DONNA GILL: I'm here.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you. Anthony Herman? Jose Hernandez.

>> I'm here.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. Linda Lee.

LINDA LEE: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Lilliam Perez? Annetta Seecherran

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: Here.

SARAH SAYEED: Anastasia Somoza.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: I'm here.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you. Thanks, everyone.

>> Chuck just joined.

CHARLES APELIAN: Hello there.

SARAH SAYEED: Great. Let me go through one more time. Is Holly on, or Anthony? Or Lilliam? No. Okay.

Thank you, everyone, again for joining. A lot has happened since we last met. That was just a few weeks ago. Things as you know continue to change every day. I want to just begin by thanking each and every one of you for all that you are doing to support for the communities around the city, and advocate for the needs of New Yorkers whose lives you're touching.

It's really wonderful to reconnect with you all in this time.

The first item on the agenda is voting on the minutes from the last meeting. I just want to make sure everyone has gotten the minutes. Is there anyone who does not have them? Okay. Were there any additions or corrections to the minutes?

MARK DILLER: Move to adopt.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. Is there a second?

AMY BREEDLOVE: Second.

SARAH SAYEED: All those in favor of adopting?

>> (Many voices) aye.

SARAH SAYEED: Any opposed? Okay. Great. Minutes are approved. Thank you so much.

I have a bunch of updates for you before we move into the discussion on the rule we'll be discussing today for posting for public comment. Later in the meeting we'll have some -- sorry, I don't know what that is -- we will discuss it and vote on it. But before we do that I just wanted to let you know where we are with our different programs, typical for what we do in each meeting.

One of the things that we shared with you on email, I also spoke with

you and texted you, and different ways, communicated with you that there is an executive order, executive order 107 which does determine some of our programmatic deadlines. And on April 14th, the Mayor signed an executive order which included, among other things, the suspension of CEC charter deadlines for participatory budgeting and poll site language assistance. And it indicates the result of the duration of the COVID-19 emergency. The first thing I wanted to mention about this, and go into it a little bit more, as you all know, participatory budgeting, the way it's been run, has required in person neighborhood assemblies and in person voting. As well as online engagement. And we are not able to safely convene in person meetings at this time. And what we're doing instead is continuing to meet with the participatory budgeting advisory committee remotely, and we're continuing to discuss with them how we can pivot the program to respond to the current emergency and also try to lay groundwork for a more effective PV program in the future when it can happen.

What we're looking at doing is trying to bring the education and participatory processes that under vie participatory budgeting, trying to take those and apply them to some of the COVID recovery work that the administration is going to be doing. And one of the things we've gotten involved in is the task force on racial equity and inclusion. I'll talk about that a little bit later. But the idea here is really how do we make CEC relevant for this moment in time and how can we support the city and its efforts as we're planning to reopen and work towards recovery?

One of the things as part of the PB work we were thinking about developing an online portal for engagement on PB, and again, we're trying

to pivot that into a portal that will engage residents in recovery. And hopefully the tech infrastructure that we laid down for this portal can be eventually used for the PB program. So we're just continuing to prepare in every way for the eventual launch of this program when the emergency declaration is lifted. And of course it will happen in coordination with appropriate health and legal guidance when we're ready to launch.

On the poll site language assistance, the deadline was also lifted. Part of the reason was even though we did approve during our last remote meeting we approved the methodology to select, or for poll site language assistance, the other deadline that's in the charter is to implement the poll site language assistance program in the November election. Right now we don't have any sense of what is going to happen in the November election. So I think suspending that deadline is also again out of an abundance of caution.

And we are discussing, as I mentioned to you last time, what we'd do in the event that in person voting is not going to be possible in November. That's kind of where things are with that. And for the immediate future, there is not going to be in person interpretation provided by the city during the June primary. And this is again out of an abundance of caution because there are obviously health and legal implications of sending interpreters in person to polling sites and we don't know whether they'll be able to secure the protective equipment needed for interpreters and staff. Given all these considerations, the city decided --

FRANCIS URROZ: Sorry, you're muted.

>> Sarah, we can't hear you. I think you muted yourself by accident.

SARAH SAYEED: What part of it did you miss? Where did I stop?

>> The last I heard was we weren't doing June primary. Out of an abundance of caution.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. Let's see. You didn't miss that much. I said that there would be no in person interpretation for the June primary. And the reason I was just explaining that there are health and legal implications obviously of sending interpreters to poll sites for the primary. And we don't really know whether we'd be able to get all the necessary protective equipment for interpreters and staff. And the state is really advocating for the use of absentee or mail in voting ballots so we're going to support that effort and that messaging.

So there are a bunch of things that our partners and we are also involved in leading up to that. One thing -- I'm going to go through some of those things. One thing that we all should be reminding people about is that people can still register to vote until May 29th. And they need to choose a party enrollment on their registration in order to be eligible to vote in the primary. So I'm just curious, and Murad, this could be you and a whole bunch of other folks also, are there efforts to sort of push for people to register to vote right now that are happening that we should know about?

MURAD AWAWDEH: Yeah. I think that everyone is trying to mobilize people in one way or another. To get people to go out and vote, this June 23rd, either by absentee ballot or in person. And is being careful as they do it. I think there are a lot of different concerted efforts not only from the candidates' side but from organizations to ensure that people are

exercising the right to vote in this upcoming democratic primary.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: I want to echo that. We've certainly have been really pushing out the message to get people to register to vote. Because there's been so much confusion with cancelling and back on. Of course our communities are suffering in many different ways. We've been making a concerted effort to get this back on people's radars and reminding them that this is a super important thing to do, especially in this time.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you so much.

LINDA LEE: Same here as well. We're trying to tack it on work we're doing around census. Social media as much as possible.

SARAH SAYEED: That's great. I'm concerned about this piece of it because people have to choose a party enrollment on their registration. Right? In order to be eligible to vote in the primary. We only have a very short window, until May 29th to really push this. I just want to -- because I'm not sure that when people go to register they're always aware that they have to pick a party to affiliate with in order to be eligible to vote in the primary. So hopefully we'd love to work with you all on that. I think our comms and IGA person is not on this meeting but we should make sure we're following all your different handles on Twitter. We are active on Twitter right now so I want to make sure we're helping to amplify each other's messages. We don't have a huge following. You all have much larger followings than us. We'd love to collaborate with everyone on that.

As you all know on June 23rd there will be primary elections. These will include Congress, state assembly, and state Senate and also a primary election for Queens Borough President. And the vast majority of New York

City neighborhoods will have at least one primary. So for now the Presidential primary is also on for the 23rd. And people are able to -- will be able to find out if there's an election happening in their area. There will be a website they can check, the New York City poll site locater.com. And this website is going to be updated soon. They'll be able to find out if there's a contest in their area, and they have a primary election to vote in.

And then as everyone probably already knows, there is this request -- you have to request your absentee or mail in ballot by June 16th. So there are a lot of different public education efforts that we are trying to connect with, and are working with now to help again educate people about these deadlines.

There is the campaign finance board has been working on a PSA to help people navigate the request for their absentee ballot. That will be translated into the CEC program eligible languages, the 13 languages. We're also working on an info graphic that will help people navigate the online portal that BOE has. That will also be translated into 13 languages. And then there will be a second PSA that CEC's actually very involved in with democracy NYC that will help voters to actually fill out the absentee ballot.

Right now that PSA is set to be completed by May 29th. That PSA will also be translated into the program eligible languages. And there's a plan to sort of do add buys in community and ethnic media and use social media that is utilized by different language communities. We'd love to also get your help with amplifying all of these messages. There's also going to be -- there's also an FAQ on the June 23rd elections also to be translated

and I just want to make sure we're connecting with you all on getting the word out about all of that.

That's the poll site language assistance update.

For community boards we actually are doing well with the needs assessment. We're almost at the finish line. 45 out of 59PB needs assessments have been completed. And we're very excited to be launching an option for community boards to access over the phone interpretation that's provided through language line. I know that you all probably know that agencies use language line. So far community boards have not had that possibility. So we are now through the CEC going to be giving them that opportunity. So if somebody calls a community board district manager and is speaking in a different language they'll be able to connect to language line for an interpreter.

Last thing on the community boards is that we are also working on a survey that will help us understand what New Yorkers know about community boards. That is in development right now. We can share that with you for input.

I mentioned before the racial equity and inclusion task force. Just to give you a little bit more update or information on this, this would be under other program areas. The REI task force is an interagency task force, yes, to Eve's question we will share the needs assessment. Yes, the needs assessment and the community member survey with you for sure.

The racial equity and inclusion task force is an interagency task force that is looking at neighborhoods that have the highest number of COVID positive cases. And whose residents carry a very high disproportionate

burden of preexisting conditions. And these are also ZIP codes, neighborhoods in which there are large numbers of people that are in front line service occupations and face a high rent burden. They're also likely to be communities of color. And what the task force is doing is we are in meetings now to make some short term and long term recommendations on COVID-19 recovery for the communities that are most impacted to try to achieve some greater economic and racial justice in New York City as part of the recovery plan. As the Mayor and a lot of us -- a lot of people have said and a lot of us believe, I don't think we want to go back to things as normal. We want to try to be better than what was normal pre-COVID.

So this task force is holding meetings, as I mentioned, and there will also be convenings with external stakeholders as well. And conversations with external stakeholders have been happening in these neighborhoods. CEC staff actually has been involved in doing a bunch of phone calls with stakeholders in these ZIP codes to just get a better sense of what they're seeing on the ground. And the task force is divided into subcommittees, a variety of subcommittees. And each subcommittee has a coChair. Along with Dr. Easterling from the department of health, I'm the second cochair on a subcommittee on COVID-19 health care access. And this committee, subcommittee is looking at ways to improve access and communication on health care testing, contact tracing, and other COVID-19 related information.

Are there any questions on that? Okay.

Tomorrow I will be speaking at a women creating change event and will share information with you on that. We'll email you information. Women

creating change is an organization that is working to promote civic engagement. And they have a series on dialogue for civil change and some of our other agency partners have spoken in that dialogue and it will be great to join that.

Saturday various community organizations are going to be hosting an informational session in southeast Queens on civic engagement. DemocracyNYC and the civic engagement commission will be represented on that panel. I'll share that information with you. We will share that information with you as well.

Are there any questions on any of the program updates?

>> Sarah, can I ask a question about the event -- sorry. I just wanted to know a little bit more about the event in southeast Queens. How are you doing outreach for that? Who is the target audience? Who is the local partner?

SARAH SAYEED: We can share that information with you. It was actually put together by two individuals. There are a bunch of organizational partners. I can email you that information after the meeting.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: Great. Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: We can be in touch further about it.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: Thanks. Because we have an office out there and I'd be -- it's a community that we've been more actively organizing in this time. I'd like to see --

SARAH SAYEED: I'll follow up with you right after this meeting about that, Annetta.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: Thanks.

SARAH SAYEED: Great. Any other questions?

>> Can I just ask a clarifying question regarding something you said earlier about the poll site interpreters for early voting? Maybe I totally misheard, but you were saying they're probably not going to be providing interpreters for the June 23rd primary and also the early voting before that because of PPE, lack of safety protocol and all of that?

SARAH SAYEED: I just want to clarify that's for the city interpreter program.

LINDA LEE: The city interpreter program. Okay.

SARAH SAYEED: We don't know what the BOE's plan is at the moment.

LINDA LEE: Okay.

SARAH SAYEED: We're reaching out. We did reach out to them and we're waiting to hear back. This is for the city's program which is like a voluntary program. It's just something that takes several weeks and months ahead of planning in order to get the interpreters recruited and lined up and all of that. Given all the uncertainty it was so difficult to get all of that in place. That's why it's not going to happen.

LINDA LEE: I guess the reason why I was asking is we're actually an early voting site. I've been wondering the same thing. We haven't gotten any real communication or instruction yet in terms of the safety protocols. We have our own internally for our site. But at the same time I don't know if there are any other specific details. I guess my question was why would that only be the case for the interpreters and not for the regular volunteers and poll workers and others?

SARAH SAYEED: I think that's a fair question. I think the BOE is going to be providing that. I'm just focused very much on the work of the Civic Engagement Commission right now. Yeah.

LINDA LEE: Okay.

SARAH SAYEED: I have something in the chat. My question related to absentee ballots. There are concerns about the questions when they're asking voters to be dishonest as to the reason they want absentee ballots. Is there any way that question can be more generic? Donna, are you back on?

DONNA GILL: I'm back.

SARAH SAYEED: Because it's illness or something that you're required to put on the request?

DONNA GILL: Absolutely. If you haven't been ill or if you're not ill -- I mean, the question says temporarily illness or disability, permanent, duty to take care of someone else, resident in a veteran administration or someone who is in a detention, in prison or in jail. Nowhere does it just say for your safety, or you prefer to -- I'm having a lot of questions asked to me as to why I would say I am sick when I'm not. That's a thing they're asking people to do in order to get the absentee ballot. A lot of people get to the question, and they just stop. And they won't fill out the ballot any longer because none of it applies to them.

>> Eve did say that on it it does say fear of COVID.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I filled out an absentee ballot and I checked the reason I wasn't there going to the poll site was I think the wording was fear of COVID-19 related illness.

EVE BARON: I don't remember the exact wording and maybe they updated this just recently but there was in bold face text some addition to being ill from COVID, being concerned about contracting COVID. I can't remember exactly what the wording was. But I felt sufficiently covered even if I wasn't experiencing anything.

>> Right. That language was in the instructions. But once you get to the actual application, nowhere on the application does it say that.

EVE BARON: Actually I was talking about the application. It has you check a category. It's possible that it was just recently updated. And the language --

>> I'll look at it -- I'm actually looking at the application right now.

SARAH SAYEED: This is an important thing that you are pointing to, Donna. What I'm going to do is make sure that when we are working on helping people to fill out this form that there is some guidance as to what they should fill out. I guess you're not seeing it but others saw it. So I think we just need to sort that out. Chuck, you had a comment? Chuck, are you still on?

>> Chuck needs to unmute.

CHARLES APELIAN: Doing that now, sorry. Can you hear me? The initial roll out of this was it was branded that everyone could have the opportunity to have an absentee ballot. At one point I think the state was going to make a law saying that you didn't have to have a reason, and then that kind of got muddled around. The way around it, and they really didn't explain it properly, was yes everyone can still request an absentee ballot. It was confusing. I filled mine out last week. It does have a line that said

COVID illness or fear of COVID illness and I had to be guided through that and have someone explain to me that is the way to get the ballot. Because otherwise there is a list of half a dozen excuses and you say wait, I don't qualify for those. If you go back it said COVID and then slash fear of COVID. I think it got commingled into the back line, fear of COVID. Basically that's your way out. I understand when someone says -- might have been Donna that you kind of feel like you're being a little bit dishonest filling that out. But that's what they're saying, you might have fear of the COVID and that's why you want the ballot. It's not being advertised properly, or very clearly. But that is the answer at this point.

SARAH SAYEED: It's also raising an interesting question. Because if you are not ill, and let's say you've already had COVID, is that the option you check off? I guess what I'm hearing is we need to have a little more guidance on how to fill out this form.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: Sorry. I just want to say the form needs to be amended. I actually filled out the form and had the same experience. None of the options applied to me. Well --

>> I have it up right now. Temporary illness or physical disability. They've added in in parentheses, including affected or potential of COVID-19.

CHARLES APELIAN: Exactly right.

AMY BREEDLOVE: That's the box I checked.

CHARLES APELIAN: Very confusing. But that's the way to do it.

SARAH SAYEED: Yeah. When we're translating this form, that's going to be another thing, to make sure that we get that right. So I believe

we will -- I'm sure there are already conversation happening about this as people are putting together the PSAs and informational material. We'll make sure to double down on that piece of it, how to fill out the form given that concern.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I just wanted to note they use the word affected. And when you're talking about disease there's the word infected. It can be confusing.

SARAH SAYEED: It can be. Yeah. Can be. And translation wise I think it's also challenging. But thank you to everyone who raised this question. Definitely good feedback I think for us to take back.

>> You're muted.

SARAH SAYEED: How do I keep doing that? Okay. I just asked if there are any other questions on the program updates? No? Okay.

So we are now going to move to the next section in the meeting which is dedicated to the rule that CEC is going to be proposing on interpreter minimum qualifications and training. In this section we'll sort of give you an overview of the city administrative procedure act, which determines how we go through the process of proposing the rule and getting public input on it and how it's finalized. And then we will hear a presentation about the rule itself. After we go through these you can of course ask questions. I suggest that what we do is have the first presentation will be from Francis. It's a short overview of the city administrative procedures act. We'll take your questions. And then Gagan will present on the rule, and we will take your questions on that. Just note your questions as they're both talking. And then after that we'll have a

discussion on whether you want to see anything changed in the proposed rule. I just want to again clarify that the rule that we are voting on is the proposed rule. There will be a period in which there will be public comment, and then potential revisions to the rule. So I think once you hear the process, the CAPA process, there's a period in which the rule has to get certified for posting for public comment. Right now we went through the process of getting it certified. So depending on what you say today, we may or may not need to go through that process again. But Francis will explain that. And then we'll have the vote towards the end of the conversation. So I'm going to turn now to Francis to take us through the city administrative procedure act. And how the rulemaking process works.

>> I can't hear anything.

SARAH SAYEED: Francis, are you on mute? We can't hear you, Francis. While that's being worked out, I'm not sure what's happening there, but there was something in the chat that said is Donna talking about the difference between the online application the actual print PDF? Donna, were you referring to the PDF or the online?

DONNA GILL: Online application I was looking at.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. You were looking at the online. Francis, how is it going? You want to put something in the chat because we can't hear you. I'm not sure why she's muted. She has to call someone I guess to unmute her. Very strange. I don't think I'm the host --

>> It says that Wendy is the host. Maybe there's some issue with that.

SARAH SAYEED: I did receive something about that.

GAGAN KAUR: Can you hear me? Francis says her Cisco web system is malfunctioning. Her screen is freezing up. I'm going to try to share the PowerPoint from my end. Give me one second. Can you see it?

SARAH SAYEED: Yes.

>> Yes.

GAGAN KAUR: Give me one second. I just called in Francis. She's on speaker. Let me know if you can hear us.

>> I cannot --

SARAH SAYEED: The audio quality is not working too well.

MARK DILLER: Is there a way Francis can call directly into the meeting instead of on the speaker?

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you, Mark. She's going to do that. I'm just looking for --

MARK DILLER: I don't know WebEx as well as I know Zoom. I would be more helpful if I could.

>> That was a great suggestion.

>> Has anyone been through a process of rulemaking with the city?

MARK DILLER: Sure.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay so you're familiar with the steps.

MARK DILLER: Not that different than the federal and state procedures in general.

SARAH SAYEED: What kinds of rules have you been involved in?

MARK DILLER: On the city level the landmarks preservation commission somewhat drastically revised its rules about three or four years ago. It actually went through -- so it has the public hearing process, and the

posting process. They actually took a lot of -- took so many comments from the public process that effectively they renoticed the whole proposed rulemaking text. So that in effect they went through the process twice.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. So as you all heard, we are going to be doing another public hearing. About this rule. There are a series of steps which when Francis gets on hopefully she can explain. The basic overview is we have to go through a process of getting the proposed rule reviewed and certified for posting. The Mayor's office of operations and the Law Department review the proposed rule. They okay it for posting. We then have to post it and it has to be up for 30 days for comment. And then we have to hold a public hearing on it. And at that point the rule -- after that the rule gets revised. It will get reviewed and revised if needed. And potentially -- well, it has to go through the internal review process again. And then it gets -- the final version will get posted.

So Gagan, do you have an update on Francis?

GAGAN KAUR: I just messaged her to see if she was able to log on. We have a call user 3 now on. We just need to make sure that we give her access to speak.

SARAH SAYEED: How do we do that? Who does that?

GAGAN KAUR: The person who is the host. The Wendy Trull that is the host right now on WebEx --

AMY BREEDLOVE: That was Francis's machine.

SARAH SAYEED: I think what I'm going to ask you to do, Gagan, if you don't mind, I'll ask someone else on the team what's going on with that. But can you just go right into the rule please?

GAGAN KAUR: Of course.

SARAH SAYEED: Thank you.

GAGAN KAUR: It's so wonderful to see you all today. I know you can't see me yet. I'll show up in a little bit in the meeting. What we're doing is we are proposing a rule setting forth minimum standards in training requirements for individuals who provide interpreter assistance for limited English proficient voters through the commission's poll site language assistance program.

Sarah briefly talked through the CAPA process. Francis really wanted to provide a more thorough review of this entire process. Like Sarah said we draft the rule, we notify the public once we publish the rule on our website, we hold a public hearing. After the revision process we publish the final rule. The final rule is then adopted and becomes law.

The time line that we're working with on the proposed rule is on May 25th, 2020, we will publish the proposed rule on the CEC website. Once we publish the rule, the 30 day public comment period starts. On June 17th, 2020, CEC is organizing a stakeholder round table. During which we will garner feedback and notes on both the rule and the training content that was previously utilized by the Mayor's office of immigrant affairs in order to take into consideration everyone's feedback, and change the content prior to using it for the November 2020 general election.

There were some folks who participated in the public hearing for the poll site language assistance methodology who expressed interest in reviewing and offering comment on the training content itself. So we will be reaching out to a lot of the folks who were involved with the initial public

hearing to make sure the folks who expressed interest during that time will continue us during this process. On June 30, 2020 we will hold a public hearing on the proposed rule. In addition, one thing I forgot to mention, the language assistance advisory committee will also be sent the training content and then we will facilitate discussion during our lack meeting to garner their feedback and input as well. This will provide the commission sufficient time to take these notes into consideration and to incorporate the feedback into the interpreter training prior to the November general election. And that is our time line.

Now to jump into the proposed rule document that was shared with folks ahead of time. We will do a brief overview of the proposed rule. Section 3202 of the charter directs the commission to promulgate rules establishing the minimum standards for establishing the floor and training requirements for interpreters under the poll site language assistance program. The proposed rule requires interpreters to be fluent in English and the language to be served. They must comply with all lawful orders from the staff of the New York City Board of Elections. They must observe the prohibition on electioneering and observe voter privacy.

The proposed rule requires that the commission provides at least one training for such individuals prior to each election event and establishes minimum requirements for the content of all commission training.

When we say that it establishes minimum requirements for the content, the minimum requirements for the content are training must include ethical guidance for interpreters that will include the standards of conduct, I will go over that in the next slide. It must also include a process

for tracking the number of voters the interpreter has served. And establish a protocol for collecting and reporting public complaints regarding the program.

Interpreters shall comply with the following standards of conduct. They must comply with all lawful orders from the staff of the BOE including but not limited to making an oath or signing an affirmation as required by section 8-306 of the New York State election law. It cannot engage in electioneering in the polling place within 100 feet of the polling place or while assisting voters telephonically. When we say electioneering we're defining that as words, communications, actions, or general course of conduct that seems to further the success or failure of a particular candidate, party, ticket or ballot question or intended to persuade or induce a voter to vote or refrain from voting for any particular candidate, party, ticket or ballot question. They must not place a mark on any ballot or do anything with any ballot because it may be identified -- they must not directly or indirectly reveal the name of any particular ballot or question voted for by a voter. They must comply with all applicable laws including articles 8 and 17 of the New York State election law. Article 8 codifies conduct requirements for election inspectors and article 17 outlines behaviors and actions that are deemed as a violation of election law which includes outside electioneering. They must -- I apologize.

They must comply with the following ethical standards for professional interpreters adapted from the national council on health care interpreter certifications code of ethics for health care interpreters. The first being confidentiality. The interpreter will regard all information obtained

during the performance of their professional duties as confidential.

Impartiality, the interpreter will perform duties in an impartial way refraining from counseling or conveying personal biases or beliefs. Accuracy. The interpreter will strive to relay all information accurately in the course of their professional duties, preserving the spirit of the original message, taking into consideration its cultural context. Professionalism: The interpreter will at all times act in a professional and ethical manner, maintaining the boundaries of the professional role and abstaining from personal involvement.

So we just reviewed the crux of the proposed rule in order to ease understanding of the proposed rule we plan a sharing a plain language version to facilitate participation and discussion by folks with limited legalese knowledge, like myself, just to make sure this document is accessible enough for folks to offer comment.

Do folks have any questions? No questions?

SARAH SAYEED: Does everyone have a basic --

MARK DILLER: Actually if I could, the definition of electioneering that was included in the materials I received, which I believe is the same one we just saw on the screen, was that taken somewhere? Is there a statute someplace that defines that?

GAGAN KAUR: I can take your question to our Law Department who drafted the rule. I can raise it to him and get back to you.

MARK DILLER: My point is there is a law that prevents electioneering. We all know it because every time you go to vote you see that little plaquard. What I would want -- what I hope is that this definition is

that definition. Because I wouldn't want to have competing definitions for in effect the same conduct. You know what I mean?

GAGAN KAUR: Absolutely. Of course.

SARAH SAYEED: Other questions?

AMY BREEDLOVE: Mark, can I jump in with a quick question?

MARK DILLER: Absolutely.

AMY BREEDLOVE: I just wanted to understand the cultural -- what was the wording around try and interpret it -- I'm paraphrasing now. Trying to interpret it closely as it is written.

MARK DILLER: Amy, maybe it's this. Preserving the spirit of the original message taking into consideration --

>> You went on mute.

MARK DILLER: Amy are you talking about the phrase preserving the spirit of the original message, taking into consideration its cultural context?

AMY BREEDLOVE: Yeah. Can you just explain to me what that means? And how that would work?

GAGAN KAUR: Absolutely. Those standards are taken from the national council on health care interpreter certification code of ethics. When it says that they will strive to relay all information accurately in the course of their professional duties, preserving the spirit of the original message with the consideration of the cultural context, I read that as there are some -- when providing -- when interpreting -- sorry.

SARAH SAYEED: Can I just everyone to be on mute if you're not speaking?

GAGAN KAUR: That outline, interpreters are interpreting information to the voter. It's important to relay the information in the context. These are rooted with health care interpreters. (Inaudible) not hearing everything)

>> Everyone I'm going to ask you to please mute yourself. Right now we're having an issue with the hosting of this meeting. Whoever is the host, as we try to figure that out, needs to put everyone on mute. But if you can't do that, the host can't do that, please just mute yourself. I'd like some peanut butter!

(Laughter).

MURAD AWAWDEH: I think we were all on mute and then we got unmuted.

SARAH SAYEED: That's kind of the problem here. The function is not working too well. Sorry, Gagan. Would you like to continue?

GAGAN KAUR: All I'm saying is that it's important to convey that the original message and it's important to take into consideration the original context of the message. This is especially important when relaying health care information which is why it's codified for health care interpreters. But we think it's important for interpreters when sharing information with voters that often if you're translating information directly, it may not make as much sense directly as it does if you interpret it with the context of the situation. Does that make sense?

AMY BREEDLOVE: Yeah. I completely understand that. It's just it's written in a way that -- the language was a little fuzzy for me. When you think about translation, and the fact that you can't do a one to one translation, that I would understand. It's just the way they used cultural -- whatever the exact language was. It just hit me as an interesting way to phrase it. That's all.

GAGAN KAUR: I hear you. That is something we should consider because we want this to be precise enough that when you read it, what I just shared makes sense. We'll take that into consideration.

MARK DILLER: May I jump in now? I actually had pretty much the same reaction, if you will, that Amy did raise and I was trying to raise. I was actually looking at the next one, professionalism. Professionalism can mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people as well.

I accept that it comes from this national council on health care interpreter certification code. I just wonder is that a universal standard or a reasonably respected standard? I'm confessing my ignorance here. Please don't take it as accusation, but as an inquiry. Is that how other contexts try to get at this issue? Because I completely get the issue, you want accurate, fair, impartial and respectful interpretation services provided. And truthfully I would like to see the word respectful put in there somewhere. Although it is in the spirit of the other four that you laid out.

I'm just wondering is that the universal or widely accepted standard? Is there another? I'm wondering, for example, since we're in the realm of voting what standards are typically used when there are interpretation services in a criminal proceeding? If that is the same standard as this, I'm

going to feel a lot more comfortable with this. Because -- well, because of the obvious concerns about what somebody's options and so forth are. Can you speak to that? I'm sorry I'm mumbling on about this but I'm trying to get at a somewhat amorphous concern.

GAGAN KAUR: I hear you and I understand what you're saying. The reason that this was suggested to be added in is the interpreter certification is one of the few if not only code of ethics that are codified and set out. A lot of other interpretation -- a lot of other folks that do trainings for interpreters or translators rely on this baseline model. There aren't necessarily -- when we were doing research and looking into this with the Mayor's office of immigrant affairs there are not other codified standards that are set. There are standards that other organizations use but they're not codified or well known like this one. But I can circle back with Mayor's office of immigrant affairs and see if I can provide you additional information.

MARK DILLER: Thank you for that. If there's some way to incorporate a concept of respect for the person for whom translation services are being provided, I accept that it's in the spirit of what's being said there. But since this is a brand new rulemaking opportunity, and not an existing document, if there's a way in another paragraph to include that concept, I think that's very much the spirit of what we're all intending.

SARAH SAYEED: Mark, can I ask you to clarify a little bit where it says the interpreter will at all times act in a respectful and ethical manner. Do you want to see the word respectful added in there?

MARK DILLER: Where are you reading, Sarah?

SARAH SAYEED: It's under accuracy where it says professionalism. Under the part about cultural context, it says the interpreter will at all times act in a professional and ethical manner. Maintain the boundaries of the professional role.

MARK DILLER: I would be perfectly happy with it to be added there. My problem is that I don't want to engraft upon the national council standards a word that they don't adopt. So if we're using that as a benchmark I don't want to misrepresent what that benchmark is.

SARAH SAYEED: I see. Okay. So you're saying if we don't want to go that route of deviating from those standards to add something else to this, like a five or something after professionalism, add something like respect or somewhere else in the document?

MARK DILLER: One place you could do it, in number six, that introduces the national council on health care interpreter certification code of ethics, at the top before the Romanette one through four you could say something like that. Preserving or paying due respect -- or being respectful of the recipient of the interpretation services or the client of the -- somewhere in there, the phrase could be added. Or it could be its own little subparagraph somewhere else. I just would like to see that concept incorporated.

SARAH SAYEED: Can you just say a little bit more about what you are looking for in adding that? I know it's probably obvious but I would just love to hear a little bit more about what you're looking for in terms of respect.

MARK DILLER: Sure. In criminal contexts, and I don't do criminal

law that much, but in criminal contexts there's been a lot of rolling of the eyes and harumphing about somebody who needs translation services and inevitably leads to delay and so forth. The spirit of what we are about with translation services is to make everyone feel on equal footing. What I would hope is that the request and the performance of the translation services would be performed in a way that does not diminish -- that does not give the impression of being disrespected to the person who is requesting those services.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. It's helpful. Anyone else want to add anything to this? Or have any other questions?

LILLIAM PEREZ: Can you hear me?

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. We can hear you.

LILLIAM PEREZ: Hi. I just wanted to say -- years ago, I don't do it when I was in school. When you take classes and you are given the certification, a lot of the languages we're discussing is part of the license. So if we're already going through a professional that is licensed to do this work it's a little bit assumed a lot of this ethical language we're adding to the document is already part of the professional license. I'm not sure the Board of Elections uses certified individuals or they just use agencies.

MARK DILLER: Lilliam, that's a great point but I don't see that there's a requirement, unless I'm missing it, in the text of what we're being presented. It doesn't require that they be certified by the program that you're referring to, I don't think. Am I wrong about that?

LILLIAM PEREZ: If that's not true, the courts do not use uncertained individuals. The language cannot match the interpreter

requirement.

GAGAN KAUR: Sorry, folks. I was on mute. We do not require that folks be certified under the national council's interpreter certification. But those are ethical standards that we lean on. And expect from interpreters, although they do not need to be certified through that program.

MARK DILLER: So I notice that there is on page four of the printout that you emailed ahead, and thank you for that, there's a subparagraph B that speaks to minimum qualifications. It says the commission, that's us, shall ensure that interpreters have written and spoken fluency in English and the language to be served. How do we accomplish that? Is there a test that they have to take? Is there an option to be, if you are certified under either one of these nationally recognized programs, is that good enough? I would think it would be. But it's a little unclear since we're putting the onus on ourselves, or really on Sarah, to make this assurance, how do we deliver on that?

SARAH SAYEED: Sorry. Gagan, you want to answer and then I'll chime in?

GAGAN KAUR: Of course. I was going to say like we said earlier this rule sets the baseline. Working with every interpreter that we bring onto the program will be screened and will be tested in fluency in both English and the nonEnglish language as well. They will be trained prior to every election. And then rescreened on a yearly basis. Taking into consideration any complaints or any nonprofessional behavior that is either observed by us, their colleagues, or voters themselves. Like we said earlier we'll be establishing a protocol for folks using this service to provide feedback on

the service as well.

SARAH SAYEED: The idea with the rule is to propose a very general guideline, as Gagan said it's kind of like a baseline. This is essentially saying that we are as a commission going to make sure that they have the qualifications needed to do their job. It doesn't necessarily spell out the path that we're going to take to ensure that because it could happen in different ways. And remember also that this interpreter program, we've nowhere said exactly how we're going to roll it out. It could happen through our connecting with interpreters. It could happen through a third party. So we have to sort of keep all of those things in mind. The city's current interpretation program which is the Mayor's office of immigrant affairs has been operating does take interpreter quality into consideration. And does make sure through a third party vendor that interpreters are qualified. So this is just to say that we're going to do it. It doesn't say how. If that helps. It would be our responsibility and obligation to ensure that if we're going to run a poll site interpretation program.

>> Okay.

SARAH SAYEED: Any other questions or comments? Before we move towards the voting on this? You all made a couple of points here. I guess I'm also wondering now if we want to actually propose changes that we vote on, and then take that back to see whether it needs to be recertified, or shall we vote on this as it stands, get it posted, and then work on making the changes if we need to -- want to make changes which it sounds like there are some things you want to tweak or edit and add?

>> If we have questions about using certified interpreters or not I

think that's a major change. So I wouldn't suggest posting it if that's going to be considered. If we don't have a more rigid way to measure qualifications, then -- if we are going to be the ones, CEC will determine whether or not they're qualified to do an interpretation, I don't know how we do that as a group when we have many languages to provide interpretation for. And we're not professionals in the field.

LILLIAM PEREZ: Are we going to be leaning on the city? Even the office of immigrant affairs uses consultants. They hire consultants to do this work for us, to screen every time we need to screen someone?

SARAH SAYEED: This is essentially what this rule is doing, making us responsible to do that. To make sure we are not putting out in the field interpreters who are not qualified. The way that we get there, to make sure that there are interpreters who are certified is included in this. It's a different way of saying it. It's saying that we are going to make sure that they are fluent through either using certified interpreters or if we go directly to the root of using interpreters ourselves or connecting with interpreters ourselves, hiring interpreters ourselves, or if we're using another vendor, then we'd need to make sure that the vendor has this certification and standards in place.

LILLIAM PEREZ: I think that's so much easier. That's what I used to do when I worked for the attorney general's office. We were not liable for the quality of the interpreter but the agency that we contracted on the contract with legal language was responsible for the content and the quality of the interpretation. I think it's really hard to do the interpreter qualifications but that's the job of the agency you hire to do the job for you. I think we

should change the language to reflect that we would hire or require a professional agency that will be providing the services for us. I think that's --

SARAH SAYEED: I hear your point and I want to also remind us that during the public hearing there was also a lot of concern about using third party vendors. I think what we're trying to do here is keep the language sort of very general, and again as Gagan talked about, in the Law Department, this is a baseline standard that would allow us to implement it in different ways depending --

LILLIAM PEREZ: The language that we're trying to use for this particular rule is too rigid and legal. It has high level requirements that will not be met unless you have an agency who does this work professionally, recruits individuals, screens individuals, and is known and reputable in the business. It's a hard thing to get anyway. As someone always out there screaming interpretation by legal -- it is not that easy. So for you to meet all those different requirements everyone wants to have in terms of quality, fairness, equal services, equal treatment for all, I think we as a group should not be liable to provide that service through our own screening process. It's just not going -- we're not going to be able to.

MARK DILLER: If I jump in to address what I'm hearing from Lilliam. If I'm understanding correctly, the language is general enough in minimum qualifications, it says the commission will ensure -- I very much share Sarah's point, and Gagan's point that it is actually not in our interest to say how we're going to do that right now. For a couple of reasons. One of which is that let's assume that the best way to do it is what Lilliam is

proposing, to hire a competent third party vendor or outside agency that does this every day for a living. If we build that into the rule, and then there is an initiative later to have a different approach, we'd have to go back and amend the rule. But if we have a general standard that says we'll ensure -- if it were me I would say we'd take reasonable steps to ensure but that's just me being weasel like. We will ensure that this happens. So we're telling you the result that we're trying to achieve. And leaving open the path to that result. I'm persuaded from the -- despite my initial concern I'm persuaded by the response that that's the most efficient way to achieve the result that Lilliam is actually probably correct in saying is the path to it. But if we announce the result and not the means to the result, then we can modify and adapt as we go along if a better model comes along or if a competing model comes along. I'm persuaded the language here is good enough except for my weasel words.

LILLIAM PEREZ: Why would a member of the public agree to this rule if they don't know how we're going to reach our goal? We're not letting them know how we're going to accomplish the kind of interpretation we're trying to get to.

MARK DILLER: I doubt the public is going to be scouring the rule. The public is going to be engaging with the interpreter. It's our responsibility to make sure the interpreter we provide to them meets the standards we want for that service.

LILLIAM PEREZ: I thought this rule was going to be posted for public comment.

MARK DILLER: It will be. Sure.

LILLIAM PEREZ: So if I have an ethnic group lacking services in the community, I will go in and I will check every word to make sure that I get a fair interpretation that's respectful, that meets the highest standards, and that I would be comfortable endorsing. That's a hypothetical.

SARAH SAYEED: I think what we can also do is leave things in and see what happens in the public comment period. Right? This might come up because it's also a question that we engage in the public hearing for the proposed methodology rather than anticipating or saying that's going to come up, we can just see what happens.

LILLIAM PEREZ: The other point I wanted to make is as someone who has experienced both, as a bilingual person and someone who had to assist in translating in the middle of an Election Day because the interpreter either was not there, or again, professionalism is huge. Individuals if they just get picked up because they say they speak the second language, I just don't know they'll meet the standards we're laying out here. The cultural competency -- I agree with that because I'm Caribbean Latina -- there's a huge difference between the way I speak Spanish than those from El Salvador, Ecuador, you name it. I like the fact you put the language there to be culturally sensitive. It's a way in a castillian way that everyone understands or you can be a little more localized to where you are from and no one understands. I'm trying to raise the bar from what I've experienced in the poll sites where individuals are not even fully bilingual. I don't know where they get them from. I don't know what the requirements are right now for the Board of Elections. But I don't think they meet all the standards

that we're writing about in this proposal. In these proposed rules. If I want to be part of something that's going to make things better I want to make sure that we as nonprofessionals in this field should not be screening these individuals, or be responsible for choosing how to screen these individuals. It should be left to the professional agencies that provide these services that are reputable and that own the contract, liable for providing the level of service that, quote unquote, we're talking about here.

SARAH SAYEED: Absolutely.

GAGAN KAUR: I hear you. I understand your concern about the mechanism through which we ensure that interpreters are qualified and professional and all of the things that we discussed.

>> We lost her.

MARK DILLER: We seem to have lost Gagan.

GAGAN KAUR: Sorry. I don't know how I went on mute. I wasn't touching the computer. Sorry. I was just saying that I hear you in terms of identifying the mechanism through which we screen and recruit interpreters. I think that we're hesitant to very strictly codify that piece. I think we want to maintain a little bit of fluidity. For example if we work with a third party vendor, a contractor, that's great. They'll screen and hire those things. The way the rule is written still allows us to do that. But if we codify we work with a third party vendor, if ten years from now the CEC wants to work with perhaps smaller community-based organizations or language co-ops or other ways to screen folks and recruit folks, it will prevent the future CEC, or even us in a few years if we receive enough public comment to change the program, we need to have enough fluidity to change the

program while still setting baseline standards for the interpreters. This will continue to be fleshed out as we create the training in partnership with community-based organizations that we provide to the interpreters. I hear you on the CEC not being qualified to screen interpreters. I don't understand Polish. I would not be able to efficiently judge if someone is correctly translating what I'm saying into Polish. We definitely hear you on that. We will not be the ones screening folks. We will be the ones ensuring that these standards are met.

SARAH SAYEED: In the interest of time since it is 3:30, I think one thing actually I completely left out of the program updates piece, which we are going to -- or was this later on the agenda? I can't remember now. We are supposed to be doing a round table with community stakeholders around the training. We'll make sure that you're invited to that. So you have a better sense of what we're thinking about and putting into the training for interpreters. And we can build the training content. I think that we have to decide right now whether we are going to agree to put this rule up for comment. I've heard from you all a couple of different things. One is some concern around what does this sort of cultural context language actually mean? It's not entirely clear. Wanting to see some clarity on that. The other concern was around having some language around respectful conduct towards people who are receiving interpretation. And the third concern was around the process of making sure that interpreters are indeed qualified to provide interpretation.

So the question that I'm posing here is that if we want to see changes in this rule, the proposed rule, I still believe that we can put it forward as a

proposed rule, and make the changes that would then go into the next round if you will. We never did get to hear about the CAPA process. But what does happen after public comment is the rule gets revised and has to get recertified before it gets finally posted. I think there's an opportunity here for us to start that process. I guess I just want to hear from you all if you're okay with that. If you're not okay with that, and you prefer to hold on that we can do that as well.

The reason why we're doing this even though our deadline is suspended, is that in the event that we do have to do in person interpretations in November, we will need to have this rule in place in order to get the interpreters to provide the in person interpretation. So we're just trying to -- working backwards from November, thinking about our meetings and all of that, summer, and everything, just trying to lay the process down so that the rule does get revised and finalized before -- in order for us to make sure we're recruiting the interpreters, if the election happens in person in November. If I'm making sense.

MARK DILLER: Yes. So it sounds to me, if I could jump in, sounds to me like there's going to be public comment and opportunity to amend after public comment. I would be comfortable going forward with this as the posting now and then revisiting the comment that I had and the comments that the others had about amendments to the proposed rule at that time instead of now. If that's an acceptable way to proceed. That's just for me. I would be comfortable voting on this now. Reserving the opportunity to have further comment later.

SARAH SAYEED: Is anyone uncomfortable with that? I do think -- I

do think that makes sense to do, given the time line that we're working with. And just trying to anticipate that we will need to provide in person interpretation in November. I just want to make sure that we're ready to do that. I think getting us started with just getting it posted will help that time line.

LILLIAM PEREZ: I'm with that as long as we can revisit it.

SARAH SAYEED: There's ample opportunity to revisit and change the language here. Sounds like there are certain changes you'd like to see made.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: I also want to say I think we should proceed.

MARK DILLER: Why don't we vote?

>> So do I.

SARAH SAYEED: Awesome. Let's just go forward with the vote. What I'd like to do here, again as we did last time, because of this meeting format online, I'd prefer to just do a roll call on the proposed rule. So if you're okay with us posting it, please say yes. If you're not, say no. Chuck Apelian left. Murad? The vote is are you okay with us posting this proposed rule?

MURAD AWAWDEH: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Eve?

EVE BARON: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Holly is not here. Amy?

AMY BREEDLOVE: Yes. Sorry.

SARAH SAYEED: Mark Diller?

MARK DILLER: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Lori?

LORI FIOROTO: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Donna?

DONNA GILL: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: I think Anthony is not here. He had to leave.

Jose?

>> Jose: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Linda?

LINDA LEE: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Lilliam?

LILLIAM PEREZ: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Annetta.

ANNETTA SEECHERRAN: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Anastasia?

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: Yes.

SARAH SAYEED: Awesome. We have now approved to go forward with posting this proposed rule. And we will begin to take in public comment. It will be up for 30 days. There will also be a public hearing. We'll give you information about that hearing. Obviously you will be part of it where we'll get to hear about what people have to say about it. We'll take back your comments and see how we can further modify the language.

So I'm going to turn now to see if we have anyone signed up or interested in making comments. Francis, are you back with us? We don't know. Do we know who is hosting the meeting?

>> Looks like Wendy is hosting the meeting.

SARAH SAYEED: Say that again?

>> This is Wendy on Francis's behalf. I can unmute anyone who wants to give comment.

SARAH SAYEED: Did anyone sign up for comment through text? Do we know? Or let's see if there's anything in the chat.

>> Sarah, they did not.

SARAH SAYEED: All right. So no one signed up through text and no one -- looks like no one is in the chat who wants to say anything. I'm going to invite anyone who is on who if you'd like to make a comment during this time, please let us know. Okay.

Seems like there isn't. Doesn't seem to be anybody who would like to comment. Are there any questions? Anything before we -- I'm thinking that maybe we can close the meeting if no one has a comment or question.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: I have a tech related question. Is there a reason why we're choosing to use WebEx as opposed to Zoom? Because this is the only meeting that I've been asked to use WebEx for. So far I've noticed there are a lot more tech issues in terms of muting and unmuting. But also there have been moments where I haven't been able to hear sound. I know that it's not wifi on my end. So at least in my experience so far it seems there are WebEx tech issues that don't exist on other virtual platforms.

SARAH SAYEED: Thanks for that question. Basically we're using WebEx because it's an approved platform for this. Any time we want to use any software we have to go through a process of getting it approved

through DoITT and also cyber. So WebEx is the approved platform for city agencies. That's not to say we're totally forbidden from using Zoom. But it just makes it easier for the city to manage the cyber issues if it is on an approved platform. We should connect with you a little bit more to understand better what concerns or issues you faced in today's meeting and before. So that we can also relay that and make sure that we're addressing them.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: I mentioned it in the chat. I notice I think some other people might have been having this issue. I didn't touch my computer at all, and there were several moments where I suddenly realized I was unmute -- somebody unmuted me even though I hadn't done so myself.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. For the commissioners, by the way, you're all unmuted. All of you are not muted by the host. It's only the other participants that are muted by the host until the comment period opens. The commissioners, you're asked to voluntarily mute yourself.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Right but we were on mute. We had all muted ourselves but something turned us off of mute.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: Exactly.

AMY BREEDLOVE: We did not do it.

SARAH SAYEED: Oh, I see.

AMY BREEDLOVE: There was a point in the meeting you heard about peanut butter and children and other things. We were not aware that we had been taken off of mute.

SARAH SAYEED: Gosh, sorry about that. Maybe it's the same

moment Francis's computer froze.

ANASTASIA SOMOZA: Amy is exactly right. That's what I was referring to. For me there were several moments where I suddenly noticed that was the case where I was unmuted and didn't realize it.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. That actually happened to me as well if you recall there were points you were saying you couldn't hear me and I didn't think I had muted myself. So we'll try to figure this out. Why that happened. An adventure.

>> There were a lot of weird things going on in this meeting.

(Laughter).

SARAH SAYEED: Yes. Someone else?

DONNA GILL: The task force for racial equality and inclusion, are they talking about housing or just are they talking about businesses and COVID? Because I don't see a housing component to that task force.

SARAH SAYEED: There are different -- good question. There are different subcommittees. I think -- I'm trying to remind myself of what they are. Housing definitely came up. Remember I mentioned that the task force reached out to stakeholders to do interviews with them? And there were about 277 stakeholders that were interviewed in these ZIP codes that are hardest hit. Housing came up as -- housing and food security were the number one concerns that came up across these interviews. I'm sure -- I should know this by heart by now, but I don't. There must be a subcommittee that's taking that on. I will double confirm that with you. Yeah.

There's another -- there is a task force on racial equity and inclusion.

There are also other advisory groups that have been assembled by the city as part of the fair recovery plan. There's a variety of different things going on where they're engaging stakeholders around this. This is sort of also planning for -- there's a short-term plan and also a long-term plan. I'm going to look into your question about who is handling the housing piece of it, and get back to you.

DONNA GILL: Thank you, Sarah. Could you give us a report on that? Because our constituency, as part of civic engagement, all those things matter to our communities. And (inaudible) especially that's one of the hardest hit by the COVID -- housing is also very important. So if you can, I would like just a report on what's going on, and what the committee is planning, and what are those long term and short-term plans coming out of this.

SARAH SAYEED: Since we have a few minutes right now, I can tell you I was able to pull up the subcommittee list for the task force. It's health care access. Data research. Data and research. Delayed health care services. For example, people aren't able to go and get their dental work done during this time. There's a whole committee that's dealing with that. Food access insecurity is a subcommittee. Housing is a subcommittee. Of the racial equity inclusion task force. The cochairs for that are HPD, and DSS. Lewis Carol, and lawan from DSS are cochairs on that. There's a job and work force subcommittee. And there's a mental health needs subcommittee. A subcommittee on undocumented workers and families, subcommittee on small business. Another subcommittee on social distancing and the last is on youth and education.

Each subcommittee is charged with meeting at least twice a week and also holding at least one meeting with external stakeholders. So if you would like to know a little more about the housing subcommittee I can look into that and see how they're --

DONNA GILL: I would appreciate that. Thank you.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. Does anyone else have any questions around the subcommittees or want more information?

AMY BREEDLOVE: No. I just want to say I did go to the national -- what is this -- NCIHC.org. For their interpretation practices. Standards of practice. They have 32 standards of practice listed.

SARAH SAYEED: What's the -- what does it stand for?

AMY BREEDLOVE: NCIHC.

SARAH SAYEED: Health council. Okay.

AMY BREEDLOVE: Looks like some were chosen out of what they have as over arching buckets, or categories, like accuracy, standards of practice, impartiality, respect, cultural awareness, role boundaries, professionalism, professional development, and advocacy.

So it seems like some were picked out, and maybe because a lot of these are specific to health care workers, but I think that maybe when looking at the ones that were chosen to try and grab some of the other ideas that were around that specific one that was chosen, because there are 32 here and I think we had four.

SARAH SAYEED: I think the effort of the Law Department was to try to keep things as baseline as possible. But it's worth relooking at that and seeing what else we want to --

AMY BREEDLOVE: Mark you might want to look at it. You like these things.

(Laughter).

SARAH SAYEED: Make your recommendation.

MARK DILLER: Gee, thanks I guess is the only way to respond.

LILLIAM PEREZ: I have to run.

SARAH SAYEED: If no one has any other questions, maybe somebody would like to make a move to adjourn.

MARK DILLER: Without objection.

SARAH SAYEED: Can someone move to adjourn and then second?

MARK DILLER: So moved.

LINDA LEE: Second.

SARAH SAYEED: Okay. All in favor? (Many voices) any opposed? We'll call this meeting to adjourn. We'll be in touch with you about when the hearing will be and the next meeting, which will be the hearing. Thank you so much. Good evening, everyone.