



Advisory Council on Reparations

Friday, January 19, 2024
2 PM – 4 PM
Meeting in person and via Zoom

[Join by Zoom](#)

Meeting ID: 861 3247 5264

Passcode: 120589

COUNCIL APPROVED JANUARY MINUTES

1. Call to Order
 - a. 2:04 PM
2. Attendance

Present: Bri Carpenter, Hazelette Crosby-Robinson, Justin Hodge, Michael Steinberg, Julie Steiner, Conan Smith, Anna Taylor-McCants, Brandon Tucker, Andre Watson

Absent: Hazelette Crosby-Robinson
3. Approval of the Meeting Minutes
 - a. December 17, 2023
 - b. Moved by: Conan
 - c. Seconded: Anna
4. Public Participation (up to 3 minutes per speaker)
 - a. Shirley Beckley
 - i. Concerned with burden of proof placed upon members of the African American community to prove their ancestry.
5. Council Response to Public Participation
6. Finalize By-Laws
 - a. ATM: How are people feeling about consensus?

- i. MS: Should make consensus our primary form of decision making, but consideration should be whether or not we want an escape clause? Nervous about important work being stalled/blocked by it.
- b. AW: What does escape clause mean?
 - i. MS: We work very hard to achieve consensus and encourage folks to step aside if they do not feel strongly. For example, if we spend 3 more sessions working on a particular topic without consensus, the Chair can decide to go to a vote. Could be a 2/3 vote, etc.
- c. JH: Important to note that the BOC approves bylaws so the BOC may not get on board with consensus and could potentially take that out.
 - i. CS: It is possible the ACRs escape valve could be getting the BOC to change the bylaws.
 - ii. AAP: Caution against the BOC being an escape clause
- d. ATM: Thinks ACR should include an escape valve that is consensus minus one or no but no block
- e. AW: Agrees with ATM. Believes ACR can go forward with this being the format.
- f. BC: Agrees. Believes that ACR can go forward with consensus format. Has faith in the fact that no one has blocked consensus yet.
- g. JS: Is not worried about anyone in the room blocking important decisions. Was personally very struck by the State of California's issue. Question to ATM- what do you think we would do if we were in the same situation?
- h. ATM: Personally would look at the folks who would receive reparations in the room and vote with them.
 - i. Could the escape clause default to those who are most affected by reparations?
- i. AAP: Questions of eligibility have been the thorniest area to tackle around reparations work across the country. Advice from groups going through a similar process is that rather to start with who is eligible, to focus on areas of harm, areas of impact, and then tackle the question of what eligibility could look like based on those two categories.

At this point Chair AW approved public comment taken out of order.

- j. AW: We should add the escape clause and move forward
- k. MS: What is the escape clause?
- l. AW: Liked ATM's escape clause suggestion
- m. MS: Favors majority rule
- n. JH: Could potentially add in bylaws to allow voting "present" when they want to vote no but do not want to block a vote.
- o. ATM: Does not believe that majority rules should be our escape clause because it is rooted in white supremacy
- p. CS: Believes that we should be able to add an area to the vote that says who voted which way, and that this was or wasn't consensus.
- q. BC: Believes we should look to learning before we look to escape clause.
- r. AW: Yes to consensus, Yes to escape clause being everyone present minus 2 (supermajority vote) "The council will aim to achieve consensus during all votes with the ability to use a supermajority of every voting member present minus two vote if consensus cannot be reached"
 - i. For voting and changing bylaws

- s. JH: Other bylaws to consider
 - i. Would have to post meetings at least 48 hours before meeting, and couldn't change format of meeting within 48 hours.
 - t. AAP: OMA is referenced in founding resolution of ACR.
 - u. **VOTE: Article 3, Section 1 Amendment: The council retains the ability to change the meeting format up until meeting time. We will make our best efforts to provide as much notice as possible.**
 - i. **Moved by: Justin**
 - ii. **Seconded by: Conan**
 - iii. **Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote**
 - v. MS: Concerned about "shall consist of 15 members appointed" language in the bylaws.
 - i. AAP: Believes that this is acceptable language with
 - ii. MS: suggests "The council shall consist of at least 15 members and no more than XX members"
 - 1. AW: Believes the most should be 20
 - iii. ATM: Can we have subcommittee members?
 - iv. JH: I believe what you want is to discuss subcommittees instead of adding members to the council.
 - w. Should be explicit that it Councilmembers are permitted to vote regardless of their participation (in person or virtually).
 - x. ATM: Are we going to add in a vote present option?
 - i. General consensus is no
 - y. Changes
 - i. Moved by: Andre
 - ii. Seconded by: Anna
 - iii. Unanimous voice vote
 - z. **VOTE: Article 5 Amendments**
 - i. **Moved by Justin**
 - ii. **Seconded by Conan**
 - iii. **Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote**
 - aa. **Section 4: Quorum Amendments**
 - i. **Moved by: Michael**
 - ii. **Seconded by: Justin**
 - iii. **Passed by Unanimous Voice Vote**
 - bb. Removing Chairs vote – counts for quorum, allowed to participate, but doesn't get a vote
 - i. Moved by: Julie Steiner
 - ii. Seconded by: Anna
 - cc. Moved the bylaws as amended
 - i. Moved by Bri
 - ii. Seconded by Conan
 - iii. Passed by unanimous voice vote
7. Visioning for future of ACR & Potential Staff
8. Retreat Information
- a. AAP: Consensus based decision making training
9. Adjourn

- a. Moved by: Michael
- b. Seconded: Conan