



Multnomah County Charter Review Committee

July 5, 2022 6:15-7:45pm

COMMITTEE MEETING 14

Purpose: Hear public comment; review and discuss recommendations forwarded, potentially vote on recommendations and draft charter language.

Attendees

Committee Members

- Ana del Rocío (she/her)
- Annie Kallen (she/her)
- Danica Leung (she/her)
- Georgina Miltenberger (she/her)
- J'reyesha Brannon (she/her)
- Jude Perez (they/them)
- Maja Harris (she/her)
- Marc Gonzales (he/him)
- Nina Khanjan (she/her)
- Samantha Gladu (she/they)
- Theresa Mai (she/her)
- Timur Ender (he/him)

Absent:

- Salma Sheikh (she/her)
- Ana González Muñoz (she/ella)
- Donovan Scribes (he/him)

Staff:

- Dani Bernstein (they/them), Director of the Office of Community Involvement
- Kali Odell (she/her), Charter Review Committee Program Coordinator
- Katherine Thomas (she/her), Assistant County Attorney
- Allison Brown (she/her), JLA Public Involvement
- Jen Winslow (she/her), JLA Public Involvement

In addition, members of the public were welcome to observe the meeting as non-participatory attendees. There were 13 public attendees during the course of the meeting.

Welcome

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, kicked off the meeting with an overview of Zoom logistics and etiquette. The Zoom chat can be found in the [Appendix](#). Marc Gonzales gave an overview of the agenda, which included public comment, discussion of subcommittees' recommendations, including jail inspections, the addition of an ombudsperson, codification of the Good Government Hotline, the auditor's access to information and the right to audit clause, and the charter review application and selection process.

Public Comment

Allison introduced the public comment portion of the meeting. Community members are welcome to submit written public comment or sign up for verbal comment prior to the meeting. She overviewed the public comment process.

- **Jennifer McGuirk:** Thanks for your service. Your agenda tonight includes considerations of potential amendments affecting the Auditor's Office. I ask you to consider the written comments I submitted on June 10 regarding the ombudsperson. I support the Government Accountability Subcommittee's proposed language. I asked the full committee to bring language to voters that requires county management to respond to ombudsperson's reports. It could be similar to existing language in the charter which pertains to performance audits, which is also in my June 10 letter. This will ensure the public record reflects both the ombudsperson's determinations and management's perspectives. I'm grateful for the recommended language to codify the existing fraud, waste, and abuse hotline under the Auditor. I asked the committee to bring language that is structured similarly to that of the ombudsperson. When my office recommended the hotline be included in the charter, we did not name it. The next auditor might identify that the hotline would benefit from a new name. Instead, my office recommended language that would speak to the hotline's purpose and standards it is to follow. Much of my office's proposed language is based on state law for local government hotlines, including how reports are to be referred to other agencies and how people who report are to be protected. I also ask the proposed charter language require county management to respond to all the auditor's reports on hotline activity, for similar reasons to the ombudsperson's reports. I'm relieved the committee is recommending language in the charter that guarantees the Auditor's access to timely records, information, and other materials related to audits. I ask that this not be limited to audits, but include the hotline and ombudsperson. I ask that the language my office proposed be advanced to voters as it's based on model legislation for local government auditors. I ask that the committee consider or recommend that future charter committees consider a budget allocation for my office. The County Chair proposes the Auditor's budget, and that is a conflict of interest. The Auditor should have budgetary independence from management.
- **KC Lewis:** Disability Rights Oregon is Oregon's federally designated protection and advocacy agency for people with disabilities. We are tasked with monitoring facilities where people with disabilities are held while ensuring their rights and wellbeing are protected. Unfortunately, due to our society not prioritizing health and community mental health resources and criminalizing mental illness, jail monitoring has become a key aspect of our work as more people with mental illness and other disabilities are funneled into our jails. I support the recommendations of the Safety and Justice Subcommittee regarding ongoing constituent jail inspections. Our staff are regular visitors to the Multnomah County Jail and have had a collaborative and constructive relationship with the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office working together to improve the conditions in our jails for people with disabilities. Too often, those whose work doesn't require them to walk into the jails and talk to the people who are living there can struggle to understand how vulnerable many of the people we are jailing are and how important it is that we keep them safe. The proposal before the committee would create a new opportunity for our community to monitor conditions in Multnomah County's jails, which would help develop a deeper understanding of what it means to be a disabled person in the criminal justice system and why a jail is not the right place for someone experiencing symptoms of mental illness. It will push

us to improve conditions in the jails and rethink the policies of criminalization and community disinvestment that has led us to treat these jails and de facto mental health institutions. We urge you to move forward with these recommendations.

- **Bob Weinstein:** The language about Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) that was returned from the attorney's office is very vaguely defined. It needs to be clearly defined so that it's not subject to interpretation by elections officials or other people, which would lead to a lot of disputes. There are multiple versions of RCV, and instant runoff is used in all but one of the jurisdictions of the United States. This requires the winner to get 50% plus one. If that is what you mean, you should have that definition clearly added. Additionally, the Portland Charter Commission (PCC) has submitted a complex charter amendment that will go to the voters and likely become controversial. Because it includes two versions of RCV, it may adversely affect any proposal coming from the county, resulting in two voting systems if the city's fails. Any proposed amendment from the committee has to go to voters in 2022. Please add a definition to avoid more confusion. Thanks to Kali for being very responsive to my requests for information.

Allison thanked the verbal commenters. Kali summarized the written comments received prior to the meeting. Comments were in support of alternative voting methods, Auditor's request for a budget floor, and a comment which stated no preference for Charter review selection as long as senate districts are retained and the party registration requirement was removed. There was a question about how the elimination of the May primary will affect other jurisdictions which still have a May primary and the costs associated. PCC's proposals may not pass, so there was cautioning against assuming Portland will fund some of RCV. Full written comments are available [here](#).

Allison closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Subcommittee Recommendations: Process, Review, and Discussion

Marc Gonzales introduced the subcommittee recommendation concerning **jail inspections**. Nina Khanjan stated that after the committee's discussion on this recommendation at its last meeting, a couple of subcommittee members updated the recommendation form. The full recommendation is available [here](#).

Allison asked if the committee had questions about the updated recommendation.

- **Annie:** What does golden key access mean?
 - **Nina:** The charter amendment that we present cannot supersede the oversight of the sheriff, so safety concerns and HIPAA need to be considered. There will not be interviews unless there is consent and they will hopefully be anonymous.
- **Maja:** How will the draft language be phrased? Will it say something such as "a minimum of two", or be left open?
 - **Nina:** We chose the language "increase" so it would be more than one, and there was an issue with four. This gives more flexibility.
 - **Katherine:** It's important to understand the committee's intent, so if that means at least two, that may be where we go with it.
- **Danica (from chat):** I like the revised recommendation, but does it address the questions raised by Carol Chesarek from her 6/30 public comment? Specifically, if reports written by inexperienced citizens

will be easily discredited, and how to avoid creating additional stress and trauma during the inmate interview experience?

- **Nina:** We thought the choosing of citizens would be similar to the Charter Review Process. They would have support to get a report together. Regarding trauma: no adult in custody would be interviewed without their permission. We want to hear people's stories, but it's their choice. We are hoping they will want to be heard so that those in power can push to for different laws and changes.
- **Ana dR (from chat):** My understanding is that the stress and trauma pieces are already being considered and addressed in the existing infrastructure of commissioner visits. Re: inexperienced citizens, I don't believe constituents are inexperienced. I think lived experience and observational powers of the people are undervalued and generally underappreciated.
- **Marc:** Are you hoping for training for these citizen volunteers to make the process and outcomes more uniform?
 - **Nina:** We didn't discuss training but maybe guidance by those who are addressing what's happening. If the recommendation for the ombudsperson passes, that person could help support and organize the effort.
 - **J'reyesha:** If you do a quick Google search on jail inspections by external folks, it's common to have interviews done by people who are not internally related to the county, which has led to better conditions for inmates. Other places have brought up troubling staff issues and stressed the importance of face-to-face interviews. We also need to better understand those experiencing mental illnesses and disabilities, and we wouldn't unless we continued to have these inspections and interviews. A community member may be more relatable than a commissioner.

There was discussion about whether jail visits would be duplicative of citizen groups who already visit the jails. Some members expressed that they thought the recommendation would be a more constituent involved and constitutional process than what currently exists.

Katherine stated that if members were ready to vote, it would be on the recommendation as written. She would draft the recommendation based on the intent of the committee. Nina overviewed the changes to the recommendation, which included clarification of what a constituent is, timeline of visits, administrative measures for safety and security, clarification that constituents are volunteers who receive reasonable stipends, and that no more than one year will pass.

Katherine asked if the subcommittee felt comfortable voting on the recommendation with the amendments she had identified. Allison asked if the clarifications and amendments matched the committee's intent. The group agreed that they were ready to vote.

Formal Vote

Allison initiated a formal vote to move forward with the recommendation for the inspection of jail facilities.

Ten members voted yes and there were two abstentions. The recommendation moved forward.

- **Maja and Georgina** noted that they abstained because they felt this type of proposal would be better in an ordinance. The recommendation would need future modifications and it would be difficult to make those changes in the Charter.

- **Annie** voted yes but echoed Maja’s and Georgina’s concerns.

Marc introduced the next recommendation, which was the **addition of an ombudsperson**. The full recommendation is available [here](#).

Maja overviewed the recommendation, which came from the auditor’s office. The ombudsperson’s office would:

- Be dedicated to taking reports or complaints about maladministration or unethical conduct by county employees or staff.
- Currently does not exist in Multnomah County but exists in Portland.
- Would be conducted within national best practice standards.

Samantha asked about the cost or number of people needed for the office, and Maja replied that there was no financial projection, but it would likely come at an additional cost. She explained that while the Auditor may already conduct investigations, the addition of the ombudsperson would increase the capacity to do so. The community may feel more comfortable reaching out to the ombudsperson, as they are already associated with reporting wrongdoing.

Kali pointed out that the Auditor is more focused on broader, systemic issues. There are often individual reports to the Good Government Hotline that are unrelated to audits, and the Auditor wanted additional tools to investigate issues. The ombudsperson typically has some kind of legal background or training in investigative practices.

Allison asked if the committee felt ready to vote on the recommendation.

Maja explained that the subcommittee had some correspondence with the Auditor, but there was no time to see if the group wanted to incorporate the recommendations to include language that would require a report being written and submitted to the Auditor after receiving information.

- **Kali:** There was a request that the language include that the ombudsperson make a report to the Auditor and the Board of Commissioners, and the Chair or responsible elected official would submit a response to the report, including actions taken after the findings.
 - **Katherine:** It would be helpful to clarify what the scope of this office is in relation to the Auditor. The Auditor’s recommendation had a lot of detail that the subcommittee did not bring forward, and that may be an additional issue.

The committee agreed that they were ready to vote on the recommendation, with the inclusion of “the spirit” of the Auditor’s language on limitations.

Formal Vote

Allison initiated a formal vote to move forward with the **ombudsperson recommendation** and including the language proposed by the Auditor about the ombudsperson’s reports and limiting the scope of what the ombudsperson has the authority to investigate.

The committee unanimously voted yes, which was consensus. The recommendation moved forward.

Voting on Previously Drafted Language

Theresa introduced the next part of the meeting, which would review language drafted based on recommendations the committee had previously voted to advance: gender neutral Charter language, expanding voting rights to the fullest extent of the law, and adopting RCV. She reiterated how great of a job the committee had done passing huge proposals.

Katherine described the language drafting process and asked if the texts captured the intent of the committee.

- **Gender neutral language:** Nouns were used in the charter instead of pronouns, and the section on gendered language was removed. The full amendment text is available [here](#).

Allison asked if the committee wanted to vote. This would be the final vote and would move this recommendation forward toward the ballot.

Allison initiated a formal vote on the **gender-neutral language** amendment.

The committee unanimously voted yes, which was consensus. The recommendation would be forwarded to the ballot.

- **Expanding voting rights to the fullest extent of the law:** Adds a new section to the chapter on elections language, speaking only to county elections. The language was drafted to be flexible in implementation. The full amendment text is available [here](#).

Allison initiated a formal vote to move forward with the **expansion of voter rights to the full extent of the law** amendment. This would be the final vote.

The committee unanimously voted yes, which was consensus. The amendment moved forward toward the ballot.

- **Adopting Ranked Choice Voting:** Text amends multiple sections of the charter and provides that RCV would be adopted by 2026, clarifies that the current system will remain in place until RCV is implemented, and that there would be a single election in November except for filling vacancies in May or November elections. The section on tie voting was not amended, because the existing wording is sufficient. The description was borrowed and slightly modified from the City of Portland to align with the city. The full amendment text is available [here](#).

Several committee members mentioned that Ranked Choice Voting should clarify instant runoff, as the current language is broad. The county should try to streamline with the City of Portland and have similar methods of voting, and would also add specific language on implementation if RCV does not pass at the city level.

Allison stated that the group wanted clarification of instant runoff language in the amendment text. The committee could vote for revised wording which captures the spirit of the City of Portland's language. Revised wording would be voted at the July 20 meeting.

- **Annie:** I would like to suggest a modification to add the phrase "if additional rankings are available" to the end of the second to last candidate, because I think we should clarify to voters that there will be times when additional rankings are not available. People might assume that their vote will always count, and it's important that they understand how the process actually works.

The committee discussed whether to add Annie's proposed language and felt it wasn't necessary.

Allison initiated a formal vote to approve changing the **Ranked Choice Voting** text to specify the use of instant runoff RCV and include more description of how that process would work. A vote in favor of changing the text would send the updated recommendation to the County Attorney's Office for updated drafting.

Eleven members voted yes and one voted no. The recommendation was returned for updated drafting. The final draft language would be voted on July 20.

The committee agreed to stay longer to work through and potentially vote on additional amendments and recommendations.

- **Good Government Hotline:** Recommendation to codify and enshrine the existing hotline in the Charter. The Auditor had requested not naming the hotline in the Charter to keep the name flexible. The full recommendation is available [here](#).

Allison initiated a formal vote to move forward with **codifying the Good Government Hotline**.

The committee unanimously voted yes, which was consensus. The recommendation moved forward for text drafting.

- **Auditor's Access to Information:** Specifically emphasizes the Multnomah County Auditor's authority and access to timely information. It also extends the Auditor's ability to audit outside contractor funds. The full recommendation is available [here](#).

Katherine mentioned that there were some questions related to how the ombudsperson's office and Good Government hotline worked within the Auditor's Office and in relation to each other, but there hadn't been sufficient time to discuss them. She felt she could move forward with the information available

Allison initiated a formal vote for the recommendation on **the Auditor's information access** with the addition that this access be available to the ombudsperson and hotline, as well.

The committee unanimously voted yes, which was consensus. The recommendation moved forward for drafting.

- **Charter Review Committee Application and Selection Process:** Tasks the Office of Community Involvement with running the selection processes for the Charter Review Committee, including outreach, application evaluation, and appointment. Ensures an even distribution between county districts, and members would no longer be required to register as different political parties. Committee members would still be eligible to serve if they move between districts after they are appointed. The full recommendation is available [here](#).

Samantha noted that there is a desire for more funding for community engagement. If it is written in the Charter, there won't be a need to specify the budget piece because the requirements in the Charter will get funded. Katherine stated that if OCI has additional duties, their work will be appropriately funded, and this was part of the first Charter review recommendation that committee voted on.

The group discussed whether there was a preference for the use of senate or county districts. There was agreement that there should be language to ensure that there is a balance of representation from the districts and that it was important to have geographic representation from rural parts of the county.

- **Annie:** I had concerns that OCI selecting committee members would be a conflict of interest, as they are employees of the county, but have since learned it's a pretty standard practice. I also want to acknowledge the comment that people who live in unincorporated parts of Multnomah County rely more on county services, but they tend to be in more rural areas. If we change the way people are appointed, we may leave some of them out. We should include language about our intent to include geographic diversity.
 - **Maja:** The Charter already has language stating that it should be a diverse applicant pool. We feel that OCI would share similar values and would ensure the process is as diverse as possible, so we didn't necessarily need to add more language.
- **Ana dR:** I'm concerned about what does and does not get enshrined, based on current events with Roe v. Wade. I think we should be as explicit as possible.
- **Maja:** I think if we add geographic diversity, we should include more things, such as gender, race and ethnicity, etc. to clarify our intent.

Kali read the recommendation language for clarification. Katherine noted that the government does not make decisions based on protected class.

Allison asked if the group felt they were ready to move forward with the recommendation, which would include general language on the intent for appointments to be as diverse as possible.

Allison initiated a formal vote for the recommendation on the **Charter Review Committee application and selection process**.

The committee unanimously voted yes, a consensus. The recommendation moved forward for drafting.

Next Steps and Closing

Theresa thanked everyone for staying longer to vote on additional recommendations. The group thanked Allison for all of her work with the committee, as this would be her last meeting. The meeting on July 20 would include:

- Reviewing and voting on the draft texts for the amendments.
- Discussion of the committee's final report.

Theresa wrapped up the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

Zoom chat: Appendix

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): Auditor Jennifer McGuirk, KC Lewis, Bob Weinstein

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): With all of the back and forth did we end up with a meeting agenda that has facilitation notes?

Allison Brown (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): I have just the annotated version and I've added in the note from Ana's email...probably going to wing it

Allison Brown (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): I can send it to you

Allison Brown (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): Saw the email, just sent it to all!

Kali Odell (she/her) to Allison Brown (she/her): Thanks!

Timur Ender (he/they): I'm here and listening. I need to be off camera for a short time

Georgina Miltenberger: I'm in rural Pennsylvania—connection is not great so I'll stay off camera.

Samantha Gladu: I'll be off camera for most of tonight ♡

Annie Kallen she/her: will be off camera for just a second

Maja Harris (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): My connection is really shaky and I'm supposed to do the presenting tonight. Please let me know if you can't hear me and I'll try to troubleshoot and turn off my video.

Kali Odell (she/her) to Maja Harris (she/her): Will do!

Annie Kallen she/her: Thank you KC!

Maja Harris (she/her) to Kali Odell (she/her): Had to move to another room to get a better connection. Unfortunately I missed most of the auditor's comments. My connection is still super shaky.

Kali Odell (she/her) to Maja Harris (she/her): She mostly just highlighted her comments from the 10th.

Jude (they/them): I'll be off camera to eat but I'm here (:

Kali Odell (she/her): <https://www.multco.us/crc/mccrc-upcoming-meetings>

Danica Leung: Thanks, Kali!

Danica Leung: I like the revised recommendation but does it address the questions raised by Carol Chesarek from her 6/30 public comment? Specifically, if reports written by inexperienced citizens will be easily discredited, and how to avoid creating additional stress and trauma during the inmate interview experience?

Annie Kallen she/her: Yes, I'm concerned about additional trauma for inmates as well.

Ana del Rocío (she/her): My understanding is that the stress and trauma pieces are already being considered and addressed in the existing infrastructure of commissioner visits. Re: inexperienced citizens, I don't believe constituents are inexperienced. I think lived experience and observational powers of the people are undervalued and generally underappreciated.

Ana del Rocío (she/her): Great point, J. A lot of this stuff is standardized.

Samantha Gladu: Disability Rights Oregon

Kali Odell (she/her): There is a Grand Jury

J'reyesha Brannon: A lot of government work is duplicative

J'reyesha Brannon: As long as it's not causing harm and has potential to provide transparency, it seems valuable

Annie Kallen she/her: My internet is struggling, so I am turning off my camera.

Samantha Gladu: My internet is so bad today, I've had to join all my mtgs by phone audio ^^

Maja Harris (she/her): Same here. :-(

Ana del Rocío (she/her): No issues from me

Annie Kallen she/her: no issues

Samantha Gladu: Thumbs up

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): yes

Theresa Mai (she/her); FYI 17 minutes left for recommendations as Maja indicated.

Annie Kallen she/her: Isn't capacity more of a budget issue?

Theresa Mai (she/her): 10 minutes left for recommendation discussion.

Annie Kallen she/her: That's right, thanks for the reminder Kali.

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): yes

Theresa Mai (she/her): I'm ready.

Annie Kallen she/her: yes

Nina Khanjan she/her: Yes

Ana del Rocío (she/her): yes

Theresa Mai (she/her): 5 minutes left.

Annie Kallen she/her: yes

Samantha Gladu: yes

Kali Odell (she/her): You can return to this discussion if there's time at the end of the meeting.

Annie Kallen she/her: It looked good to me.

Maja Harris (she/her): Looks great

Timur Ender (he/they): I'm good with gender neutral charter amendment; no comment.

Nina Khanjan she/her: Sounds good but I don't see the link in the chat

Theresa Mai (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Gender%20Neutral%20Charter%20Amendment%20Text.pdf>

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): yes

Annie Kallen she/her: I'm ready

Kali Odell (she/her): To be clear: this is the final vote

Timur Ender (he/they): I'm good; no comment

Theresa Mai (she/her): No comment.

Jude (they/them): no questions for me

Annie Kallen she/her: no questions

Danica Leung: no qs for me

Maja Harris (she/her): No questions

Samantha Gladu: I agree with public comment that on RCV we should specify "instant runoff ranked choice voting" and/or include the clarification offered by Bob Weinstein which describes the method of voting

Marc Gonzales (he,him): I agree that we should specify that "Instant Runoff" is our preferred mode.

Samantha Gladu: This is the paragraph Annie and Maja are referring to: "The Mayor and the Auditor are elected at-large using a method of ranked choice voting known as instant runoff voting. Instant runoff voting elects the candidate who has a majority of the vote after the initial round of counting based on the number of first rankings each candidate receives. If no candidate receives a majority of the vote in the initial round, subsequent rounds are counted in which (i) candidates retain the number of votes counted for them in the first and any subsequent rounds that already occurred; and (ii) the candidates having the fewest votes are successively eliminated in rounds and their votes are counted as votes for the candidates who are ranked next on the ballots that had been counted for the eliminated candidates. The process of eliminating candidates and transferring their votes to the next-ranked candidate on ballots repeats until a candidate has a majority of the vote."

Theresa Mai (she/her): FYI 5 minutes left until we lose quorum.

Kali Odell (she/her): We may not lose quorum, at 7:45. But I do know a couple of people need to leave. If there is still a quorum and the committee would like to continue discussion, you can decide to do so.

Theresa Mai (she/her): Thank you, Kali.

Samantha Gladu: The process of eliminating candidates and transferring their votes to the next-ranked candidate on ballots repeats until a candidate has a majority of the vote.

Samantha Gladu: The process of eliminating candidates and transferring their votes to the next-ranked candidate on ballots repeats until a candidate has a majority of the vote if additional rankings are available.

Maja Harris (she/her): I think it's clear enough as is.

Samantha Gladu: agree

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): agree

Theresa Mai (she/her): I think it's fine. We're focused on intent not wordsmithing.

Jude (they/them): ^same

Timur Ender (he/they): same as Theresa

Ana del Rocío (she/her): ^ditto

Nina Khanjan she/her: Yes fine

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): yes

Timur Ender (he/they): yes

Danica Leung: yes

Theresa Mai (she/her): yes

Nina Khanjan she/her: Yes

Jude (they/them): Yes

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): I do

Danica Leung: I can stay longer

Ana del Rocío (she/her): I can stay until 8:20

Nina Khanjan she/her: I do

Jude (they/them): I can stay a little longer

Samantha Gladu: yes

J'reyesha Brannon: Til 8!

Georgina Miltenberger (she/her): Thanks everyone!

Kali Odell (she/her): It's fine to just focus on the report next meeting

Nina Khanjan she/her: Is it ok if I go or do you need me for quorum?sorry miss3d that

Timur Ender (he/they): I agree on using meeting time to discuss and vote on as many things as possible

Theresa Mai (she/her): Short summaries are ok.

Theresa Mai (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Good%20Government%20Hotline%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Theresa Mai (she/her): No comment from me.

Annie Kallen she/her: ready

Ana del Rocío (she/her): Let's goooo

Theresa Mai (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Charter%20Review%20Application%20and%20Selection%20Process%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Kali Odell (she/her): We may still have 9 people at 8:00

Samantha Gladu: I think the other auditor's one will be easy!

Samantha Gladu: I agree with Marc :)

Theresa Mai (she/her): <https://multco-web7-psh-files-usw2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Auditor%20Access%20to%20Information%20Subcommittee%20Recommendation%20Form.pdf>

Theresa Mai (she/her): ^auditor

Kali Odell (she/her): We can't defer any of these votes to your next meeting, unfortunately, since that doesn't allow time for Katherine to draft.

Theresa Mai (she/her): no comments from me

Maja Harris (she/her): I have one more comment

Kali Odell (she/her): "I ask that the language presented to voters also include my office's access to county government employees, information, and records related to all of the Auditor's Office's work. In other words, this ability to access employees, information, and records should not just be related to audits, but also should be related to work of the hotline and ombudsperson."

Kali Odell (she/her): What the auditor wrote

Maja Harris (she/her): That's it. Thank you.

Theresa Mai (she/her): I feel comfortable.

Samantha Gladu: like

Annie Kallen she/her: yes

Jude (they/them): yes

Ana del Rocío (she/her): I can stay a little longer to discuss that.

Theresa Mai (she/her): I can stay if needed.

Jude (they/them): I can stay a bit longer too

Kali Odell (she/her) to J'reyesha Brannon: Jay, if you need to leave, that's totally understandable.

J'reyesha Brannon: Have to hop off - do we still have quorum?

Kali Odell (she/her): yes

Theresa Mai (she/her): Yes

J'reyesha Brannon: Thanks everyone!!

J'reyesha Brannon: Great work!

Theresa Mai (she/her): Thanks for staying on, Jay!

Kali Odell (she/her): The leadership selection piece was actually voted on in the first Charter review vote

Kali Odell (she/her): The engagement process was part of the other vote

Theresa Mai (she/her): I'll still be here. I'm just getting water to refresh my brain.

Ana del Rocío (she/her): I strongly support the part about more budgeting for community outreach, including outreach to community-based advocates.

Kali Odell (she/her): The engagement piece was part of the first vote already

Samantha Gladu: Nice nice nice

Samantha Gladu: I think too, some senate districts have a sliver of various counties in them

Theresa Mai (she/her): I'm in one of these districts. It's hard to recruit folks, since it has a tiny sliver of Multnomah.

Ana del Rocío (she/her): Diverse applicant pool isn't the same as diverse appointees. The latter is my interest.

Theresa Mai (she/her): I'm ready to vote.

Jude (they/them): ready

Kali Odell (she/her): I've heard some interest in adding a requirement that OCI appoint a diverse committee, including geographic diversity, is that included?

Annie Kallen she/her: Can we clarify what specifically we are voting on?

Ana del Rocío (she/her): agreed on expanded definition

Annie Kallen she/her: I'm okay leaving it broad. But if we do have a list of types of diversity, I would just want to include geographical diversity in that list.

Marc Gonzales (he,him): I believe that the County includes the preference for diversity of many types in every outward-reaching search for volunteers.

Samantha Gladu: Thank you for clarifying — I think it is worth specifying a diverse committee. The outreach efforts for current charter review process were outstanding; hope that can continue

Theresa Mai (she/her): Yes.

Samantha Gladu: Yes yes yes

Ana del Rocío (she/her): I think our current committee has benefitted from rich diversity; I'd want that going forward for the county. Enshrining a requirement for diversity in appointments (to the extent legally possible) can do that.

Jude (they/them): yes

Annie Kallen she/her: let's do it!

Samantha Gladu: And thank you, Maja, for leading us through so many recs tonight

Samantha Gladu: wowwww

Ana del Rocío (she/her): Congrats, everyone!

Danica Leung: 🙌

Maja Harris (she/her): Thanks for putting up with me ;-)

Samantha Gladu: Is this the most recommendations a multco charter review committee has ever put fwd?

Annie Kallen she/her: Thanks Allison!!

Ana del Rocío (she/her): we heart Allison

Maja Harris (she/her): Thank you, Allison!!!!

Danica Leung: Thank you sm Allison!!

Annie Kallen she/her: <3

Allison Brown (she/her): I heart y'all too!

Samantha Gladu: ♡

Danica Leung: The lifeblood of the committee

Jude Perez: Sorry about that

Marc Gonzales (he,him): We have benefited greatly from your help!!

Timur Ender (he/they): There was talk about bundling [at the ballot?] re: the 3 auditor related amendments. It would be great to get more info about that during or before next mtg.