



## Charter Review Commission (CRC) Regular Meeting Minutes May 20, 2021

**1. Call to Order** – 10:04am

**2. Roll Call:** Tony Ghazel absent. Tom Starr joined a bit late.

Members of the Public: Amy Vira, Alexandra Gayek, Christine Minney, Carl de Boor, Michelline Halliday, Milene Henley, Minor Lile, Randy Gaylord, Jamie Stephens, (360) 445-7090, (360) 790-7174

**2a. Land Acknowledgement**

**3. Committee Report – Justice & Equity Committee:**

Jane Fuller shared PowerPoint. Jane Fuller and Kyle Davies co-presented.

Highlighted Res. 31-2020 - core values guiding county conduct - the Justice & Equity Committee's proposed amendments draw from the commitment to this.

Discussion on expanding some language and repositioning some. Jane agreed with these suggestions.

Jane will ask the PA's office about adding language that employees or prospective employees cannot be discriminated against for being pregnant.

**Motion by Anne Marie**, seconded by Maureen, to add these language changes:

Kevin: Some issues are covered in state and federal law, and we're underscoring those in our county Charter that our county is prioritizing these.

**Friendly amendment by Liz** to add pregnancy to the list.

**Friendly amendment accepted** by Anne Marie and Maureen.

More discussion on language – Jane supported the suggested language.

**Friendly amendment by Bob** to add this language: "Hiring and conditions of employment are the words generally used."

**Friendly amendment accepted** by Anne Marie and Maureen.

Jane: Pregnancy would be included in clauses 1 & 2.

David's language would be in the 1st clause only.

Janet's suggestion to move language to the top of the document.

David's addition to add "all staff" on the second line.

**Vote on motion with friendly amendments** to adopt all four changes and items 1 & 2 as presented by the committee with changes as stated: **Motion carried unanimously.**

Jane presented on 2<sup>nd</sup> Article, parts B&C (the meat and potatoes of the committee's work) – explained the reasoning for creating a new Justice, Equity and Inclusion Commission, the broad purpose mandate and tasks of this body, and the situation with including tribal members on this new commission.

Discussion of whether to have two issues on the ballot or to combine them into one issue for the ballot.

Discussion about fair representation on the new commission.

David D: Agrees with Bob that a reference to the Charter needs to be included – no need to specify a section, but include "consistent with the county Charter" and that carries forward.

Kevin: This commission would be chosen by the SJCC.

Janet: Add that language should not be a barrier to being on this committee – translator/interpreter will be provided.

Olivia: In order to stick, make sure it completely adheres to Randy's recommendations – maybe set aside some time to work directly with Amy and Randy.

Jane: That's already in process. There are some changes already made based on what Randy sent us on Monday.

Maureen: Since the goal is to execute Res. 31-2020, what kind of teeth are in here to make it stick?

(Kyle had to leave the meeting for EMS response)

Jane: Justice, Equity & Inclusion Commission can have intersection with mandates of the Judicial branch.... It will be its role to review and take stock of what's happening there and in the Sheriff's office and treatment of employees in management of the county government. Can produce reports, should welcome engagement from the public. Teeth lie in the transparency with which this commission would function in collaboration with county government - a lot about relationships, authentic intent.

Kevin: Two possible friendly amendments:

1. Addition of reference to the first point in the commission point.
2. Janet's suggestion that language not be a barrier and interpreters will be provided.

We could vote to move both items forward and have committee reinvestigate possibility of having just one ballot measure rather than two. That allows the committee to look into this further. But the CRC will have moved forward in terms of putting these changes into the Charter with the two friendly amendments suggested.

**Motion by Dick, seconded by Maureen.**

More discussion on whether this should be one or two amendments on the ballot.

Jane invited others to join the Justice & Equity committee's meeting on Monday 5/24 at 4pm. She's not comfortable with combining the two amendments at this stage.

Anne Marie called the question.

**Vote: Motion carried.** 16 in favor, 1 opposed (Bob) – wanted to add a friendly amendment.

Jane presented on Proposed Amendment C – Purpose of Personnel System – recommendation relating to inefficiencies having to improve minor amendments by ordinance - a very minor change found in 1<sup>st</sup> sentence.

**Motion by Maureen**, seconded by David D. to accept Jane's recommendation

**Vote: Motion carried (unanimously).**

Jane presented on Section 8.20 – Exemptions. In consultation with the Operations Committee, proposed two clauses as amendments to the Charter.

Maureen thinks this is perfect and solves a lot of problems. Maybe add "volunteers including ..." – then Operations can drop "exemption" out of theirs – shortens the list.

David D: Add "SJC legislation" – they have a responsibility to uphold the Charter.

Brief discussion.

**Motion by Anne Marie**, seconded by Janet, with addition of commissions, boards and committees as directed by \_\_\_\_\_ (?)

Brief Discussion.

**Motion carried (unanimously).**

Jane: Presented on proposed amendment to Article 9, Section 9.21 – Vacancy.

Discussion, including:

Dick: This is a really critical and desirable change.

Kevin: Important designation – suggested reversing the language to put it in the positive.

Discussion.

Jane: The intent is to make the situation more equitable for everybody. We can all have exceptional personal circumstances that deserve to be heard to allow for specific circumstances.

**Motion by Bob**, seconded by Maureen, to adopt as discussed to include full commission and public meetings.

**Vote: Motion carried unanimously.**

Jane: Presented on proposed amendment to Article 20, Section 2.60 - Miscellaneous Appointments – an effort to ensure Res. 31-2020 is embedded in our Charter.

**Motion by Maureen**, seconded by David D., to accept this.

Discussion, including having tribal members who aren't residents of San Juan County.

Kevin: Go to the tribes as ask who they would like to represent their vote and see if there's a nomination from the tribes. There are members of Coasts Salish tribes who are residents of SJC, but we would ask the tribes.

Jane: We're not being specific about requiring a certain status within a tribe. We want to know if there are individuals who are interested in engaging with us on this level.

**Friendly Amendment by Liz** – given earlier comment from the public about exceptional job the county is already doing, invites language that acknowledges where good work is being done already.

David D: Called the question.

Brief discussion, Liz Jane, Maureen, Sharon.

**Vote:** To accept recommendation from committee as is to add to existing text. **Motion carried.** Either 13 or 14 (?) in favor (not sure if Janet was present for this vote); 2 abstentions (Dick & Bill). Olivia was not present for this vote.

Jane not sure what to do with Liz's friendly amendment. Maybe try to add some language after the vote? She doesn't see the relevance to this proposed amendment.

Jane: Presented on a Land Acknowledgment being incorporated at the very beginning of the Charter and be spoken as a matter of practice. Acknowledged that Kyle had worked on this piece.

Discussion, including:

David D: Request to delete "let us" – instead should say "and honors".

Jane: Noted.

**Friendly Amendment** by Kevin: Change aboriginal to indigenous – a more appropriate term.

Kevin made the edits.

Patty: Prefers "We" to "SJC" at the beginning, even if not grammatically correct.

Bob, Bill, Liz, and Kevin agreed with Patty.

Kevin: Final sentence: Treaty rights are not passed down from generation to generation. Better to say "We honor and respect Indigenous treaty rights."

Jane: This language was discussed between SJC Natural Resources and tribal members. It's not ours to make major changes. Suggested that the CRC approve the proposed amendment subject to the wording being deliberated further by the committee, which will propose revised text to the full CRC.

Bob noted that this very acknowledgment has been used for at least a year in another body.

**Motion by Liz**, seconded by Maureen, to put tribal acknowledgment as first 1A item in the Charter.

**Vote: Motion carried unanimously.**

Jane: Presented on proposed recommendations and findings re Law & Justice Council: Primary purpose is to ensure that there is citizen representation in this body.

Jane explained the significant difference between the existing Law & Justice Council, derived from a state statute, and the proposed new Justice, Equity and Inclusion Commission.

According to Judge Loring, there was no communication between the 3 branches of government about implementation of Res. 31-2020, though it intersects with the Judicial branch. Res. 31-2020 wasn't touching the Law & Justice Council at all until the CRC Justice & Equity Committee started asking about it. It's reasonable for the council to have some citizen representation, though excluded from certain sensitive subject matter.

The Justice, Equity and Inclusion Commission will be a citizen-led body with an advisory function, and quite a significant membership. The council and this new commission don't overlap.

Discussion, including:

Concern expressed that this would be confusing to the public.

Kevin noted that this would not be on the ballot – it would be a recommendation to the SJCC.

Sharon noted the need for outreach and education.

Bob summed up: The new Justice, Equity and Inclusion Commission is a citizen-led organization that is a county project. The Law & Justice Council is a non-citizen-led state project.

The two recommendations are:

1. To include a citizen on Law & Justice Council.
2. That the Law & Justice Council be more transparent in its functioning and function more like a proper body.

**Motion by Paul**, seconded by Bob, to move both recommendations 1 and 2 forward.

**Vote: Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. Discussion of Ranked Choice Voting** – Postponed until next week.

Kevin asked that those who wanted to have another RCV discussion contact Kevin, Olivia and Kathryn, and be prepared to speak to why we should bring this up again. Put together a brief slide deck – doesn't want a tit-for-tat but put together why RCV is really important and why the CRC should consider it for SJC – should be thoughtful and thought provoking.

Since Bill can't attend next week's meetings, he will submit a written statement on RCV for people to review next week.

**5. Follow up to May 6** – Postponed until next week.

- \_Minimum qualifications for elected office
- \_Electing the County Manager/Executive (Mike Thomas present)

**6. Review of approved motions, continued** – Postponed until next week.

**7. New Business – \_add additional regular meeting next week:**

Kevin wants to get Mike Thomas early on an agenda so he doesn't have to wait and then leave the meeting. Added another regular weekly CRC meeting - Tuesdays from 4:00-6:30, so the CRC will now be having 3 meetings per week, starting this Tuesday, May 25.

**8. Open for Public Comment (11:50am):**

**Public Comment:**

Linnea Anderson: SJC developed an infant-at-work policy. County made workarounds for her to work remotely and to bring her infant to work when she was very small - supports working families. The Auditor has gone above and beyond to advocate for her working parents. Good to put this into the Charter.

Alexandra Gayek: Great work.

1. We need to be careful about leaning on state and federal statutes to protect us – the county has the ability to develop more stringent regulations, we just can't be more lax. Name the things we want to protect.

2. Representation question – there's a broad variety of concerns in every group we want represented. Is it fair for the SJCC to assume it knows who is someone who can represent the majority of views within a group of people? Maybe add something to the application process or have a petition with signatures from people in that group to show alignment behind and level of support for that person.

**ADJOURNMENT** – Adjourned at 1:00 pm.

Sharon Abreu  
CRC Member

*Minutes were approved by consensus at the May 25, 2021 Special Meeting*