

Civic Engagement Commission 6.22.22

>> Can we make sure that each Commissioner shows their faces on this thing. I think it would be good for the public to show everybody that is visible.

>> I usually ask them to do at the beginning after we start. We need to wait for a quorum, I will go off camera until that time.

>> Good afternoon everybody, or good evening, rather. I believe we have quorum; is that correct, Abby?

>> Yes, we do. Do you want me to go through?

>> No, it's okay. As long as I will get to the attendance portion after I open up. So I would love to call to order the Civic Engagement Commission public hearing focused on a proposed rule to change the minimum age to vote in city wide participatory budgeting. And we are live streaming this hearing as part of the open meeting guidelines and again, want to welcome everyone, including anyone who may be participating through the live stream, thank you so much for taking the time to be with us today and I want to also start off by thanking the staff members of the Civic Engagement Commission who have been working diligently to help coordinate today's hearings and colleagues from the law department and operations who guided us with respect to the City Administrative Procedure Act and also members of the Civic Engagement Commission participatory budgeting advisory committee and pipelines, youth fellows to lead in CEC's participatory budgeting processes that we've held over the last two years.

I'll go over some technical assistance information that is noted in the slides. So as we begin, I think you could switch to slide view. And I'll go

through the first two slides for anyone who may be new to our meetings so they understand the protocol. It's still showing. If you hit from beginning it should help you on the top left. It's showing all the slides on the left. So it's not in presenter view for some reason. I'm sorry.

>> Forgive me.

>> On the left side top corner, does it say show from the beginning, I don't know, I can't tell. In either case I could go through, if you just move to the next slide I can go through it and I think people should be able to see it.

>> I'm not sure. Because I'm seeing it full screen.

>> So for our hearings and meetings that are virtual, we usually for all the Commissioners your audio is enabled and we ask that you mute yourself if your not speaking. We also request that all Commissioners have their video cameras on during the meeting as we would if we were in person context. Unless you have some important reason to have your camera off we do ask that Commissioners be on camera, to everyone on this meeting, this is eggs is being recorded and streamed and you are free to turn your camera off if you wish, but we encourage comes and everyone to participate with your camera on. Participants are muted onagri and the moderator will enable (Inaudible) owe for participants during the public testimony period: We will be calling prior to the hearing and then for anyone who is registered during the hearing. Abby, I'm still seeing your first slide. I don't know if everyone else is seeing the first thing as I am.

>> Oh.

>> I think you need to, if you haven't already done so, you

probably need to download the deck and play it off your hard drive, there we go. Okay. Now I can see it. Thank you so much. As I was saying, we'll be calling on people in the order that they registered prior to the public hearing and then if you're registering during the public hearing we'll call on you to offer your comments in the order that you sign up.

If you haven't already signed up and would like to provide testimony you may sign up until 6:30 p.m. There are two ways that you can do this. One you may type your name and affiliation in the chat, to offer public testimony. The other way that you can sign up is if you're not in front of a computer monitor you can use a phone to text sign up. And you can text your name and affiliation to 917-587-9103. And you would text your name and affiliation and again we will call on you in the order that we received your name. Due to technical issues with web ex live captioning is happening today through a link that is posted in the chat. Is that correct Abby?

>> Yes.

>> Or to the captions, is that correct, am I giving out correct information.

>> Yes. Okay. So there is live captioning through a link and for anyone who needs captioning you should be able to click on this link and you'll be able to see the captions. And for members of the public who are with us today on the WebEx call, if you're not already on the Civic Engagement Commission's list, e-mail us, I'm going to drop the sign up form into the chat to be on our e-mail list. Also, if you are a member of the press, you can connect directly with our Director of Communications and intragov affairs. Through the chat you can message him directly and you can also e-mail and if you

could just drop your e-mail into the chat if there are any members of the press here, that would be helpful.

Abby, I'm not seeing the deck anymore. Yeah, you have to be careful. In preparing for this hearing I'm going to ask the Civic Engagement Commissioner's to briefly introduce themselves. We are going to have the Commissioner's vote on a statement regarding our virtual public meeting in relation to the open meeting law. The way that we're going to do the intros, I'm going to call on the first person I'm seeing on my screen and then if you could please pop it over to another Commissioner who hasn't spoken, this way question get all the Commissioners. I am Sarah Sayeed, the executive director of the Civic Engagement Commission and I am going to send it over to Michael Nussbaum.

>> I'm mayoral appointee.

>> Do you want to send it to someone else?

>> Go down to, let's say, Chuck is below me. Go ahead Chuck.

>> Hello everybody, my name is Chuck Appelian. I am the Queens borough President appointee. Let's see, I see a name, Donna Gill.

>> Donna Gill, appointee, community Central Harlem.

>> Pass to someone else Donna.

>> Amy Breedlove.

>> Amy Breedlove, mayoral appointee, Brooklyn. I will pass it to Murad.

>> Hey folks, he and his Murad, hoping everyone has a great evening tonight. Commissioner and professionally I'm the executive director of the -- coalition, and I will pass it to my sister Lillian.

>> Lillian Perez, the Bronx borough Commissioner, my day job is vice president of community relations for Montefiore health system, I'll pass it onto, who is left, Jose, I can see you.

>> I'm saying I don't see the captioning. My name is Jose Hernandez, I am a mayoral appointee, also the President of the New York City chapter of united spine association and I'm a person with a disability. I will pass to Eva.

>> Hi, I'm the Brooklyn borough President's appointee, my pronouns are she, hers and my day job I'm the chairperson of the planning department at Pratt institute and I will pass it onto Annetta.

>> Good evening everyone, my name is Anetta, I'm the executive director of community development corporation during the day as my day job and I am a mayoral appointee from Queens. And did everyone go, oh Mark.

>> Hi there, I'm Mark, I am the Manhattan borough President's appointee and also a member of community board 7 in mat han tan, unlike Chuck who is community board 7 in Queens my day job is as a practicing attorney. My pronouns are he, him and I'm looking for anybody else who I should be passing the ball to.

>> That might be me.

>> Is Reverend Holly Bonner ready to go?

>> I am, my pronouns are she, her hers. I am the director of spirituality and civic engagement at Wagner college and the mayoral appointee of Staten Island. I am a woman when he is visually impaired so I'll go back to Dr. Sarah Sayeed.

>> Thank you so much holly. Natalie.

>> Hi, I am going to finish my technical issue to get my camera on but I am Natalie DeVito Staten Island borough President appointee and a person a disability. Commissioner.

>> Thank you so much. I believe that covers all the Commissioners. So now we are going to discuss the resolution that I shared earlier about our virtual meeting. Did everyone get the text of the resolution? Or I should ask, has anyone not received the text of the resolution, you can raise your hand, we'll make sure you get it. So the resolution is related to our virtual meeting and as everyone knows under the open meeting law we are required as a Commission to hold in person meetings and hearings and more recently the New York State open meeting law was amended to add new provisions that specify how and when a public body can use video conferencing in conducting its meetings. These provisions are found in part WW of chapter 56 of the laws of 2022. The new law provides that if a state disaster emergency is declared by the governor or local state of emergency is in effect in the city, a public body may continue to hold its meetings entirely remotely, so long as it determines that the circumstances giving rise to the emergency make it difficult to hold the meetings in person. So what our resolution does is allows us to meet remotely until such a time as the governor ends the state disaster emergency and the mayor ends the city state of emergency, related to COVID-19 transmission or such a time that the Commission concludes that the circumstances that necessitated the emergency declarations by the governor and mayor would no longer affect or impair our ability to hold in-person meetings. So understanding that and I'm assuming everyone read through the resolution, is there any discussion that

you would like to have before we move to approve the resolution?

>> Can I jump in.

>> Yes, Murad and Chuck.

>> This is for emergency use because obviously we're still in a pandemic but at some point we should probably have a conversation about potentially having hybrid as an option even when we go back to in person.

That actual question about the resolution.

>> Yes, thank you. Chuck.

>> I just had a question, I'm confused because there was an or at the end and it almost seemed like once the emergency is rescinded by the mayor and the governor, we still have our own decision to say if we feel it's a problem we can continue?

>> That's a really good point. Maybe it's not necessarily after but it could be before.

>> I'm sorry.

>> Legal perspective in advance.

>> I'm sorry to be jumping in but I can't see where, I don't know that there's a raised hand function on my phone so I apologize for being rude. The whole thing is subject to the limitation that going forward even if we were to adopt provision for hybrid meetings and I would recommend that we do that whenever it's convenient, doesn't have to be today, that the law still requires that a quorum, so a minimum of half plus one of us must be in person at one or more locations where the public can also be present. So unless there is, unless we adopt a resolution that says that the next state of emergency will trigger the ability to be again wholly remote, that will be our limitation on what it

is that we can do in a hybrid resolution. Thanks.

>> Thank you, do you have a comment on the "or" because Chuck just asked about that, the last part of the resolution that says until the emergency ends or until the Commission concludes that the circumstances . . .

>> My connection. Okay. My comment is that that's a well taken concern, so if the resolution were to be amended to say, or as continues subject to the provisions of the open meetings law then there would be no ambiguity.

>> I'm sorry, I didn't follow that.

>> That last clause, if you qualify that last clause, to say or the second phrase, I don't have it in front of me, forgive me.

>> Do you want me to read it?

>> Yeah. I'm sorry.

>> I can also drop it into the chat, it says therefore our resolution allows us to meet remotely until such a time as the governor ends the state disaster emergency and the mayor ends the city state of emergency based on COVID-19 transmission, or such a time that the Commission concludes that the circumstances necessitating the emergency declarations by the governor and mayor would no longer effect or impair the ability of a Commission to hold in person meetings.

>> So tack onto that hold in person meetings in compliance with the open-meetings law. And then you're fine.

>> No, that's not --

>> I think the or, sorry, I'm jumping in. The or just gives power to the Commission to decide to hold an in person meeting even if the governor

and the mayor are saying that we have the option to hold an open meeting virtually, we at our discretion can hold a public meeting. That is what the or reads to me, Mark.

>> I agree with that Amy.

>> I got it backwards then, forgive me.

>> I put it into the chat.

>> So what we're reading and what Amy just clarified is that technically that means that we could say that we want this meeting to be in person even though we've been told that we can go virtual. So during the time that the governor or the mayor executive order is in place we can decide on our own that it's safe to meet even though the executive order says not to.

>> It's not that the executive order says not to, it says that you have the option to hold a virtual open meeting. But we may decide that we want to have some sort of meeting where we want to be somewhere and then in person and that would give us the right to do that.

>> But the executive order gives us the option then this is duplicative.

>> I also read it differently, where I agree with Amy's definition of it but the first option is that this will remain in order, in place until the mayor and the governor rescind, or that we feel there's a need for meeting. So it's not just if the order is rescinded, or expired, this can continue as per the Commission, which is why I think leaving it as is makes sense because I think the last rescission of the emergency order happened very abruptly and left us in a vicarious position in trying to figure out space and where we're going to meet and all that. This gives us the opportunity to have some control over our

Commission.

>> But Murad, you're saying that extends the option, this says that we can cut it short. I think it's the opposite.

>> I just unmuted myself. One of the items that was mentioned through this discussion was the possibility for hybrid. And that it would necessitate a quorum. In person, in other words, we do have the means potentially to allow for hybrid as long as we do have an in-person car refresh your memory and just speaking as one of several disabled Commissioners I would say that if we have the option of hybrid, what I would like to do is take some of the difficulty, the burden off of our several disabled fellow Commissioners and insure that we have an in-person car refresh your memory even if that means someone, one disabled Commissioner is attending a live meeting while several others do not have to be in person. So in other words --

>> I think that is a very good -- but I think I would amend our bylaws because our bylaws do state that we have to be in person.

>> This is the time that I'm looking to introduce that idea so no further action is taken without consideration of the burden of, we've got Commissioners in the Bronx that may have to depend on public transportation difficulties or whatever. I'm in Staten Island, it's probably one of the worst locations to have to abruptly pop into Manhattan for, unless we're talking about rotating boroughs for meetings, I just don't want any situation where every Commissioner must have the undue burden of transportation.

>> Michael.

>> I would recommend that we ask that the chair of the

Commission take the question back to the law department to get clarification and to allow the flexibility of the Commission based on the interpretation of "or," that we have the flexibility to be able to determine given the state of COVID and any other conditions that may arise for the ability of the Chair to decide that it's appropriate to have either a hybrid or an in-person or a virtual meeting or any one of the three and allow us to govern ourselves unless someone says different. You can ask the law department for interpretation and they will probably have pages and pages but I would assume they're all intelligent enough to understand what both Amy has interpreted and I think everyone understands that we have the flexibility of doing what is best for the Commission as well as protecting everybody.

>> This sounds like we're not ready to -- we have some additional questions.

>> Thank you for pointing that out. Eve and --

>> So I also wanted to point out the use of the word earlier. Shall remain in effect until the earlier of these two options. So I think we need some clarification around that because it does seem to imply that it's sequential. If the state of emergency rescinded then we no longer have the option, that happens prior to any decision.

>> We need to mute everybody.

>> Apologize. That was my little sister. Thank you.

>> Eve, were you finished?

>> Yeah, I just wanted clarification on the use of the word earlier.

>> Could I ask a question. Sarah, do we need to vote on this today?

>> I think the purpose of doing this, asking us to vote on it was that it allows us essentially to hold this virtual hearing, at a time when the open meeting law has, was, it took effect. And it took effect on June 9th specifically. So it was intended to allow us to do this. However, if we have questions we can, I mean I think that it makes sense for us to take this back to the law department, maybe have a meeting to clarify questions and then come back to our next public gathering and vote then.

>> May I jump in?

>> Yes, Mark.

>> So if there is any question as to whether we can actually do this the way we're doing it and we need the resolution in order to do it, then I would move the recessive solution and put it on the agenda for the next meeting to clarify or amend or change. But make sure we can actually hold this meeting that we're now about to hold. If that's the stop gap here, maybe that's an appropriate thing to do.

>> Okay, that sounds like a reasonable solution to me. So if we're going to go with that approach, is there, can I hear a motion to approve the resolution?

>> I move.

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> All in favor of the resolution say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Anyone opposed?

>> Okay, so we are approving the resolution and we will go back to the law department with some of these questions and circle back with a proposed amendment as needed or if needed. We'll circle back in our next meeting. So we spent a lot of time talking about that, so I want to turn to the topic that we're gathered here today to discuss. So we're going to be hearing about the proposed rule change for the minimum age to vote in participatory budgeting. Before we do that, I just wanted to remind everyone also about what we're doing here in terms of changing the rule and situating it in context of how city policies, rules and laws are made. We have been through a rulemaking hearing before for our poll site language assistance program, and as people may know, a rule is very specific to city agencies so the work of a city agency, and it defines how agencies implement relevant laws when conducting their programs and this rule is only applicable to CEC, it's not applicable to other city agencies. And what makes a rule is that there's, there are specific processes that agencies have to follow under the city wide administrative procedure act or CAPA. We have to for example when changes rule we were to post the change in the rule for public comment for a minimum of 30 days and we have to hold a public hearing. This is different from a law, which also goes through a public hearing process, a law is initiated as a bill, is sponsored by a legislator, group of legislators, council members voted on in the City Council and signed off by the mayor and there are a lot of rules that impact public life, some of these rules include things like speed limits, stand, driving, garbage collection, noise rules and what's great about this process is that we're allowing for the public to review the rules and provide feedback before they're finalized and of course if we did have this process we

would be making rules sort of in the abstract and may not, may create rules that are not helpful to the public and may potentially even make things more difficult or cause harm, so this public input process that we are all here for is a really important part of our democracy and how New York City works. So leading to the rule change presentation what I want to do is do a very quick overview of the Civic Engagement Commission for anyone who may not be familiar with the program and turn to the participatory budgeting team to talk about the PB process and the rule change. After that we'll begin the comment period and each commenter will speak for about three minutes and we'll have a timer to help us stay on track. Once all the commenters finish then the Commission may ask clarifying questions. Depending how we're doing on time we may need to restrict the number of clarifying questions that we have. Then if Commissioners have no questions I will open the floor to questions from staff. And so I'm going to go over the slide that we left off at that provides an overview of the CEC, if you can get that back up. Abby.

>> Great. So for anyone, I'm assuming that everyone here is here because they know the history of the CEC and who we are. We were created by ballot initiative. We are charged with promoting inclusive civic participation, and building, strengthening civic trust and democracy in New York City. Our charter charges include city wide participatory budgeting which we are going to be speaking about today. Language assistance at poll sites, we provide translation interpretation services for limited English proficient voters at selected poll sites in 11 languages, we work with community boards to provide technical support and training to community board members, more recently there was an executive order that brought

democracy NYC into the civic engagement Commission through that program working on voter participation through voter registration, public education and policy reform. And the CEC also works through partnerships to provide greater education of the public about city services and civic engagement opportunities. Next I'm going to turn it over to Lexi Spencer, who is one of our phenomenal interns who will go through the overall participatory budgeting goals and steps. After that our advisor for participatory budgeting Daniella, will provide specific information on the rule we'll be discussing today. Lexi, the floor is yours.

>> Are you able to unmute?

>> Lexi?

>> I don't think she's connected to audio but I can put back the slides.

>> It looks like she's -- I can see her but --

>> No Lexi, I don't think you're connected to audio.

>> Okay. We can't hear you. So Daniela.

>> Yeah, we can put up the slides. Do you see the slides?

>> YouTube studios.

>> Oh, okay.

>> We can see it, it just needs to be on slide view.

>> That's fine. Good evening everyone. Just wanted to do a quick interaction to our goals and vision for the citywide participatory budgeting program, goal one is to address equity issues, goal two is promote greater respect for lived experience within city government, goal three, build civic leaders and aid grassroots organizing efforts in the city, goal 4, bridge gaps in

knowledge, goal five, increase civic engagement among under represented communities and goal 6 is strengthen confidence and trust in local government. Starting in July of this year the CEC will begin the process of running New York City's first participatory budgeting program, will decide how to spend \$5 million of mayoral expense funding, this process is distinct from the local process run by City Council members.

Next slide. Just going to go through quickly, what the steps in the process will be. For the citywide PB program, first step needs assessment, we're going to correct data from several sources that will be used to inform project development and project eligibility criteria. This will be the basis and will inform the conversations that are partner community-based organizations will hold throughout the city. To brainstorm ideas for expense projects. Then we will partner with new CEOs and different stakeholders to establish equity criterias and project betting and development. Projects determined to meet the cry tear will be developed into proposals that can be implemented after the winners have been decided. Open call will be conducted inviting organizations to apply to implement those projects. Then we have voting, residents vote online by paper ballot or by phone, and then we have the project implementation and monitoring phase. So the rule change that we're going to talk about today pertains directly to voting. The current rule as it stands now provides that any New York City resident at least 16 years of age may participate in the citywide PB program. The current charter also authorizes the Commission to establish by rule a minimum age requirement, lower than 16. So what we are proposing is to set the minimum age for participation in the citywide PB program at 11 years of age. By lowering this

age we alien with the eligibility criteria for City Council participatory budgeting program as well as the program that DOE operates in middle schools around the city. The charter also authorizes restrictions for the protection of minors who participate in the citywide PB program, this means the proposal will require that children between the ages of 13 and 17 obtain parental consent before registering on our platform, and then we also are saying that children under the age of 13 are not allowed to register for an account on the digital platform and those who are not able to do so will be able to vote and participate through other methods in the citywide PB program, including paper ballots and maybe other tools.

Next slide. So that was a summary of the proposed rule. I'll turn it back to Dr. Sayeed.

>> Thanks so much. Daniela and we are going to now turn to the comment period for members of the public who signed up to make comments and as I mentioned before, we are going to call on you in the order that we received your sign up. And then if there are additional people who would like to sign up you may drop your name into the chat or text as I gave the number before, which was 917-587-9103. The order that I have right now based on the people who signed up before, I'll just read your name out loud. I have Natalia , Kathy price, Isabel, Kathy knight, Benjamin solitary and careen, sorry if I'm brutally mispronouncing your name Darlene. First, Natalia and everyone has three minutes to speak and after that three minutes is up you may hear from Abby to wrap your testimony up in case you were running over. So Natalia, the floor is yours.

>> Thank you, again I apologize for earlier, that was really my

bad. Hello, my name is -- I am 17 years old and took part in the people's scholarship a 10 month program where youth worked to make civic engagement to make PB more accessible. Personally I've always found it important for youth to be civically involved in the processes around them. After all, after the older generation we are next to inherit the world around us. The law mostly affects today's youth but the older generation that are on their way out. An example would be how public funding is spent within the education system. Many schools tend to adhere to parent's desires for extensive stem programs and college readiness, like in my high school but do not think about the desires of their children. They do not stop to ask us what we want, such as assart programs or mental health services which will affect us more positively now and in the long run. This is one of many examples of course. Hence, why when I was informed that the civic engagement processes were beginning to open to youth my little brother's age, he was an 11 year old, soon to be 12 in November, and is a foster youth as I am and a special needs kid and has expressed many issues about the environment of his school, such as state of the altercations, if his voice had more impact he could also change that environment within his school. It would also make him feel more heard when he is usually not in many instances in his life. This would provide me with more comfort that intellectually gifted and considering youth like him may have an impact on their future and my own.

I think it would be a shame not to include those whose voices are equally as important as yours or my own. Youth in general have much more to give than you may think. So it would be devastating to not let that full potential be expressed. Thank you.

>> Thanks so much Natalya. Next up I believe we have Darlene who is also a PB fellow.

>> Actually, no the next person I have on my list is Kathy price. This is the order that they signed up. I'm assuming that the order I got was as they signed up.

>> No worries. So Kathy, the floor is user.

>> Hi Dr. Sayeed, hello, good to see you and other members of the CEC, it's been a while since I attended one of your meetings but great to reconnect at this, for is this particular topic. So I am in park slope Brooklyn, I am on the district committee for participatory budgeting in district 39 and have been for a number of years. And as you probably know, are aware that brad Lander the council member started PB in district 39 along with several other councilmen over 10 years ago and I think since the beginning the voting age in the district has been 11 and up. So from that perspective, having seen it work and engage our youth, including a vibrant and active engaged youth committee, I definitely support it from that perspective. And also as someone as the parent of two young children who are 8 and 10 who I seek opportunities for them to be engaged in community, I also support this initiative or rule change, and also someone who started an initiative called citizen's world to engage families with young children to be involved in community through small actions, I also support the rule change to allow younger 11 years old and opt students, to vote. I think there are no down sides to this. To the rule change. But there are many opportunities and so I will just name three benefits, three main major benefits, one is that participatory budgeting I see as a gate way to civic engagement, so if we can reduce the obstacles for participation across

the city, you don't have to be a citizen, you can be 11 years old or 6th grade basically and up when our students are getting engaged and more aware of their community and environments, that's a great entry point to civic engagement. Also PB is very tangible and a lot of the projects are visible. So you can, students can relate to a book drop being added to, of their local library and see and feel and be affected by the Ben -- see the benefits of that and I think a lot of our civic projects can feel very abstract and conceptual, so the more that we can make things tangible and visible will be helpful to support engagement. And going back too the idea of removing barriers, reducing barriers to participation, is another major benefit. So I wholeheartedly support this effort and thank you to the CEC for creating this forum for folks to provide testimony. Thank you.

>> Thank you Kathy. Next is Becca Davis. she might not be here. Okay. Isabel Sienna.

>> Hi everyone, my name is Isabel, Luciano, I've been leading PB processes with youth across the country since 2014 where the PB voting age in New York and other cities has typically been 11. I guess I would like to use my three minutes today to show you how matching the age of participation, to young leaders who have pivotal role when implementing PB in New York City as long as we can remember is really critical for survival. So the start of the pandemic in 2020 when the City Council process was put on pause and budgets affecting young people were being slashed the young people, the youth program I was running at that time which was a PB program, asked to continue engaging New Yorkers, they thought it was really crucial especially had this moment in history to do something to continue to engage every day

New Yorkers. And that they did and that's actually how the CEC's it's our money first ever youth PB process started when the CEC ran a PB process along side 11 young people to ask to continue to engage New Yorkers. So brainstorming teams, they worked together to brainstorm which organizations should be included, which youth organizations, a lot of young people knew about, to really invite young people into a conversation about what they needed in this moment. They also designed and facilitated the community conversations with young people on zoom and each time changes to the next discussions, so I wanted, their learnings and their recommendations actually have shaped or become the foundation for writing PB processes online when many adults thought it was impossible. So it's also the reason we've been able to achieve better access right now online despite the fact it's really difficult to engage people when you can't meet them face-to-face. In my experience behind every successful PB process is a thorough youth engagement plan. So all this to say, I've seen countless 11 year olds get excited to vote and fill out a ballot. There's been no issues. The 14 year olds in my program often find it exciting and accessible to engage middle schoolers in their lives and PB presents a really tangible gate way to get involved in our democracy, keeping the age of participation at 16 in the city charter means telling all the 11 year olds who have already voted in our former PB processes that the city no longer deems their input valuable. It would mean telling all the 14 and 15-year-olds that they can no longer participate in what they helped design. It would mean telling all the teachers and youth service providers to help engage New Yorkers year after year there is one less option for their youth to start building civic engagement. The last thing that emerged throughout PB

throughout the years, which in it's sense means removing sources of income and education from our city's youth, as I see it, future colleagues. Thank you for my three minutes. I'll pass it together the next person.

>> Thank you Isabel. So the next person is, I'm not sure if it's Kayla knight.

>> Kayla. Hi, my name is Kayla knight and I also work at participatory budgeting project, I'm the project manager and in my current role I'm responsible for supportive training and governments and school and nonprofit organizations. I work with institutions to insure their budgeting processes really center equity and community wide decision making. I want to share with you how I got to where I am. As a young person I helped implement the first report budgeting process, which is just for youth between the ages of 12 and 25 where they get to decide every year how to spend a million dollars of the capital budget and during this pilot process it was the first of its kind in the U.S., an adults are really hesitant. Can 12 year olds really make decisions around budgeting, I'm here to tell you yes they can, and even younger. So these times are unprecedented, what we would be doing with this money and the process, so the process is now going into it's 8th cycle and I am now tooled to vote in this one and I'm happy to see this process is still going on. I wanted to share some of my favorite projects, a community center that allows for youth to have better access to technology, and create a more conducive learning environment, solar panels on city owned property that will save money in the long term and investing in local farming and neighborhoods to create food access, explicitly targeting areas that are considered food deserts such as my own. Since this is a pilot process I joined the PB team

and became the youngest board member of people power, it's an international nonprofit organization that builds power and impacts organizations while meeting -- builds power and impacts organizations and leaders worldwide who are building a more participatory democracy. So in other words, I'm now teaching others in countries all over the world how to implement PB processes and I don't think I would have had the opportunities at such a young age if I didn't engage in youth participatory budgeting when I did, so I can say with certainty that 11 year olds have the ability to not only be a part of processes but they can also lead PB processes. So thank you for allowing me to speak today.

>> Thank you so much. Next on the list we have Benjamin Solitary.

>> Thank you very much, I just want to clarify, although I am a staff member on the CEC I'm here tonight as a private citizen with extensive experience, I spent 7 years running the PB process for council members Leven in Brooklyn, district 33 and eight years on the steering committee, so just a couple years ago. The steering committee, at that time was charged with writing the PBNYC rule book and when we initially the voting age in that rule book was 16 as well but when it came time to discuss lowering the age a couple years into the process, to lowering it to 11 as we're talking about tonight, there was no disagreement that we should, just how low we should go. Some wanted nine and some wanted no limit at all.

We settled on 11 or in 6th grade because we felt at that time that would be acceptable to the council and other council members and that it was a great time for us to begin the conversation of civic engagement for our

students. Our goal as a steering committee was always to find ways to lower the barriers to participation and lowering the age was one of the most effective and meaningful ways we did that. More personally, I've been to so many middle school classrooms to talk about PB and our communities and my conversations in those classrooms I have heard amazing insights into the world around us from the students and watched as they eagerly participated by voting in the process. Even pop up street voting it was always the youth that came over to us dragging their parents to participate. Youth care greatly about their neighborhoods and can see the inequities around them as clearly if not more so than adults and they have great ideas about how to make our city better, we need to engage youth as young as possible and cultivate that engagement, maybe this rule change for the city wide process would be a huge acknowledgment that we value the voices of our youth and that is something that they will carry forward with them throughout our lives. I want to thank the Commission and the other people who testified tonight, I know many of them have worked with them, their commitment to PB and their belief in our youth voice is as strong as I've ever heard, so I hope you decide to make that change tonight. Thank you.

>> Thank you Benjamin. Darlene.

>> Thank you. Good evening everyone, my name is Darlene, I am 19 years of age, I currently serve on the advisory, outreach subcommittee for the CEC, I have worked as a youth fellow for outreaching for participatory budgeting and most recently I took part in the people's fellowship. It was more than a welcome reminder of why I love to do what I do. As a young person PB is synonymous with empowerment, my communities not inspire

fear but in determination and hope for change. This inspiring tool has been between myself and this process over these past few years. When I was 15 speaking to youth concerning the issues that affected them the most at the height of the pandemic, issues of mental health and lack of preparation for the future, establishing a safe space for us all to channel our fears into productive plans or ideas with human handling. Our voices were valued and our experiences were validated. I believe in the power of my own voice, all of our voices if they rise to create cultural shifts. We were given this platform it by no means went to waste. In these conversations I learned the invaluable lesson that an agent of change can look like all of us and it starts with all of us. This is a message that we need to teach, many of the people in this club called leaders of tomorrow as well. I wouldn't have learned this metric so early on at the inclusive age range, the current age minimum of this process of 16 inhibits the creation of a cohesive comprehensive outlook of the needs of the New York population. We're missing a huge demographic of people who have access to schools and spaces in a way that we simply do not. At this point can we truly call it citywide, do we truly want to? Everyone deserves a seat at the table. The problems we navigate through PB affect us all, we cannot afford for anyone's light to be dimmed. The children of the city, the power of their voices so when they grow older they will not be demanding for what is right. Thank you so much for your time.

>> Thank you Darlene and your name was -- did I do that right.

>> Uzoigwe.

>> It's an Oi. Thank you so much. Thank you for all of those who offered comments. I'm wondering, Abby, if you have any additional

people who signed up during this meeting either through the chat or by texting you to offer comment.

>> Yeah, I don't see anybody through texting. And I also do not see anyone in the chat unless anybody wants to speak now.

>> Okay. If there is nobody who wants to speak right now, or hasn't signed up during this portion, it is 6:34 so the time to sign up is now closed. What we're going to do next is go to the Commissioners to see if anyone has any clarifying questions to anyone who offered comment. This segment of the meeting is only for questions from Commissioners. Yes, Chuck. if Commissioners, you can put your name into the chat if you would like to ask a question, that would be helpful.

>> It's not about the commentary, that is very clear. I didn't understand something about the voting restrictions, something about 16 and above can go online or whatever the age was but certain restrictions on the voting procedure. Could that be explained.

>> Yes, Daniela, would you like to take that on?

>> Sorry. Had some issues. The question was, what were the restrictions?

>> Yes, for the voting online we had some restrictions and protections bit in for younger youth. So could you explain that.

>> And Ben can jump in because he helped me understand this. There is federal law, federal guidelines that say that protect privacy for minors, so for young people under the age of 13 that's one of the reasons why e-mail accounts, you can't create an e-mail account if you're younger than 13. So for those young participants ages 13 to 17 if they want to sign up for an account

because you need to sign up for an account through our digital platform in order to vote online, they will be asked to submit parental consent or they will fill out a form. We don't have that configured yet in the system but that will be a requirement for young people in between those ages to be able to participate on the platform. And then unfortunately, online voting will be available for folks lower than 13, so for young people that still want to participate they will have to figure out a way to get, to have paper ballots available for them or other voting methods. Does that answer your question?

>> It does except for what you just said No. so we don't have the method for those under 13 or will it be specifically a paper ballot?

>> It will definitely be a paper ballot. We may have additional methods as well.

>> Exactly.

>> Okay. So the whole thing is a legal issue. You're not allowed to have an e-mail, I didn't know that, an e-mail address under 13 years of age, so therefore they could not participate online, understood, thank you.

>> Notice that some other Commissioners also wanted to ask a question. Murad was first and then Amy.

>>

>> Would this rule go into effect across the board with all PB not just the mayor's expense and DOE but would it go across to the councils?

>> Good question Murad. For the rule making process, which we're going through right now, this rule is only applicable to participatory, citywide participatory budgeting of the CEC.

>> Okay. Would be great to have it translated across on the

other side as well, but that's a different fight for a different day. I support this measure and look forward to the other Commissioners joining in support as well.

>> Great. So Amy council is already 11.

>> Thank you Benjamin. So next we have a question from Amy and I think Michael also raised his hand.

>> Thank you, I wanted to thank everyone tonight for testifying, it was really wonderful to hear from you all and all the different perspectives. Darlene, you said something that really resonated. Can she be unmuted, it's a specific question for her. Can I ask a clarifying question.

>> Yes, this is exactly what this section is for, clarifying questions.

>> Darlene, your testimony was wonderful and there was a really key point that you said that I would like to explore a little more if you could, that is about building up a base, a coalition, you know, from a 11 up that is hard to do when it's only 16 and you don't have that much time. Could you elaborate a little bit because I think that can help us really build a more robust program as well.

>> Absolutely, thank you for the question. Referring to this 11 to 15 demographic that has access to spaces, parks and schools in a way that I think perhaps the older demographic 16 and upwards might not be able to. It's definitely a resource you want to tap into. Isabel touched on this, youth truly are the backbone of these processes and it's an incredible resource which would be the 11 to 15-year-olds would be doing a service to this process and also in regards to the longevity of this process, making the young younger generation care about this process it would serve us in that way. So hopefully

I'm getting at your question, but please let me know if there's something I haven't or clarified.

>> That's wonderful. I'm sure we'll have more questions in detail but I really appreciate that, thank you.

>> Of course, thank you.

>> Sorry, Michael and then Natalie.

>> Darlene, if you're still on, I just have one clarification of what you just said. Do you feel that those that are under 15, if they were given the opportunity would consider themselves second-class voters where they're not as free to be able to participate as the older people? Then I have some comments.

>> I think that's a very fair question and also a very fair concern. I can only speak from my own experience working with this very demographic at hand. I do think they would want to participate within this process as much as possible. As much room that we would be willing to give to them. From what I've seen, it's a money process and also working with the New York City council process as well, I have experience with speaking to them and seeing how they interact with this process, they're definitely hungry to be able to communicate the problems they're having in their communities and their own circles and spaces. So I think whether or not they have an issue, maybe not having as much ability to interact with the process as their other counterparts, their older counterparts might be a concern but I don't think the solution would be to take away their ability to engage with it at all. Hopefully that resonates.

>> Well --

>> Michael. We're just asking questions, and if you wouldn't

mind, could you hold your comment on this until the discussion portion.

Thank you so much. Natalie, you're next.

>> Thank you. So I would like to direct this question to Natalia, if she's still here, are you still here?

>> Yes I am.

>> Great. You spoke to some experiences that you have had and your sibling and some children in foster care that might potentially feel further empowered in circumstances which I got the impression these young folks do feel ignored in some ways. For example, you cited priority on stem education, but some youth might appreciate priority in arts education and mental health. So my question to you is, have you encountered any cynicism from older people and I'm mentioning older people, because you specifically cited at the beginning that older people might, to quote you, might be on their way out, and I think you mean in the engagement process and not necessarily on this earth. Is it, has it been maybe your experience that anybody has given you a bit of a cynical push back for this and do you have an advocacy note for them, for example, if older people minded that many more youth were able to be engaged and if they found an imbalance there then they could step up too. So I'm interested in hearing have you come across a cynical answer in opposition and if you did come across and haven't yet, do you have some kind of a response for that for us to consider?

>> So when I have spoken with a couple of older individuals most are very supportive. I have come across one or two who are like in the mindset that youth shouldn't participate in like, even someone who is over the age of 16 or 17 or whatever, they even view a 20 year old being civically

engaged as something that is negative because they're so young. And so I have come across that and I feel as well the way to combat that is to make them realize that they are nearing an age where civic engagement isn't necessarily going to benefit them as much as the people who are going to inherit all of these processes and I feel like that's very important for people to realize. Most are very supportive but there are those in an older mindset who view the older generation as more important than the voices of youth.

>> I appreciate your answer, thank you so much.

>> Thank you for that, are there any other questions from Commissioners? If there are no questions from Commissioners I'm going to ask the staff if there are any questions for the folks who offer testimony? Anyone from the CEC team have a question?

>> Hopefully my microphone is --

>> Your mic is working.

>> I was going to say, I see one comment in the chat, there's one question from Corina, will this mean more funding will be directed towards education rather than other agenda items?

>> So I'm not entirely sure what that question means, Carina, can you explain a little bit more? are you still with us?

>> There you are. I'm not sure if Carina is still there.

>> Hi there. I just saw this on Twitter and I figured I would check in. So does this rule change mean that there will be more funding directed towards PB for education projects? I'm only really familiar with the PB from council members. So I know there was always a contention that education was like getting a lot more funding than other projects.

>> That's an interesting question. So for this process we are going to be going through an idea generation phase where communities will have a chance to express their priorities. And based on those priorities we will then be generating ideas to put on the ballot. So it may vary greatly by community. As to what is, what ideas are priorities for communities and also what gets put on the ballot. I hope that answers your question.

>> Yeah I guess it does.

>> Okay. And then if there are no questions from the CEC team I'm going to go to members of the public, I see that Kayla you have your hand up, would you like to ask the question or offer comment? or maybe that was from before.

>> I think that was from before, I didn't realize I had my hand up.

>> No worries. So it doesn't seem like there are anymore questions from the Commissioners or staff or members of the public. So what we are E going to do now is close the public hearing segment and we're going to open, turn to a public meeting where we will discuss and vote on the rule change. I just want to confirm that we still have a minimum of eight Commissioners with us. Looks like we do. Donna, Michael, that's two. Natalie, mark, Chuck, do we have eight? Yes I think we do. Great. Thank you so much. So this part of it is, I'm going to start off with Michael. If you have any discussion points to make, put your name in the chat stack. I stopped you before, Michael. You're on mute.

I have a question about the validity and the viability of this discussion as a public hearing. Really the majority of the people that spoke, at least three are participants in some way within this Commission. I would

not consider them representatives even though they're citizens of the city but they're engaged with the Commission, so I think while their viewpoint is important it's not a public hearing and I don't know what we've done to increase the ability of people to speak. I really am very very disappointed therefore at the outreach that the staff and the Commission has done to really get the people of New York engaged. I don't know what we've done for the community boards, I don't know what we've done in other areas to try to council people districts to really encourage people to discuss this issue. So we've had six people on this. One is a full-time staff member who spoke. The other two I believe are people that are engaged in work with the Commission on participatory budgeting, so their viewpoints while valid and important, it's not the public's point of view. And I question if we really are the public that we're listening to versus a select group of insiders.

So I have a real problem with this. Other than that I also have a question about the capability of a establishing a two-tiered process of qualified people to vote. A, one level has to get the parents permission, and another level cannot even vote directly or engage in any remote way electronically, so we disenfranchise them possibly and could be accused of doing that. Certainly we need to be engaged and the people of New York must be engaged in spending this money. I don't think we did a very good job of encouraging nor explaining this. So I have a real problem of voting for this resolution.

>> Thank you for that comment Michael. I mean, I think as you have all -- I think it's correct to note that we don't have throngs of people here with us tonight talking about this rule, that's a very fair and accurate

observation. I do want to note that as part of the CAPA administrative process we are required to send the notice about this hearing to community boards, district managers did receive this notice. So that was done. To answer specifically on the community board side. We also did reach out to community-based organization partners, we reached out to the Department of Education, and attempted to, we also got recommendations from Commissioners on specific organizations to connect with and we did reach out to them. We had a couple of people who signed up to comment who weren't able to make it at the last minute, including a council member. So I think different things have happened. I completely wholeheartedly agree with you about the attendance here. It would have been great to have more people present with us and offering comment and it would have been interesting also to hear potentially different points of view on this. If there are people who feel like this is not something that would be appropriate to do. However, that didn't happen. So and I think it's a very important point for us as a civic engagement Commission because we are charged with increasing participation and here's a process we have to get public input on a rule and that's part of why I provided the context about what a rule change hearing is. I don't think that a lot of people even though this process exists in New York City. So there's a lot of work we have to do to raise awareness.

I also want to say we need Commissioner's help to get the word out about our meetings, about these hearings and encourage you to send out this information to your network and get people to show up. Not just send out an e-mail maybe recruit, like get a friend to come with you next time, as a way to continue to build audience for our meetings. That's kind of my response

and I want to open the floor to anyone else from the Commissioners who would like to respond to that.

>> Sarah, to add to that, we don't get the proper response from our Commissioners to come to many of our virtual meetings either and we sometimes have difficulty meeting a quorum, I am just saying we have to do better and I don't know if this is the right form to make a decision without having the public really engaged.

>> Any other responses or comments about Michael's point?

>> Yeah, I just like to say that I think not voting on this would be a real disservice to those who did show up and I actually don't agree wholeheartedly, I think that those who showed up tonight are super engaged young people and others, who took the time tonight and while it was not to be captured in our meeting there was a comment from a younger sibling who said this is boring. And to be quite honest, these meetings are boring. If you're 10 or 11 years old or 15 years old it's hard to sit through a meeting that is set up with Roberts rules of order and voting on things and the discussion, so I just like to point out that I think we should move forward where the vote, I think we should respect those that spoke tonight and really applaud their level of engagement. While yes, it's always better to have more, but let's take what we have this evening and be positive about that.

>> Thanks Amy, I think that was your, you put your name in the stack, so I guess that was your comment or did you have anything else to say other than responding to Michael?

>> Well, since I responded that way I will leave it at that and regroup on what I was going to say.

>> Okay. Anetta.

>> Thank you very much. I wanted to respond to Michael and make my own point. I was one of the commissioners who suggested nonprofits and that the staff can reach out to and somebody, I spent half of my career working with young people, and it is very difficult to engage young people and I think your point Michael, from my perspective, I think that your point actually in fact makes the case for why this is so important. Because this is a really structured way to get young people involved at a young age and the earlier you engage in voting even if it's one thing, civic need in any way, it really builds, you develop those muscles and that just continues to grow later in life. So I do agree that it would have been -- I was looking to hear more perspectives, and so I think your point is valid. I also want to say that I think the young people while, the young people who spoke, while they most certainly came from the system or had some advantage and want to be able to know about it, to be able to prepare for this hearing, I do think that they represent our city. I was really impressed with the diversity, I was impressed we had a foster youth, so for me, I was persuaded by their point of views, I think that's all I wanted to say, thank you very much.

>> Thank you. Mark?

>> Here I am. So Anetta just said most of what I wanted to say as well. Yes, the whole point -- first of all, I take serious issue with people who are denigrating Robert's rules, there's nothing quite so engaging as approving the minutes of a previous meeting and we know this because there's a hit Broadway show that's all about that right now, putting that to one side. Anetta hit it right on the head, the whole point of expanding the youth

vote is to engage a broader audience and one that we can count onto carry that forward. And so that is in itself a reason to vote tonight. The other is, I saw the publicity for this, it's out there. I've struggled with this as a PTA President, as a community board chair, as a member of this Commission, as a member of any number of other things where I do in order to avoid work, and in all of those instances decisions are made by the people who show up, and people show up for things that they care about. The CEC, the other CEC, the community education council in my district says, people show up to our meetings when they are outraged, so in a certain sense if there's a high level of participation it means that we're on the right track. So for all of those reasons + plus my innate belief that children are going to be responsible and insightful contributors to the conversations that PB is all about, I encourage my colleagues to vote yes and to vote at all but to vote yes. Thanks very much.

>> Next is Jose.

>> I think this is a great idea, to match the City Council, it's a lot of times the first and the only way children are going to be exposed to civic engagement, not everyone has parents like Kelly Price who is really engaged, and if not for my injury I would have never voted because in my neighborhood voting isn't considered important because you don't see any effective change. So bringing this to students that are 11 and maybe possibly getting their parents involved, the kid is going to be excited about participating in something, that would mean that you would have to engage with the parents and the parents can see, hopefully see that being civically engaged is important to their children, so in turn might also be civically engaged themselves. I also agree with Mark that this is something that is necessary

and I hope everybody supports it.

>> Thank you Jose. Natalie did you have your mind up or was that from before?

>> No, it was probably from before, but if I'm here, I can make a quick comment.

>> Of course.

>> Okay. So I actually want just to make the statement that initially when I heard about this proposal my instinct was, to feel very contrary about it and say, oh, gee, wow, 11, year olds, 12 year olds, 13, what's the value here of expanding these important decisions to a younger generation. I'm glad I had those thoughts at first. I took some time with it to consider some possibilities there and of course we've heard this testimony. I agree with Mark that the very attendance that we do have here shows the importance of expanding this. But what I want to point out most is something that I actually said to Natalie, I'm going to double down on it. One of the thoughts that I had in trying to come up with the possibilities of contrarian views on why this might be not a great idea or people could be opposed to it, hypothetically I was thinking about folks who said, well, we're much older and we've been around the block a time or two, and how come 11, 12 or 13-year-olds get to have so much of a voice now, and I was amused by the, by that conflict potentially presenting itself in the future, because it means if older folks start to feel like the voices of the younger are being heard more well then I guess we all have to get more engaged. And I think that is the whole point. So I'm inclined very strongly to take to heart the testimony of the folks that showed up here and to vote yes on this. And I appreciate everybody's

time.

>> Thank you Natalie, I'm sorry, I missed the other folks who had signed up in the staff or put their name. So Murad and then Amy again and then Eve.

>> Yeah, I agree with most of the sentiment here. We don't lose by having more people and franchising the system. And the more voices that come in the better we all are off. I would also just technically, if the council is already doing it at 11 it makes sense that we equal the playing field. I think Jose said this earlier, but making sure that we're not actually creating a separate system for the same exact program just because it's the mayor's side. So based on literally that, I would actually, even if I don't believe in more people, it comes down to technicalities and process and how we want the systems to do the same. So I do believe more people in the system are always better than not. And I think we should move this forward and vote on it. I would love for this WebEx to be filled to the rafters with public comment, but I have been a Commissioner since this started and we've had the people who are civically engaged and a sprinkle of people who are now getting engaged but I think COVID has thrown a wrench in that. We all have to do a better job and I don't put this on the staff. I put this on all of us. So just making sure that we're all stepping up to make sure that we're having the Commission we want to see be as successful as possible. Thank you.

>> Thank you Murad.

>> So my original comment I just wanted a little space in between my comment towards Michael. But I guess my thing is why we're even having this meeting tonight since it could have originally looked to the council and

started at 11, not started at 16 and then have to vie and pull it back. So as Murad has said and a couple other Commissioners I think we really need to look at processes that we use and one of the commenters brought up about Boston and their process, also was brought up about Brad Lander when he was a council member setting this in place and I know he traveled around the country and looked at other PB processes. So I think we need to establish a best practice look when we set these things up and we really need to be rigid about that. And methodical about looking at best practices around the country and really build the best possible PB processes we could have.

>> Thanks for that. I think, I just want to make a note on that, the reason, part of the reason why we had to do this is that it's in the charter that it should be 16 and I think what we're doing in coming together is being responsive to what's been happening in the city so far to date with the council process and also seeing best practices and so I think this is our opportunity to do that because I wasn't part of the charter writing process, I know Anetta was there, so I could maybe ask her about the background on that but we felt it was important to have this public discussion to change that charter specification.

>> I understand that. I guess what I'm saying is originally, since the council was 11 it would have been nice for it to be written as 11 and it wasn't. And I don't want to go back and rehash that, but my point is to really look at best practices and make sure we are putting that in place so that we don't have to go back and redo things.

>> Makes a lot of sense, yeah. The next person is Eve.

>> Thanks, just quickly, I wanted to express appreciation for the

staff who reached out to us early and very comprehensively about this to answer our questions. I had a number of questions about the process and about the support that would be in place and I got a lot of good information and I was also given an opportunity during that conversation with the staff to provide the names of organizations that I thought should be contacted to participate in this and they followed up very effectively, so I want to just put out a vote of appreciation on that. The Commission has never had sufficient staff to do the type of engagement that we really need to do. So I think it's incumbent on all of us to help. Already inclined to look favorably on this resolution but hearing the testimony of these young people who are so passionate I mean, for me now it's all that much more important.

>> Thank you Eve. The team wanted me to also let you know that the notice did go out in addition to community boards, the CAPA procedures requires us to inform council members and we are also required under LML to share our meeting notice with media, we posted on social media, we also shared with our agency colleagues. I think the point that Eve just made also relates to a question that was put in the chat by Keyon Bliss about how much funding staff CEC's provided for out each in engagement to the public I have to say until very recently the Civic Engagement Commission had one outreach person on the team and we are in the process of recruiting more staff, we have two additional lines to fill, so hopefully all of this will improve. I think it is also about relationship building. There are a lot of things competing for people's attention and time, and I think with more staff we'll be able to build the relationships that will hopefully get people more curious and engaged to come out to our meetings and participate and have a voice. So are there any

other Commissioners who would like to make any comments now? Jose, do you want to say something okay.

>> I had my hand raised. As Mark said, I think yes we should go ahead and vote on this but I wanted to speak to Mike's point that yes, it seems that we didn't do what we were supposed to do but I think we as Commissioners need to understand that part of this is our, that we have to take on. And things that we have to do ourselves in order to assist the Commission to do the job that we wanted to do. So I think the staff has done the best that they can and some Commissioners have been helpful but I feel like we need to step up and do a little bit more. And that's my comment on this whole thing. I think if we work together we can be an awesome force.

>> Thank you so much. Thank you Donna for that point and we will definitely make sure to connect with you all for the next opportunity we have, which is going to be another public hearing about the proposed methodology for providing services at poll sites and we did have very good attendance at our first public hearing on that methodology, so it would be great to invite people into the next conversation on that. And then doing an audit of other processes and I would like to hear a little bit more from you on that before we move into the vote if you want to add anymore about what kinds of things you're thinking about in terms of alignment. For example, are there other things you want to have us check out.

>> I think we're going to see what happens over the next few weeks with our vote, that's making its way through the court system and I don't think it's going to be over when it's over, so even with that just making sure that we have systems in place, language access, like on this topic of PB, I'm

assuming might come up again, and just seeing how other systems that we have already in place around civic engagement, I'm not sure how aligned we are with democracy New York City, but seeing if any of our work interacts with them and making sure that is holistic, and just moving the work forward. I could have sworn there were other agencies that were supposed to come online to do PB as well, I think it was DOT and NYCHA, wondering if those came online and if they haven't, why. And then how do we increase the resources available not just for the Commission, because I think we should all be advocating for the Commission to get more funding to actually be staffed up, this is an agency that has four or five outreach staff when fully staffed and that's sad, it should be more. So just thinking about what are the other systems that are already in place and how do we make sure that we're aligned or we make it better.

>> Thank you for that. The hands that are still up I'm assuming they're just from before. I can see on my screen. Donna and Natalie. Great. So are there -- does anyone want to propose any edits to the final rule? If not, could I hear a motion to approve.

>> Can I make a motion to approve the PB -- go ahead.

>> I think what we do now is call the question. It's already been moved.

>> We need to call the question.

>> You're saying because before you all, different people said we should vote on this, is that what you mean?

>> Sorry, I'm speaking --

>> After the discussion you have to call the question in order to

make the motion.

>> Right, this is the discussion, the motion has already been made, right?

>> Yes.

>> Okay, so the motion has been made I call the question. That should trigger the vote.

>> Call to question.

>> Call the question.

>> Call the question. Can you explain what that is.

>> It means that there is a motion already made, it's on the floor, we just had the discussion about the motion and now it's time to vote.

>> Okay. So.

>> It's a procedural device, it's like the motion in the United States senate it's time to vote.

>> So for the vote, so there's no process of seconding the motion, is that what you're saying.

>> Mark, just for clarification, I think went into the discussion without the motion being called. I don't have recollection of the motion being called. So I think we were actually out of order in Robert's rules.

>> We won't tell him.

>> Because we did go to the discussion. But I think the motion needs to be made and then seconded.

>> So therefore I move the question. I move the resolution.

>> I second.

>> I third.

>> As a point of order I submit to the chair that we've already had our discussion and with can proceed to a vote.

>> Okay. So all in favor of approving this rule change say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Any opposed to the rule change?

>> Yes, I oppose not so much the rule but the nature of this hearing to vote on this but given my other concerns I'm going to have to just be contrarian and I question the validity of what we've done tonight so I'm going to vote no.

>> Okay. So based on the majority in favor we are going to go forward with this rule change. And I think Michael your points are really well taken about the importance of just making sure we're continuing to build on the outreach.

>> If I may, just ask Sarah, where do we go from here for the implementation, are there any other public hearings or what is the process on implementing this?

>> So what will happen next is that we do have a meeting coming up July 26th, it should be on your calendars already, that will be a moment in which we will be discussing revisions to the Commission's methodology to provide language assistance at poll sites as well as discussing the proposed strategy for implementing city wide participatory budgeting. Commissioners will have an opportunity to vote on the strategy as well. And that will be in the public meeting format.

>> Are you also hoping for a budget allocation to implement this? Is that what we'll discuss on the 26th?

>> Yes, we have shared that in the past and we will share that again. We do have a budget for implementation, it is \$5 million process, so we do have a budget for example, to conduct outreach, and communications around this initiative and we also have been given staff lines, to run the process. In addition to outreach staff we've been given project management staff lines to work with organizations that are contracted to work with us on this process. So we could share more details about that. Chuck?

>> While Robert's rules and Mark are still in the it a yens, when we have a vote of this type of nature, not like a minutes where an open can be taken in bulk, should the roll call be taken?

>> That is a really good question, I have done that in the past. I think I may have done that in the public hearing that we did, one of our public hearings. I mean, does it, should we change that and go through a roll call now.

>> Under Robert's rules, once again, if a member of the Commission calls for a role call vote then you have to do it. It's probably a pretty good practice too. My count was 8 to 1, to 0 to 0 but you probably want something that you can report specifically. So I think Chuck is on the right track. There's only 9 of us. So.

>> This is so great. I'm learning so much about how to run these meetings and what not to do. I'm going to go down the list of Commissioners, so you could please do a voice vote if that's okay. Chuck.

>> Yes.

>> Murad.

>> Here.

>> You're going, are you voting yes or no.

>> Yes.

>> Eve.

>> Yes.

>> Holly -- Amy.

>> For the record I would like to state that I am a fan of the Robert's rules of order, mark, just so you know. I vote yes for this.

>> Natalie.

>> I am voting aye, I acknowledge the super fan of Robert's rules of order in this meeting.

>> Mark.

>> I vote aye, thank you.

>> Donna.

>> Yes.

>> Anthony Harmon is not here, Jose her Annetta December.

>> Yes.

>> Michael Nussbaum.

>> No.

>> Lillian Perez. Anetta.

>> Yes.

>> And Anastasia is not here today. Great. So that was to tally that up. That was nine yes's and one no. Thank you about Abby. On the issue of Robert's rules I would like to note that when I was a professor teaching at Baruch college, the old school of public affairs, I was teaching communications 101 and I assigned a book called Robert a's rules of order,

which is sort of a feminist critique of Robert's rules. I think this is really important, another important conversation that we all need to be thinking about how to educate the public better on Robert's rules because participation in these public meetings requires that kind of knowledge. It is not common knowledge and one of the things we started to look into is even for community board members we do offer trainings on parliamentary procedures, is how do we create opportunities for community boards to have a parliamentarian on their board. Like someone who is knowledgeable about this process. And I feel like I need to go through a Roberts rules course now based on what happened today. So I'm grateful to all of you for pointing out how we can be doing better procedure wise.

Murad, you made a point that this is being recorded.

>> Yeah. The entire hearing is recorded, so in case we need to go back to something or note who was here, it is recorded. Was my point at the time. This is before the roll call.

>> That's right, thank you so much for that point too.

>> Sarah. I think just so you know if you went to that refresher course, I think Robert's Rules is pretty general and easy to follow but some of the specifics I bet you both Robert and Roberta will be in that refresher course with you.

>> Are you okay?

>> I'm fine. Okay. So I think we did, we are nearly at time. So in order to, I already told you that we have a meeting coming up on the 26th, so we'll share more information about that meeting, we're also going to be posting the revisions to the methodology for public comment. We are actually

not required by the charter to hold a public hearing on the revisions to the methodology like we were required to hold a public hearing for the initial round, however, we are going to do that. We are going to post the revisions and take public comment in a public hearing format. So we'll share more information on that. And Eve, if there's no other comment I think we can, I would like to entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

>> Motion to adjourn the meeting.

>> Do I hear a second.

>> Second.

>> All in favor.

>> Aye.

>> All right, hearing no discussion and I'm assuming no opposition, the motion is carried and we are adjourned and I will see you all in July, thank you so much everybody. Take care.