Marin Human Rights Commission 2022 July Drafted Minutes

Tuesday, July 12, 2022 — 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

.....

Call to Order at 7:09 pm with quorum.

Present: Stephany Barahona (SB), Curtis Aikens (CA), Sister Joan Hanna (SJH), Jeremy Portje (JP), and Sean McQuaid (SM)

Order of Business

- 1) Approval of Agenda and Minutes
 - a) Motion to approve the drafted Agenda for July 12, 2022 SJH/JP m/s/p
 - b) Motion to approve the drafted Minutes for June 14, 2022 SJH/CA m/s/p

Regular Business

The Commission will hold a discussion on an agenda item, at the end of the discussion, the Chair or Co-Chair will ask for public comment on that particular agenda item. The public will then have up to 2 minutes per speaker to speak on that particular agenda item before any action on the item is taken by the Commission.

2) Commissioner Announcements for Items Not on the Agenda

a) No announcements

3) Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

Open time for public expression. The Commission will take public comment (up to 3 minutes per speaker) on all items not appearing on the agenda during this portion of the regular meeting.

- a) **Bill Hale** Is this a Commission or Department? Remind me of the difference. Deferred to Roger.
- b) Rodrigo Izquierdo Interesting...It's not visual for phone callers. Violation of 1st Amendment. Wants visual representation. Minorities need to be seen. Wants to present to BOS to present visuals to callers. Denying minorities 1st Amendment rights. Happy with tonight's agenda. We need to limit presentations to 30 mins. We aren't accomplishing enough.

4) Marin City 80 Year Celebration

(Introduction by Commissioner Nancy Johnson)

This was to be an item spoken on by com Johnson, however she is ill today and we will move on from this item

5) AB 1185 Citizen/Resident Sheriff Oversight Update

(Commissioner Curtis Aikens and Commissioner Jeremy Portje provide update)











CA: This is our last update. Ready to make recommendation to BOS. Commissioner Portje & I have held meetings with community groups, NACOLE & the county. Have been listening to the community and goal is to bring this to Marin sooner rather than later. Money is set aside. Want to create workgroup of public. Need to sign.... Want to put forward to BOS. Can share the email letter the Commissioners Portje and Commissioner Aikens have developed.

- a) **SM:** Asking for clarity. Please provide an overview.
- b) **CA:** NACOLE is the only company that certifies citizen oversight.
- c) JP: Stands for: National Enforcement of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement.
- d) **CA:** Have had 8 meetings with them and have ideas we want NACOLE to present to the community.
 - i) AB 1185 grants counties in CA the oversight of the sheriff by civilians.
 - ii) Each county implements it uniquely.
 - iii) Want input from this HRC group.
- e) SM: HRC was looking at AB 1185 that passed in the legislature that gave more oversight of the sheriff. Previous HRC had invited NACOLE Assemblymember McCarty to present. Commissioners Portje and Aikens have been working together since then to move forward. Advise to work with NACOLE and create a working group that wouldn't necessarily be the HRC to work alongside NACOLE and the county to determine a path forward for oversight of the Sheriff of Marin County.
- f) JP: Terminology As a Commission, HRC was tasked with this. Commissioners Aikens and Portje formed a committee. Looking to form a sub-committee, which will be the working group. Want to hire NACOLE as consultants to form the working group, either as a subcommittee or whatever the Board decides.
- g) SJH: 2 Questions.
 - i) Reference made to an email that described particulars. Don't recall receiving the email. Reference to document sent to BOS. Are these two things one in the same?
- h) CA: These are the same. Can send it BOS, but not all Commissioners due to the Brown Act.
- i) **SJH:** (2nd Question)
 - i) Language used that HRC was "tasked with" implementation of AB 1185. I don't recall this coming from outside the existence of the Commission. Recollect that the interest came from within the Commission. This is a distinct difference.
- j) CA: Yes, it did come out of here. Supervisor Arnold wanted Curtis to be clear about this. Came from here (HRC) as well as the supervisors.
- k) **JP:** In conversations with individual supervisors expressly pointed out that the BOS is relying on the HRC to find a way to implement this.
- I) **CA:** Felt personally asked to do this. Maybe was not clear enough that I was speaking on behalf of myself and not the entire Commission.
- m) **SJH:** Clarifying that BOS, as a body, has not sent HRC this message, but support and interest has been expressed in individual conversations with Supervisors
- n) **JP:** would word the recommendation as such 'As an HRC Commission, we recommend this be the path...not, 'As ordered...'











- o) CA: Have had meetings with each supervisor individually (not as a group). Received positive feedback when they received the letters this week. Whether "tasked" is the right word, we are doing this work for the community and our county. We are learning about this whole process and Supervisors seem to be leaning into us for this. These are my words, not speaking for anyone else.
- p) **JP:** Commissioner Castillo was the expert, however Chair SM may be able to fill us in on the first iteration and orders that were given there.
- q) SM: Both of you have been closer than I have recently. Former Commissioner Castillo and former Commissioner White were involved in this process as their sub-committee. Organized around bringing more education into the community. My understanding is that there is interest. BOS proposed a working group or a community group. Commissioner Portje and Aikens have been having appropriate conversations.
- r) **JP:** Found that AB 1185 is important and have found an organization that can do this with public input.
- s) **CA:** Have had deep conversations with community organizers from Novato north to Sausalito south. We have a consensus with community groups that we've spoken with that they want to see NACOLE working with Marin County.
- t) **SM:** Have also heard from multiple community groups about wanting to move forward on this. You want to make a recommendation, correct? Not making a motion yet, but if I'm understanding correctly, you want to make a recommendation, correct?
- u) CA: We want to make a motion at some time tonight...
- v) **JP:**with public input...
- w) **CA:** ... We want to make the motion that we as the Commission, make a recommendation to the county they hire NACOLE to get 1185 started. After we do our work here tonight and get public comment.
- x) **SM**: Are there any questions comments from any of the other Commissioners?
- y) **SJH:** Roger you may have to weigh in on this. Is the email able to be shared from the public record?
- z) **Roger Crawford**: Yes, it's a public record. You're not coming together to discuss anything, you're looking at a document that is in the public record.
- aa) CA: Can we put it in the chat so everyone can see? I sent it separately to each supervisor.
- bb) **Roger Crawford:** Because you're in this meeting and have a quorum, you are able to add it to the chat. You can put the entire email or put a link into the chat.
- cc) **SM:** Recommends reading it out loud.
- dd) **CA:** Addressed to each individual Supervisor: "I want to update you on how our committee working on sheriff and jail staff oversight has progressed. At tomorrow night's HRC meeting, we will give our final update then put forth a motion to recommend to the county, the county engages the services of NACOLE to help in implementation of California Assembly Bill 1185 here in Marin. Also having a sub-committee of HRC as part of the process with concerned citizens acting as an advisory board to both the HRC sub-committee as well as NACOLE. Respectfully, Curtis Aikens HRC"

This was sent to each Supervisor, as well as the County Administrator, and the person in











- charge of Equity and Diversity for the county, and to other community groups. Questions or comments?
- ee) **SJH:** A question. Are you proposing the subcommittee working w/NACOLE and the Board that the membership of HRC be the subcommittee to work with them and not include others in that?
- ff) JP: Can you rephrase that?
- gg) **CA:** I'm not saying that Jeremy and I should be the subcommittee. It should be a subcommittee from HRC to work with NACOLE, and then we have an advisory group of concerned citizens to advise all of us. Did that answer the question?
- hh) **SJH:** Yes and no. I see an exclusivity possibly in the membership of the HRC to be that subcommittee, and then I was happy to hear of this advisory board. So are the advisory group and the subcommittee two separate organizations or two separate bodies.
- ii) **CA:** That is an interesting question. Jeremy do you want to share what your thoughts are and then I'll share my thoughts?
- jj) JP: I think it's putting the carriage in front of the horse. NACOLE is the expert at making this working group. I think one way to do that is to create a subcommittee of the HRC which involves citizens that would be picked through a process with NACOLE as the consultant. They would then formulate the plan under NACOLE's guidance to then present to Curtis & I, with a way to recommend and enact that, and then to the Supervisors. That may be a little convoluted, but it also is a bit premature. For the purposes of tonight we should either put subcommittee on a future agenda or leave it up to BOS. Our recommendation is that we engage NACOLE in creating that working group.
- kk) **SJH:** I support and endorse that the focus is NACOLE knows what they are doing and know what will make things work. Concern was about posity of numbers of our Commission and what Is being proposed is so important groundbreaking that we want to get it right. I speak personally and not for anybody else that I don't know that we have the time, expertise, resources to do what is needed. I endorse it, but I don't know if I am knowledgeable enough to help implement. That's why when you talk about non-profits and individuals who have vested interests, that is very positive.
- II) CA: Experts are NACOLE as Jeremy said. HRC is the conduit to reach out to these non-profits. Want to ensure that we are an open fair county for all. As HRC, we want to ensure that takes place.
- mm) **JP:** Subcommittee was backup to this working group.
- nn) **SM:** Questions around the issue and then there are the questions around what would potentially come with a motion. I think it would make sense to take public comment and then if there is going to be a motion, and there are questions pertaining to the motion, we'll have that discussion to iron that out. Any questions around NACOLE or AB 1185 or any of the work that has been done leading up to this?
- oo) **CA:** Jeremy & I have met w/ & talked with NACOLE representatives. They area very responsive to what we want to do. They are passionate in the work they do. They want to get it right. They want to create something that is uniquely for Marin.











pp) PUBLIC COMMENT AB 1185 Citizen/Resident Sheriff Oversight Update (update timer to 2mins)

- i) **Debra Taube**: Express strong support for adopting AB 1185 oversight and for NACOLE. However, it is important the working group be formed in relation to the needs of Marin. Important for 3 things:
 - (1) Board have subpoena power
 - (2) Board have an Inspector General appointed
 - (3) As this goes forward, if we choose to engage NACOLE, that community members that are knowledgeable be involved and focus on 4 different areas
 - (a) Legal issues
 - (b) Organizational issues
 - (c) Research issues
 - (d) Financial issues
- ii) Rodrigo Izquerdo: IJ article Opinion of Brian Washington AB 1185 will not stop the sheriff in any capacity whether advisory or oversight that they cannot stop the sheriff in their functions. Last meeting was quite lengthy, and you start to lose your audience of those who are not as well versed as you are in NACOLE and AB1185 and advisory or oversight committee. Maybe clear all of that up for everyone who is not as well versed.
- iii) Veronica Geretz: Grateful. Thank you all for taking the time to thoughtfully consider how to inform our Board of Supervisors or recommend to our BOS how to move forward with AB 1185. Would encourage to include in recommendation that members of the community are part of that dialogue. Want to reinforce what Debra Taube said around subpoena power and an Inspector General and include those in your recommendation to the BOS.
- iv) **Lisa:** Want to add my voice in agreement in asking you to forward this to the BOS would love to see an Inspector General and subpoena power. Many would love to support on a citizen's advisory board. Please forward to BOS. Hope this moves forward swiftly. Thank you.
- qq) SM: Would anyone like to make a motion
- rr) **CA:** I'd like to make a motion that we, the HRC rec to BOS to engage the services of NACOLE with the express interest of implementing AB 1185 here in Marin County with HRC as a subcommittee and members of the community working as advisors or part of that subcommittee.
- ss) SB: I so move.
- tt) **SM:** Before you repeat, let me repeat the motion. Commissioner Aikens is moving that the Marin HRC makes a recommendation to the BOS of Marin to engage with NACOLE and their services as it relates to forming a sheriff oversight committee & having the Marin HRC acting as subcommittee. I think we need to break this down, as it is rather lengthy.











- uu) **JP:** Moves to remove the last bit about the HRC acting as subcommittee and table that until further conversation and keep the motion as the HRC recommends the BOS engage NACOLE to form a working group made up of local citizens to enact AB 1185 in Marin. Or to draft a policy.
- vv) **CA:** I understand why you want to do it, I do feel though that this is my opinion and not based on anything they have said to me I do believe that the BOS like the idea that we are attached to this. Roger, maybe you can help us with this If we make a motion and we are not part of it, we can't jump on later on, correct?
- ww) **SM:** I can answer. What is being proposed is that this Commission drafts a letter and that letter would say that we are recommending to the BOS that the county engage w/NACOLE and create an oversight committee. There are essentially two motions on the table right now one from Commissioner Aikens where we would include language stating the HRC should be part of the working group. Commissioner Portje is recommending in his motion that we do not include language pertaining to that. That does not necessarily rule it out, it would just not be included in the recommendation.
- xx) **JP:** Clarification with wanting to remove it. Doesn't want to create the ins and outs of AB 1185 policy ultimately being presented to the Board. Believes this should be up to NACOLE and the working group. Believes that NACOLE should form the working group of concerned citizens and that if the BOS wants the HRC to be involved, they should say so. Don't think it has to be restricted to HRC when recommendation is given to BOS.
- yy) **SJH**: Instead of saying HRC would be subcommittee The HRC is available to work with the BOS and NACOLE "as they see fit". This would link the name of HRC in.
- zz) **CA:** His fear is that if recommendation is made and HRC is not part of it initially, that HRC will be unable to join in later on. We could be a subcommittee with an advisory group to us.
- aaa) **SM:** Want to make sure I am tracking Commissioner Hannah you said you were suggesting that we include...I'm sorry, please rephrase
- bbb) **SJH:** That we include some wording stating that the HRC would be available to the BOS and NACOLE working towards the implementation of this in the county.
- ccc) **SB:** Thinks that sister Hanna is right on it. It is important for a subcommittee, well us, to oversee the implementation of this. I agree with Sister Hanna.
- ddd) **JP**: I also agree and going to reword it to and suggest that the HRC act as conveners of NACOLE and the working group.
- eee) CA: We're in agreement, just need to get the wording right. Correct?
- fff) **SM:** Commissioner Portje proposed an amendment to his motion, which was to include basically what Commissioner Hanna said which was: HRC is available as an advisor and we are open to engaging in this. Propose that we amend Commissioner Portje's motion. Propose that the motion be that a smaller group of this Commission would craft the letterand be empowered to send that on to the BOS on behalf of the HRC.

Something like: 'We the HRC move to sending a recommendation to engage NACOLE regarding the sheriff oversight committee. We essentially are here as an advisor if needed.' At the end of the day, we can keep it simple and say the working group would essentially be responsible for the language. Is that where we're all landing?











- ggg) **JP**: Recommend we shorten to: "We strongly urge the BOS to engage NACOLE in enacting 1185 with their process...and their process is creating a working group.
- hhh) **CA:** May I? "Put forth the motion to recommend the county engage the services of NACOLE in helping implement AB 1185 in Marin County. We the HRC stand ready to
- iii) JP: ...convene a working group under the advisory of NACOLE.
- jjj) **CA:** "Put forth the recommendation that we suggest to the Supervisors to engage the services of NACOLE to help in implementation of AB 1185 in Marin." That's the motion. The add to is: The HRC is available, as needed, to help NACOLE...
- kkk) **JP**:to convene the working group....but I think that Sean makes the point that the motion before us is that JP or CA draft the letter of recommendation to the BOS.
- III) **MOTION:** Moves that Commissioner Aikens and Commissioner Portje, alongside the Chair of the Commission (myself) draft a letter to BOS, recommending that NACOLE be engaged regarding the oversight of the Sheriff and forming a working group for that issue.

SM/SJH m/s/p

Motion unanimously passes 5 to 0

Have a couple other motions on the table

Need to withdraw any outstanding motions

Commissioner Portje withdraws any previous motions.

Commissioner Aikens withdraws any previous motions.

mmm) CA: Plan to draft the letter to BOS this week.

6) Discussion on Human Rights Commission Ways of Working and Priorities

- a) Topics
 - i) Review of Recent Focus Areas
 - (1) Just passed Motion related to AB 1185
 - (2) Presentation last month by Santa Rosa Police Department had set up program called In Response
 - (3) Additional speakers/presentations not specifically identified by name

ii) Review of Subcommittees (recent past)

- (1) Justice system and law enforcement oversight subcommittee
 - (a) Initially formed to discuss AB1185
 - (b) Commissioners Aikens and Portje members of this subcommittee
- (2) Housing subcommittee
 - (a) Recent presentation on Golden Gate Village arranged by Commissioner Hanna
- (3) Immigration subcommittee
- (4) Childcare & Education subcommittee(s)











- (5) Subcommittee dedicated to closing the gap of the digital divide (those who have internet in the county and those who do not)
- (6) Because of the way the Brown Act works, Commissioners cannot all meet at once on a given topic outside of an organized and agendized meeting. Instead, they meet in subcommittees, which gives opportunity for less than a quorum to meet, discuss and move forward an issue. Historically, Commissioners will report back to an HRC quorum and will introduce presentations, make motions or take other actions to move issue forward.

iii) Discuss Commissioners' Priorities and Interests Going Forward

- (1) **CA:** Do you recall if childcare and education were combined?
- (2) SM: Defer to Commissioner Hanna
- (3) **SJH:** Believe it was pre-pandemic. Believe the Childcare & Education piece morphed into the work to close the gap of the digital divide.
 - (a) Childcare
 - (i) Need for childcare in the county is tremendous
 - (ii) Fairfax San Anselmo Child Center
 - 1. Serving children 3 months-5 years for close to 50 years
 - 2. At one point were threatened with having to vacate within 30-60 days. Fundraising for legal response.
 - 3. Educational need right now for families that can't afford other kinds of childcare or education.
 - (iii) Circling back to original question believe childcare and education morphed into digital divide work. Still needs more implementation. Many areas where the gap is still there.
- (4) **JP:** Question for a point of clarification- Are we talking about subcommittee or committee? My understanding is that we are a Commission, and when we break off into a smaller group it is a committee, and a smaller group from that is a subcommittee.
- (5) **SJH**: It was a committee.
- (6) **SM:** I believe we referred to it as a sub-committee, but I may be wrong.
- (7) **JP:** Maybe Roger can clarify, because we form a committee, and then can form a subcommittee, which involves members of the public.
- (8) **Roger:** As far as terminology as far as including members of the public, you can do that. I can figure out the terminology on whether that would be considered a committee or subcommittee and get back to you on that piece.
- (9) **CA:** Did I understand that each Commissioner talks about their passion and what they'd like to work on?
- (10) **SM:** Would like to understand priorities of the group.
- (11) **JP:** Are we proposing to remove or add (sub)committees based on this conversation?
- (12) **SM:** We can propose revisiting the subcommittees we have.











- (13) **CA:** Personal passions are:
 - (a) Education
 - (b) Childcare (echoing what SJH said)
 - (c) Water (situation across the state)
 - (d) AB 1185 If someone else wants to step forward on this, am willing to be advisor
- (14) **JP:** Of the thought that the public should be involved in deciding in what HRC addresses.
 - (a) Would like to see an avenue for this to happen aside from general public comment.
- (15) **JP**: Areas of Interest (separate but intertwined):
 - (a) Mental health
 - (b) Homelessness
 - (c) Poverty
 - (d) Don't know what it would be called, but also have interest in a group working closer with the public to get issues in front of us.
- (16) **SB:** Agree with Commissioner Portje. They are all intertwined. Would like to look to the public to see how to move forward. Three main areas of interest.
 - (a) Homelessness
 - (b) Immigration rights
 - (c) Mental health
- (17) SJH:
 - (a) Education is priority
 - (b) Childcare foundation of any kind of learning
 - (i) Building blocks of all education
 - (c) Housing
 - (i) Injustice around how homeless individuals are treated
 - (ii) Golden Gate Village
 - (iii) Lessening of gun violence
 - 1. No community is immune from it
 - 2. Unsure of regulations for Marin County gun sales if assault rifles/munitions are permitted, would like to address that as the Human Rights Commission: We have the right to be safe
- (18) **SM:** Seeing overlap of previous subcommittees
 - (a) Education
 - (b) Childcare
 - (c) Housing
 - (d) Immigration
 - (e) Justice
 - (f) Mental Health











- (g) Poverty
- (19) SM (his areas of interest):
 - (a) Education
 - (b) Digital divide
 - (c) Mental health
- (20) **SM:** I'd like to ask Commissioner Portje, you brought up public comment. Getting information from the public is critical to what we do.Would love to get your input on what that looks like to you.
- (21) **JP:** Not sure what the established route is for the member of the public to bring an issue before us other than 3 minutes at the beginning of our meetings. Get emails and information from our liaison. This could possibly be online/website, possibly social presence, possibly educating the public about current topics we're addressing and ways for them to weigh in. If we're addressing the digital divide, we'd need other options maybe an 800 number? other than just online because not everyone has access.
- (22) **SM:** Any other thoughts on how we engage with the public? Many of us are having conversations offline. There is public comment here. Great ideas around soliciting comments by Commissioner Portje. Any other ideas? Commissioner Hanna We talked about having a number in the past and there were some logistical issues with that. We can take a look at what those were Commissioner Portje and revisit.
- (23) **SJH:** Website development
 - (a) May be opening can of worms If website asked for input (10 words or less) 'What would you like to see the HRC focus to be?'
 - (b) Where are we with the website? Would that be a vehicle to get public comment on topics?
- (24) SM: Commissioner Portje and I have had that conversation. He brings a skill set to the table to continue to help me set up the new website marinhumanrights.org. Website needs to be updated. Have discussed including a submission form for members of the public to reach out to the Commission and provide their point of view in a way that does not require them to attend. Think we can definitely add to the website in terms of functionality
 - based on other public comments tonight one of primary purposes of website originally was to provide place for people to go for information. Having everything in one place will be valuable.
- (25) **SB:** Would website be accessible (for example by pressing a button) for translation into other languages?
 Would we consider social media fb, tw, insta to promote attendance at our meetings?
- (26) **SM:** Background on website. We need to figure out how to do this going forward. County has an HRC website where agenda, minutes, bylaws,











etc. are posted. People can contact the Commission by sending an email. Public reports that County website is difficult to navigate. New website will not replace county website but would have all the content and have more flexibility. Potentially could sign up to receive email updates, could have social media involved, etc. Commissioner Portje can help using his similar skill set to get the website up and running.

- (27) JP: Love the website and strong advocate of social media. Who manages that? Will this involve another committee for design & maintenance? How do we post to social media Is it one person? Do we all post individually?
- (28) **SM:** HRC is a Body and we speak as one that creates an issue if an individual does a post individually on behalf of the Commission. Need to develop a process for how to post. Need to post things that are factual, not opinion based, and need to figure this out as a Commission. Each Commissioner could bring back content to discuss as a group, we make a motion, and pass it prior to posting.
- (29) **SJH:** Addressed to Roger Are there norms or limitations of the county as it relates to social media for Commissions such as ours?
- (30) **Roger:** Not aware of limitations or expectations. There has not been anything drafted to my knowledge on how Commissions can use social media communications in general. With the press, would caution to not be contrary to the message of the BOS (in both social media or more traditional media).
- (31) **JP:** Is there a policy specifically in relation to twitter for Commission or BOS (either private or public) Does it all become public domain?
- (32) **Roger:** Have an agreement amongst yourselves/themselves → does each member of the board have an official twitter versus as a private citizen.
- (33) **JP:** Rules are more clear as a candidate, but not when they're sitting.
- (34) Roger: Exactly. I can find that out whether they have public versus private accounts. Once you're a supervisor nothing is really private.

 As a county employee, I have a freedom of speech and can speak as Roger Crawford at a rally for something I believe in. Don't know how members of a public body would speak on Twitter. Good question.
- (35) **SM:** In the past we have fallen on the side of being careful of the language you use.
- (36) **Roger:** Be clear that you are not speaking on behalf of the Commission. Specify that you are speaking as an individual.
- (37) **SM:** For context spoke with Sup Rice regarding how we would speak as one. Spoke about process of getting content approved prior to posting.
- (38) **SM:** Want to call out the time. Will not cover everything today as Commissioner Johnson is absent and may have a new Commissioner joining us soon. Suggest we carry this forward to the next meeting. Will open it up to











Commissioners for additional comments. No additional comments.

b) PUBLIC COMMENT: Discussion on Human Rights Commission Ways of Working and Priorities

- i) Rodrigo Izquierdo: Violation of the Brown Act. Only giving 2 minutes to respond. Controlling the entire show for yourselves. Think you should break this down. I think I know more than many of you on this Commission. You are denying people their rights to speak.
- ii) **Bill Hale**: Didn't take any action, so didn't believe you were in violation. Are you considering shifting law enforcement vehicle code enforcement to other jurisdiction? **SM**: We'll take this under consideration.
- iii) **Deborah Taub**: Good to listen to. Would you consider going out into the community? Appreciate your meetings are at 7pm so working people can attend. Maybe partner with Marin County Library. Talking with community in libraries and how this Commission could get their input.

SM: Thanks for your comment

7) Adjournment

- a) SM: Are there other motions Commissioners would like to make?
 No additional motions. Move on to the last item which is adjournment.
 No motion is required for adjournment if we get through everything on the agenda, as we did tonight.
- b) **SM:** I hereby adjourn the meeting.









