

September 17, 2025

Subject: Racial Equity Commission September 17, 2025, Meeting Minutes
Prepared By: Toya Davis, Operations Manager, Racial Equity Commission
Reviewed By: Larissa Estes, Executive Director, Racial Equity Commission

Recommended Action

Approval of the September 17, 2025, Racial Equity Commission Meeting Minutes.

Racial Equity Commission September 2025 - Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item #1: Welcome

A. CALL TO ORDER: Commissioner Matthews called the meeting to order at 9:38 AM. Shared a reminder that the Commission condemns acts of hate and discrimination. Commissioner Matthews shared the CA vs Hate resource line. Commissioner Matthews noted that Commissioner Pastor would be participating virtually.

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND COMMUNITY ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

C. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA

Executive Director Dr. Larissa Estes, reviewed the agenda and requested to have Agenda Item #5, Model for Transformation and Draft Framework moved up on the agenda to be heard after the Consent Agenda (Item #3) due to travel needs. Commissioner Maldonado moved to move Agenda #5 Model for Transformation and Draft Framework moved up on the agenda to be heard after the Consent Agenda (Item #3). Commissioner Hedrick seconded the motion. Motion approved 9-0.

D. REMARKS FROM DISTINGUISHED GUESTS

Joseph James, Chairman of the Yurok Tribe, recognized the Racial Equity Commission and brought remarks regarding the work the Commission is currently doing. He wanted to highlight the work of the Commission. He spoke about the generational trauma experienced by Indigenous people of Color including removal of culture, language, and heritage. These issues are present today. Yurok is a natural resource tribe surrounded by the Klamath river. He shared there were many obstacles such as boarding schools, lack of funding, and access to resources. He shared education is important to them, but there is still inequity, and lack of access to electricity and broadband internet services. In Northern California, there is lack of basic necessities. He stated elders in the tribe ensured the languages were not lost through having schools and sharing the language. They are fighting for future generations to ensure they do not have to go through the same struggles. He shared that Tribe wants to partner to make the change for all.

The Commissioners presented the Chairman with a basket of items from around the State as a “thank you” for welcoming the Commission to Klamath. Commissioner Matthews also stated

the Commissioners are thankful to be able to host the meeting in the chambers of the Tribal Council, and for being able to sit on the dais.

E. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM: Quorum was met; 9/11 Commissioners Present.

Commissioners Present:

1. Commissioner Candis Bowles
2. Commissioner Virginia Hedrick
3. Commissioner John Kim
4. Commissioner Gabriel Maldonado
5. Commissioner Traco Matthews
6. Commissioner Dr. Manuel Pastor
7. Commissioner Yolanda Richardson
8. Commissioner Dr. Luke Wood
9. Commissioner Simboa Wright

Chair Matthews noted Commissioner Pastor has been present (virtually) since the meeting was called to order, but his vote was not initially noted due to the volume of the microphones. The issue was rectified, and it was noted that he did vote for the two preceding agenda items.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

No Public Comments on Agenda Item #1

Agenda Item #2: Public Comment on matters not on the agenda

Public comments were made by Shannon Homer regarding not forgetting “the Last Mile” and hardship due to lack of resources but having a prideful culture of not wanting to ask for help and Kim Omarotos who spoke on lack of access to the Klamath Community Center. There was another public comment made indicating the sound was “garbled” which may be an issue for those who are hearing impaired even with the closed captions.

Agenda Item #3: Consent Agenda

Action: Motion to approve the June 26, 2025, Commission meeting minutes with one correction was made to have comments (pg. 7, under Next Steps for Staff Action) attributed to Commissioner Maldonado that were attributed to Commissioner John Kim. Motion was made by Commissioner Wood and seconded by Commissioner John Kim. Motion passed 9-0.

No Public Comments on Agenda Item #3

Agenda Item #5: Model for Transportation (continued from June 26, 2025) – ACTION ITEM**Joyce Chiao, Facilitator, Abundance**

Joyce Chiao presented the Model for Transformation as it lays out the roadmap of the work of the Commission and the role of the Framework in achieving the Commission's vision; it is a summary of the Commission's approach to impact. She reviewed the visual of the work of the Commission and how it feeds into the impact that the Commission hopes to achieve.

She reviewed timeline starting with the first draft outline that was presented at the December 2024 Commission meeting in Sacramento, CA. The feedback at that time resulted in three main items: 1. Making the language clear-in plain language, 2. Collaborating with partners to implement the Racial Equity Framework, 3. Racial Equity Framework is used to advance racial equity, address structural racism and shift power to communities.

Mrs. Chiao posed the question to the Commission: "Does the Model for Transformation produce a pathway to racial equity, address structural racism and shift power to communities?"

Dr. Estes clarified the Model for Transformation is a roadmap to help guide the Commission as a public advisory body that is charged with developing framework, providing technical assistance, engaging communities throughout the State of California. The framework should be focused on the audience that the Commission defined at the June 2025 meeting in Salinas, CA. The Commission is not in a position to direct State agencies. That is beyond the Commission's charge.

Commissioner Maldonado wanted to gain clarity on what is considered a "directive". Dr. Estes reiterated the need to get guidance from the Legal team where a public body is concerned. Doug Bojack (Senior Staff Counsel, Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation) stated the Commission is charged with advancing racial equity through best practices including providing advice and direction- the Commission has the authority to provide information.

Commissioner Kim asked about "Collaborate with Partners to Implement the Racial Equity Framework" section and the dependence of the four sub-topics: Community Engagement, Budget Equity, Data and Organizational Infrastructure. Dr. Estes shared that the entire section of the model is what the Commission has impact on through "Implementation and Technical Assistance".

Commissioner Hedrick asked about "Collaborate with Partners to Implement the Racial Equity Framework" section and asked "who are the Partners"? Dr. Estes responded with the definition of partners were defined at the June 2025 meeting: State government entities, inclusive of judicial, legislative and administrative agencies, departments, boards and commissions.

Commissioner Hedrick maintained she did not see in the Framework, specifically "Collaborate with State Government". Dr. Estes pointed out the introduction of the framework details the

intended audience for the framework as defined by the Commission at the June 2025 meeting. Dr. Estes asked the Commission if they wanted to change the “Partners” to “State Government” or the specific groups that are defined in the document at the beginning. Commissioner Matthews stated that he would be comfortable with changing “Partners” to “State Government”. Commissioner Richardson agreed. Commissioner Wright offered “State and Local Government”. Dr. Estes state the Executive Order does state the Commission is required to provide “technical assistance to “State and local government”.

Commissioner Pastor asked what does “Technical assistance” mean in regards of community engagement, budget equity, data, and organizational infrastructure?

Executive Director Estes stated Commission staff has started to engage in technical assistance with government agencies and departments including reviewing strategic plans, consulting on issues around training, and technical assistance related to budget equity. She further stated Staff is able to prepared support to the development of an Implementation and Technical Assistance strategy through the named Committee, but that is hard to build the strategy without knowing what you are implementing. Commissioner Pastor stated what has been done until now, is within the parameters of the Executive Order. Executive Director Estes further reiterated that there are limitations to technical assistance support due to size of staff and resources available with the Commission’s budget. Dr. Estes noted that the Staff have discussed how to prioritize technical assistance that it could provide information to government entities on the content of the Framework. This will give the agencies time to engage in their own work and understand how the Framework connects with what they are already doing.

Action: Motion to adopt the Model of Transformation with the editing “Partners” to “State and local Government” was made by Commissioner Kim and seconded by Commissioner Wright.

Public Comments

- Shannon Holbert
- Alejandra Ponce de Leon, Catalyst California

Motion passed 9-0.

Agenda Item #5: Draft Framework – ACTION ITEM, continued

Joyce Chaio, Facilitator, Abundance continued the discussion regarding the Draft Framework Outline Discussion. Dr. Estes kicked off the discussion on the draft Framework Outline providing additional context to set the tone for the discussion.

She reviewed the Commission’s charge as outlined in Executive Order N-16-22.

Dr. Estes gave a “thank you” to the Staff for their hard work in drafting the Framework. In reviewing the Framework development, Dr. Estes share that the Commission Staff has hosted

over 45 hours of public meetings, 175 hours of meetings with community, advocates and allies and over 1,000 community residents have attended our meetings throughout the state.

She identified common themes shared across the State include: access to quality education, lived experience of equity, mental health and well being, substance abuse and access to basic needs. Communities are the experts which led to informing the Framework. The Commission is not the implementer, State and local governments are the implementers. Finalizing the Framework has to be approved, posted publicly, and submitted to the Governor and Legislature by December 1, 2025.

Dr. Estes further iterated, for each draft of the Framework, it takes about two and a half weeks (which does not include the staff research in writing) of review prior to the Commissioners and public seeing a draft. Opportunities to make changes will still be available in future iterations of the Framework from agencies and departments on what works and what doesn't work. The annual report would be available to add updates the Framework in the future.

Mrs. Chaio reviewed the process of "Building an Adaptable Framework: Foundation, Framework and Flourishing Neighborhood and Thriving Community. Foundation includes: Executive Order N-16.22, Commission and Commission meetings, Community Meet and Greet, and Listening Sessions. Framework includes: Methodologies and tools to advance racial equity and address structural racism through budget, data and community engagement; Flourishing Neighborhood and Thriving Community: Racial Equity Framework is carried out by the Commission through Technical Assistance to government entities and ongoing community engagement.

Mrs. Chaio reviewed the Racial Equity Framework and asked if there were spelling and/or grammatical edits, send those comments to racialequitycommission@lci.ca.gov. The discussion question reviewed was: 1. Is this framework written for your key audience/user? 2. Based on the approved outline, is there anything missing? 3. What should be considered for the annual report and recommendations to the Implementation and Technical Assistance Committee? 4. Is there anything we did not ask that you want to share?

Commissioner Pastor one of the strengths of the current version of the Framework is trying to reach State Agencies with a series of more practical tools. It is important to note in the document, that racial equity is one form of equity. There is also equity around disability, income and class, geographic equity and it is correlated with race. While the charge is Racial Equity, there are other dimensions regarding respecting gender identity but it is not vital to this framework.

Dr. Estes pointed out on page 47, there is an acknowledgment of intersectionality of individuals ranging from age, gender, income, educational level, seen and unseen disabilities and place of birth, there is a brief acknowledgment. Commissioner Pastor remarked that he would like to NOT see that on page 47, but more in the front of the document as there are many kinds of

equities and intersections. Dr. Estes stated that information will be moved into the introduction.

Commissioner Kim noted the extraordinary amount of work we get them to this place. He cautioned that the Commissioners have had a couple of weeks to review the document which can only be discussed in a public meeting. His recommendations include:

- Pg. 7, Strike “often unintentionally”

- Wanted more uplifting of community partnerships such as non-profits and community organizations who are “long-term” partners

- Pg. 24, “Not helpful” to include the “ranking” or “rating” of communities building up disaggregated data, it is important to note the difference in communities such as internet in Silicon Valley versus another community.

- pg. 27, Budget – statewide equity index as they relate to the State budget or inequity for specific programs, departments or agencies, etc.

Structures on Office of Racial Equity, collective interest on the Office of Racial Equity, and state that in the initial draft of the Framework. I.e. Make a recommendation on where is the best space for the office to be located?

- p. 39, Delivering results, review of Prop 209, dissemination of information to organizations/people who need to hear more; make a note that some of the experts that were brought-in, had a different interpretation of some of those laws- is there a different way to word that in this section. There are limitations in certain fields like contracting and education that build race conscious programming for an entire community.

The Team has done a phenomenal job in capturing this information, he fears that the Commission has been the only leadership that has reached communities, and people share a wide-range of challenges and stories, look for a way to share the document to see how State government can make use of them. He would like to see us deliver a long-term mechanism to get their stories government entities.

Dr. Estes will consult Legal’s interpretation because the audience is State-government. The draft as written aligns with all applicable law. Each government entity has their own Legal team with their own interpretation of applicable laws. This is not to say that we cannot do this work and the draft framework reiterates there is an opportunity to do this work. A programmatic focus would be more feasible than something statewide. Initial recommendation discussed at the June 2025 meeting was to include the development of a Commission memo that would provide details of the structure of the Office of Racial Equity, what the staffing could look like, what type of authority it could have- actual articulation of what the Office could look like.

Commissioner Hendrick pointed-out the Racial Equity Commission is going to be looked at as having suggested definitions in the area of “Key Terms” that may be widely applied:

Under the definition of “race”, where is {says} “for example”, reword to “In the U.S., Office of Management and Budget has five major racial categories: American Indian Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander, and White”. List all five categories in alphabetical order.

Under the definition of “Data Disaggregation”, it is great to include an example of the “During COVID, specifically with a call-out to the impact to Native Hawaiian Pacific Islanders, second-graders falling behind, may be more powerful if a race-based example is used”.

Commissioner Maldonado pg. 28, started with a “clear recommendation”. He wants more recommendations included in the document-opening with recommendations and adding context under the recommendations. Most of the document reads more as a recount of the listening sessions. Using the example if he was the Director of the Department of Finance, he would have a hard time “drilling-down” to the recommendation because there is so much context around it. He believes it State agencies would miss the mark on the recommendation provided. The “future strategies” section states “another critical area is ‘improving access to capital, small businesses often cannot meet upfront costs.” The description states “helping with upfront costs for bonding requirements,”- that is perfect, love that. There were also recommendations for a rule that shows transparency process; more of an anecdotal recommendation to improve transparency broadly for residents which is implied by the establishment of the Commission.

Commissioner Maldonado wanted to “state for the record”, that the Framework is giving direct recommendations. He would like the entire document to have that tone.

Dr. Estes shared the section that Commissioner Maldonado was referring to was the “future strategies”, and the content had not yet been discussed with the full Commission. This content has come up in Commission committee meetings and conversations with Community and State government entities, so this would need to be a conversation the Commission has in a public space to articulate that. She also wanted to note the difference between “may” and “shall”, as the Commission is only able to “say may”, because government entities have a choice on what they can implement. She wanted to acknowledge that these are topics that can be brought up at future Commission meetings/conversations.

Additionally, Dr. Estes wanted to acknowledge, on pg. 27, the web-based interactive timeline on the budget process that can help support Communities with understanding the status of the budget process and to visually see where they may be able to engage in the process.

Commissioner Maldonado also stated, he sees an inconsistency in the “affirmativeness of the language” as the “future strategies almost sound bolder than the here and now”.

Director Estes responded that the rationale behind that, is the responsibilities of the agencies or departments and not necessarily the Racial Equity Commission". The Commission would provide technical assistance on what that could look like...giving them the tools via the Framework "so they can build the house".

Commissioner Maldonado further stated that is his observation, that the "here and now" recommendations are "soft" and a lot "less prescriptive" and he "would not know what is being recommended because {I} am not an expert in racial equity issues. As a State Director, I would need something a little more prescriptive so that it would be most helpful to me to know when I am talking to my staff. The document generally reads like that, but there are elements that have recommendations. Maybe gather that information at the bottom of the document? But that cannot be done within 24-hours.

Director Estes stated there are a number of Equity leaders throughout State agencies and departments that are already doing this work. The Commission is not building the manual or a to do check list, we are here to provide the Framework.

Commissioner Bowles stated she is looking for a readability, a table of contents, a list, Directives at the end of the document, "how to use" the Framework, definitions of "Framework, toolkits, Office of Racial Equity, and clear guidance on how to use the Framework. She wanted to know if she was a state or local agency, how would she take the document and use it, and "how do we make it easy for them to use". Where do the recommendations go, like to the "Office of Equity". In part one, "How to Build the Framework", it needs to be clear on how to take this guidance and advice. She wants to reference important conversations, even if they are not part of the framework. Further reiterated she was speaking to the readability of the document and break part one down into more sections.

Dr. Estes shared the structure of the document will be available once the Framework draft is given to the designers. The second part of this Commission is Technical Assistance as the framing guidance may look different as to how we can support within in the universe for which you are operating.

Commissioner Matthews thanked the Commissioners for their feedback. He gave two options: 1. Vote to approve the draft Framework, and trust Dr. Estes and her Staff to work on the draft Framework taking into consideration the all comments, recommendations and edits 2. Three levels of Legal review would be needed if a major/seismic changes are needed.

Action

Commissioner Wright made the motion/Commissioner Richardson (seconded) for to approved the draft Framework with consideration for the recommended edits

Dr. Estes shared making these changes as outline would be best approved at an additional meeting of the Commission on October 14, in-person, to discuss the changes. Changes need to be made by Staff, reviewed by Legal and then voted on in October.

Commissioner Kim indicated he would like to have some “back and forth” on the draft after the Staff makes adjustments.

Dr. Estes indicated the next draft would have to be discussed in public. The draft could not be sent in advance for back and forth edits to adhere to the Bagley Keene Act.

Commissioner Wood would host the October meeting at Sacramento State to meet the timeline. Referring to page six of the document, Commissioner Wood asked to have the first two sentences deleted under the definition of “Equity” because there may be confusion if someone just reads the first two sentences. He also suggested the definition of “racial equity” should be: a heightened focus on groups experiencing disproportionate outcomes in order to address disparities and those outcomes of their experiences.

Commissioner Bowles asked how does the Commission decide what changes are made?

Director Estes suggested reading the document and coming prepared to vote at the October 14 meeting. She can use track changes, but she also has to send the edited document back through Legal to review. She would note in the document if Legal did not accept the change.

Douglas Bojack (Senior Staff Counsel) public disclosure is the goal with the shared deliberations of the Commission.

Commissioner Maldonado asked if part of the tone in the recommendations meant to play to the emotional frustrations of leadership?

Director Estes shared the Framework shares structure which identifies some challenges and identifies “psychological safety” on pages 37-38.

Commissioner Maldonado shared that he will make his recommendations by the end of the day and how he would write the recommendations for the document. He gave an example of how he would structure with the following example:

Recommendation:

Develop public on-line budget tracker.

Rationale:

The State of California should create a robust on-line platform to track the State budget’s development in real-time. The digital tracker would greatly enhance transparency, here are the following key components for engagement: 1. Real-time updates, 2. Granular breakdown, 3. Change of explanations into plain language, 4. User-friendly digital accountability and archives.

Director Estes asked Commissioner Maldonado to share his recommended structure to see if it is feasible to make the updates prior to Monday, September 22. She further stated the document was drafted with the audience of State and local agencies in mind once the Commissioners defined their audience, this became relevant.

Commissioner Maldonado responded that the recommended structure would not be for his benefit, but what works best for the people. He also stated that he had not considered the audience until it had been emphasized at this meeting.

Commissioner Kim this is the inaugural and most important document. In the budget section, beyond the questions, part of the budget change proposal process, what to do when question response is attributed their risk versus gaps, like organized for assisting customer needs. Recommending that there is an intentional integration of how to effectively address community needs in terms of those gaps. There's both people on the ground, and how to close the gaps. The only other element in the budget section that is missing is to explore participatory budgeting. Multiple points of community engagement, as an opportunity of intersect. The communication cycle, the budgeting side, and there is national new practices around rebuilding jurisdictions. Appreciate each section has a few things to explore. What is missing is "here is what the mission is going to do with the meter gap to publication of this". He worries that if the Commission rushes to adopt the document, nobody comes onboard afterwards. How do we make sure that we hit the ground running?" Ideas that the Commission is actually going to do and focus on relating to colleagues from the Commission

Director Estes asked Commissioner Kim if he was suggesting adding an additional topic of "Participatory Budgeting"?

Commissioner Kim If need be, Participatory Budgeting could be represented in the same way that other content was fully discussed in the Commission, such as "future things to consider" or there were a couple of topics that the Commission did not fully flush-out where it could go or add a section at the end, if that makes more sense.

Director Estes with the timeline we are working with, that is one of the items as well as a few others, that I would highly recommend this Commission consider for a future Annual report.

Commissioner Richardson stated next steps: each Commissioner would provide recommended changes, and these changes would need to go through Legal. The Commissioners would receive a document with some of these reflected changes prior to the October 14 meeting for review and comments can be shared with the Commission and the public on October 14. Whatever is not able to be incorporated, would be noted in the draft.

Director Estes indicated the Commissioners would get the updated document by October 4 because the Commission is governed by the Bagley-Keene Act. Commissioners would have to submit their recommendations by 9:00 a.m., Thursday, September 18, 2025.

Commissioner Pastor shared how this is an amazing piece of work, and he is appreciative of the Staff who have put this document together with some input from the subcommittee.

Douglas Bojack (Senior Staff Counsel) recommended that no action is necessary in order to direct Staff to make updates; until the actual document is ready to be put forth for adoption-language would be adopted in the final report.

Public Comment Public Comment was made by

- Vince Leus, Prevention Institute
- Alejandra Ponce de Leon, Catalyst California
- Holly Nickel, State of Equity, Capitol Collaborative on Race and Equity
- Elena Santamaria, NextGen CA and California Racial Equity Coalition
- Maria Barakat, Greenlining Institute and California Racial Equity Coalition

Lunch Recess

Chair Matthews called for a lunch recess at 12:14 PM to reconvene at 12:44 PM; the meeting was called back to order at 12:48 PM.

Agenda Item #4: Reflections from Community Immersion and Engagement

Commissioner Matthews expressed the experience was emotional and beautiful of the region in Community with the Yurok people. Hearing the shared experiences of inequities in education, in healthcare, same that we have heard throughout the State. He highlighted the focus on centering community groups and during a non-election year. The community shared to “not let this work die”, this has to be long-term and it should be an iterative process because we are talking about human relationships. Also recognized Rico Miranda, Tribal Liaison for the Governor’s Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation.

Commissioner Hedrick thanked the Commissioners, the Staff and the Tribe for hosting in such a beautiful way. Understand the experiences of the communities and rural communities such as the challenges with Wi-Fi, cellphone connections, and travel time. Thanked the local Yurok tribe for hosting and the local Tribal Council for allowing the Commission to utilize their meeting space.

Commissioner Wright stated that we “stand on the shoulders” of the Indigenous people. We learned so much, and we truly appreciate the experience.

Agenda Item #6: Executive Directors Report

Dr. Larissa Estes, Executive Director, Racial Equity Commission

Dr. Larissa Estes introduced two new staff members: Jessica Gadow, Program Analyst and Asia Butts, Journalism Student Intern from Sacramento State University.

Proposed meeting locations for 2026:

- Central Valley
- San Diego/San Bernadino-Commissioner Maldonado recommended San Diego to support ease of travel for Commissioners
- Central Coast (Santa Barbara, Ventura, San Luis Obispo)-Commissioner Pastor acknowledged the equity work happening in the Central Coast region.
- Sonoma

Proposed Meet-n-Greet locations for 2026

- East of the Sierra
- South Bay
- Shasta or Siskiyou County

Commissioner Hedrick emphasized the need to go east of the Sierras including Owens Valley (Mono, Ino, Alpine Counties)

Proposed Follow-up locations for 2026

- Antelope Valley
- Salinas
- Klamath, , -

If Commissioners have relationships with potential Community partners in those locations, please share those details with Staff.

University of California Los Angeles, Luskin School of Public Policy students are interested in using a Commission topic as part of their capstone project for the current school year. The students are specifically interested in discovering how shared governance can strengthen the decision-making processes and support equitable outcomes in the topics of housing or transportation planning. The staff have brought the opportunity and topic to the Commission to provide feedback on the topic. This is a full school-year project. They would present their results at March or April 2026 Commission meeting. Commissioner Pastor volunteered to talk to the students and/or faculty advisor to maximum their experience.

Action- Motion by Commissioner Wright and seconded by Commissioner Hedrick to move forward with research related to shared governance and public policy recommendations. Motion passed 8-0, Commissioner Dr. Wood, had to leave early.

Commissioner Kim shared how there are opportunities to research shared governance including, the educational system (e.g., Local Control Funding Formula) or the needs of Tribal communities.

Dr. Estes indicated she would share that information with the students.

Commissioner Matthews indicated Commissioner Dr. Wood, had to leave the meeting at 1:00 p.m..

Public Comments**No Public Comments on Agenda Item #8*****Agenda Item #9: Next Steps for Staff Action***

Dr. Estes thanked the Commissioners for paying attention to the Framework. Any edits, changes, comments should be shared with Staff no later than 9:00 a.m., Thursday, September 18. Dr. Estes specifically noted weaving in content discussed during the meeting including

- adding information about government entities using the existing network of CBOs.
- Changes around the equity index,
- Lifting up intersectionality so that people are aware of the broadness of equity but also the impact of race.
- She noted receipt of Commissioner Maldonado's written comments.

Staff will review the structure to see if anything can be changed to create a structure to the Framework as requested. Readability and accessibility, as requested. She stated the October 14 meeting has already been calendared. Working on the Travel Guide and the meeting location has been secured. The changes will be presented to the public by October 4.

Meeting Adjournment

Meeting adjourned by common consent at 1:19 PM.