

OPEN MEETING MINUTES

Name of Governmental Body: Governor's Health Equity Council		Attending: Gina Green-Harris, Maria Barker, Mandela Barnes, Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, Sandy Brekke, Amy DeLong, Janel Hines, Vincent Lyles, Tamra Omann, Lilliann Paine, Lisa Peyton-Caire, Tito Izard, Gale Johnson, Patty Metropulos, William Parke-Sutherland, Karen Timberlake, Paula Tran, Elizabeth Valitchka, Andrea Werner, Jasmine Zapata Sam Austin, Cecie Culp, Nadiyah Groves, Joshua Lucas, Julia Nagy, Kevin Reddy, Sarah Schuit, Vipul Shukla, Andrew Walsh, Elizabeth Wikler, Donna Wong, MayChee Yang
Date: 3/23/2022	Time Started: 1:00 PM Time Ended: 2:00 PM	
Location: Zoom		Presiding Officer: Gina Green-Harris

Minutes

1. Welcome, Overview of Agenda, Updates..... 1:00 to 1:05 PM

Gina Green-Harris welcomed Council members, provided several reminders, told Members that they are on track to produce a powerful and impactful report for the Governor, and thanked them for their commitment and efforts with the Council.

Gina provided an update on the status of the major recommendations and shared some critical updates. The next full Council meeting is scheduled for April 27th from 1-4pm. Gina said the goal is to make sure that Members have the full context for the work ahead and know exactly what to expect for the final vote on April 27th.

She reminded the Council that they are not voting on major recommendations today.

Gina went over the agenda: Overview of process so far, preview the Chair recommendations, preview the voting process and protocols for the final vote on the 27th, and explain the materials Members will be receiving over the next few weeks, including draft recommendations and feedback.

2. Summary of Process from January – March1:05 to 1:10 PM

Gina stated that although the full Council has not met, she and Michelle have spent many hours with the planning team, with external stakeholders, and with other state partners processing how best to turn the work into a final report.

She stated that the aim was to produce the recommendations in time for some of them to either help inform or be considered for inclusion in the FY23-25 Biennial Budget process. She confirmed that the Council is still on track to meet that objective. She said they anticipate having a report finalized by the end of May or early June, with plenty of time for the Governor's Office, state agencies, and stakeholder partners to consider as part of their budgets and budget advocacy.

3. Major Recommendations.....1:10 to 1:20 PM

In January, subcommittees reviewed drafts of major recommendations, offered amendments, and voted them out for full consideration by the Council. The Chairs and the planning team were thrilled to see such high-quality work in areas that they believe will advance health equity across the state.

Gina thanked the subcommittee chairs, including Jasmine Zapata, Amy DeLong, Maria Baker, Gale Johnson, Elizabeth Valitchka, Paula Tran, and Shiva Bidar and the subcommittee facilitators, Andrew Walsh, Sarah Schuit, MayChee Yang, Vipul Shukla and Donna Wong.

After receiving the drafts, the planning team sent the recommendations to partners in state government and asked for feedback. To help ground the feedback, they shared the Council’s 9 decision-making criteria with state partners and asked that the reviewers consider what changes (if any) were needed to ensure that the recommendations were achievable through one of our policy pathways, conceptually and technically sound, possible to operationalize, and actionable.

Gina shared that this process took some time. In some cases, they had to consult state agencies more than once to clarify legal and programmatic questions. She said this step was rooted in their commitment to a bi-directional partnership with state government, which will help improve the Council’s overall success both in the short and long term.

Feedback was organized into three buckets: 1) Changes that needed to be made based on federal or state law and/or other criteria for the recommendation to be actionable or implemented; 2) Suggested changes that could potentially strengthen or enhance the recommendation but are not essential to achieving the purpose of the recommendation; and 3) Revisions that provide additional context or background to justify the recommendation or guide its implementation if adopted.

Gina stated that given the amount of work it’s taken to finalize the major recommendations and the chair recommendations, she and Michelle made the executive decision to not include a list of minor recommendations and instead work to ensure that the major recommendations and the rest of the report are best shape possible for to set them up for success.

She said that they did this the minor recommendations varied widely in terms of their degree of specificity and how developed the concepts were, and because the team is stretched to capacity addressing feedback on the major recommendations and writing the rest of the report. In addition, none of the ideas were deliberated in subcommittees, vetted by the group, or considered as part of a more thorough strategy to drive change. She invited Members to contact her if they have concerns.

4. Chair Recommendations.....1:20 to 1:25 PM

Gina explained that the executive order that established the Governor’s Health Equity Council charged them with establishing a plan supported by a body of research, with key benchmarks to reduce and eliminate health disparities throughout the State of Wisconsin by 2030. “The plan shall address health disparities in populations based on race, economic status, education level, history of incarceration, and geographic location.”

After the January votes, she & Michelle conducted a crosswalk between the drafts and the charges in the executive order to ensure that they were on track to meet the objectives in the executive order. There were a few areas where additional work was needed. The Chairs focused on those areas and set to work drafting a set of chair recommendations. They drew on their previous experiences, their subject matter expertise, and feedback from key allies and drafted three additional recommendations.

The Council will be sent the drafts soon, but the Chair recommendations are housing, guaranteed income pilots and baby bonds.

Housing. Gina recognized Wanda Montgomery, fellow Council member, on the power subcommittee for voting out a recommendation to address housing insecurity among marginalized populations in Wisconsin. Michelle and Gina found this work compelling and worked with Wanda to add to it to expand the reach of the recommendation and make it more actionable.

The revised recommendation now calls on the state to dedicate resources to support homebuyers and increase homeownership among marginalized groups. It also calls on the state to establish community land trusts, which are community-driven organizations that acquire and maintain permanent ownership over parcels of land and govern the terms around which owners and tenants can utilize it. Community land trusts—or CLTs-- ensure permanent affordability, build community empowerment, and promote home equity and wealth creation for generation after generation.

Guaranteed Income Pilots. The legacies of historic policies as well as more recent economic shifts in agriculture and manufacturing have entrenched systemic inequities in income and poverty in Wisconsin. Across the world and across the United States, innovative policy leaders are launching programs that offer individuals and families a level of guaranteed income for a set period of time. These guaranteed income programs offer recurring, no-strings attached monthly payments to eligible individuals, with the goal of reducing poverty and empowering marginalized communities. Existing programs vary in who is eligible for funding—some communities provide payments to new moms and others support foster children aging out of the system. Their recommendation calls on the state to fund five pilot programs across the state to test various models of guaranteed income programs and evaluate their impact on poverty in Wisconsin.

Baby Bonds. Distribution of wealth in the United States, as well as in Wisconsin, has become increasingly unequal – particularly along racial lines, across urban and rural communities, as well as between the lowest and highest earners. The use of “baby bonds” – or investments made for babies born in the state – can help close these gaps, foster economic security, strengthen the labor market, and position the next generation for success. The recommendation calls on the state to create a state-level baby bonds program that would distribute an initial payment of \$3,600 to each baby born in the state and provide additional payments that ranges from \$100 to \$2500 based on household income each year until the child turns 18. Once 18, the child could use the funding to support education and training expenses; purchase a home as a primary residence; start or expand a business; cover medical expenses and potentially other allowable uses of funding determined by a newly-formed Statewide Baby Bonds Taskforce.

5. Other Recommendations.....1:25 to 1:30 PM

Gina mentioned that there are three other new recommendations focused on supporting individuals at-risk of being involved, currently, or formerly involved in the criminal-legal system. Gina stated that GHEC council member Sarah Ferber resigned from the Council. Sarah was previously representing EXPO, or Ex-Incarcerated People Organizing. She and Michelle didn't want to lose this important perspective so they asked that Tamra Oman, the current Statewide Program Director of the FREE Campaign at EXPO, be appointed to the Council in Sarah's place.

Because Tamra joined the Council after subcommittees started their work, they have been working with Tamra separately to draft recommendations on topics that she, given her expertise in this field and her work with other partners and stakeholders, thinks are important to advance. The first supports peer-led community-based diversion programs, the second aims to improve the health of pregnant and postpartum people who are facing criminal charges or are incarcerated, and the third is focused on

policies and programs that help reduce barriers to employment for formerly incarcerated individuals to improve conditions to access economic opportunity. Gina thanked Tamra.

6. Voting Process and Amendments.....1:40 to 1:45 PM

Gina told members that the primary purpose of the vote is agreement in principle. The recommendations will go through editing when folded into the report. If an amendment passes it still needs to be lawful, so if writers determine amendments aren't implementable, they will edit.

The goal is not consensus but a democratic process. A simple majority is needed for a quorum in order to vote and 2/3 of that quorum must vote yes for the motion to pass.

Gina reviewed the decision-making criteria:

1. Must be achievable through one of the policy pathways
2. Reflect a commitment to equitable and just practices across all sectors of society
3. Be directed at structural and systemic levers and not individual behavior
4. Be respectful of groups of particular concern
5. Be clear, intuitive and compelling
6. Be sufficiently unambiguous that it can guide policy priorities
7. Be conceptually and technically sound, consistent with current understandings of best practice, or may generate new knowledges
8. Be possible to operationalize for the purpose of measurement, which is essential for accountability
9. Be actionable

Gina explained the voting process:

1. Chair will invite remarks from authors
2. Authors speak – up to 2 minutes
3. Chair opens discussion – 2 minutes total all speakers
4. Chair calls for a motion
5. Chair asks for a member to second a motion
6. Chair asks if there is further discussion
7. Chair initiates roll call

Gina explained that amendments will be put forth for discussion during the discussion period. After discussion on the recommendation, the Chair will ask for a motion. The motion does not need to specify every detail, but can specify the direction of the revision.

7. Recommendation Feedback.....1:45 to 1:50 PM

Gina said that authors whose proposals received feedback will be sent that feedback. Feedback fell into three buckets: 1) Helpful context in terms of additional background and information to inform implementation; 2) Changes that would potentially strengthen the proposal but are not necessary; and 3) Changes that need to be made based on state, federal or other criteria. Proposals that were identified as unactionable will need to be amended in order to move forward.

Authors will receive their proposals with red bullets at the top outlining the changes and which bucket they fall into. After the vote, changes will be incorporated into recommendations and the final report.

Gina reviewed the next steps and asked for questions. March 29-April 8: drafting teams receive feedback, April 13: all Members will receive all major recommendations with proposed amendments

and revisions, April 27: vote on major recommendations and amendments, May: report drafted, June: final report published.

8. Questions & Answers1:50 to 2:00 PM

William Q: When necessary changes are identified (due to fed, state law, or other criteria), will the document include specific citations or details about which of these constraints are incompatible with the recommendations?

A: Yes. Gina will be setting up meetings with writing teams to go through the feedback.

Tamra: Thank you for not forgetting about this population (people with history of incarceration).

A: Thank *you* Tamra.

William Q: Will the Chair and other recommendations follow the same path for voting and amendments?

A: Yes

Gale Q: Two minutes total all speakers?

A: Yes. It may go over, but this is the starting point.

William Q: Is it up to the authors to decide whether to include the feedback received?

A: Yes; however, for feedback that impacts the ability of the recommendation to be implemented, it will need to be incorporated.

Prepared by: Donna Wong on 3/23/2022.

These minutes are in draft form. They will be presented for approval by the governmental body on: 4/27/2022

