

Meeting Date: May 6, 2026

Attendance:

Jeff Davis

Melissa Jackson-
Collins

Natassa Mason

George Greenidge

Brown, Deidre

Diana Milkey

City AFC Staff

Action Items will be highlighted in yellow

Call to Order:

Agenda and Minutes:

Opening & Context Setting

Jeff Davis opened the meeting by reaffirming the purpose of the session:

- To review previously submitted governance proposals
- To develop a practical decision-making framework
- To prepare recommendations for the broader commission
- To create operational clarity before expanding subcommittee work

The meeting was framed as a **working session only**, with no formal votes to be taken.

Core Governance & Decision-Making Themes

2. Establishing a Shared Governance Framework

Jeff introduced a draft decision-making structure rooted in the commission ordinance and focused on:

- Addressing systemic and ongoing harms to American Freedmen
- Centering Freedmen community voice
- Building transparent and collaborative systems

- Creating operational accountability and clarity

The group discussed the importance of grounding all future decisions in:

- Reparative justice
- Anti-racist design principles
- Community accountability
- Clear operational structures

Natassa Mason emphasized that anti-racism must remain explicitly rooted in the Freedmen experience and transitional justice work rather than becoming generalized racial equity work disconnected from the commission's specific mandate.

Melissa Jackson reinforced the need to ensure the commission remains focused on harms specific to American Freedmen communities and does not unintentionally dilute its mission.

3. DACI Decision-Making Framework

Jeff presented a proposed **DACI framework** to clarify roles in commission decision-making:

- **Driver** – Responsible for moving work forward
- **Approver** – Final decision-making authority
- **Consulted** – Individuals/groups engaged for input
- **Informed** – Stakeholders updated on outcomes and actions

Examples discussed included:

- Subcommittees acting as "Drivers"
- Full commission serving as "Approver"
- Community members and city departments serving as "Consulted"
- City leadership and the public remaining "Informed"

The framework was generally well received as a practical structure for reducing ambiguity and improving accountability.

Natassa Mason specifically noted that the model felt helpful and intuitive despite being new terminology.

Operational & Structural Concerns

4. Need for Immediate Operational Guardrails

A major theme throughout the meeting was concern that the commission currently lacks sufficient operational structure.

Melissa Jackson stressed that:

- The commission is already discussing subcommittees and expanding work
- Without governance guardrails, the commission risks confusion, inefficiency, and exposure
- Operational systems must be implemented before major expansion of subcommittee activity

She described her proposed operational framework as:

“The guardrails... the functional stuff that we do.”

Jeff Davis described his relational governance framework as focusing more on:

“Why we do it, how we do it, and how we govern.”

The group ultimately concluded that both frameworks are complementary:

- Melissa’s framework = operational/technical structure
- Jeff’s framework = relational/governance philosophy

Community Accountability & Alignment

5. Concerns About Commission Alignment

Natassa Mason raised concerns about public confidence in the commission’s effectiveness and cohesion.

She shared that community members increasingly perceive the commission as:

- Disconnected
- Slow-moving

- Lacking clarity
- Not operating from a unified direction

She emphasized the importance of:

- Establishing a shared operational framework
- Building internal alignment
- Clarifying how the commission works
- Restoring public trust

Jeff acknowledged directly that:

“We’re not on the same page as a commission... and we’re not on the same page with the community.”

The group recognized deliberate process-building itself as an anti-racist practice that requires time and intentionality.

Presentation & Sequencing Strategy

6. Agreement to Break Recommendations into Phases

The group agreed that the proposed governance materials are too large and complex to introduce all at once.

Melissa Jackson recommended:

- Breaking the material into multiple meetings
- Allowing time for discussion and deliberation
- Making concepts digestible for commissioners and the public
- Avoiding information overload

D. Brown reinforced the need for:

- Practical framing
- Educational context
- Clear organizational structure

- Simplicity and accessibility

The group discussed sequencing as follows:

Proposed Sequence

Phase 1

- DACI framework
- Operational framework
- Decision-making guardrails
- Subcommittee structure discussion

Phase 2

- Relational governance framework
- Long-term governance philosophy
- Equity-centered decision-making structures

Phase 3

- Additional policy discussions
- Roadmaps
- Structural refinements
- Long-term strategic recommendations

Meeting Logistics & Upcoming Meetings

7. Agenda Concerns & Scheduling

The group reviewed the published agenda for the upcoming May 12 working session and expressed concern that it did not fully reflect the subcommittee's intended focus.

Key concerns included:

- Too many competing agenda items
- Insufficient time for governance discussion

- Need to prioritize governance before broader subcommittee implementation

Melissa Jackson volunteered to contact Chair Greenidge to recommend adjustments to the May 12 agenda.

The subcommittee agreed to request that the May 12 working session focus primarily on:

- Governance structure
- DACI framework
- Operational framework discussion
- Subcommittee operational design

Key Takeaways

Major Agreements

- The commission urgently needs clearer governance and operational structures.
- The DACI model provides a strong foundation for decision-making clarity.
- Governance work should remain rooted in the specific experiences and harms of American Freedmen communities.
- Operational frameworks and relational governance frameworks are complementary, not competing.
- Governance recommendations should be phased and digestible.
- The commission needs stronger alignment internally and greater clarity externally with the community.

Action Items

Action Item	Owner
Synthesize governance and decision-making notes into a blended framework presentation	Jeff Davis

Draft recommendation/request to revise May 12 agenda	Melissa Jackson
Continue refining operational framework and DACI model	Subcommittee
Prepare phased presentation plan for full commission	Subcommittee
Coordinate with Chair Greenidge regarding agenda alignment	Melissa Jackson / Leadership
Develop simplified presentation materials for commissioners	Jeff Davis

Closing Reflection

The session concluded with broad agreement that governance clarity and operational alignment are foundational to the commission's credibility and effectiveness. Participants emphasized that building thoughtful structures now is necessary for sustainable reparative and transitional justice work moving forward.

Meeting Adjourned