

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 **HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION**

11 **Thursday, March 4, 2011**

12 Council Conference Room

13 Palo Alto Civic Center

14 250 Hamilton Avenue

15 7:00 PM

16 SPECIAL MEETING
17

18
19 **ROLL CALL: Commissioners Present:** Bacchetti, Bernardo, Chen, Ezran, O’Nan, Verma **Council**
20 **Liaison:** Gail Price **Staff:** Minka van der Zwaag, Debbie Park, Amy Johnson
21

22
23 **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

24
25 None

26
27 **BUSINESS**

28
29 **1. DISCUSSION OF 2011-2013 HUMAN SERVICES RESOURCE ALLOCATION**
30 **PROCESS (HSRAP) FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

31
32 Commissioner Bacchetti introduced the topic and explained that the meeting tonight was to hear
33 speakers and then to deliberate on a recommendation to the Finance Committee. He also explained the
34 process to-date, which included holding public meetings. He explained that 19 applications were
35 received, making requests that exceeded available funds by 68 percent, and the members of the
36 committee—Commissioner Bacchetti, Commissioner Bernardo and staff from Office of Human
37 Services and the Planning Dept—read and discussed all the proposals. The committee held 3 two hour
38 meetings and had further discussions. He explained how the decision was made in making their
39 recommendations. He also explained that the Finance Committee will review the HRC recommendation
40 and make its own recommendation that it will pass on to the Council for a final decision. Commissioner
41 Bernardo added that it was a very difficult process and difficult making the recommendations.
42

43 **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

44
45 Mr. Philip Dah, Executive Director of Opportunity Center said that it was his 5th time applying and that
46 they have not received funding. He explained the services they provide food, shelter for homeless and
47 rental assistance programs to Palo Alto residents.
48

49 Ms. Lynda Steele, Executive Director of Abilities United, thanked the HRC and city for supporting

50 them. She commented that there will be a reduction of services if funding is reallocated to
51 administrative costs.

52

53 Ms. Stephanie Beach, President of La Comida thanked the HRC and said she appreciated their support.

54

55 Ms. Kim Ferm, Director of 211, passed out information to the commissioners.

56

57 Ms. Georgia Bacil, Executive Director of Senior Adults Legal Assistance, discussed the services their
58 program provides and explained that they serve very low income seniors.

59

60 Mr. Heiri Schuppisser, Outreach Worker for Momentum for Mental Health, thanked the HRC, but
61 explained that they provide more and more services and they are receiving less and less funding.

62

63 Commissioner Bacchetti ended public comment and opened up discussion for commissioners.

64

65 Commissioner O’Nan asked for clarification on why InnVision was not recommended for funding, but a
66 new agency was recommended. Staff explained that the new agency has access to Section 8 (rent
67 subsidy) vouchers for homeless people to get them off the street. There is only one other agency that
68 had access to these vouchers and this filled a gap that existed. Commissioner Bernardo added that
69 InnVision will be recommended for CDBG funding.

70

71 There was a discussion about reducing HSRAP funding by 2.5% and allocating that sum of
72 approximately \$27,700 to the Office of Human Services budget to enable coordination of support
73 services to HSRAP recipients and the Human Services program. Ms. van der Zwaag explained the
74 history of budget cuts and how the Office of Human Services work unit was left without an operating
75 budget.

76

77 There was a brief discussion about the recommendation providing sufficient funding support to basic
78 needs. It was understood that there are needs not being met, but since the funding budget has not
79 increased, it is very difficult to include all the needs.

80

81 There was a some discussion regarding the zero-sum character of the process, i.e., to fund any new
82 recipients, funds would have to be reduced for renewed recipients so that all changes (up and down)
83 added to zero. The committee considered whether programs would be able to continue with less funding
84 and agencies were recommended because they have a strong history of doing a good job, and since there
85 is not a new set of needs that need to be addressed, they were considered again for funding.

86

87 It was suggested that the 2.5% cut recommended might come from somewhere else and that maybe there
88 should be a discussion about changing the recommendation because there is always the hope that the
89 city could find money somewhere else.

90

91 There was a brief discussion concerning the potential of services being diluted with the proposed cut of
92 2.5%. Ms. van der Zwaag explained that she would certainly not expect the same level of services with
93 less money being awarded.

94

95 There was discussion about adopting the recommendations from the committee, and adding a request for
96 the finance committee to find and restore the 2.5% budget cut from the HSRAP funding budget.

97

98 There was a discussion about alternative funding recommendation options.

99 **AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSION COMMISSIONER EZRAN MADE A MOTION TO**
100 **APPROVE THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING THE 2.5 PERCENT**
101 **REALLOCATION TO ADMINISTRATION. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VERMA,**
102 **AYES: UNANIMOUS.**

103

104 Further instruction was given to the subcommittee to meet and deliberate and offer a second option that
105 included a distribution of the 2.5% admin costs.

106

107 Commissioner O'Nan asked that the committee try to address more basic needs in the second
108 recommendation, if the 2.5% is restored; or to not dilute services any further.

109

110 **ADJOURNMENT**

111 The meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.