

HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Thursday, March 9, 2017

Community Meeting Room Palo Alto Civic Center 250 Hamilton Avenue 7:00 PM REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Alhassani, Chen, O'Nan, Stinger, Stone

Absent: Gordon Gray, Savage

Staff: Minka van der Zwaag, Mary Constantino

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Stone: Welcome to the March meeting of the Human Relations Commission. Let's start with roll call. Council Member Kou will not be in, she texted me. Yes, she is not feeling well, unfortunately.

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

Chair Stone: Any agenda changes, requests or deletions? Alright, wonderful.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Stone: Then we will move into oral communications. I have one speaker card, Sarah Pike, if you please. Feel free to use the nice – yes, thank you.

Sarah Almond Pike: Hi, good evening. My name is Sarah Almond Pike. I am here as a Board Member of the Local United Nations Association. You might know us from our great gift shop on Emerson with Fair Trade Gifts. You might know us from the UNAFF, the film festival that we do every year. We're a proud part of the Palo Alto community. We're here today to speak about something called Cities for CEDAW, and I have my fellow Board Member Shelly, here with me as well. First, to start, what is CEDAW? CEDAW stands for the Convention on Eliminations of all forms of Discrimination against Women and it's a Landmark UN Treaty that spells out all forms of discrimination based on gender and it was really the landmark treaty when it was first brought out in the 70s. It was signed and ratified by nearly all UN member states except for a handful, unfortunately, including the United States. That led to a grassroots movement in the US for cities to implement the ordinance locally, meaning that they would adopt these principles of gender equity at a local level. That first started in 1998 with San Francisco and they've had great success. Out of that, they actually built their own office related to gender equality and the status of women. The reason we are bringing this up is that we'd love to see Palo Alto also become a CEDAW city. There's movement now and there are more than 20 cities across the US that have either a resolution or an ordinance that are advocating for the

principle of gender equity and another 60 that are exploring implementing of a resolution or an ordinance. Specifically, because of the great resolution that was passed unanimously in December by the City Council calling for a commitment or a recommitment to diversity and inclusion, it is our understanding that this would be a great Commission to put together some specific recommendations for how the Council might implement that. What's so great about CEDAW is that it's a framework that already exists. It's already been implemented successfully in San Francisco and other cities and I can provide for you a sample ordinance. It's already a framework that exists and that works really well. It only calls for a couple of things. One is to sign the ordinance, one is to appoint or give power to body – potentially an existing body like the Human Relations Commission, to do a study into the gender equity issues that may or may not exist in the city. Then the third is a small amount of money to go towards any changes, policy or otherwise, that might be needed if after the gender review and there are changes that need to take place. If there aren't many changes that need to take place because Palo Alto is already doing a great job of promoting gender equity, then all the better. We are just here to respectfully but very enthusiastically bring this idea to the Commission. We'd be eager to speak to you more about it because we think it would be a great tool, without having to reinvent the wheel that can be used to move forward the values of inclusivity, diversity, and respect that we know the city and the Commission are working towards. Thanks very much.

Chair Stone: Thanks so much, appreciate it.

IV. BUSINESS

1. Recommendations to Finance Committee for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding for Fiscal Year 2018 - CDBG Ad Hoc Committee

Chair Stone: Alright, we'll move onto our first item of business. A recommendation to the Finance Committee for CDBG funding for the fiscal year of 2018. We have Eloiza here again.

Ms. Eloiza Murillo-Garcia: I'm here to give you a brief overview to the fiscal year 17-18 CDBG allocation process. The City of Palo Alto receives annual funding from HUD as an entitlement city under the Community Development Block Grant or CDBG. CDBG is the principal federal program that provides grants to improve physical, economic and social conditions, primarily for persons of low and moderate income. Activities funded through CDBG must meet 1 of 3 national objectives which are to benefit low and very low incomes persons, add in the preventions or elimination of slums or blight and meet other community needs that are particularly urgent for the low-income community. That mostly has to do with natural disasters. All of the activities that are funded by the city meet the first objective which is to benefit low and very low-income persons. This is an estimate of the funding available for fiscal year '18. Unfortunately, as of now, HUD has not notified this city or any city of what their CDBG allocations will be. We're using an estimated grant amount. Currently, HUD is requesting a 14% reduction in funds for formula application grants from the current fiscal year so that's the amount that we used. We took what we currently get as an entitlement grant, which is \$441,000 and we reduced it by 14% so our estimated grant amount is \$379,000. We also have \$329,000 which we've reallocated from previous years from either project that had money left over or we had some access program income. We have an estimated program income amount of \$136,000 for a total of \$844,583. This slide here, there are 5 different categories in which we allocate CDBG funds. The first category is Public Services. This slide here demonstrates the five different applications that the city

received under this category. As you can see, there was a total request of over \$124,000. This category does have a 15% funding cap so we only have just over \$76,000 to allocate. This chart has the agency, the program name, the request, the recommendation and the recommendation reflects the recommendation from the Selection Committee. The last column shows the current allocation, just to give you some context. The next category is Planning and Administration. There are two programs under that category and this also is subject to a 20% funding cap. There is one agency that applied and that's Project Sentinel for Fair Housing Services and this also funds the city for CDBG administration. The request was over \$117,000, we are limited to \$103,000 because of the cap and then the last column also shows you what the current allocation is. There was one applicant under the Economic Development Category and that was an application from the Downtown Streets Team for their Workforce Development Program. It shows you the request, the recommendation, and the current allocation. I should say that Economic Development Category does not have a funding cap so the only categories that have caps are Public Services and Planning and Administration. The final application that was received was under the Public Facilities Category, which is an application from La Comida for a kitchen renovation project. Just to give you some additional information on the process. HUD requires the preparation of a 5-year strategic plan of action, which is referred to as a consolidated plan to address priority house and community development needs and to set goals for obtaining identified objectives. The current Consolidated Plan was approved by Council in – on May 4th, 2015, so it runs from 2015-2020. The primary objectives of the Consolidated Plan include the preservation of existing affordable housing units, supporting activities to end homelessness and provide community services to special needs populations, strengthening neighborhoods, promoting fair housing choice and expanding economic opportunities for low-income households. A 1-year action plan is in addition to the 5-year plan and a 1-year action plan is required every fiscal year and it outlines the activities that the city will undertake to implement the strategies of the Consolidated Plan. Currently, the CDBG program runs on a 2-year funding cycle, which is similar to the HSRAP program. Fiscal year 17 -18 is the first year of the next funding cycle and as I mentioned before in these tables, the recommendations are based on the recommendations of the HRC Selection Committee, which consists of Commissioners Alhassani, Stinger, and Stone. The Selection Committee met on February 17th and made funding recommendations and of course, I'd like to thank them for their participation and hard work in the allocation process. As I mentioned earlier, the city has not yet received its entitlement amount from HUD so it is also necessary to come up with a contingency plan in the event that there is an increase or decrease in funds. The proposal is for the public – in the Public Service Category. Well, staff proposal is for each applicant to receive a proportional increase or decrease - I'm sorry, if there's an increase, the staff proposal is to have a proportional share of funds for all the applicants. I know during the Selection Committee the Committee expressed an interest in funding the Opportunity Center and YWCA at the recommended levels as a possibility and then possibly decreasing the other applicants by a proportional amount. There was also a recommendation that each applicant receive a minimum grant of \$5,000 due to the administrative burden of managing the grant. In the Planning and Admin Category Project Sentinel is recommended to receive – in the event of additional funds, Project Sentinel is recommended to receive an additional amount up to the total amount requested with the remainder applied to the city administration. In the event of a decrease, the Selection Committee also expressed an interest in keeping Project Sentinel at the recommended level and further decreasing the city administration. The two remaining categories, Economic Development and Public Facilities, I'm

not sure if we really need to come up with a contingency plan because the recommendation is for them to receive their full amount. Again, I'd like to thank you for your participation and the action requested is to open the public hearing and take public comment and to come up with funding recommendations for the fiscal year 2018. Thank you.

Chair Stone: Thank you, Eloiza. Alright, let's open it up then to public comment. I have two speaker cards. The first is Amy Marseline. Did I pronounce that wrong?

Ms. Amy Marseline: No, you did well. Thank you. Good evening, my name is Amy Marseline. I work for the long-term care on the Ombudsman program of Santa Clara County. I just wanted to thank you for the opportunity to tell you about the long-term care on Ombudsman Programs at Catholic Charity in Santa Clara County. I also wanted to thank the City of Palo Alto for your past and continued support of the Ombudsman program. Ombudsman is advocates for the most vulnerable citizens of your city, those who live in the nursing home and assisted living facilities. We advocate for their dignity, rights and needs of seniors and disabled living in long-term care facilities. We do this by maintaining a regular presence in all facilities in not only the City of Palo Alto but all of Santa Clara County. We do this through Ombudsman, who is certified by the Office of the State of Long-term Care on Ombudsman. We're an unduplicated service in Santa Clara County as no other agency has 24/7 access to residents in long-term care facilities. The Ombudsman program is authorized by the Federal Older American Act, as well as the California Older Californians Act and all of our services are free to residences and their family, friends, and caregivers. The main function of the Ombudsman program is to investigate and resolve complaints made by or on behalf of residences related to issues of quality of care and abuse. We also provide mediation, give referrals and witness advanced healthcare directives. Ombudsman protects and helps to improve the quality of life and quality of care to those in long-term care facilities. Especially, for those who have no option but to live in a long-term care facility. Often times these residents do not have family, friends, visitors or any other form of support and for the most part, these residents that don't have any other way of speaking up for themselves or having the ability to advocate for themselves. For these reasons, the presences of a long-term care Ombudsman in facilities is critical for giving a voice and an advocate to residents to ensure that their needs are met and their concerns are addressed. Unfortunately, a lot of our efforts go towards investigating reports of known or suspected elder abuse and helping to resolve these complaints and reports. We do frequently partner with other agencies in Santa Clara County such as Adult Protective Service, Senior Adult Legal Assistance, Silicon Valley Independent Living Center, police and sheriff departments and the respective agencies of licensed long-term care facilities; just to name a few. Specifically, in Palo Alto, we have one full-time staff member who covers the four nursing homes. She goes to the nursing home one time a month at minimum, as required by the State Ombudsmen Office and 10 assisted living facilities, which she is required to visit and see residences at every quarter at a minimum. As of last year, we visited 1,050 residences in the City of Palo Alto alone and this year 1,024 residents reside in facilities in Palo Alto. Thank you very much.

Chair Stone: Thank you.

Ms. Marseline: I just want to say that we're very happy with the recommendation. Thank you

Chair Stone: Thank you. Alright, next is Sheri Burns.

Ms. Sheri Burns: Good evening members of the Human Relations Commission and City Staff. My name is Sheri Burns, I'm the Executive Director of Silicon Valley Independent Living Center. We are a service resource and advocacy organization providing services for people with disabilities including, seniors with functional limitations and disabling conditions throughout Santa Clara County. We've been empowering and supporting low-income people with disabilities for 40-years now and we have a dozen services that we provide absolutely free to these individuals because 95% of our folks are very low income. Our project is assisting low and very low-income Palo Alto residences with disabilities including seniors, in learning the skills and resources necessary to locate or maintain safe, affordable, long-term and accessible if necessary, housing and avoid homelessness or unnecessary institutionalization. We really appreciate the City of Palo Alto support of our program over the past many years. We do this through our monthly group housing search workshops offered throughout the County and such as in the City of Palo Alto, the Life Moves Opportunity Services Center and we also work one on one and provide housing counseling for our consumers to develop an individualized plan of action – excuse me – with specific step of how we can work with them to obtain long-term housing. The comprehensive areas that we cover with them include credit readiness and credit repair, types of low-income housing and eligibility, application and interview preparation. We actually do mock interviews on the phone with them so they are prepared for that, tenant and landlord rights and responsibilities, fair housing and home modifications law and resources. We assist with security deposit and rental assistant programs. We partner with the emergency assistant network organization throughout the county to provide that emergency assistance. We also are a Second Harvest Food supplement food site so we can assist with emergency food as well. Then lastly, we provide long-term services and support such as hooking them up within home supported services if they qualify and they need in-home care, low-cost utilities, meal programs etc. to help again, individuals with disabilities and seniors to live successfully in their own homes. As I mentioned, we have 40-years of experience in disability service provision. If you Google Santa Clara County housing resources, we are at the top of the list for the disability services area. We have seen a tremendous increase in the number of requests over the past number of years. We're at 120% increase in requests for our assistance and in that way, utilizing the funds from the City of Palo Alto along with other cities that allows us then to have a second full-time housing coordinator who can go out into the community and provide these workshops. Again, through your assistance, we are able to do that. I'm available to answer any question that you might have.

Chair Stone: Thank you very much.

Ms. Minka van der Zwaag: I think if they have questioned it's later on but usually...

Ms. Burns: Just the presentation now.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Just the presentation now.

Ms. Burns: Ok, great. Thank you so much.

Chair Stone: Thank you. We only had two speaker cards. Did any other organization want to say a few words before we move onto our discussion? Ok, great.

Ms. Ann Marquart: I'm here from Project Sentinel in case anybody does have any questions.

Chair Stone: Wonderful, thank you. Alright, then let's move onto our discussion and I actually, liked your idea that if anyone who has not spoken yet, could just raise your hand and introduce yourself and the organization you're from so that way, the members of the Commission who weren't on the subcommittee knows what organizations are here so we can ask questions.

Mr. Bill Blodget: I'm Bill Blodget, I'm the president of La Comida.

Ms. Zia McWilliams: I'm Zia. I'm the project manager of Downtown Streets Team in Palo Alto.

Arnold: I'm Arnold. I would like to hear more about the Human Relations Commission, and I would like to hear more about how the non-profit organizations could support the elderly and the disabled and other people that need help.

Chair Stone: Where are you from?

Arnold: I'm from Palo Alto High School.

Chair Stone: I had a feeling. You are welcome to stay in the room. Alright, so move on to now our discussion. Did anyone have any thoughts or anyone on the subcommittee want to go through our thought process on our recommendations?

Commissioner O'Nan: I was wondering if I could Eloiza a question about the categories first.

Chair Stone: Perfect.

Commissioner O'Nan: One is that I was puzzled as to why organizations like Palo Alto Housing Corporation are not under the Housing Category? Can you explain how that works?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, so I didn't talk too much about the Housing Category because we didn't receive any applicants but that's for housing rehab projects.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: More like a brick and mortar type of project.

Chair Stone: I also want to clarify something before we go forward -- that Eloiza clarified for the subcommittee, that the 2015 or 2020 Consolidated Plan goals, those goals 1-6, those aren't in any particular order of importance. Those are just the 6 goals; it's not saying that affordable housing is more important than economic development. That's just all the goals on there.

Commissioner Chen: I have a question...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Sure.

Commissioner Chen: There's a table with numbers but without legend. I don't understand that. This is agency in here in one column and then it says annual goals and there are numbers. What are those numbers for?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Oh, yes. I should have clarified that a little bit better. This indicates the agencies that have applied that are currently receiving CDBG funds. It lists the agency and then it lists each agency's annual goal which is a certain number of people that they are supposed to serve during the year and then the last column is from the semiannual report. They are required to report to the city semi-annually. It's just to give you a sense of how they are doing this year in terms of meeting their goals and that's the only purpose for this table.

Commissioner Chen: Those are the numbers of persons they served?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Eloiza, can I just ask, is that their annual goal for their program or for the money that's provided under the terms of their contract with you?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: This is the goal for their contract with the City of Palo Alto.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's what I thought, just wanted to clarify.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes they served many more people but this the goal that they have for this particular contract.

Commissioner Chen: I just have some comments. My impression is that it's very interesting. Look at the numbers because of the public service and then the planning and administration, they had a fixed cap. Maybe they have more but there's a cap.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: There is, yes.

Commissioner Chen: Look at the other ones like economic development and the – big numbers.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, unfortunately, that's something that has regulations so we cannot exceed the cap and it's very unfortunate because we tend to have a lot of applicants, especially in the public service category.

Commissioner Chen: Exactly.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Commissioner Chen: There's no way we can switch it?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No it's a regulation so we'd get in trouble because we have to do calculations when we report to HUD at the end of the year and we have to tell them that this is the percentage we spend on these categories. Yes, there's no leeway, unfortunately.

Commissioner Alhassani: If I recall to clarify in the subcommittee meeting, the \$844,583 number, that's your estimated base times 14%?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Commissioner Alhassani: From what we had last time. Now, we only – because of the limits on the categories, we only allocated \$817 and change?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Commissioner Alhassani: I guess I have two questions, one is whatever we end up getting, if it's more or less, is there a certain margin where the money would carry over to next year.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: We have to – we have to allocate it all.

Commissioner Alhassani: No matter what it's going to be, we're going to be...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Commissioner Alhassani: Because of the category cap, we have a buffer a little bit as in...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, we did and then I think we put in the memo that if there are extra funds, then we are recommending adding that to La Comida but more for the city for project delivery cost because we will have to prepare an environmental review. The project will be subject to prevailing wages so we will have to monitor it and more than likely, we'll have to hire somebody who goes out to do the monitoring. It would be costs associated with delivery in the project; if we happen to have a little bit extra.

Commissioner Alhassani: If we have more or even if the cut is less than we think it is, is that the difference between what we allocated – is that divided proportionally across the categories by any means or it all goes to a certain category?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: If we receive...

Commissioner Alhassani: If we have an extra \$10,000 does any of it automatically get put into Economic Development versus Services.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No, not necessarily. You're saying that if we end up with \$854,000, then our two categories that are subject to caps, the caps would slightly increase so you could recommend that you want – if it increases slightly, that you want the 5 applicants to get a proportional increase or you can recommend that you want a certain agency to get the extra amount.

Commissioner Alhassani: I know we gave some high-level guidance of to what our thinking was if had more but did we say that we would meet again as a subcommittee.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: We can certainly meet again.

Commissioner Alhassani: Chair Stone if the number ends up being different than what we have, I think it would be worth it to huddle again.

Chair Stone: Didn't we have that conservation.

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes, I wasn't sure.

Chair Stone: Yes over a certain percentage that we would reconvene.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, it was – yes it was...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, thanks for reminding me. Was it –I forgot what the percentage was. Was it 5% or was it 10?

Commissioner Alhassani: I thought it was 3% but...

Chair Stone: That's the number that's in my head.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: 3%?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, I think it was 3%.

Chair Stone: As far as the – I know our total or at least our total projected is \$844,000, we've only recommended \$817,000.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Chair Stone: I understand we're precluded from adding that to the Planning and Administration or Public Services, but I think we should probably make sure we take advantage of it and allocate the rest between Downtown Streets and La Comida. I don't know how much more La Comida needs for their kitchen renovation but I think that can be – I would hate to see the funds go unused.

Commissioner O'Nan: I don't think we can give them more than they requested so if they are already getting...

Chair Stone: Is that...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's a little tricky to give them more than they requested unless – the only possibility is if they made an amendment and said we need additional funds but it's real – HUD

kind of frowns upon that if they see that you're giving them more than requested.

Vice Chair Stinger: I think that as a community, we would start to question the construction contracts and the contracts that La Comida received. If we start to see changes or I -- just having come off the library's construction project, I thought your proposal to use the funding for Administration directly related to filings was logical. There's going to be change orders and administrative...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: As I mentioned...

Vice Chair Stinger: ... details that will be needed to managed.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: ... the project will be subject to an environmental review so we'll have to prepare a NEPA Environmental Review for it. Depending on how complex the project is, we may have to get a consultant for that and it certainly will be subject to prevailing wages, which will require extensive monitoring to make sure that the workers on site are getting paid the appropriate wages. It's a pretty intensive process, which requires weekly payroll monitoring, on-site visits, some different meetings so the intentions are that the city will probably need to hire a consultant to do that monitoring.

Vice Chair Stinger: Given the time constraints that we have to hire – I would want the City to hire a consultant to keep it – keep the project expedited.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Chair Stone: Are we already at the cap for the City of Palo Alto then? I mean, for the Planning and Administration? This is just assuming that we get more money than what would be necessary.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Well, the thinking is because we were only able to allocate \$817,000 and we could potentially have up to \$844,000, we were proposing that if there's extra money available, that we allocate that to La Comida but not for their construction cost but more for a Project delivery cost. Part of the thinking was to – was the recommendation for the CDBG Administration. I think the recommendation is – it got cut to so the city is not receiving the amount that it was requested and as I said, this project will probably be pretty staff intensive and it's my understanding that this is La Comida's first CDBG project so I think we're going to have to spend quite a bit of time on this project.

Chair Stone: That funding would be going to the City of Palo Alto?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, but only for costs associated with getting this project completed so it wouldn't be for any...

Chair Stone: That takes it out from under the cap of...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, it does.

Chair Stone: ... planning and administrations and into public facilities?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, it's considered a project delivery cost.

Chair Stone: Ok, so that's permissible.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, that's permissible for capital projects – for construction projects.

Mr. Blodget: Can I ask you just a brief question?

Chair Stone: Please.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can you go to the microphone, please, Bill?

Mr. Blodget: Could some of that incremental amount for city activity, could that be used to offset some of the City fees? Right now, we are facing a \$5,100 fee to apply for a Conditional Use Permit and so as we get more and more into this, we find that there are more and more costs that we didn't fully appreciate. I'm just wondering if that extra city money could be used to offset city fees.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's a good point. We would probably ask you to amend your request to include that.

Chair Stone: Are we able to make a recommendation that La Comida gets their \$321,000 and make a contingent recommendation on if La Comida amends their request – that way we don't have to come back and revote on it. Is that an option?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's an option. Yes.

Chair Stone: I know what you mean about the additional fees. I'm trying to pay for a wedding right now so maybe we could throw that into HSRAP.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No, please don't add that.

Chair Stone: Other thoughts?

Vice Chair Stinger: I'm slightly embarrassed but I can't help myself. There's a typing error on page 2, is this document go anywhere but to us?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Can you tell me where it's at? I'm sorry, I'm not seeing it.

Vice Chair Stinger: Somewhere it was La Comida on page 2, kitchen facilities where meals. I think it is kitchen facilities where meals are provided.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Oh, yes. Yes, thank you for pointing that out.

Vice Chair Stinger: I'm sorry.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No, no, that's fine. Thank you.

Commissioner O'Nan: I was wondering if we can clarify the scenario in which we do get the \$844,000 so there's somewhat more money and then the cap for Public Services would be slightly higher. Then was the plan to equitably distribute the incremental increase across all of the applicants?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's one way of doing it and I think as the Commissioners that were on the Selection Committee said – I think if the increase was 3% or less, then the plan is to distribute it equitably but if the increase was more than 3%, I think the recommendation is to reconvene.

Commissioner O'Nan: I do have a concern about that in that I think two of the larger agencies are quite far off from what they requested and was they were allocated. For example, Palo Alto Housing Corp is more than \$20,000 off and Life Moves is like \$15,000 off. Where some of the other agencies are really close or much closer to the amounts they've requested. I'm just wondering if there is an incremental distribution, whether we should favor the people whose gaps are wider.

Vice Chair Stinger: Can I speak to that?

Chair Stone: Please.

Vice Chair Stinger: The piece that we don't have here is the spend in 2017 and we tried to keep that as a straight line so that there was a staple budgeting process – past experience and going forward.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: I did just put up the slide that has the column with the current allocation.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok, I see what you're saying.

Chair Stone: Also, those two organizations that aren't getting nearly as much as they asked for, they are still getting most of the money from the Public Service section.

Commissioner Alhassani: If we get the \$844,000, that's a 3.25% difference so it would trigger us meeting.

Chair Stone: Any other thoughts or comments?

Commissioner Alhassani: Thanks to the city staff for shepherding us through and thanks to the applicants for putting together a lot of effort and, one final – I will say just to be super honest and blunt, if you showed up at a Subcommittee meeting and was there to answer questions, then it helped you in your process a little bit because it helps to clarify a lot of things.

MOTION

Chair Stone: Oh, absolutely. Very helpful. Do we have on here – this is the only recommendation that we have that came out of that subcommittee, right? Ok. Then, I'd like to first make a motion on having – if there is an increase in funding that's beyond 3%...

Commissioner Alhassani: Or even decrease, right?

Chair Stone: Oh, you're right. Increase/decrease beyond 3% that the Subcommittee would reconvene and determine allocations at that point and then bring it back towards the full HRC at a later date.

Commissioner Alhassani: Second.

Chair Stone: Ok, we'll vote on it. All in favor that motion, say aye.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner O'Nan: Aye.

Chair Stone: Alright, any opposed or abstained? Alright wonderful, that motion passes.

MOTION PASSED 5-0 WITH 2 ABSENT

MOTION #2

Chair Stone: I will also make a motion and bear with me as I try to work through the wording that if they make a contingency plan for if La Comida does amend their application that we would fund them up to – Mehdi, I need your math – you're my calculator –what do you have for me Mehdi?

Chair Stone: Just to be able to make up for this gap between...

Vice Chair Stinger: I have \$26,589

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes.

Chair Stone: \$26,589? Ok, I like it. So, make a contingency plan that if La Comida amends their application up to \$26,589 extra, then the Commission would accept that funding allocation.

Commissioner O'Nan: Is that the entire difference, though, which means there would be nothing left for the other categories?

Chair Stone: The only other category that we could fund extra would be Downtown Streets Team because the other ones are at a cap right now. Downtown Streets Team could but I mean, they are not here. I haven't heard – Oh! Man, she is quite back there. Clearly, they don't need it. Did

you want to speak before I finalize this? Man, this just got dramatic. I'm excited.

Ms. McWilliams: I didn't – I didn't realize ...

Ms. van der Zwaag: You have to speak into it, Zia.

Ms. McWilliams: I didn't realize you were making a decision at this moment. Yes, we could amend our budget but I think the more we have access to, the more people we could help. Then potentially fund another part time staff member to help with housing and employing more people. We would definitely take a look at the budget and see if we could amend it. Thank you though for your generous grant. We really appreciate your support and continued guidance. Thank you.

Chair Stone: Thank you. Does either La Comida or Eloiza, have an estimate on how much total all these hidden fees are going – are costing? Don't just say \$26,589.

Mr. Blodget: It's really in the process. The \$5,100 obviously just came up and so that's one we're sure of that we didn't know about. We strongly expect that there are going to be others and we also know that if the somehow cost came in below what we are asking for obviously, be funded in the amounts that we actually have bona fide bills and costs. From everything that we are told, we think we are being somewhat conservative with the overall project cost. We've estimated \$631,000 but I couldn't swear that we have any strong evidence that's going to be \$650,000 total or \$640,000 total. We do know the \$5,100 for sure and expect that there will be more when we start looking at the building application.

Chair Stone: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Blodget: I should point out that if we weren't going to actually have the \$5,000 for the Conditional Use Permit this way, are intent was to go to City Council and see if we can somehow get that waived but maybe this would eliminate the need for that, which would be great.

Chair Stone: Thank you. Any thoughts based on what we just heard?

Vice Chair Stinger: Where are we? Have you made a motion?

Chair Stone: Well, I haven't made motion yet so now I'm trying to think – it was a good point that Commissioner O'Nan made regarding Downtown Streets Team.

Vice Chair Stinger: Everything the Downtown Streets Team does is brilliant. It makes a huge contribution to the city. My only concern about increasing the funding is that they did get 100% of what they requested and I wouldn't want to make a promise that we could do that again next year. That we might not – we're trying to keep funding at a reproducable level – at a sustained level and so I have a concern that we are over promising.

Commissioner Alhassani: My thing is that we don't need to decide this now. We have a plan in

place that if the numbers come back different, we'll meet again and act accordingly.

Chair Stone: I think that this is based on if the numbers stay the same; we still have that gap there.

Commissioner Alhassani: We could still meet again, though, right? Are you saying – if the numbers come back \$844,000, we would still meet again and ...

Chair Stone: If the number stays at \$844,000 or \$844,000 plus or minus less than 3%, then – and La Comida and Downtown Street Team do amend their applications, then this extra \$26,589 would be distributed in – whichever way we vote towards them.

Commissioner Alhassani: Ok. Wouldn't we meet as a Subcommittee first?

Chair Stone: No, not for this. Not for this issue. I think the idea is that it's only - it's two organizations and we still have money left on the table.

Commissioner O'Nan: Don't we also have the option of rolling over if there were excess funds, say the \$26,000. We can roll it over to next year in case there's an emergency or something came up.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No, that's not an option. We have to allocate...

Commissioner O'Nan: Oh, we'd roll over funds from this time, though.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That was funds that were leftovers so we allocated \$20,000 to a project and they spent less than that. Then that remaining amount gets reallocated. Also, last fiscal year we received a large amount of program income, which are basically loan repayments from some old housing loans that we have so that's why the amount is so large this time.

Commissioner O'Nan: We do need to allocate everything?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: We do.

Chair Stone: I think they need it more than the federal government does. It's all going to go to the military it seems.

Ms. Marquart: Can I ask a question?

Chair Stone: Yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ann, can you please state your name and go to the microphone?

Ms. Marquart: Ann Marquart for Project Sentinel, if it can't be rolled over – how much money is it that you're talking about right now? I mean you have unallocated?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Potentially about \$26,000.

Ms. Marquart: Ok, that's probably not enough then to put anything back out to bid but...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No, that's not. If it were a larger amount, that would be a possibility but we did extend the applications out after the original deadline for Housing and Public Facilities projects because we originally didn't receive any during the first round so we've already done that.

MOTION AMENDED

Chair Stone: I think it's important to make sure that we don't leave anything on the table for these two organizations that are clearly doing such an exemplary job in our community. Thank you for being here and representing those organizations. I will – they both asked for nearly an identical number and we've given them – give both La Comida and Downtown Street Team the amount of money that they asked for. My motion would be that contingent on La Comida and Downtown Streets Team amending their applications to request additional funding beyond their \$321,000 for La Comida that they have already asked for and Downtown Streets Team, which has asked for \$317,400. We would grant both organizations an additional \$13,294, given that they amend their application to ask for it.

Commissioner O'Nan: And given that there was a surplus. I mean if there is a surplus.

Chair Stone: Right.

Commissioner O'Nan: All of this may be moot.

Chair Stone: True.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's the difficult part about not having our Entitlement amount.

Commissioner Chen: I have a question just to clarify something.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Commissioner Chen: If the funds have increased from \$817,000 to \$844,000 and those 15% and in 20%, those are increased to, right? A small bit?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, there will be a slight increase.

Commissioner Chen: So, it's not going to be exactly \$26,000 whatever, it's going to be less than that because of the other...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's only if it's over \$844,000.

Chair Stone: Right.

Commissioner Alhassani: \$844,000.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, that's if it's over \$844,000.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok, want to make a motion?

Chair Stone: I just did, right? Did I make Minka?

Ms. van der Zwaag: CDBG is her baby.

Chair Stone: Did I make a motion Eloiza? Was that sufficient for you or I can reword it for you?

Ms. van der Zwaag: It would be easier to probably restate it for the record.

MOTION AMENDMENT #2

Chair Stone: Let's do it for the record for then, this time. Ok, I will make a motion that the Human Relations Commission will recommend that La Comida and Downtown Streets Team can both amend their application to request up to

Ms. van der Zwaag: You might want to add if they so choose.

Chair Stone: If they so choose?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Your kind of directing them to do so if they so choose.

Chair Stone: If they so to amend their application to ask for additional funding – do I have to give a specific amount, Eloiza?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: You can say to be you saying 50% to each one?

Chair Stone: Yes.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Just 50%, that way we don't have to...

Chair Stone: Ok, that sounds good. Up to 50% of the gap between the total funding available and the Human Relation Commission's current recommendation.

Commissioner Alhassani: Are you waiting for a second?

Chair Stone: Yes.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Sorry, I was just trying to...

Chair Stone: We're just building up the drama right now. Yes, is there a second?

Commissioner O'Nan: I'd also I feel uncomfortable limiting them to 50% of the amount because one agency may have stronger needs and the other may not have a project that reaches that amount and then the other one can't ask for the additional funds because it's limited to its half. Maybe just say up to the unallocated amount and we'll have to reconvene and see how we want to do that.

Commissioner Alhassani: That's why I said, -- that's where I thought we were going with this. That's why I was saying that if we get the \$844,000, compared to the \$817,000, it's still worth huddling.

Chair Stone: I think what I'm trying to avoid is that this would then have to come back to the Subcommittee, then back to the HRC, then back to Eloiza and all this in time to be able to have Council vote on it. I think right now, I think there's clearly enough need that both organizations could use it and like La Comida pointed out that if for some reason, they don't end up using all those funds, then that unallocated funds or unused funds would be able to roll over to the following year. Then that will fulfill your concerns on those issues. Yes?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I'm just – as Staff to Staff to Eloiza, just know that unlike HSRAP, CDBG has a very tight deadline to get it on to the Finance Committee. Is there something in the public participation plan of which the role that the HRC plays for you, is there a requirement that it has to go back to them with any kind of change such as this or would a motion by them with instruction be specific – the HRC may want to hold on to their role so I'm not trying to take that away from you but I'm also concerned about timing as well and trying to marry both of those together somehow.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Thank you, Minka. There is no requirement that it goes back to the – either the Selection Committee or the HRC. As Minka said, we do have this timeline that we are on so the intention is to go to Finance Committee next month.

Ms. van der Zwaag: In theory if you are willing and the HRC was willing, if our next meeting was at a time later, the HRC could say hey, we'd really like – we give authority to our subcommittee to give some more feedback to you.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: There's leeway, yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...myriad of options there.

Chair Stone: We are on a tight – when does it go to the...

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, we are on a deadline. This year might be a little bit different. We are waiting on some HUD guidance because of the unknown this year. They're saying that they might give us a little bit of extra time to submit our plan because they don't want us to submit a plan with numbers that aren't accurate. That's – we're trying to sort that out with HUB right now but the typical deadline is May 15th for that to go to Council or to HUD I mean.

Chair Stone: Ok, when does it get finalized at the City level.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: It typically gets approved at City Council in early May.

Chair Stone: I think my other concern is if we open it up again for La Comida and Downtown Streets Team to bring it back to us there is more of concern on the timing and wondering if it would necessarily be so helpful because both organizations are going to be able to show a strong need I'm sure and to be able to then break it down to this organization really needs \$3,000 more or \$4,000 more. I think it would be really difficult for the Subcommittee to come back and make that redetermination. Anyone else wants to speak to it? Is there a second on the motion?

Commissioner Alhassani: I guess I'm still not clear how to split the money exactly.

Chair Stone: I would say, if the numbers stay exactly the same, that it's \$844,583 and we've only allocated \$817,994, so we have that \$26,589 left. That allows ...

Commissioner Alhassani: The \$26,000 and change left.

Chair Stone: Right, so that would allow both La Comida and Downtown Streets Team to amend their applications to ask for each one individually for an additional \$13,294.50 and so with this motion, it's basically saying if everything stays the same and they amend their applications, then both organizations will get that without any further need for the HRC or its Subcommittee to intervene.

Commissioner Alhassani: Ok. I agree with O'Nan. It's a little dicey but I feel like if we push sort of cooking the books a little bit like that but it that guarantees the money gets spent then I'm fine to second that motion.

Chair Stone: Hey, thank you.

Commissioner Alhassani: You're welcome.

Commissioner O'Nan: I agree too. We do want the money to be well used and I know both agencies would do that. I think my concern is that I think La Comida's undergoing a very usually stressful year in having to relocate and they may have some extraordinary expenditure that are not a part of their normal budget. I would be a little concerned that those funds weren't available for these extraordinary circumstances because we have an arbitrary 50/50 split. I'm not saying Downtown Streets Team couldn't use the money but as I said, I think this is a usual situation with the relocation and I just want to make sure that we fully get them settled and supported and also take care of other agencies as best we can. That's where my concern is. I sort of don't want to lock people down just in case we do end up needing that additional flexibility.

Mr. Blodget: May I speak

Chair Stone: Please.

Mr. Blodget: You're right and as we learn more and more about this, it now looks as if we're

going to end up moving twice. The new place won't be ready by the time we have to be out of our current place and so we are going to have to go through a temporary relocation. We haven't quite come to grips of what the cost of that is going to be. That's also a challenge.

Commissioner Chen: I thought that maybe when the thing comes up, maybe the Subcommittee can decide and then with that, they don't bring up to the Commission to approve it. We just give the Subcommittee the power to decided, how's that? That will save you some time.

Commissioner Alhassani: If you're making a motion, I'll second that.

Vice Chair Stinger: Is that a motion?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think you have to deal with the first one first and then you can.

Chair Stone: Yes – ok, sounds good. We'll take a vote on Mehdi's motion. Take a vote on that motion, all in favor of that motion say aye.

Commissioner O'Nan: Wait, wait, I don't think we seconded it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can you restate that. I believe that's the 50/50 one.

Chair Stone: The 50/50 motion, yes. The only motion that is on the table right now, the 50/50 motion. All in favor of that say aye. All opposed say, nay.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner O'Nan: Nay

MOTION FAILED UNANIMOUS VOTE

Chair Stone: I'll be on the winning side here. Alright Theresa, do you have a motion to make?

MOTION

Commissioner Chen: I'd like to make a motion that when there's actual funding available and we know the exact number, we'll leave it to the Subcommittee to convene just once and then decided to whom – to what organization they want to spend that money for.

Chair Stone: I think my concern now with that motion is that it's -- now it seems like it's going beyond the scope of the gap that we're trying to deal with between what's allocated and what's still left on the table.

Commissioner Chen: I don't understand that.

Ms. van der Zwaag: What he is saying is there was an earlier decision of whether to convene the subgroup again if there's any funding increase or decrease beyond the 3%. He feels with your proposal, that's putting all the funding under that if there's a change, you will meet. You can

amend your proposal to have those two aspects of it. You could keep it the same, that's really up to you.

Commissioner Chen: Because this is all unknown, I would like to keep it the same.

Ms. van der Zwaag: What you're saying is that any increase or decrease in the amount of funding that the City receives in its final allocation or whatever the correct wording for that is, that you would request a convening of the Subcommittee.

Commissioner Chen: Correct.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Then you see if there is a second.

Chair Stone: That's modified – you're modifying the original plan of the – it would take a 3% change.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's what she said. Eloiza.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: I just wanted to add that as I mentioned earlier, we are on a strict timeline so there is a possibility that we may not have our grant amount yet, even when we go to Finance Committee next month. If you could keep that in mind when you make your motion.

Ms. McWilliams: May I speak

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Please, go to the microphone.

Commissioner O'Nan: You have to walk for the right to talk.

Ms. McWilliams: Let me turn it on.

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's still on.

Ms. McWilliams: It sounds like for us, it would be most convenient to do the 50/50 suggestion and that La Comida could apply for the Human Services Emerging Needs Fund if there was additional funding needed. I don't know if that's true or not. That's the handout I saw over there for the \$5,000 for short term urgent funding, as a possibility. It just seems like that would be a fair way for our agency to amend our budget and come back to you. Yes, would reflect that. Thank you.

Chair Stone: Thank you. I don't want to – speaking on that motion, I think the original plan of the 3% change is – I think that's a reasonable plan, especially since we do have this time crunch and times going to get away from us and all this stuff always move slower than anyone anticipates. I think the 3% our existing plan is best for that.

Commissioner Alhassani: Sorry, Chair. Could I get clarity? If it's a less than 3% change, what simple happens?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: As I recall that the agencies would either get a proportional increase or decrease if it's less than or more than.

MOTION

Commissioner Alhassani: Then, I would make a motion that if it's less than 3%, it's a proportionate increase or decrease. If it's more than 3%, the Subcommittee will huddle again.

Chair Stone: Wait, wait and say it again.

Commissioner Alhassani: If it's less – just thinking of what we had originally.

Chair Stone: Ok.

Commissioner Alhassani: If it's less than 3% -- I would make a motion that if the change is less than 3%, then there are proportionate changes across the board.

Chair Stone: That's the existing plan?

Commissioner Alhassani: If there is more than 3%, Subcommittee would huddle and we would take modified applications for the funding.

Chair Stone: Oh, modified?

Commissioner Alhassani: As in they would either apply for the additional funding to see how we would allocate it and if it's more than 3% than we had allocated, then we would decide how to cut the...

Chair Stone: I think especially since we're dealing with the time constraint here too, opening up an application process again. I would imagine that that is also going to cost more City dollars as well to be able to do that. I don't know what's...

Commissioner O'Nan: I think we can authorize the Subcommittee then to just make the changes without coming back to us and just simple expedite it.

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes, that's what I was...

Commissioner Chen: This is my suggestion too.

Commissioner O'Nan: There would be a burden on the Subcommittee to have to meet one more time but then we would authorize you to just go ahead and make whatever changes you feel is needed.

Commissioner Alhassani: That's one meeting before next month basically.

Commissioner O'Nan: Now, I think that would keep Eloiza on schedule as well.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, that was my only concern is we are scheduled for the Finance Committee for April 18th and there is a possibility that we may not have our grant amount yet.

Commissioner Alhassani: In which case, you would go with what we have, the \$817,000. If we haven't heard anything from HUD by April 18th, we're just going to go with the \$817,000 recommended, correct?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: No, we have to allocate the \$844,000.

Commissioner Alhassani: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think at this point Commissioner Chen has to withdraw or you have to ask for a second because you really have two competing motions at this point so Chair, if you could please call for second for Commissioner Chen's or if she would like to withdraw that – I'm not asking for the obviously but...

Chair Stone: Commissioner Chen, do you want to withdraw or would to like to speak to it one more time or we can – or I can ask for a second?

MOTION AMENDED

Commissioner Chen: I want to get the minimum amount of work for the Committee and for our Commission as well so what I want to do is just give the Subcommittee authority. Whatever happens, you could decide to allocate the funds. That's my proposal.

Chair Stone: For any change?

Commissioner Chen: Well, its ok, more than 3% you need to meet again.

Chair Stone: Ok.

Commissioner Chen: ...less than 3%, that's fine. As long as it does not add work for you guys and then the City.

Chair Stone: Ok. Sounds good. So, you're amending your motion to ...

Commissioner Chen: Yes, I'm amending. That's fine.

Chair Stone: Does anyone second Commissioner Chen's motion?

Commissioner Alhassani: Chair, can I ask a quick question? Are you against this idea because you think it's – having another meeting is going to ruffle the timeline between now and the

Finance Committee?

Chair Stone: I have no problem with this motion for handling the 3% change. I think that's the right way to go because that is what we originally wanted to do and it allows us to be able to do it in a much faster way. I'll vote to approve this motion. I think we still haven't addressed this gap and I think we will need a separate motion if we intend to address the gap between what we're recommending will be allocated and what's actually available.

Commissioner Alhassani: Ok.

Chair Stone: We can address that after we address Commissioner Chen's motion.

Vice Chair Stinger: If I understand the motion, it authorizes the Subcommittee to act on behalf of the whole Commission. If I understand it correctly, I second the motion.

Chair Stone: Great. Anyone else wants to speak to the motion? Alright, then we will take a vote. All in favor of Commissioner Chen's motion say aye.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner O'Nan: Aye

Chair Stone: Alright, wonderful. That motion is approved.

MOTION PASSED 5-0

Chair Stone: Thank you.

Vice Chair Stinger: I think if I understand it, we have \$26,589 not yet distributed.

Chair Stone: Correct.

Vice Chair Stinger: Assuming that we

Chair Stone: The numbers stay the same.

MOTION

Vice Chair Stinger: There are right now, three places for that money to be spent. City facilitation of the La Comida project, La Comida amends its submission and Downtown Street Teams amends its submission. I guess I am going to try and make a motion that will be clear. If we receive amended submissions – applications prior to April 8th, we will meet as a Subcommittee and allocate the funds accordingly. April 1st?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: If I could just make one comment. The Staff reports are already distributed to the public 10 working days in advance so April 8th would not work.

Vice Chair Stinger: Get out a calendar; I want to make sure that I don't pick a weekend date. March 25th?

Mr. Blodget: Can I ask a clarifying question?

Chair Stone: Yes.

Mr. Blodget: I'm really intrigued by the thought of the City having money to help manage the process as the Staff had suggested. Eloiza, maybe you can help me understand, I'm assuming that could actually help expedite and move the whole process along further if the City had the funding to hire this Davis-Bacon to monitor and so on, is that, right? Is that part intended to expedite the overall?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, that's correct. I'm currently a Staff of one and I do all of the City's housing programs in addition to CDBG so, I am currently doing the monitoring for a project that we have and that's just because we didn't have any additional funds available but it is a very long process. It would be really helpful to have additional funds available to be able to hire that outside person to do the monitoring.

Commissioner O'Nan: Given the accelerated timeline, should we ask our agencies to submitted revised applications within the week and then we would meet the following week?

Ms. van der Zwaag: A question to Eloiza. If the HRC can make a request to an agency to submit – that's where I'm a little fuzzy here. That the HRC can make a recommendation that an agency amends their application. I'm not familiar with the guidelines of the program. I just want my Commission just to stay within the realms of what is within their authority and within CDBG so that something doesn't come back and then, we have to do some switches based on following protocol that wasn't correct.

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: I don't think we can direct them to submit but I think earlier there was some language that said that if they choose. Maybe if you included language like that, that said if they so choose. Just so you're not directing them to...

Commissioner O'Nan: Oh, yes, I never meant to imply that. I don't mean to rush people but it sounds like we are in a bit of rush so I just wonder if theoretically if they agencies choose to amend and if they get those amendments to us within the week. Then the Subcommittee could meet within the next week so, within two weeks, we would have an allocation for the larger amount, the \$844,000 amount. As well as what we decided for the \$817,000 amount and so we're ready to go with both those amounts distributed and then if there were additional changes because again, we are not sure about the actual funding. If it's below 3%, then we're good. If it's over 3%, we have our plan to meet. It's a little bit of a burden on the Subcommittee I know, but it seems like that's the agilest way to get this thing done. What do my colleagues think?

Vice Chair Stinger: That was the intention of the motion I was trying to make, was to leave it up to the two agencies to decide and then we would react accordingly as a Subcommittee.

Chair Stone: Eloiza, when is the latest that you would need the Subcommittee's recommendation, if we went this route?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Well, probably the absolute lasted would be probably about March 31st. The – preparing Staff reports for Finance Committee and Council, there's about a 6-week lead time. As Minka said, the reports are available to the public about 10-working days, 10 days before the meeting.

MOTION AMENDMENT

Vice Chair Stinger: Can I amend my motion? I think the only amendment that I need to do is change the date to March 31st. That we would need to prior to March 31st, amended applications if they were submitted.

Commissioner O'Nan: I will second that motion.

Chair Stone: Just to clarify your motion that also means that you're giving the subcommittee exclusive power to make the recommendation without that having to come to the HRC?

Vice Chair Stinger: I think that was a separate motion and we voted for it.

Chair Stone: I just want to make – because I know that was for the 3% switch. So, I want to make sure that that's also included within – with this.

MOTION AMENDMENT

Vice Chair Stinger: My misunderstanding. I thought that was a broader motion. I would add that as a second sentence. That the Subcommittee will act as representatives of the whole Commission.

Commissioner O'Nan: I second the amended resolution.

Chair Stone: May I recommend that one – that language be added to the motion for a date in which we would need applications due by – the amended applications due by the organizations.

Vice Chair Stinger: Thank you. Is a week prior enough turnaround time? Could you have copied them and email them to us in a week?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: A week before March 31?

Vice Chair Stinger: March 31st so March 24th?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes because if it's March 24th, we only have a week so if the Committee feels that that's enough time. I would suggest an earlier deadline of maybe March 20th because we're not asking them to redo their whole application; it's just an amendment to their amount.

Vice Chair Stinger: I think we need to split the timeline and that makes sense. If agencies so choose to submit by March 20th and then we would review that by March 31st or – that's right. Yes, those are Fridays.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You might want to add language under a process as directed by City Staff or something to that effect because that would all have to be governed under the guidelines of how HUD would want that to happen. I'm not sure if there is certain wording – if that wording works for you, Eloiza?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: That's fine Minka.

Vice Chair Stinger: I think I have followed where we are. What I've said and what we've amended but could you read it back to us?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: I think I lost some of it. I'm sorry.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Do you want to see what I have?

Ms. Murillo-Garcia: Yes, that would be...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I said the CDBG subcommittee of the HRC act as representatives from the HRC to meet to disperse additional funding if agencies so choose to submit an amended application by March 30th in a process as governed by City Staff. So, that's not completely clear. I can write it out but it's something to that effect.

Commissioner O'Nan: I think we're saying something like, the HRC authorizes the CDBG Subcommittee to make funding allocation recommendations for the additional \$26,589, should that money be available, if the agencies care to amend their applications by March 20th and the Subcommittee will meet subsequent to that so that staff has time to make a report.

Commissioner Alhassani: Before March 31st.

Commissioner O'Nan: Before March 31st, so Staff has time to make the federally mandated reports to Council and to the public.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would say in a process as governed by City Staff and CDBG regulations because if Eloiza goes back and she's looking at the fine print and sees that something that was decided tonight just can't happen for any reason, then she has to be able to come back to me to communicate to you that that wasn't possible due to the HUD rule 507B, bullet point 12 or something to that effect. I think she still needs to have that authority to if something just doesn't meet regulation guidelines because there are a lot more specific for CDBG than for HSRAP.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I was going to say that there's not a second.

Chair Stone: Ok, perfect. All in favor of that – of the motion say aye.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner O'Nan, Commissioner Alhassani: Aye.

Chair Stone: Any abstain or oppose? Ok, fantastic.

MOTION PASSES 5-0 WITH 2 ABSENT

Chair Stone: Alright so we have our amendments. Now we will move to – actually if there is an additional amendment that anyone wants to make? Oh, I'm sorry, any additional motions? Then we will move onto actually voting on the Subcommittee's recommendation for the allocation of CDBG funding.

Commissioner Alhassani: I was just getting ready for the vote.

Chair Stone: Oh, ok.

Commissioner O'Nan: I wanted to say that I thought the Subcommittee did a wonderful job. It's so painful when we have to allocate less than we would like to but I think they did a very good job of trying to be fair and equitable to all the agencies who applied and so I just commend my colleagues for that.

Chair Stone: Thank you.

Vice Chair Stinger: I want to say thank you too. That is just the hardest thing to do to try to be fair and try to equitable and to truly acknowledge the work that's being done in the community.

Chair Stone: I will second Commissioner Alhassani motion. Did you make a motion?

Commissioner Alhassani: No, I didn't make a motion.

MOTION

Chair Stone: I'll motion to approve the subcommittee's recommendation for CDBG funding.

Commissioner Alhassani: I'll second your motion.

Chair Stone: Great, thank you. Anyone want to speak to it? Ok, then we will take a vote. All in favor?

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner

O'Nan: Aye

Chair Stone: Alright, wonderful, that passes unanimously. Thank you very much everybody and we will not be offended if you want to go but you are welcome to stay.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0 WITH 2 ABSENT

Commissioner O'Nan: Thank you for speaking to us.

Chair Stone: Thank you.

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes, thank very much.

Chair Stone: Thank you, Eloiza.

2. Review of a draft letter in support of December 12, 2016, Council Resolution and the HRC's commitment to working towards a diverse, supportive, inclusive and protective community.

Chair Stone: Alright, we'll move onto action item number 2 then. Review of a draft letter in support of the Council resolution. Who was revising? I know Commissioner O'Nan, anyone else?

Commissioner O'Nan: There was input from Commissioner Gordon Gray.

Chair Stone: Ok, wonderful. Well, then Commissioner O'Nan, please.

Commissioner O'Nan: Thank you, Chair. At our last HRC meeting, we had a draft of a letter to Council and we discussed it. It was a letter in support of the resolution Council passed in December to affirm that Palo Alto is a safe and supportive City and it was in response to recent changes at the federal level. As we discussed it, some of us felt that the letter was perhaps a bit too long, a bit too repetitive and needed to be made clearer and to the point. I had offered to take on look at revising it. I'll throw myself to the wolves tonight and let you all tear apart my work and I said, the point was to be maybe a little bit more businesslike in tone, a little bit more clear from the outset with what the purpose of the letter is and to let Council know that we do support them and we are their alias in making Palo Alto a safe and supportive City.

Chair Stone: Great, thank you very much for taking the time to edit the letter.

Vice Chair Stinger: If I can speak to it. I really think you did a nice job on the wording. It is businesslike, it is clearer. My only request would be that we consider making "the ask" stronger. I'm not exactly sure what direction that should take but I might suggest having our liaison to help us design an implementation plan.

Commissioner Alhassani: When you're asking specifically we welcome your guidance on identifying future events and activities etc.?

Vice Chair Stinger: Yes, that was the guidance we have given you, I think last time so you were consistent with the ask but I'm coming back to it and saying I'd like to be stronger if we felt as a Commission we could be stronger.

Commissioner O'Nan: Do we want to ask Council for more direct input on what activities we

should undertake? Did you mean work with Council Member Kou, as our liaison to try to get that information?

Vice Chair Stinger: Maybe that is a good way to say it. Maybe just say we'd like to take advantage of the opportunity to work with our liaison and Council person Kou and our alternate who made the resolution; Council Member Wolbach just suggested that that's what we would do.

Commissioner O'Nan: Then would your edit be, the HRC would welcome guidance from Council Member Kou and Wolbach and identifying?

Vice Chair Stinger: I was thinking on my feet and I couldn't get a grasp on it prior to the meeting but I think now, the edit I would suggest is the HRC would welcome guidance from all Council Members and in particular, we look to meeting with Council Member Kou and Council Member Wolbach to develop strategies and implementations.

Commissioner O'Nan: Itit feels to me that we might be burdening our Council Members a little bit with the responsibility of helping us create an implementation plan. I'm not sure they have the bandwidth of the interest to do that. Maybe I'm not being realistic...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I know behind the scene the City Manager will be in direct contact when he is back in the office with Council Member Wolbach as one of the creators of the Colleague's Memo to get more direction from him, in order to give more direction to the HRC. That has not happened yet because he has been out of the office.

Commissioner O'Nan: Maybe we want to say that we would welcome guidance from Council and look forward to working with Council Member Wolbach and our Council Liaison Council Member Kou in – it's getting a bit wordy.

Vice Chair Stinger: In identifying future events and activities. Leave it as you have it.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok, then that would be, in addition, the HRC would welcome guidance from Council and look – in – wait, guidance from Council and identifying future events and activities. I'm not sure how to word in Kou and Wolbach without making this sound super, super long.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You also have to think in the manner in which this will be communicated to Council because your options are as an informational report. We had talked about a representative from the HRC could read this during oral communications so it's your letter; it's your edits to them. Just if it's read orally and if it only calls out two Council Members, they might – yes, it makes complete sense as Council Member Kou is our liaison and Council Member Wolbach as one of the originators but there were several Council Members. He was key in starting the Colleague's Memo but I think if I have to go back to the minutes, there were at least three or four other Council Members who signed onto it before it went to Council. That would just be my caution so if you wanted to name someone, I think working through our HRC liaison, that would make sense. I think calling out just one more Council Member seems -- that

seems a little odd to me although, I understand why.

Chair Stone: I agree. The original drafters of it were Council Member Wolbach, Holman as well and...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think Burt.

Chair Stone: Yes, I think you're right so I...

Ms. van der Zwaag: The others are the ones that just come to mind at this moment.

Chair Stone: I do agree, I think the task needs to be stronger. I feel it's a bit too passive, part of the point of the letter was to point out, and we're here. We are doing this work; we're ready to take on the responsibility that Council put out there with this resolution. I do think it needs something.

Commissioner O'Nan: Do we want to say the HRC requests your guidance or Council's guidance?

Chair Stone: Yes, I think that's helpful.

Commissioner Alhassani: In my attempt for propriety, I think -- the first way you had it was it looking forward to working with?

Commissioner O'Nan: We would welcome your guidance.

Commissioner Alhassani: Would welcome your...

Commissioner O'Nan: I was trying to lay out that we are already doing things and we will continue down that road but we would welcome input from you, should you care to give it. Without trying to be too directive to Council because...

Commissioner Alhassani: That's why I had hesitation about it. Oh, I felt like Council requests that from us not always vice versa.

Chair Stone: I think that it is traditionally we are forgotten about or not really given many directions as far as from Council regarding these issues and so that's why I wanted to make sure it can be a bit more...

Commissioner O'Nan: Maybe we should say that we look forward to receiving or look forward to ...

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes, I like that.

Chair Stone: Yes, the HRC looks forward to your guidance. Ok, that's a good compromise.

Vice Chair Stinger: I also like the clarification that you said, we will continue to proceed. We will continue to develop programs and look forward – in addition, look forward to your guidance or however you said it. That was a nice – was nice wording.

Commissioner O'Nan: How about we will continue to work on promoting inclusion and diversity in our community? Continue our work...

Vice Chair Stinger: We will – the last paragraph, we will, of course, keep the Council informed of these community events and hope that some of you will be able to attend.

Commissioner O'Nan: Then we're going to change it to; in addition, the HRC looks forward to receiving Council guidance in identifying future events and activities?

Chair Stone: I think it's a strong end. Minka?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Do – I was just thinking of it in response to that because I didn't think you needed to, you're already are doing it because you just reiterated what you've done. I wonder if you just take off the HRC looks forward to requesting your guidance. I don't know if you just want to say events and activities because that might be policies, maybe there's some bridge you could give there that isn't just events and activities – into receiving your guidance.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: HRC looks forward to receiving your guidance to help ensure that Palo Alto remains a safe and welcoming or you decided what you want to do with that but just leaving just guidance a little more vague or direction.

Chair Stone: Maybe something like, in fulfilling – not just saying in fulfilling your resolution but in fulfilling the goals...

Commissioner O'Nan: How about this?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That might be implied.

Commissioner O'Nan: How about this? In addition, the HRC looks forward to receiving Council's guidance in how we can best partner with you to help ensure Palo Alto remains a safe and welcoming community that we can all be proud of.

Chair Stone: Works for me.

Commissioner Alhassani: Nailed it.

Commissioner O'Nan: Do we like that? Then we establish that we are a partner that we are ready to collaborate?

Chair Stone: I like that.

Vice Chair Stinger: It's a little stronger. What you've also done is address the resolution and the City's priorities of the year.

Chair Stone: Well done.

Commissioner O'Nan: Thank you.

Chair Stone: Very nice. Very nice.

Commissioner O'Nan: Alright, so with these edits, do we feel good? Does anyone have

additional input?

Commissioner Chen: I don't. I think it's a very good revision.

MOTION

Commissioner Alhassani: I'll pass a motion to accept Commissioner O'Nan's letter with the proposed edits.

Commissioner Chen: Ok, I second.

Chair Stone: Great, all in favor say aye.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner O'Nan, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner Alhassani: Aye.

Chair Stone: Alright, wonderful. That passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSED 5-0 WITH 2 ABSENT

Commissioner O'Nan: Alright, I will make revisions and then I should send that to Minka or Mary or both?

Ms. van der Zwaag: You might want to...

Commissioner O'Nan: Send it to Council directly?

Ms. van der Zwaag: You might want to designate how you want to present this to Council. Did you want to authorize a member of the HRC to read this during oral communications? Did you just want to email this to the Council?

Commissioner O'Nan: I think it would be nice if we have a live presenter. I'm wondering if we can impose upon our Chair to maybe attend the next City Council meeting and read this during oral communications and...

Chair Stone: Yes.

Commissioner O'Nan: ...let them know that we're here. Then maybe follow up by email so they all have an email copy as well.

Chair Stone: That would be good. Should we ask to have it put into their packet as well?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Let me just check how that works with an oral communication. If it works that if you read something – if you could give it to them At Places or it's follow up with an email so I will check on that procedure for you.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok.

Chair Stone: Do we have to vote for me to speak on the HRC's behalf? Is that...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would do it just for a simple cautionary as the Chair, I don't believe that's necessary.

MOTION

Commissioner O'Nan: I would make a motion that we authorize Chair Stone to read the letter aloud during oral communications at the next City Council meeting...

Commissioner Alhassani: I'll second the motion.

Chair Stone: All in favor say aye.

Chair Stone, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner O'Nan, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Chen: Aye.

Chair Stone: Alright, wonderful. Thank you. Thank you,

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Vice Chair Stinger: I'd just like to add to that. It doesn't hurt if the Commission to be in the audience.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, you can all stand there with him.

Chair Stone: Ok, thank you for that. It's really well written.

3. Review of revised Human Services Emerging Needs Fund Draft Policy

Chair Stone: Moving on to a review of the revised Human Services Emerging Needs Fund Draft Policy. Minka, can you give us a little introduction to this?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think you thought this was all gone and it was and it was working its way through the City approval process when and as it does then different Staff members ask questions. So, two key question came up and in consultation with the Chair, I asked if he felt like these were revisions that he could give Staff the authority just to make or just to go back to the HRC. He suggested that I come back to the HRC. I'd like to go over each one with you and then, open it up for conversation. The first change that was suggested was that there is a \$5,000 cap on any grant request. The struggle with this type of grant program is really the great unknown of who will apply and how much they will need. This was Staff's biggest point of conversation as it started through the approval process and other Staff members asked along the way – I mean there are pros and cons to making such a decision. There's a philosophy, do we want to help as many people as we can with smaller grants or less agencies with bigger grants. I'll just share some of the pro and cons that I came up with and then maybe we will take the two points separately and just start with on this aspect of the decision. The pros that I saw are it is really consistent with other emergency grants. Now, we have, to be honest, we've got a 2-prong program. We've got emergency grants and then we have emerging needs or critical needs. In the background research that I did, having a cap on emergency grants was very consistent. Most of them were between \$2,000- \$5,000. It allows us to help more agencies. It doesn't give all the money to one or two causes and then, we don't know what's out there. That's actually one of the biggest reasons why it got pulled, was a Staff member saying well, if we get a request and give \$40,000 out and then 3-weeks later we get another one and we say, wow, that one's amazing. I wish we had some more money. It's really this kind of tussling of a question of do we want to help more with less or – because, with an emergency fund, you never know the next thing that's going to come in. You just don't know and with all the policies that I reviewed, it was very clear, once it's gone, it's gone. It's really that philosophical tussling back and forth between those kinds of decisions. This fund was not intended to deal with all the expenses that an agency has with an emerging or critical need. The con to having a deadline is good causes may need more than \$5,000 or it may be – so that's really it. There might be groups that need more than \$5,000 so that's really the philosophical question that we wrestled with and that we decided to bring to the Chair and then bring back to the HRC. I mean, I just wanted to get your input on that.

Vice Chair Stinger: When you go through the two sides, the pros and the cons, it makes sense. When I read it by myself, I thought \$5,000 seems really low and if it was a true emergency, I wondered if it would be restrictive but I also recognized the advantages of having a limit. I wonder if there was some way to have wording to say that – I forget how you have it here. There's a limit of \$5,000 for a single grant request but then offer the flexibility to extend or...

Ms. van der Zwaag: There certainly is – I've seen wording in other ones that have that. I think you need to be very clear on what would be considered an emergency circumstances or that Staff and the representative from the HRC has the ability to make that decision because then it has the ability to be scrutinized as subjective. I clearly see and one of my thought processes to is, do we always give ourselves a carefully worded out that says, in general, grants will be given for \$5,000 unless an extenuating circumstance as determined by the Selection and review Committee.

Vice Chair Stinger: That's certain one sentence. I was thinking about saying flexibility to come back and ask for a second grant.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would have more concerns about that because we have said it's a one-time grant so I'd hate for someone to think they've got it and then, a couple months later, well, it really didn't help us. We really want the money that we give to solve a significant part of the problem. I think what we're saying with – if it is \$5,000, then maybe we're the emergency grant program for needs of \$5,000 or less and they might have to seek out other funding sources. If their office is flooded, they don't have insurance and they have \$100,000 or \$50,000 cost that is coming their way. Maybe we're the little emergency fund and I'm not trying to belittle it at all but you will have to make a decision what kind of fund this will be and to what level it can help.

Commissioner O'Nan: I want to share that I agree with Vice Chair Stinger, the amount struck me as perhaps too low and it could be that I've lived in Palo Alto for a long time and everything is so inflated here. Everything is so expensive here; that even I, a person of relatively modest means, thought that \$5,000 was really low. I'm worried that if there were a catastrophic emergency – say there was fire or a significant loss, \$5,000 doesn't go very far in this area. I would feel more comfortable if we had the flexibility to up to something more like \$10,000. I'm not saying we would give a \$10,000 grant but I think maybe we should have that right reserved for our judgment.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right and just to let you know, it's \$50,000 and that money doesn't carry over so if we don't use the \$50,000 in one year – so, you can say – use that point of reasoning to say, well, then we should give out more money because if we don't get enough applications and then the money doesn't carry over, we might leave money on the table and that might a fear of the HRC. The amount could go higher than – it would just be the philosophy that less people could be helped because it's like I said, it is \$50,000.

Commissioner Chen: Then other things that I'm concerned about is how do you define an emergency?

Ms. van der Zwaag: If you look in the policy, the definition is an unforeseen event that has or will significantly interrupt essential services such as a nature disaster, storm damage, theft, equipment failure or similar such occurrence. It has a very specific definition. It's not just – we don't have enough money for that. It's an emergency because we can't fund it anymore.

Commissioner Alhassani: I apologize if you guys discussed this in the last meeting. Do you have an estimate of 2016 how many – for example, I know Abilities United obviously, had the theft...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't because I think if people don't...

Commissioner Alhassani: Report.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Since the fund doesn't exist, people don't call to ask for it. Abilities United didn't call to ask for it. It was just us, in our research, thinking the type of needs it could fulfill. Several years ago, Life Moves had a critical shortfall for one of its food programs so those were all the types of needs that we used in our presentation with Council about what this could be used for. Now, since the word is out, I've received at least 3 or 4 phone calls asking when the policy will be in. I think once it's out, I don't think — I think we will be at a loss for applications. I see

them primarily coming in the emerging critical need category and not the emerging need. As you're making this recommendation back to Staff, I just urge you to think about it in the lenses of both types of funding requests because I do think we won't be at a loss for request number 2. Especially, since it's not limited to HSRAP grantees. Then you have to think under that philosophy, would it be wow, would we want to give \$5,000 to so many grants instead of \$10,000 to \$5,000 and so forth.

Commissioner O'Nan: I think though that the thinking doesn't have to be that rigid because if we raised the up to the amount, that doesn't mean we actually give people \$10,000.

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, no, that's true.

Commissioner O'Nan: We can give small grants if that seems appropriate but should something really difficult or terrible happen we have another suicide cluster or something happened where we really feel like we need to intervene and that means hiring someone or running a program for a year. Where we want to be able to contribute more, I would hate to see use loped off at \$5,000 when that mission critical thing really needs more support.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's why I brought it back to you all.

Commissioner Alhassani: I would echo Commissioner O'Nan.

Commissioner Chen: I had a question, is that \$50,000 annually, every year?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes.

Commissioner Chen: So, that makes sense.

Ms. van der Zwaag: It doesn't roll over.

Commissioner Alhassani: I do echo your concern on this issue that \$5,000 feels like something that especially in an emergency situations, is not most of the time, may not remove the needle on a lot of issues.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok, I hear you.

Commissioner Chen: If it's natural disasters and there are many organizations affected, how are going to do this kind of thing?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's when the hard decisions come in, just like with HSRAP or CDBG.

Chair Stone: Again, to echo what has already been said. It's – we're just raising the cap. Not saying that if that does happen where there is an earthquake, then sure, whatever Committee reviews it, will be able to recognize – well we can adjust the give.

Commissioner Alhassani: Do you want to make a motion on this point? Make it \$10,000?

Commissioner O'Nan: There was one other point. I don't know, Minka if we want to mix things in together or you want to take things very separately but I also had a concern about the once in a 5-year period. I felt like that might be too long to me and I wondered if we would consider changing that to once every 3-years?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's up to you.

Commissioner O'Nan: Just for my colleague's sake, I think sometimes we live in a volatile, socioeconomic situation, particularly now since the national elections and I don't know what's going to happen in the next 5-years; no one does. Sometimes things come up, suddenly, trends shift and especially, here in Silicon Valley so I felt more comfortable with a 3-year period. I wouldn't want someone to come hat in hand year after year after year but 5-year to me feels a little bit too long. An agency that was struggling to rebuild itself, was doing ok, could potentially have another serious issue come up a few years down the line and I wouldn't – I would want to be at least open to their application and not cut them off at the knees.

Vice Chair Stinger: I think that's a good suggestion and for the emerging needs, since we consider those quarterly if I understand the proposal...

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's the recommendation.

Vice Chair Stinger: ... we would have a chance to make sure that emerging application was, in fact, unique and viable and if there are other new organizations submitting, we'd have that chance to weigh that. So, if you make a motion, I would support it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think we can make all the ones that in one motion if there's no more comment, I can move onto the second part. The second part was really looking at addressing my colleague's concern, within the limit, but also the thought of this is really deciding things one by one by one. There's no not real analysis or comparing applications so it's like, you get it, -either you get it or you don't and then we wait for the next one, you either get it or you don't. We incorporated this proposed change for the reason; I made it two prongs, so emergency need – the whole sense of an emergency, you don't know when it's going to happen. You can apply for that at any time but if it's a critical or emerging need, opening that up once a quarter. That's still four times a year in which someone could submit something. It won't be driving the HRC crazy because you're not responding to every call that I give to you to provide a Commissioner to help in the review process. It allows Staff if there are 3 or 4 applications and the HRC representative to say, well, let's really read what they have to say and be able to make a funding decision in the context of all the applications that are received. The con that I can come with is that someone would have to wait. Now the observation that I wanted to bring to your attention by being open quarterly is that there are things that can come up. A HSRAP applicant can submit their application in December and they're still waiting for a recommendation that start's July 1st. If something critical or emerging comes up in April, this type of a fund would allow them to still apply in that in-between time or even just – even July 1st. They got their HSRAP application but something has happened in that 6-month window so I think this is very accommodating to either HSRAP agencies or no HSRAP agencies to have enough deadlines along the way that could

really address something that was an emergency, emerging or critical need. That's why Staff is making this recommendation just to be able to give a little more – not formality but a little more framing around and helping to make the decisions and what we feel is a better use of the funding. Not just whoever gets it in first.

Commissioner O'Nan: I really like the idea of the quarterly system because I think it keeps things manageable from an administrative...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner O'Nan: ...point of view but it also gives the flexibility to people who are in crisis...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner O'Nan: ... to get a timely response.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, but once it's gone, it's gone. We'll get a better sense of this. If once – if this is excepted by Council in – what I would like to do if this is expected by Council at the end of this month and we start a process that's like May 1st. It is possible we could spend all the \$50,000 still this year but my hope is to get at least one application cycle in this fiscal year.

Chair Stone: I like the quarterly deadline as well. I think that is brilliant and I second everything that's been said so far. Commissioner O'Nan, if you'd like to make a motion based on the recommendations you've already made, then I would definitely support it.

Commissioner O'Nan: Did anyone else, though, have question or comments on the quarterly proposal? Ok, I think we're all good there. I had just one more thing but this was more to the formatting. Is that ok to give you feedback on that, Minka?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, I did make some of the changes from last time.

Commissioner O'Nan: So, under the application process, I think I counted 11 bullets and I think this might be easier if you maybe made it a number check list so that people can really make sure they checked off each requirement.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, that's been helpful in HSRAP and every change that Mary instituted was if you have to fulfill need 1 in the purchasing guideline, you fill out this form and you do this. It's very clear what people do.

Commissioner O'Nan: If you miss something, you can go back to say It is checklist item...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, and say it's number 12 not bullet 5 from the bottom.

MOTION

Commissioner O'Nan: Alright, well I don' have any other comments. Does anybody else or should I go ahead and make my motion? Alright, then I would like to submit a motion that we approve the new policy for allocating the emerging needs fund with the following changes, that we will raise the cap from \$5,000 to \$10,000, that agencies will be eligible to reapply once in every 3-year period and that we support Staff's recommendation as to the quarterly process.

Commissioner Alhassani: Second the motion.

Chair Stone: All in favor of the motion say...

Vice Chair Stinger: I have a question.

Chair Stone: ... oh, wait.

Vice Chair Stinger: Did you mean can apply or can receive?

Commissioner O'Nan: Can apply.

Vice Chair Stinger: The way it's written is can receive funding, not more than once every 5-years.

Commissioner O'Nan: Right, so that means they couldn't even apply for it because they are not eligible to receive it for 5-years so I was just saying maybe to change that to 3-years.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I see your point. It's kind of cat and mouse because you can't apply because you wouldn't receive it but...

Vice Chair Stinger: But if I didn't get it? If I applied and didn't – I was denied.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, then this says received so that would

Commissioner O'Nan: Should I change the wording then of my motion to match the wording here?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, if that – right.

Chair Stone: I agree.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... it has to match that but I see your point. If you're rejected, as it's currently written, they would be eligible to reapply. Yes.

MOTION

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok, so then – alright, so then I propose a motion that we approve the emerging needs fund allocation process with the following changes, that we raise the cap from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and that grants may be awarded to an agency no more than once in 3-years?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think you can say...

Commissioner O'Nan: I'm messing up this language.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think to say that because it already says may not receive so you don't have to add that to your motion because you're not suggesting a change to that wording.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok. Except that I wanted to change it from 5 to 3, is that ok?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's right but that doesn't change the wording in front of it. You could just change it from 5 to 3 and you won't have to – you're not making a suggested change to the sentence in front of it.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok, correct and that we affirm the quarterly process.

Commissioner Alhassani: Second the motion.

Chair Stone: Anyone else wants to speak to the motion? All in favor of the motion, say aye.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner Chen, Commissioner O'Nan: Aye.

Chair Stone: Ok, it passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0 WITH 2 ABSENT

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you.

Chair Stone: Thank you.

4. Update and discussion on work plan items

Chair Stone: Action item number 4, update and discussion on work plan items. Anybody have any updates on events forum that they are working on?

Commissioner O'Nan: Commissioner Chen and Vice Chair Stinger and I will be meeting next week to discuss our involvement in the elder abuse forums at Avenidas and the 'Y'. I am very pleased to be more involved in this again. I've been spending some time on my own recovering but I'm very great full to my colleagues for keeping this ball rolling. Elder abuse is getting more and more attention nationally and locally. It's really become an epidemic. I think we even heard one of our speakers here tonight from Catholic charities talk about how important their Ombudsmen work is and helping to prevent elder abuse and giving seniors a voice because seniors are extremely vulnerable when they are in care facilities and not able to speak out about the abuse they are suffering. I'm just really proud of us for taking on this work and I hoping we can come together with our partner agencies in the community and do some really great community outreach and education on this important issue.

Chair Stone: Anyone else?

Vice Chair Stinger: I'll speak to Being Different Together, Taking the Conversation Deeper. That was our series of 4 forums to address inclusive, bias, racial and social justice. Mary and Minka have done a brilliant job on the logistics and the planning and the thinking about the event. We've had our second forum a week ago, tonight, March 2nd, close to 90 people, 80 participants, 10 facilitators and moderators. I've gotten a lot of good feedback. I think our goal was to have some really good discussion at this second event everybody talked as a group and then the small table discussion. I'm thrilled to be working with the Committee that we're working with and looking forward to planning the third event that you are all invited to on the first Thursday in April.

Chair Stone: Thank you. Any other updates? Ok.

5. Discussion on re-establishing the Council Buddy Program

Chair Stone: Move on to action item number 5. Discussion of re-establishing the Council Buddy Program. If any of you remember, we use to have a Council buddy program. I guess it fizzled out but the idea was that each Commissioner would choose a Council Member, that they could go out and get coffee with or dinner and just be able to discuss whatever you want but discuss items that are relevant to the HRC and Council and just try to create a stronger bond with City Council and its individual members. I don't know how much success people have had in the past one buddy program – you had zero? What about you, Commissioner O'Nan?

Commissioner O'Nan: I had mix success. I happen to be a member of the same 'Y' as a few of the Council Members and when I could trap them on a machine while they didn't want to give up their treadmill, I could get their attention to talk.

Chair Stone: I bet they loved that.

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, they loved that. Persistence, it pays off. As far as really having time to socialize with Council Members, you know it's difficult. I work, they work, people are busy and I I don't think the program didn't work for us overall. Most people didn't have a satisfactory buddy relationship, which isn't to say that we couldn't reestablish it and create a buddy relationship but I think the burden is really on Council to make time to do this and they have been so busy. I mean, we can't even get a study session with them so I have to admit, I'm bit skeptical as to whether they'll make time for one on ones with us.

Chair Stone: I had decent success with mine. I think we met several times and I think last time we had it was the beginning of my tenure on the Commission so it was helpful as a learning experience to be able to learn about various issues that Council is struggling with and what they wanted from us. I just think that it's one of those things that even if we don't have much success with it and one or two us have any success meeting with our Council Members, I guess that's better than no communication with them. I'm not committed either way.

Vice Chair Stinger: On a previous Commission, the Council buddy system program was really

important to make sure the Council Members were aware of the issues and could make an educated vote when we came before them. We were coming up for frequent votes and I just think in this budget year, there might be a similar experience where we might not be able to socialize, we might not be able to get a lot of time but even if we get an email in or a phone call, to just give some background to our budget requests and the proposals before them. I think it would be worth a try.

Commissioner Chen: My experiences are even with multiple emails, there's no response. Maybe just me.

Chair Stone: Mehdi, do you want a buddy? You never got a buddy?

Commissioner Alhassani: I never got one. I would say that I agree that Council Members are incredibly busy so it's hard to make them commit to something regular. On the other hand, I would say that if you find persistence I think if you have specific issues or questions with Council Members, they are pretty receptive to getting a hold of them, one way or the other. Maybe saying hey, let's just chat once a month is a little tougher for them because they are being pulled in so many different directions. That's my two cents.

Chair Stone: Thank you. Well, does anyone want to make a motion to reestablish the Council buddy program and then we can look into, at another meeting actually.

Commissioner O'Nan: One format we used in the past was that our Chair and Vice Chair were matched to the Mayor and the Vice Mayor so you guys had less flexibility on who your buddy was. Leadership has to go with their leadership and so then, the rest of us have to line up with whoever's left over on Council. Just so you know, there sometimes can get locked into things to just because of the position you're holding.

Chair Stone: I think – like I've already said, I think it's worth it, even if you just have one coffee with a Council Member throughout the year. At least they know you and have somebody that they can personally reach out to if they have a question on an individual HRC related issue. I don't think it hurts to reestablish it. If it fizzles out like it has in the past, then it fizzles out but at least we open up that line of communication with Council.

MOTION

Vice Chair Stinger: If you want a motion, I would move that we try a pilot for this year.

Chair Stone: Mehdi, is kind of my go to seconder tonight.

Commissioner Alhassani: Second the motion.

Chair Stone: Alright, all in favor of the – reestablishing the buddy program, say aye.

Chair Stone, Vice Chair Stinger, Commissioner O'Nan, Commissioner Alhassani, Commissioner Chen: Aye.

Chair Stone: Anyone opposed? Wonderful, then that passes. Yes, thank you, Minka. If you could pass that around.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0 WITH 2 ABSENT

Chair Stone: Then I guess Vice Chair would be with Vice Mayor Liz Kniss, I'll be with Mayor Greg Scharff and this is why it benefits to be at the meetings. Thank you.

VI. Reports from Officials – Chair Stone

1. Commissioner Reports

Chair Stone: Alright, well, then will that's going around, let's move on to our reports from officials. Do we have any Commissioner reports?

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, I have one. I was invited by our colleagues at the Palo Alto Mediation Program to their annual social and it was lovely to see everybody. I had, as you all know, I've been a bit under the weather but I managed to get out one evening in a prospect of getting free food because you all know my policy in on that. It was a lovely potluck and it was great to meet some old friends that are veterans of the mediation program but also, they have some lovely new members. They've done a great job with recruiting and training and they are just very committed to trying to expand the types of services that they offer. I'm just very impressed with the program and how well they are doing. I just want to report that they all say hello and look forward to reporting into the HRC later on this year.

Vice Chair Stinger: I have a few things to report. I went a program in Council Chambers organized by our Human Services Department...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Community Services.

Vice Chair Stinger: Community services.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, I was involved but mostly the people on the back did all the work.

Vice Chair Stinger: I don't know what adjective to use. It was a wonderful evening; it was called Honoring the Journey. There were 6 people who were honored with City Council resolutions. It really established Palo Alto as a point in time, we were very involved in the history of the civil rights movement and I think there's some people who say Palo Alto is in the room and Palo Alto was in the history and you really just felt a lot of pride for the type of City we are. It was a great event. It was well attended. I was just really proud of our City at that event. I've already spoken about Beyond the Line but I did just want to come back to it for a second. You reminded me when you mentioned facilitators. We've had County facilitators working with us and I have to give them a lot of credit. Most of them are coming from South County. They are extremely professional; they are very involved, very enthusiastic about our experiments and try to apply something that's done in an academic environment to a civic setting. They are just giving us full support and it's very impressive. The last thing that I want to mention was Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities stakeholders meeting was March 2nd and the initiative there is to work on

applying metrics to changes that are happening as a result of the resolutionand you will hear more as we move forward on that.

Chair Stone: Thank you. My reports, I was featured on Beyond the Headlines a couple of weeks ago. Sue and Gennady were both interested in learning about the different things that the HRC has been doing in the community so that was a nice opportunity to be able to really headline all the great work that we've been doing. That is on Palo Alto Online if you would like to...

Commissioner Alhassani: I already watched the whole thing. I thought you did a tremendous job.

Chair Stone: Oh, thank you, appreciate it. Also, I will be getting sworn in on Tuesday at County HRC and unfortunately, I am here tonight because this month is the retreat and so the retreat will be held next Thursday so I will be able to attend the retreat for my first meeting. Which is actually interesting because my very first meeting on this Commission was at a retreat. Mehdi, you were just in Commission diapers at that time. I've been approached the residence association at Buena Vista, to help them put on an event similarly to what we did in January with the Immigrants and Allies event. I am trying to get Joe Simitian to be a panelist at that event and several of the other panelists that were at the Immigrants and Allies event back in January. I'm excited for that because that seems to be such a relevant forum that's aimed just at that community, who are all really terrified of everything that's happening at the national level. I'll send the information along to Minka when we finally have a date established but we're really waiting on Joe Simitian to get back to us to make sure we're setting the date around him. I'll have Minka be in contact with all of you. If anybody would like to attend that whenever that happens, it will probably be sometime in April, on a Friday night. That's all I got.

Vice Chair Stinger: That's good stuff.

Chair Stone: Thank you. Alright then, moving on to – did you have?

2. Council Liaison Report

Chair Stone: Moving onto the Council liaison report. I know Council Member Kou is not here but she did wanted me to send my kudos that she was at the event last Thursday, correct? Yes, Being Different Together last Thursday and she said it was absolutely incredible and she was so sad that she wasn't able to make it tonight to congratulate you on another successful event. She wanted to make sure that you got that message.

3. Staff Liaison Report

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok. The Age Friendly resolution will be going to Council early next month so that will be going on the consent calendar unless it's pulled. I think one of the key reasons is Council is just overwhelmed with Actions Items so it will be going on the Consent Calendar but that does not negate the work that the Subcommittee – the task force – professional task force that is working to implement some of the action items. We have identified some Action Items for the Palo Alto community in guards to Age Friendly. When those are ready for prime time, Vice Chair Stinger is in that group as well. You, Commissioner O'Nan, was but I think that you had to step away for a little bit so when that's ready for prime time, we will bring that back to you. The second thing is our next HRC meeting. The next HRC meeting is April 9th and the fact that that

is during my daughter's spring break, otherwise, I would just have a colleague handle the meeting for me. My concern is because we had to move HSRAP off this agenda and probably for the best because I'm not sure after that really significant conversation on CDBG, you would have been up for a conversation on HSRAP as well. My question to the Commission is if you would be willing to consider meeting on another night, just to discuss HSRAP or just to have our full cancel our regular meeting or just to have our HRC meeting on another night in April, if you'd be willing to consider that. If so...

Chair Stone: April 13th is that next meeting.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you. That's the week – it's her spring break and getting relatives from outside the country coming. That would be nice so if that is amenable, there are – Mary has looked into -- there are 5 dates that are available either in the Chambers, here or at the Downtown Library so those are the acceptable locations because the Media Center will be able to do that. We will send you out a doodle with those dates for your consideration. There was also a request by Chair Stone and Commissioner Savage to look into the possibility of changing the HRC meeting night. We were going back and forth with the Clerk's Office, it looks at this point that there would possibility be availability on Tuesday nights, either in one of those same three facilities that I just mentioned. For that, the HRC at their last meeting said they'd be willing to consider that so I will also send a doodle for that. I know we'd all love to have Commissioner Stone continue with us but to make the decision to move the night there would have to be unanimous – that people on an on-going basis are able to accommodate a change to the schedule. You'll be getting two doodles requests; one is a one time change, only for next month. The other would be an on-going change that I'm asking -- you will be asked to consider if you're able to accommodate that or not, so if you are, then Staff will work to do that. If we don't get anything unanimous, I don't want to have to doodle twice so you put you either can make that night on an on-going basis or you can't because sometimes with doodles, people put the night that works best for them and then you wind it down and then you re-doodle. I think for this, just to think – for you to think on the long-term basis if it works or not. That will also go out as well. If you'd like, we can space that a couple days apart so not to confuse people between the two or we can send them both out tomorrow. Whatever your preference is, we'd be very clear in separate emails what they are for.

Vice Chair Stinger: I think you can get the job done.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok.

Commissioner Chen: I won't be able to get back to you. I'm going away tomorrow morning at 6 o'clock.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok.

Commissioner Chen: For a week. I'll get back to you next Thursday at the earliest.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok. We'll probably – Maybe we can talk offline. Ok.

Chair Stone: Great, thank you

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: April 13, 2017

Chair Stone: Tentative agenda for our next regular meeting.

Ms. van der Zwaag: HSRAP. The decision could be made, HSRAP and whatever you want to add with it or just HSRAP. That's up to you.

Commissioner O'Nan: I think we should just try to have a full meeting on the alternate date that we end up picking rather than try to have two meetings.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh, I was never suggesting two meeting, no.

Chair Stone: Oh, ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I was not meaning that we would have two HRC meetings next month.

Commissioner O'Nan: We did do that at one point.

Ms. van der Zwaag: We did once and I think you all are committed enough to so many things that won't work.

Commissioner O'Nan: I think HSRAP is going to take up most of our time probably, at the next meeting but if we have time, I would like to explore the CEDAW, gender equity framework that was mentioned tonight by the speaker of the UN. That's I think, an example of an activity that we might want to undertake. I was intrigued that there was already a framework for it and that cities like San Francisco have already implemented them. We are focusing a lot on immigrant rights a concern right now for obvious reason but I think gender equality is a big part of the picture too. I really would see us at least discuss whether we want to form a subcommittee to explore that.

Chair Stone: I was thinking that too but I was thinking maybe at another meeting we could ask Sarah Pike or a representative to come and actually present to the Commission and then we could open it up to a conversation because of that definitely – it fascinated me. I'd like to explore more about that but I think I'd like to hear from them more indefinite with a presentation.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I will have to say I think, there have been some Commissioners that raised certain issues to me that they are interested in exploring further as far as maybe an event. What I want is if this ends up being an event, I want leadership to say, ok, these are 2 or 3 ideas that are floating around. Not just who gets first on the HRC agenda because Commissioner Alhassani has been speaking to me about an idea that he has and so has Chair Stone and with an idea, I really want to make sure that not every idea we have gets discussed at the HRC but we spend some time looking at it, framing it. Is this the right time? Is that really the way in which we would do that and so forth? I'm not saying no to that, I'm just saying if we can bring the idea within the scope of the other idea that we have if it's that's really easy to put on the agenda. If it's starting a conversation with them about hosting a certain type of event, I'd like to be able to – with our limited time and resources, to have more of a conversation to say ok, which one do we want to

go forward with? Do we have the bandwidth to do so?

Vice Chair Stinger: My thinking is that I'm interested in it and I'd like to have more information presented. I think if we framed it that way, then we could consider it at our retreat in the summer to decide if it was a priority that we want to take forward.

Chair Stone: I think for now, maybe we just have them back as our presenters one night. Not the next meeting but maybe in May.

Vice Chair Stinger: I had another idea for a presenter that I wanted to think about. I'd like to have somebody from either the Police Department or the Jewish Community Center or maybe the Multi-Faith Representative, just to talk about where they see issues in the community now and I guess I see it as a needs assessment. How their community is fairing? What are they doing? What their concerns are and I think that would be informative. Again, it would be helpful for us to hear that before we went into our planning session for the retreat. It might help us work on some inclusion and diversity activities with the Council.

Chair Stone: Ok. Sounds good. I think we should keep the next agenda light with HSRAP. You weren't suggesting that we take that up at our next meeting, right?

Vice Chair Stinger: When I came into the room that was my thinking. After we sat through CDBG.

Commissioner Alhassani: I actually think Commissioner Stinger's idea is a good one too so I would love to hear about that more. Not suggesting necessarily that it happen at the next meeting but I think it should happen sooner rather than later, only because we've seen an uptake in activity.

Vice Chair Stinger: I would really like to have it happen sooner but I'm afraid of over taxing us in a meeting and I really don't have a concept of how much discussion we'll have with HSRAP. I'll put the idea out.

Chair Stone: Minka, would this be what I've been talking about is actually right in line with what Vice Chair Stinger and Commissioner Alhassani has just...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think if you just want to...

Chair Stone: Go off online and talk about it or give them a brief little?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think if you could just in generalizations in topics that would be ok.

Chair Stone: Ok. I've had a woman from the Jewish community reach out to me over this past week who's raised the exact same concerns and has been having conversations with me about how – in what best way to create the conversation the community is doing regarding the recent anti-Semitism that we've seen popping up in the city and nationwide and just her great concern on that. Also, the concern that she's – I think people across Palo Alto have been having and how

we can address that. I brought up the model that Commissioner O'Nan used with the Senior Summit. Something similar to bring people to the – like representatives of the Police Department, the Jewish Community Center, Synagogues and other organizations across the city maybe to the table to be able to start talking about where there are gaps in services and where – what are the trends that we're seeing and what needs to be done to address those issues which seems similar to your concerns.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Before this becomes a discussion which is not an agenda item. I think where we can go from here is maybe talking in leadership because a lot these ideas that are being brought forth, they have a lot of similar elements to them and I think in that setting, we could really look at the best way to bring them back to the HRC to discuss if you wanted to discuss them more in full. If you want to as a first start to just have some informational speakers but I think any further discussion would put a little too dangerously close to actually discussing an item. I think that folks have a pretty good general sense of some topic areas and that could be taken up with leadership to see how it can best appropriately be brought back to the full HRC.

Chair Stone: Perfect.

Commissioner Chen: I think that way you can have more of a focus point.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner Chen: You have to be diverse, everybody has ideas.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner Chen: To get focused on what to do.

Chair Stone: Ok, wonderful. Then we are adjourned.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:41 pm