

HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Thursday, February 8, 2018

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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Alhassani, Brahmbhatt, Chen, O'Nan, Lee, Chair Stinger

Council Liaison: Council Member Wolbach

Staff: Minka van der Zwaag, Mary Constantino

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Stinger: Welcome, thank you all for coming. This is our first HRC, Human Relations Commission, meeting for 2018 and we're kicking off the new year in grand style. I appreciate you all being here. I'd like to begin with roll call, please Mary?

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

[The Commission heard oral communications first.]

Chair Stinger: Oh, I see I went out of order. Any agenda changes, requests, deletions?

[The Commission moved to business item one.]

III.ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Stinger: Oral communications, the public is invited to speak on any item that is not on the agenda and I have two cards, the first is David Carnahan.

Mr. David Carnahan, Deputy City Clerk: Thank you, Chair Stinger, Commissioners and members of the public. I'm David Carnahan in the City Clerk's Office, and I am here tonight to talk about Board and Commission recruitment. As these folks know, this is a fantastic way to help influence your community and help continue making Palo Alto the great place that it is. The City is currently looking to fill one term on the Historic Resources Board, three on the Human Relations Commission, three on the Public Art Commission and two on the Utilities Advisory Commission. So, even if you don't feel that maybe you necessarily want to fill that role, if you think of a community member that would be a good fit, definitely encourage them to apply. Applications are available on the City's website; www:cityofpaloalto.org/clerk, and applications

are due March 20th. There will some fliers in the back for anyone to take and also Commissioners, your homework is to take the flyer home and encourage at least two community members to apply one of these Boards and Commissions. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: Thank you, David. If we can comment, please consider the HRC with some priority. Cherrill Spencer, please.

Ms. Cherrill Spencer: Good evening Human Relations Commission and members of the public. I am Cherrill Spencer, I'm a resident of Palo Alto for the past 43-years and I'm the coordinator of the Disarm Peace Committee of the Palo Alto branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which we call WILPF for short. Our branch has been working on peace and justice issues for the past 95-years, continually; not myself. Looking at the mission of the Human Relations Commission, I notice that it is to promote the just and fair treatment of all people in Palo Alto. Particularly more vulnerable populations so I think it is appropriate that I address you this evening about the terrible threat of nuclear weapons; which make the whole population of Palo Alto vulnerable to an awful death if a nuclear bomb were set off in our City or even within a few miles of our City. There are over 1,500 nuclear weapons in the world today owned by nine nations; about 3,700 of them are deployed and ready to be delivered by the USA and Russia. Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, ICBMs, can deliver multiple bombs after traveling through the sky for thousands of miles. The latest Russian Sarmat Missile carries twelve bombs equivalent to 40 megatons and is reported to be capable of wiping out parts of the earth the size of Texas or France. That means that just one ICBM could wipe out all of Northern California and such an act is contrary to international law which says that civilians should not be targeted by weapons during a war, only military combatants. The mission of the international organization called Mayors for Peace is to raise public awareness around the world regarding the need to abolish nuclear weapons. Not unilaterally but as 122 nations who signed the United Nation's treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons last July the 7th. They intend that every one of the nine countries who own these awful weapons of mass destruction dismantles them and the world ends up with none. The members of Mayors for Peace are cities, not just Mayors, and currently, it has 7,439 members in 162 countries. Including 211 in the US, 32 in California and amongst them is Berkeley, Carmel by the Sea, Los Angeles, Santa Cruz and so on but not Palo Alto. We belonged from 1985 to 2013 when our then Mayor decided without consulting the City Council to pull us out. So, Mayors for Peace organizes a significant grassroots effort to urge governments towards a world free of nuclear weapons. I addressed the City Council a couple of times last year about rejoining Mayors for Peace and I was not able to get it on their busy agenda, and I have been advised that your Human Relations Commission might be able to ask for this topic of returning for Mayors for Peace to be added for a future City Council agenda. Last year's Mayor visited three of our sister cities in Europe, I have established that Heidelberg, Germany where he visited to sign a new sistership and an Enschede in the Netherlands an existing sister city, are members are Mayors for Peace. Furthermore, the Mexican City, which has been our sister city for 54-years in which the Mayor visited last October, is also a member of Mayors for Peace. In all, four of our seven sister cities are members of Mayors for Peace and the fourth being Tsuchiura in Japan. I find it a source of embarrassment and I hope you do too...

Chair Stinger: Can I ask you to finish..

Ms. Spencer: ... that these sisters are members of Mayors for Peace and we are not. So, I am asking for your assistance in getting this awful situation of not belonging to Mayors for Peace to get it on to the agenda of the City Council. I have got copies of my speech here which I can leave for you, thank you. Oh, and there's a lot of people here who agree with me, hands up.

Chair Stinger: Thank you, I appreciate that, and I hope you will leave the copies for us. I just want to clarify and I should have done this before we spoke that as oral comments are made, we cannot speak to them. We appreciate you being here and I want to thank you but I can't address them tonight. We have one more speaker and that's Roberta Ahlquist. Is that what you held that timer too, three minutes? Good, I'll ask you to hold it to three minutes also.

Ms. Roberta Ahlquist: We've been to the City Council, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, to ask for some kind of protection for renters. This is one of the few cities in the area in which we live where there is no control for rents. We have received numerous complaints from landlords who are increasing the rent up to 300% in one year. The Human Relations Commission/City Council resolution 9653 addresses hate crimes, discrimination, assault, and fear. Many of these tenant's fear speaking out so we'd like to ask you to develop a survey, an anonymous survey of the city renters to find out just how severe this issue is. We have received complaints on a regular basis. In fact, not far from here a 14-unit apartment complex which had mostly one-bedroom unfurnished apartments that went 3-years ago for \$800.00 is now up to \$2,850 a month. All of those tenants who are workers in the city or older people retired; a woman who is retired with her older mother, for instance, all of them were forced to leave and many of them had to leave the city. We need some kind of protection for renters; these are discriminatory acts where people can greedily raise rents to the highest market rate. So, if you could consider providing assistance to us to do a citywide survey anonymously of tenants who are receiving regular and not very regular rent increases, we'd really appreciate it. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: Thank you.

[The Commission moved back up to agenda changes, requests, and deletions]

IV. BUSINESS

1. Review and consider ad hoc committee report to Council on an ordinance related to the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women.

Chair Stinger: We'll move onto our agenda and agenda Item One is the review and consideration of the Ad Hoc Committee recommendation regarding CEDAW. As Chair, I want to just introduce this item by saying that my goal is to reach an agreement on a motion that balances a workable framework and addresses our priorities as a city for gender equity. Accordingly, as we move through the material that will be presented to us, I will be focusing on a core question and I'm going to ask the rest of the Commission to do so also. That question is what is the most efficient process to make meaningful change for women who live and work in Palo Alto? Just for perspective, I'd like to comment that an Ad Hoc Committee of the HRC recommended seven programs and policy areas as an initial response to the Council's resolution for a diverse, supportive, inclusive, and protective community. Gender equity is one of seven which the HRC is carrying forward and which demand our attention. A policy recommendation under gender equity was to look at an ordinance, a step up from a resolution and assessing the value and

implication of that ordinance is our task under this agenda item this evening. Our process will be a presentation by Staff, a presentation by Commissioner Lee – thank you – oral communications and I have cards, Commissioner questions to staff and/or the Committee and Commission deliberation. Then finally we'll have a motion and deliberation on the motion and a vote. Starting with staff, please.

Ms. Minka van der Zwaag, Human Services Manager: Thank vou, Chair Stinger. The HRC has a very important recommendation to consider tonight. My Staff Report was intended to provide some general information about the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women or CEDAW. I want to recognize the hard work of the Ad Hoc subcommittee on this matter so that's Commissioner Gordon-Gray before she left the Committee and moved out of state, Current members are Chair Stinger and Commissioner Lee who have put an enormous amount of work and time into this matter so thank you. My report was intended to give some basic information about CEDAW for your review which what is involved in committing to an ordinance, what other entities in which past CEDAW have done and lastly my analysis. As I stated in my Staff Report, I am fully in support of gender equity and am pleased that the Human Relations Commission has lifted the matter as a focus on its work plan. After spending much time reviewing the CEDAW framework, I wanted to pass along the following concerns, questions and comments for your consideration during your deliberation. First is the time commitment, the commitment of the HRC and staff time needed to implement the initial and ongoing work connected to the ordinance are not completely known and look to be quite significant; which could draw HRC and Human Services staff away from other core functions and priorities. The question of an ordinance, an ordinance is essentially a local law. Although it's said to be flexible, the CEDAW framework in its implementation, it is still a local law which the city would be bound to uphold. I believe the work involved in the mechanics of setting up and upholding the ordinance may take time away from other efforts to make a meaningful impact on gender equality so the taskforce that is required as far as CEDAW. One comment that I included in my Staff Report that I wanted to include tonight is asked that when the HRC consider the question of a taskforce as mentioned in the Ad Hoc CEDAW Committee report, they have the option of having the taskforce report to the HRC or to the Council. I'm sure there are other options that may be out there but those were the two that are usually present in this type of a situation. Just wanted the HRC to be aware that if it's a taskforce that is reporting to the HRC, then the HRC would be responsible for overseeing the work of the taskforce to conduct the gender analysis, analyze the results and prepare a report and recommendation for Council review. I don't want to understand that this would be a huge responsibility that you should consider. The city does not need an ordinance to conduct any type of gender equity study within city operations. You know when I checked with our Human Resources Office on this matter, they say they do periodic checks into gender-based pay equity in the city and make recommendations for increases when needed. Since the HRC and city staff time is limited, I would like to suggest that the HRC check with members of the public as to what actions on gender equity issues would be most impactful for them. Otherwise, the HRC is making assumptions for actions based on perceptions perhaps. There can be meaningful avenues for impact short of an ordinance, such as a resolution or even what the HRC is working on to hear the concerns of the LGBT community with your listening forum that's coming up in late March. So, staff encourages the HRC to discuss and consider the following questions during their deliberations. What are the HRC goals -- I would add the communities - in regards to gender

equity and is CEDAW the right mechanism to reach these goals? Does the HRC have the bandwidth to fully commit to the initial and ongoing work associated with a CEDAW ordinance, as well as other core responsibilities and special projects? The third is just a question again if a recommendation on CEDAW is forwarded to the Council, does the HRC want to recommend that the taskforce suggested in the Ad Hoc Subcommittees report reports to the HRC or not? So, that is my report and again, I want to reiterate full appreciation for the subcommittee's work and full support for the matter of gender equality in the community and look forward to hearing your deliberations.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: Before I begin I just want to thank all of the extraordinary women in this room and on this Commission, who have worked for so many years on gender equality issues. Many of you have been working on these issues for longer than I've been alive. So, while I'm putting forth this recommendation, I'm really standing on the shoulders of some extraordinary women and men who have worked on this issue for quite a long time. So, I'm very privileged to do my small part to further that cause here in Palo Alto. Instead of repeating what's been mentioned in the Committee's memo, I'm going to confine my presentation to some of the questions raised by staff and hopefully provide some clarification to my fellow Commissioners before we discuss the recommendation in going forward. Regarding the goals of the recommendation, I think we can all acknowledge that there are gender equality issues in Palo Alto. There are gender equality issues that purvey in our community at large, there's no disputing that. You just have to look into the news or your own experiences to know that is an issue so I don't think that's anything that we can dispute. What we do need to look into is the extent to which gender equality is a problem in this community and how it manifests itself and what we can do to actually address those issues. That's precisely what this recommendation seeks to do, is to study how gender equality issues manifest itself in Palo Alto and to have a discussion with the community to identify policies and other initiatives that actually address those issues. With regards to the specific mechanism that we have proposed, the Cities for CEDAW initiative approach is nothing unique. The Cities for CEDAW initiative basically recommends that cities conduct a comprehensive analysis of city operations in terms of its role as an employer, it's role as a policymaker, it's role as a program and service provider in the community and just analysis all of its various functions as the city on a comprehensive basis as a way of analyzing the problem and then seeking solutions for those problems. So, whether Cities for CEDAW or CEDAW existed, I think any approach to solving gender equality issues would adopt a very similar approach which is analyzing the problem and then going from there to identify solutions. With regards to the bandwidth question presented by staff, I know this Commission has a whole slate of issues that it's very passionate about and the aim of the recommendation on the table is to really help leverage existing resources so that we can do more with less. By establishing a separate gender equality taskforce, it will enable us to look at gender equality on a comprehensive basis throughout the city without necessarily tying down the resources or the time of this body and allows us to leverage the tremendous expertise and passion and experience that we have in this community to help identify solutions to these issues. So, I think today, it's 2018, women have waited long enough for the city to make this a priority. I think given the current political and social climate now is time for us to take a very comprehensive look at how we can address all of these gender equality issues. It may take a little

bit more time to do a comprehensive study but I am firmly convinced that it will lead to more sustainable and systematic reform and change that will impact the women who work for us, who live in this community, and who work in this community in a very profound and significant way that goes beyond some of the prior initiatives that the Commission has taken. I think if we really want to make a change in this community we need to examine what we are doing as a city in terms of all of the different functions that we serve and use those tools as a way to address these issues in our community in a very comprehensive and deep fashion. So, I look forward to the discussion from my fellow Commissioners and I hope that we can come to a consensus this evening. I just want to make one thing clear so the recommendation on the table would ask City Council to direct staff to look into drafting an ordinance which would set up a taskforce to study these issues. The precise structure and scope of that taskforce and that gender analysis are to be determined. I think there are certain questions such as staff and budgetary resources which need to be asked of staff which is beyond the purview of this Commission. So, the recommendation on the table is not asking us to pass a set ordinance this evening but rather asking Council to have staff look into it and then come back with an actual recommendation for this body and Council to review. So, at that time we'll have another chance to weigh in and determine, based on the resources available within the city and within the community, what sort of effort can we undertake? I hope that this Commission will take that in mind and that this is just one step in the very long process but there certainly will be plenty of time for us to weigh in and really evaluate whether this is the right approach. Also, I just wanted to mention that while this approach asks for an eventual ordinance, I don't want us to get bogged down by it. There's a way to draft an ordinance in such a way that it would merely set up a taskforce in the same way that the Council might create a new Commission charged with setting particular issues within this community. So, while it is local law, it can be drafted in such a way that it limits the city's responsibilities, limits its liability and such so don't let the fact that it's called an ordinance detract you from authorizing a body of community stakeholders to undertake this important work. I look forward to having a discussion with you and hearing from the public on this.

Chair Stinger: Thank you very much. Do I have all the cards? I have eight cards and I'm looking forward to hearing from the community. I'm going to ask that each speaker take two minutes and I'll begin with Adrienne Murphy, please.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can go there and as long as the red light is on we'll hear you.

Ms. Adrienne Murphy: Somehow over the last year while this work has been going on with CEDAW, I was engaged with Greg Scharff and Carla [Medda] on this same issue around gender equity. We looked at the CEDAW program and huge respect to San Francisco, San Jose, and Los Angeles for making it work. They each have invested in staff, they get paid the city in order to make this gender equity a reality and I'm not sure that Palo Alto can afford that. So, when we looked at CEDAW and said maybe that's not the right answer, we went onto EDGE which is an organization out of Switzerland which comprehensive for a lot of the lack of process and lack of resources that cities have when they come to – sorry, I'm nervous because I'm running out of time. I thought I had five minutes so I'm shortening my sentences. This is a really important issue, it's a really important issue for me, it's a really important issue for my son and my daughter when they grow up. I don't want to wait two years for the city to get through an ordinance, to get through a taskforce and go out and do research when there are organizations

like EDGE out there that could be folded into this process. So, they have an 18-week gender equity study that the city can do, it will cost \$25,000 and about 3½ people hours over those 18-weeks from the city. So, congratulations for bringing gender equity and CEDAW to Palo Alto and I hope that as you continue the conversation, you'll think about adding EDGE in as part of your process. Oh, I do? Oh wow.

Commissioner O'Nan: Tell us what EDGE is.

Ms. Murphy: EDGE comes out of Davos and it is the economic dividends for gender equality. It was founded by the daughter of Schwab and what they've done is they brought minds together from all of the gender universities around the world and put together a repeatable process. There are three steps in their analysis, the first one is peer gender equity in terms of numbers but they are not looking at just who's in leadership, they are looking up promotions, and they are looking up pay scales. The second stage is they look at policies and then the third one is they go out to the community of workers or people who live in the community to find out how do you experience this policy in compared to how the policy is actually written. At the end of that 18-week process, Palo Alto would be given a gender equity seal which I think would be awesome for the city to be the first one in the United States to say we're committed, we're doing. The seal is based not achieving particular numbers but, on the fact, that the city has committed to the process. Now I think that CEDAW has – I'm done.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you. Our timer is not very loud so I might just hold it up when the time is up instead of interrupting people because that doesn't feel nice.

Chair Stinger: Leah Russin, please.

Ms. Leah Russin: Good evening, thanks for having a public forum tonight to talk about this, I very much appreciate the opportunity. I personally am deeply committed to gender equity along with racial equity and the idea that Palo Alto, as a city, needs to make a priority of supporting those who are inequitably treated and those who are less privileged. To me, there is a huge value in the nomenclature of CEDAW. There is a history of decades of work done by many, many women around the world and having Palo Alto commit and affirms that work, has value. I understand that there's a huge commitment of resources and the exact scope of that work that would need to be done to become a CEDAW City seems to me, frankly an open question. It also is something that is probably quite malleable and the extent to which Palo Alto commits resources is an affirmation of the extent to which we value equity for women. I think that is something to consider and I think that we need to reflect on what we have to tell our children about how we chose to spend our money. I understand that we, as a city, have a lot of needs, we have a lot of things that we want to be and want to do but equitable should be right at the top of the list. So, thank you, you've all received my letter so I won't repeat those points but I think the value of standing on the shoulders of CEDAW is something that we should not overlook and an opportunity that we should not pass up. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: Thank you very much. Lisa Ratner, please.

Ms. Lisa Ratner: Hi, I'm Lisa Ratner from League of Women Voters, and I'd like to read a letter

that we have submitted in support of the proposal. The League of Women Voters at its national state and local levels believe that no person or group should suffer legally, economic or administrative discrimination and that due process should be forwarded to all persons including the right to a fair hearing, right to counsel, right to appeal and right to humane treatment. The League of Women Voters also supports the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women; CEDAW. In December of 2016, the League of Women Voters in Palo Alto urged Palo Alto City Council to adopt Resolution #9653, reaffirming Palo Alto's commitment to a diverse, supportive, inclusive and protective community which the City Council did. Accordingly, the League of Women Voters of Palo Alto supports the recommendation to forward to the city the consideration of a local CEDAW ordinance as described in the Ad Hoc CEDAW Committee memo. Thank you very much.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. Cherrill Spencer, please.

Ms. Spencer: Hello, I'm still Cherrill Spencer and I'm still speaking on behalf of WILPF. I first learned about the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women in 1985 at the United Nations Conference at the end of the UN Decade for Women which I was privileged to attend in Nairobi. I've been educating the public on and off about it ever since. It has been described as a sort of bill of rights for women in that it quite comprehensively describes the types of discrimination that can be made based on sex or gender and the need to counteract them and provide remedies. Let me read you what (inaudible) article one describes, is says it describes sex discrimination as distinguishing, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women of human rights of the fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or another field. We've been waiting since 1979 for the United State Senate to ratify the UN treat. It's one of the five or six countries that have not ratified it so we've decided we're tired of waiting, we want a local effort to make the changes we want in our communities. There's a lot of things in the convention that we can take and customize to what we want to see in Palo Alto. The reality is that there is discrimination against women both individual, systematic, intentional and unintentional hear in the city. The convention also wants to get rid of bigotry in all forms; this is all in my speech that I'll give you. So, WILPF would draw particular attention to the issue of affordable housing and low-income housing in Palo Alto which impacts women strongly. We want an ordinance that produced to ensure that women that are given equal access to affordable housing. With all this in mind, our branch of WILPF passed the following Resolution in December – the Palo Alto – Ok, I have got a copy of the Resolution and you will each get a copy of it. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: Thank you for coming with the copies. Gail Stucky, I hope I pronounced that correctly.

Ms. Gail Stucky: You did. My name is Gail Stucky and I'm not of an organization, I'm just a 40-year resident in Palo Alto and I heard about this and...

Commissioner O'Nan: Please make sure you speak into the microphone.

Ms. Stucky: Sorry, I've never done this before. I'm just a 40-year resident of Palo Alto and I just

think it's important, and I think it's important to be made an ordinance. I'm hearing words that I guess I'm kind of shocked when I heard yes, it's too much time; too much money. We spend a lot of money in this town. I have granddaughters and all I can say is I can't look them in the face and tell them that a survey on a light pole is more important than gender equity in their lives. I guess I'm shocked by some of this and I'm mostly shocked by I'm part of Next Door Neighborhood and emails going out where a lot of women are saying this is not important. There is no discrimination in Palo Alto, we don't need to talk about it, women will just call it out and I didn't even know how to respond to other women thinking that. So, I guess I'm here today to encourage you to make this an ordinance, make it important because if we don't put ourselves behind it and our money behind it, it won't be important. I mean as I said I've been here for 40-years so I guess thank you.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. Shelly Kosak, please.

Ms. Shelly Kosak: I'm not going to speak.

Chair Stinger: Ok, then Mary Jane.

Ms. Mary Jane Marcus: Alright, hi, my name is Mary Jane Marcus, and I grew up in Palo Alto – well, kind of in Palo Alto and moved back in 2003 and went to Palo Alto schools I guess. I just want to really support the CEDAW measure and in particular, because I've seen in other cities that have implemented this, I think to have someone who represents CEDAW with the city – you can contact me. I'm happy to raise money for this position and a lot of us would help contribute to this so that we can have a part-time person who's really focused on this. To me the reason why it's so important -- I'm glad all the people who brought this up because I'm just showing up tonight – is I think women in Palo Alto are not necessarily thriving right now. It's a really stressful life here in a lot of ways; financially and just it's a very – the tech culture is a very strong male culture and it's come to dominate Palo Alto. I think that's had a huge effect on everyone and so I guess I just urge us to pass this measure and also to start prototyping. Let's benefit from tech, we don't need to study everything for two years and not just eliminate discrimination. I worked at a Stanford restaurant last year and faced severe sexual harassment there so I know a lot of restaurant workers face a lot of issues but also just let's help women harness the amazing energy; just like they give women money and microenterprise. I think we need to harness the energy of women in Palo Alto to strengthen this community. A lot of us want community space, I'm working on opening a community space but most of the landlords are male, most of the property owners are male so we have a historical gender discrimination here that makes it harder for women to contribute. I just urge us to work on this and happy for everyone to be here tonight and yes, let me know what I can do to help and you can start by eliminating fees for renting Mitchell Park as just a starting point to make it easier for people to just even gather and organize and build a better Palo Alto. Thanks.

Chair Stinger: Thank you, Mary Jane. Roberta Ahlquist, please.

Ms. Alhquist: First I'd just like to finish her sentence about the Resolution for those of you who are not at the Council meeting. WILPF proposed a Resolution that the Palo Alto Peninsula Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom heartedly support the

actions of the Palo Alto Human Relations Commission towards the adoption of a CEDAW ordinance in the City of Palo Alto. In particular, WILPF urges the City Council to direct staff to research and draft a CEDAW for this HRC and City Council consideration. I would like to speak to a couple of points that have yet to be addressed. One is that how many of you know what the disparity is between men and women's pay in this country? Anyone? A guess? (crosstalk) It's 82 cents per dollar and that's gone up in the last 20-years about 10-cents – 20-years, 10-cents so we live a very wealthy, predominately white, male-controlled city. If you look at the demographics of the city, there are a lot of people who just can't afford to live here even the people who work in City Hall, including high paid professionals. I've done a little semi-survey in the building and they would like to live here but they can't afford it even people making \$150,000 so this notion of inclusivity and equity, racial equality and gender equity is not something new. We want a more multi-cultural, more multi-ethnic city and we'd like to have the people who work here like the janitors and the City Clerks and whoever else works for the city and in the city to be able to live here. I would like to know if the city has published this survey on gender equity. I have not seen a...

Chair Stinger: Can you come to a conclusion.

Ms. Alhquist: I'm sorry?

Chair Stinger: Can you come to a conclusion?

Ms. Alhquist: Sure, but I would like an answer to that. I have not seen anything that says the city's done any kind of surveys on gender equity. I'd like it to be made available. There's a Tenant-Landlord Mediation Board, I'm very familiar with it, the city has it and it has no legal teeth at all. Generally, tenants go and they say well, it was just a waste of my time so expose yourself some kind of legal basis is important. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: Our last card is Janet Cook.

Ms. Janet Cook: Hi, thank you to the Commission and to the public. My favorite sign at the Women's March not too long ago was one that said 'I can't believe I'm still marching for these issues'. In 1980ish, I was a leader of the Palo Alto National Organization for Women, we approached Palo Alto for the purpose of dealing with what we call then comparable wealth and salaries. We had limited success but some success and its past time we talk – took care of this issue and I thank you for your efforts in that behalf. I speak in support of CEDAW Resolution and there are ways to make this financially viable. This is a smart body, this is a smart city, these people out here are smart, that just cannot be the reason this isn't done. Thanks.

Chair Stinger: I just want to thank each of you for taking the time to come. Some of you to listen, some of you to speak, all of you to speak passionately, factually; it's very thoughtful of you and I appreciate it and it reinforces the work that we're doing and that we spend time on. I just have to say thank you. This discussion comes back to the Commission now and at this point, we can have questions of clarification to Commissioner Lee or to Staff.

Commissioner O'Nan: I'm still puzzled about how the taskforce would work. Someone has to

lead it, manage it, and develop the report and who is going to do all that?

Commissioner Lee: So, assuming – I had notions as to how I would set up the taskforce but the Committee felt that it would be most appropriate for either this body to weigh in on how they would like to see the taskforce set up or to refer that question through the Council to staff. So, I assume we have notions as to how I would set it up but there are many ways it could be set up. The idea would be to leverage the tremendous expertise and resources we have in this community. We have so many experts here in this room, at Stanford and at non-profits and at law firms throughout this community. We have one of the highest concentrations of law firms in the Bay Area. As a lawyer, I've already reached out to some of my lawyer friends who specialize in this kind of issue and who are passionate about finding ways for them and their law firms to get involved. I'm sure that there are student organizations on campus and other groups in the community and individuals who would be more than qualified to help us do that. So, the taskforce would really help us add to our existing expertise and human power as I call it or people power beyond what the Commission itself could do. Certainly, at this point, we are leaving that up to staff as they are drafting something to propose how they would set up that taskforce.

Chair Stinger: Commissioner Chen.

Vice Chair Chen: Yes, Commissioner Lee I just had a question about what is the actual process - step 1, 2, 3, 4 -- in your plan to get this -- the work done. Then we could think about resources and we have people who even want to raise money for us. So, that's a good point to start to see how you do it exactly.

Commissioner Lee: I think the first step is we need to identify the resources that the city has and is willing to dedicate to this effort to do a gender analysis. Once we have identified those resources or to the extent that Council wants to add additional resourcing or staff, from there we can figure out what additional support do we need from the community. Then combining both city and community resources we can figure out what is the scope of work that the taskforce would do. So, at this point, the next step is really an exploratory one and that's what the recommendation focuses on. It asks Council to direct staff to explore this issue more thoroughly as to what resources are available and once we've identified that question – once we've answered that question, we can determine to what extent can the taskforce do X, Y, and Z.

Vice Chair Chen: The taskforce members, how do you draw the taskforce members? From the city? From the community?

Commissioner Lee: So, assuming I have notions as to who I would like to see on a taskforce but again, the recommendation is to ask staff to put together its recommendation of who they believe should be on the taskforce; taking into consideration existing resources and resources we have in the community. I would envision that it would involve various stakeholders from the community as well as members from this body.

Vice Chair Chen: My question is staff and the city, they have their own duties right and this is additional duties for them to do. How are you going to generate the funds to support extra staff to

do this kind of work?

Commissioner Lee: So, that's part of the question that we're asking staff to look at as to what resources can they dedicate to this? Are there existing resources? Do we need additional resources and once we've answered that question, then we can narrow down what can we actually do as a gender equality taskforce? So, I think that's the next question that we need to answer, it's not an answer that this body is equipped to handle and it's one that we need Council to direct Staff to answer for us.

Vice Chair Chen: Alright, thank you.

Commissioner Lee: When the staff comes back to us and identifies what resources are available, this body I envision would have a second opportunity to weigh in as to is this the right path forward to address gender equality issues? To what extent do we want this taskforce to do X, Y, and Z? So, certainly, this body will come back and re-evaluate it once staff has examined it further.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think if the Council directs the issue back to the HRC, then the HRC would have weighed in on what happens then. If and when the Council deliberates, it could decide well, we actually want the taskforce to report to us. Its first step would be city staff look into this a little bit more, provide us with some options and as staff, we will certainly work at the direction of Council to look into that and to provide the Council with a full report of options that they can consider. Then make the policy decision that we as staff would then implement.

Commissioner Lee: Did I fully answer your question?

Vice Chair Chen: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Great.

Chair Stinger: Other questions?

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes.

Chair Stinger: Please.

Commissioner O'Nan: I'm still really uncomfortable with the way that the Ad Hoc Committee's report was laid out. It feels to me like we're trying to punt the ball over the Council who I can already tell you – I mean I don't know if our liaison wants to jump in here – is way, way, way too busy to take on something like this. They are going to wonder why the HRC isn't doing it and why we're trying to give it to them. Two, staff is super busy and we're under staffed in many departments and they don't have time to take this on either. Three, we're what, six million dollars in debt as a city. We don't have any room in the budget right now to do this so this is all long-term doable, I agree but in the short term, I already know there isn't the staffing, there isn't the resources, Council doesn't want to do it. It's really an HRC issue, if we want to do it we're going to have to do it, the seven of us, three of whom are terming out so we're going to have

brand new members coming. They didn't agree to this project and I'm not really seeing realistically how we're going to get this thing off the ground.

Commissioner Lee: To give you an – whoops, sorry, did you want to...

Council Member Wolbach: After you.

Commissioner Lee: To give you an example, in Cincinnati when they adopted a similar approach, they leverage \$8,000 in city funding and got over \$25,000 in-kind contributions from the community (crosstalk)...

Chair Stinger: Can we – let's see, keep it down.

Commissioner Lee: ...to conduct their analysis and they got other folks in the community to help do the study. So, my initial recommendation really assumed that there weren't any significant city resources to dedicate towards this. So, my initial recommendation tried to take that into consideration and would depend on our ability to leverage community buy-in and resources. We've kind of modified that to leave that question up to staff and Council to decide. If Council does find this a priority which I believe they should, then perhaps they would dedicate resources to it, not lessening the other budgetary priorities. They may find that it's less of a priority and say these are the resources that we can dedicate towards it, take it or leave it, see what additional support you can get with the community. So, I'm very sensitive to that concern and that's why, at this point, instead of presuming one way or the other, I would like Council to weigh in on it as to whether they find it a priority and to direct staff to identify resources that we could potentially leverage to do this.

Commissioner O'Nan: It would be interesting to hear from our Council Liaison.

Chair Stinger: Please.

Council Member Wolbach: Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in. I think this item will dovetail nicely into the following item on tonight's agenda. Just to go back or ahead to that one, remember this Resolution that we passed in 2016 said the City of Palo Alto will promote actual safety, sense of security and equal protection for the constitution on human rights leading by example through equitable treatment of all by city officials and departments. It also prior to that said that the city will proactively work to ensure the rights and privileges of everyone in Palo Alto regardless of religion, ancestry, country of birth, immigration status, stability, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity. I think that this issue of CEDAW and other opportunities to pursue gender equity in Palo Alto certainly fits within that concept. Although I think it was included in your packet, the actual motion from that evening on December 12th of 2016. Part B of the motion was – I think you're familiar with the concept but I just want to make sure that everybody remembers it was to refer the subject matter of this memorandum to the Human Relations Commission for recommendation of implementation measures and additional elements that should be considered by the Council in the future. In other words, how can we make this real through action and what did we miss or what did we forget? I think this falls not into a category of something that we missed or forgot because we did mention gender but it definitely is an

example – should it move forward, it would be an example of HRC fulfilling its obligation under Council direction in one piece. I don't think that CEDAW would cover everything that we asked you to look into. It was a very open-ended ask to the HRC that we made in December of 2016 so over a year ago. As one Council Member, I was hoping to see recommendations sooner than this so I'm glad that the HRC is starting to put together substantive recommendations whatever decisions you make about which ones to forward to Council. I am looking forward to seeing them and hopefully more than just one. So, I think it's absolutely appropriate if the HRC thinks that this is a good recommendation, it is absolutely appropriate to refer it to Council as a recommendation to bring it back to Council because we asked you for recommendations. We asked what we can do to make this Resolution real. CEDAW would be an example, so would EDGE or perhaps any other mechanism or program that you would like to recommend so I don't think it's inappropriate to bring it forward. As far as staffing, cost, those are things that Council will have to consider but if it's the right thing to do in pursuit of something the Council has said is a priority for us through our Resolution in December 2016, I hope that the HRC won't prevent Council the opportunity to hear your recommendations. The balance of what we pay for, what we don't pay for, what we pay for this year, what we pay for next year, do we hire additional staff, do we turn to the community as we did with the Children's Museum and Zoo where the city is putting in \$7 million but the community put in \$25 million. All those options are things that the Council would have to wrestle with, with any recommendation. There is always a cost but I hope the question you're considering is whether it's a good policy for the city to consider and let us figure out how we're going to pay for it or whether we want to differ it for a year until we figure out how to pay for it.

Commissioner Lee: Just to...

Commissioner Lee: ... to address a point that the Council Member brought up, establishing a separate gender equality taskforce would enable us to identify potential policy recommendations or other recommendations for the Council's consideration in a more timely manner. Obviously, this body only meets once a month and gender is one of many issues under our purview. So, by establishing a separate gender equality taskforce composed of people who are quite honestly a bit more expertized on this subject matter than we are, we're leveraging the energy in the community to help do our job to really bring these recommendations to the Council in a more time fashion and in a more comprehensive fashion. While it is a lot of work, I think it helps this body do more in a shorter period of time than we could otherwise do on our own or with only City resources.

Chair Stinger: You have a question?

Commissioner Alhassani: I actually have a few questions if that's ok.

Chair Stinger: Please, we've spent hours on this, days and we would like to see more – I can't believe there aren't more questions so go for it.

Commissioner Alhassani: First, to echo what Commissioner Lee said, thank you all for coming and especially a lot of you are a part of Chapter organizations here that are doing really great grassroots work. Again, to echo what Commissioner Lee has said, on one hand, we've made a lot

of progress on gender equality but today I saw a picture of woman who was abused by Senior White House Official in the paper and it's very sobering to show you know we're not done. To be clear, my line of questioning is more around clarity as to be candid from a process perspective, I felt like I heard conflicting things a little bit. I think Minka raised a concern that an ordinance is a law that binds us to things but that we don't need an ordinance to do a gender study. I think that's what you said and then Commissioner Lee said don't worry that it's an ordinance; we can still limit our liability and risk for the city. I guess I don't understand what ordinance means for us exactly in the scope?

Commissioner Lee: Did you want me to address them one by one or wait for you to go through

Commissioner Alhassani: Let's start with that one.

Commissioner Lee: There is a certain way that we can draft the ordinance in such a way that it would establish a taskforce in the same way that the Council would establish a new Commission. They would set up a community body with certain members appointed by whomever and they are responsible for studying X, Y, and Z. So, that would be city law in a sense that it would be in the Municipal Code that this body exists and it has this responsibility to conduct a gender analysis. It is law but you could have it stop there to say that we set up this body responsible for doing the study, period. You could go a bit further and say add additional things in there to make it stronger which I think might concern staff but you can stop it there and say this is what we're doing and that would be it. So, really by us setting up that taskforce and having them think about these issues that would be fulfilling the commitment under this new city law.

Commissioner Alhassani: Has...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can I just interject? So, the job of crafting an ordinance falls to the City Attorney and he or she, whichever Attorney works on that, works under the direction of advice or Council -- given by the City Council as far as when they've deliberated CEDAW and in consultation with staff and so forth. That would not be up to the HRC, now if the HRC goes forward with a recommendation for Council consideration of an ordinance, I mean you can add in an addendum to the Staff Report information of what the HRC thinks to a point but it's really going to Council for that general question. Then the Council gives direction to the City Attorney to work with staff to study the matter, come up with a draft ordinance and come back. I would agree with Commissioner Lee that different cities have done this in different ways. Some Cities have been extremely prescriptive and there's a draft CEDAW ordinance on the Cities for CEDAW site which mentions twenty-five things. The City of Berkeley, theirs reads like, in my perspective, a Resolution that is really an ordinance which it speaks to a point of – like a resolution really speaks to the opinion and the commitments of the city to a certain topic. Theirs really speaks to that and speaks to the City of Berkeley is committed to X, Y, Z as shown in this city policy. I would agree with Commissioner Lee, there is some leeway in the matter; there are some ordinances that say the taskforce goes away in a couple years. So, there is leeway but the fact of the matter is it is a local law.

Commissioner Alhassani: What's the difference if we made a recommendation to City Council saying we recommend that you direct staff to have say a community group, like similar to the

CAC, to study gender equality? What's the difference between that and a formal ordinance?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The ordinance would be the local law. Now the Council could, as it deliberates this, could say hey, as a first step, could we do this? Include that in a Staff report the findings of that community conversation, include that in a Staff Report either by itself or in combination with a draft ordinance for us to consider. All those things could happen. It could be that the taskforce is set up and it gives recommendations back to Council but it's not under the guidance of an ordinance. There's plenty of taskforces that the city sets up, the Blue-Ribbon Taskforce, that aren't bounded by an ordinance. That would be up to the HRC to make a recommendation for the Council consideration for the Council to consider and for staff to implement. So, that's really how it works in that effect but...

Commissioner Lee: Really, the way I see it, there's only an upside to having an ordinance. It solidifies or it makes it clear that this is a priority for the city but you can draft it in such a way that it only sets up the body charged with doing X, Y, and Z. Right, it doesn't force us to do anything beyond that and I've actually...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Why ask the Commission then to consider if it only sets up the taskforce, is it really the full intent of the principles of CEDAW because the principles of CEDAW is the hope and of to do a whole lot of things. I would just ask you that you consider that in your deliberations.

Commissioner Lee: Sure.

Commissioner Alhassani: I think this is an important point because the devils in the details here. There's going to be all sorts of rules that come with this is my guess, like is the taskforce going to be public meetings or not? Is there going to be a Brown Act or not? I think this is important implications for how this gets done to be clear.

Commissioner Lee: That's highlights the importance of getting staff to weigh in on it. I actually drafted one myself because I'm an attorney and I know how to do that sort of thing but the consensus of the Committee was that we didn't want to pre-judge certain aspect of it. So, we wanted to differ to staff to actually come back with something but certainly, the intent of the recommendation on the table is for the HRC to weigh in on any draft ordinance before it gets implemented so that we can look at those details. So this recommendation is just asking that we take that next step and study the issue and come back with a proposal that would become an ordinance should we like it.

Commissioner Alhassani: Actually, one of the issues that I had though is that, tell me if I am wrong, but that specifically the recommendation is that this taskforce or study or however the City Council recommends that they do it, is actually going to look at specifically when they say the City of Palo Alto, they actually mean the city government body of Palo Alto. It's not the actual studying of the community, is that accurate?

Commissioner Lee: The focus of the taskforce would be over areas where we, as a city, have influence, jurisdiction, powers to effect change so there are various functions in which I envision

that the gender equality taskforce would look at. Certainly, one would be the city as an employer, you know we employ hundreds of employees and certainly, we would want to be walking the talk so to speak in terms of gender equality and how we treat our own employees. Also, there's an outward facing component of the city, we set policies that govern things that go on here. We fund programs and services that thousands of our residents take advantage of and utilize. We have all these social services which try to address certain issues in our community. We certainly, as a city, partner with other government agencies and non-profits and businesses and individuals so what has been laid out in the recommendation, it just identifies the different ways that the city right now has an influence or power to effect change. I think it's drafted in such a way that it's very broad but it gives the taskforce authority to look at all of those different areas and if they discover that maybe the city as an employer is doing really well, maybe they are doing A- work, then maybe they won't focus on that. Maybe they will focus on the shows and programs we offer to the community or maybe it's they determine that we need to partner with local businesses more or non-profits. It just identifies the different ways that the city interacts with the community and the different tools available to us to effect change.

Commissioner Alhassani: My gut is that something more community focus is a little more beneficial because I think that's my guess to your point is city government itself is part of ...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Save that for the...

Chair Stinger: Yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...deliberation time.

Commissioner Alhassani: Oh, I apologize, sorry...

Ms. van der Zwaag: If you could just focus on...

Commissioner Alhassani: ... Ok sorry so then on the ordinance, we aren't making an ordinance that we recommend that we study with CEDAW framework, it's just to do a study in general and at the discretion of Council, is that accurate?

Commissioner Lee: The CEDAW framework which is pretty loose in itself recommends that you have an ordinance that does a couple things. It sets up a taskforce responsible for doing these things, that conducts a gender analysis, and if so deemed appropriate funding and staff to do so. So, that's the general framework, it's very flexible, it's not necessarily unique to CEDAW. If I were going to recommend how we address gender equality issues in Palo Alto, I would recommend that approach regardless of whether CEDAW existed because in order to understand and address a problem you have to study it first. I think a separate body with the expertise to do so and a time to do so would be the most appropriate way to do it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would just add that is certainly what CEDAW encourages but there's not a specific oversight body. So, if this goes forward to our Council, our Council can definitely say yes, that those are the three areas that we definitely want staff to look into or that we want once we have an ordinance. Those are the steps we definitely want to take or could decide on

something else. Just wanted to...

Commissioner Lee: One of the things they could consider is the EDGE proposal. Maybe that's how we do the gender analysis or maybe...

Commissioner Alhassani: That's what I was getting at.

Commissioner Lee: So, it could be weaved into it. CEDAW is flexible enough that we could do that.

Commissioner Alhassani: Thank you.

Commissioner O'Nan: So, are we wedded to the CEDAW framework? I mean can we do something to advance gender equality outside of CEDAW that might be faster or more efficient or more on point with this community?

Commissioner Lee: I think this is the right approach in the sense that it takes a comprehensive look at gender equality. It allows us to approach the issue in a more significant and long-term way than this Commission might be able to do otherwise by itself. I think certainly having events that bring awareness to certain issues are fantastic and trying to educate the community on these issues are great. There are policies and procedures and programs and funding that have long-term consequences for how gender equality has advanced in our community that I think it's worth us taking a comprehensive look at it. Again, by setting up a separate taskforce to do it, that frees us up if we wanted to do a chunk of it or a piece of something else, it allows us that flexibility to do while having this other body who can focus on it in a more comprehensive fashion.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would just add you can certainly do other goals regarding to gender equity that aren't part of the CEDAW framework but the question on the table today is the CEDAW framework.

Chair Stinger: I'd like to take a crack at it also. One of the things is this is a continual learning process and one of the things that were pointed out to me this weekend was that the normal process is a resolution and then an ordinance. We have been working with the ordinance that the City Council of 2002 passed.

Commissioner Lee: Resolution.

Chair Stinger: I'm sorry, the resolution. I am getting resolution and ordinance mixed up but not intentionally. That ordinance never...

Commissioner O'Nan: Resolution.

Chair Stinger: That resolution never confirmed CEDAW values or committed to them. It was a motion to ask the US Senate take action on the UN Convention. So, I think there are within the CEDAW framework there is room to commit to CEDAW values and at least I'd like to explore having the resolution and starting with a taskforce and then maybe considering maybe an

ordinance subsequently. That would be something I'd like to explore in the deliberation but I think your question was are their frameworks that we can look at within CEDAW and I think there are some important frameworks we can look at within CEDAW. Are there other questions? Can we move on to deliberation? I don't want to walk away from this issue. It is so important to me that we, as a City, make a commitment to gender equity and that we do it in a way that satisfies all of the issues on the table because it is going to affect our workload and our thought process and our other commitments in the coming year. I want to ask each of us to comment on the Committee's recommendation, the Committee's memo and the comments that you've heard in oral comments. Nobody gets a pass tonight. I do want to keep us moving and I'm going to suggest that maybe as we go through deliberations, we might be able to stay more focused if we direct our comments to two questions. Those are: what are the most significant actions we can take in this regard and is a CEDAW ordinance the best mechanism to achieve these goals? I open it up for deliberation.

Commissioner O'Nan: Well, I'll start so I was a very passionate advocate of CEDAW when I first heard about it. I was not familiar until we had a speaker come I think a year or a year and a half ago and that time we were told that CEDAW was going to be actually pretty easy to implement. That there a template or some sort of a framework that we could follow etc. etc. and so many of us jumped on the bandwagon. In the year or so since then, we've have dedicated quite a bit of time as a Commission to this issue and have discovered in fact that it's not very straightforward. It's not as easy as was made out to be, it's going to be a big effort and I think little by little we've gotten a bit discouraged in moving forward. Even though I think all of us on the Commission are very committed to gender equity. I have a few concerns about the process which I think my colleague Commissioner Alhassani also raised. We are a Commission with a broad Charter and some of the work we do has to do with women who are being abused, beaten, raped, and having other very, very serious issues. I'd be concerned about spending so much time on this issues that we sort of lost track of what's happening over here to some of our more marginalized sisters in the community because we no longer have any bandwidth to help them. I'm concerned about who's going to manage all of this and I'm concerned about burdening staff and burdening Council. I don't have an image in my mind of exactly how this is going to work. I think you were here on the Commission with me, last two Commissioners who did the City-wide needs assessment about six years ago that was an enormous undertaking that took more than a year to do. It really does require all-hands-on-deck and so I'm feeling a little overwhelmed with what CEDAW requires. I noticed too in the background information that no city of our size has done it. The smallest city that's comparable to us is Berkeley and Berkeley is twice as big as we are. So, I'm wondering if this is a solution that just doesn't scale to Palo Alto very well and if rather than wrestling with the CEDAW framework, we should be looking at some other way to make a meaningful impact with gender equality. I'm a little reluctant to support the idea of moving forward with CEDAW per say. I'd really like to look at some other options to see if there's a more efficient, more effective way to do this.

Commissioner Lee: If I could address the – sorry, did you want too...

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: No, you can address that.

Commissioner Lee: To address the bandwidth issue, again I think the recommendation is in light

of the limited time of this body and given our wide mandate, with that in mind, that's why it's important that we establish a separate gender equality taskforce. Maybe based on what I'm hearing from this Commission, it's totally separate from this Commission and reports directly to City Council but would enable the city to address gender equality issues in a comprehensive fashion without tying up the HRC on that issue. There was an aspect of gender equality that we wanted to focus on in any given year, we'd still have that prerogative but it wouldn't stop a separate taskforce from doing those very important and very comprehensive work. From a bandwidth standpoint, that's exactly why this is the right approach because it wouldn't require this body to totally focus on it 100%. The open question, of course, is how much staff time can we devote to those? How much community time do we need to leverage to do something and I think that's what we are asking Council to direct staff to look into. I am confident that there's enough expertise and people power and time in this community that with a separate taskforce, that they can get this done. Just what I've seen and my sense of the hunger for people to do something on this issue other than just commenting on it on Facebook I truly believe that if we can leverage the resource in the community, we can do more with less from us, from the city and from this Commission.

Commissioner O'Nan: Well, I do take your point Commissioner Lee; it's just that I think there's a lot of passion around the issue. I can see people wanting to come to meetings and share their opinions but often when it comes down to doing the work over a long period of time somebody has to develop the survey, somebody has to figure out how to send out the survey, somebody has to compile the survey results, somebody has to write the report, somebody has to come to Council and give the report. You start to see people sort of fall away, right? They are excited up to a point and then it's like well, I've got a family and I've got a job and I've got things to do and we've got to make sure that we don't burden Council and burden staff and then find out that there's nobody running this show. Somebody's got to run the show and it's going to come back to us and I think we've got to make sure that we, having made this recommendation, don't let it go off the rails. It's just very, very important and somebody's got to be in charge and I'm still not feeling like anybody is in charge.

Commissioner Lee: That's a fair point and a lot of the communities who have done CEDAW, they've worked with local Universities to do a lot of the work and we are blessed here to have fantastic Stanford University here and there are other Universities in the region who would be willing to step up. I've already reached out to the Women of Stanford Law group and they are very interested in this. There are many other women's groups on and off campus, experts who do this kind of research for a living and so I think given that we are so close to a major University that we can find people who are willing to make that commitment. It's not something that can be done overnight but anything truly worth doing isn't easy and I don't think we should be daunted by that challenge. We may try and end up failing but I'd rather us does that than not try at all. So, I'd like to give this community a chance to do it and as I mentioned, it's really going to come down to our ability to leverage that community support. I'm willing to go out on a limb and say that I'm willing to put in the extra effort that is needed to lead/co-lead to bring folks together to get this done. I can't allow but I'm certainly willing to make that extra commitment above and beyond my commitment to the Commission.

Commissioner O'Nan: So, for...

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I just wanted to address Commissioner O'Nan's question that Berkeley is twice the size of Palo Alto. I think you compare Berkeley and Palo Alto, we have a lot more resources than Berkeley has and Berkeley is not that rich of a city. Plus, as a woman working in Palo Alto, I feel there are issues with gender and equality where if this body or committee, at a local level, then women would feel more comfortable going up. I'm visualizing the taskforce more as a helpline or a social network that people can reach out and talk and bring open their issues like somebody said she faced harassment in a restaurant. I'm thinking if a women partner in a law firm who faces sexual discrimination, she's going to file a lawsuit in a federal court. She's probably not going to need support from the City of Palo Alto through this ordinance but we'll really be helping women who are marginalized and at that lower income level who are doing work in the restaurants that have a support line that may not have the means to go file a lawsuit in a federal court. So, I think is very important from that perspective.

Commissioner O'Nan: What you just said actually even makes more uncomfortable because in my mind we are not setting up a support group or an 800 number for people to call. This taskforce would have no legal enforcement abilities what so ever so I really, really feel like we're starting to drift into the weeds here and we can't do that. Whatever we recommend has got to be really clear to Council and to the community because we're going to have to keep this commitment if we make it. Also, just FYI, when we did the needs assessment across the community, we also had the idea of reaching out to the University because at that time we had Commissioner who was a retired member of the Vice Provost office. Stanford is happy to help if you pay their consultation fee, it was really expensive, they are not that invested in Palo Alto, Stanford, it isn't own other world and all the promises that we had from them never came to anything and it ended up with this Commission doing all the work by itself with no budget. So, again, just FYI, we've done big project before, we can do it but we've really got to think long and hard about it.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes, I know, we're not setting up another Committee to again discuss something. We need some meaningful action and I'm thinking this taskforce will lead to that meaningful support group or action that connects with people and connects with a woman having these issues. I mean that is where it should go; otherwise just setting up another body and a Committee that's just discussing issues doesn't really support the women of Palo Alto. I mean eventually that's where you want to get, where you are addressing issues on an individual basis; otherwise, how you can correct if you don't know of an individual problem.

Commissioner O'Nan: That's actually my point but I thought the taskforce is just a means of getting the needs assessment done which is part of the requirement to get the CEDAW ordinance implemented. Is that not correct because the taskforce doesn't have...

Ms. van der Zwaag: There are different ways different cities have done it so the City of San Jose just passed a CEDAW ordinance and their taskforce is just going to be operational for three years. They set certain goals that they are going to do for those three years. The City of Berkeley, their CEDAW ordinance, as I said before, reads more like a resolution but their taskforce is basically a Commission they already have, The Commission on the Status of Women. So, they actually never did a gender equality study, that Commission just uses CEDAW when there's women's issues going to Council to refer back to the CEDAW ordinance to say Council, you

have a certain commitment to women's issues in this, this, and this area. We're referring back to this ordinance when they would like money or support for a certain item that involves women's issues. It's all over the map, I have not seen one as Commissioner Brahmbhatt as suggested but perhaps the Commission on the Status of Women in Berkeley functions more in that capacity in being able to hear cares or concerns of the residents. Again, this would be something if this goes forward to the Council, the Council could really give input on the scope and the breadth of what it would like to see as far as the taskforce; you know another Commission or whatever and appropriate the resources to be able to do so.

Council Member Wolbach: I wanted to wait until everyone spoke.

Chair Stinger: Commissioner Chen.

Vice Chair Chen: I am still worried about the logistics about your process. I totally understand Commissioner Lee that you want to start in the city via Council Members recommendation to to study what kinds of resources are available. So, all this information from the Council Members will come back to you the subcommittee again and then it's up to us to organize the taskforce, right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Not specifically.

Vice Chair Chen: No?

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, I meant the taskforce can be done in certain ways. The HRC could say to the Council, we are more than happy that the HRC has the authority to have a taskforce report to them in the Municipal Code. So, you technically have a taskforce that reports to you, one to two members of the HRC would serve on it and it would be a body that you would help lead the agenda and review the recommendations for so that's one way going about it. The other way is the Council could have a taskforce that reports to the Council that could do many of the same things. So, there is no prescription that it has to report to the HRC, there are different ways of going about it or the Council can say we're more interested in having a Commission on the Status of Women. There are ways in which the framework could look different but if it did report to the HRC, the issues that I brought up earlier as far as scope and oversight and responsibility would fall to the HRC.

Vice Chair Chen: Thank you.

Commissioner Lee: Certainly, our recommendation could be that Council directs staff to draft something and they just bring it back to Council for consideration. If this body doesn't have the appetite to do an additional review then we could certainly advocate that responsibility. I would personally prefer that this body weigh in on any ordinance before it passes but then beyond that, if we wanted to we could say this is exclusively a responsibility of the taskforce. If they are not able to get their act together, we as a Commission are not going to take over those responsibilities if that addresses Commissioner O'Nan's concern, we can certainly do that. I had originally anticipated that we would take a bit more ownership over that taskforce but that's certainly nothing that we have to do. We could just have it set up as a separate taskforce and they

will either sink or swim.

Chair Stinger: I'll wait to comment.

Commissioner O'Nan: I think Cory, did you want to say something?

Council Member Wolbach: Just a couple of thoughts as a Council Member's perspective on the process. I agree that the devils in the details, but I don't think that needs to all be worked out here tonight.

Male in the audience: Can you speak louder?

Council Member Wolbach: I agree that the devils in the details but I don't think all of that needs to be worked out here tonight by this Commission. In fact, I think that the appropriate next step, whatever you decide to recommend to the Council, should be to recommend something to Council. So, that Council has the opportunity after over a year now to hear your recommendation, consider it, and I think keeping it simple might be best. For example, have a recommendation that Council directs staff to draft an ordinance to create a taskforce that would report to Council and/or to the HRC on a periodic basis. If the HRC has a lot on its plate and given everything else that was just in this one resolution we passed in 2016, I think you do have a lot on your plate. Maybe just have it report directly back to Council and whatever you recommend, we might do something different. You might recommend that you have it report back to you and we might say, we want to have it report to us on Council. You might recommend it reports back to Council and Council might say, you know what, we're going to give more homework to HRC and we're going to have it report back to HRC. Obviously, you're not going to be able to answer all the questions. We'll tackle it, we'll take our own stab at it, whatever you recommend and I think in the interest of the Council is in seeing something come forward. I think going back to the point about staff obligations -- beyond the HRC's bandwidth are the staff bandwidth which I think is very important. It's good that you're keeping that in mind but again, I'd reiterate that if there's a vision for a policy or program that you think the city should pursue, I'd hope that you'd make that recommendation. Maybe acknowledge that additional resources may be required and then we can take up the question about whether current staffing is sufficient, whether a consultant for a nine-month or one year or two-year period would be necessary to get up to speed to help run a short-term taskforce to do a study whatever or whether we want to hire additional long-term, part-time or full-time staff to support an ongoing effort. All those questions Council will have to consider in consultation with staff but until a recommendation comes to Council from this body, we're waiting and we can't have those conversations, Council with each other and with Staff until you send us something.

Chair Stinger: I'd like to speak to this. I think I've already said I want to have a statement on gender equity. I'm not willing to fail so I want it to be the right statement and I also want the HRC involved in that. I don't know if that's a reporting link but I'm not willing to or well, I guess it doesn't matter what the Council will decide but I'm willing or not willing to do but my hope would be that we would continue to be involved in some way. So, what that says to me is that I think your question Commissioner O'Nan is can we look at this outside of CEDAW and my question is can we look outside of an ordinance. As I continued to do work this weekend, I

looked at Boulder, Colorado and they started with a request to do an ordinance and their analysis was that there were too many considerations. They proceeded with a resolution and some activity so that they would better be able to define their ordinance subsequently. I just don't believe that we have fully exhausted that root. We haven't, as a city, made a commitment to gender equity and I would like us to do that; to set up the taskforce and start to define where we want to put our attention. My concern with the ordinance is that it may take us so long to get to the ordinance. I'm not talking about how we're bound to it, it's just getting to the ordinance point, getting it through the City Attorney's Office and that meaningful endpoint may be lost or delayed. We could start this if we had a resolution and a committee, we could be going in a couple months to talk to people in the community and define what gender equity means in Palo Alto. I would like to explore that so I'm going to turn it over to the other Commissioners who haven't spoken.

Commissioner Alhassani: Can I ask you a process question? We have a recommendation in the memo, do we have to officially vote on that first and then if it doesn't pass, we can make amendments to it or are we allowed to create a motion without having to vote on the recommendation in the memo first?

Council Member Wolbach: Just based on what we usually do at Council, just I think it's up to the Chair to decide how to proceed with the meeting. Generally, when a recommendation has come from Council Members such as bringing forward a Colleague's Memo, the Chair will usually differ to the lead author of that memo -- of that recommendation to make a recommendation at the meeting. So, at the meeting a Council Member would make a motion to take the written recommendation and put it on the table as a motion and then if they get a second, then the conversation would proceed. I mean usually, if a memo has been brought forward, the Chair would differ to the author or authors of that memo to make that recommendation as a motion.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. I think we also have a question about the way our agenda item was written. We can certainly hear a motion and we can vote up or down on that, can we take amendments?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I did not hear back from the Attorney's Office, I would maybe differ to Council Member Wolbach who the question on the table was if the agenda item is specifically on an ordinance related to CEDAW, do they have the ability then to recommend a resolution instead?

Council Member Wolbach: I am not the City Attorney and that is the kind of a question that I would ask them.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right and that's my feeling is that would not be possible based on initial staff look at that but we're awaiting City Attorney's so if it's something, for instance, going forward to Council such as an ordinance or a resolution, I believe an ordinance specifically needed to be an option or this needed to be more vague. If it's something that the HRC decides itself to do something instead, then you don't need a recommendation to be able to say hey, let's do these programs or hey, let's do this listening session instead. That doesn't need to be on the agenda but the question as its forwarded and was forwarded by the subcommittee was at this

point for lack of a better phrasing an up or down on a recommendation of an ordinance on CEDAW.

Council Member Wolbach: So, not as a legal recommendation but as a policy recommendation, one is I think just as far as running the meeting, probably want to have somebody, maybe one of the authors, make an actual motion to make this recommendation. Until you've actually said we want to move the recommendation, there is no recommendation to vote on. Then when it comes to what that recommendation might be, we do ordinances on all kinds of things, some are very comprehensive, some are very simple and we've already had two resolutions. We had the resolution in 2016, we had the resolution specifically on CEDAW in 2002 and I think –I'm tipping my hat about how my feelings are about this one but I don't think it's going to be a quasijudicial issue when it comes to Council. So, I don't mind saying that I hope you move forward with something similar to the written recommendation here, I think Council would look forward to it.

Commissioner Lee: To give the Commission some context, I was able to put together my own draft ordinance within a week and putting together the ordinance is the easy part. The tough part is actually doing the analysis itself and so I would really implore this body to not get stuck up – that's a bad way of saying, not to be stopped at that first initial point. This was supposed to be the easy part. There are draft ordinances out there on the website that we could easily adopt. We could adopt what I've drafted and I'm willing to volunteer my legal time to provide that assistance. I know other City Attorney's, I know other lawyers who can put in the time to help the City Attorney. I'm sure...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right but that's still the...

Commissioner Lee: Sure, it's the prerogative...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Of the City Attorney.

Commissioner Lee: They would need to review it but if they needed help doing that legwork...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner Lee: ... it would be easy for them to - it would be easier for them to review something than as opposed to drafting it from scratch.

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's the time within the other priorities that usually takes the length of time for the City Attorney. Not in that the expertise or anything in regards to drafting an ordinance. It also depends on what Council asks for as far as a consideration within the bounds of an ordinance. So, it's not the expertise, it's fifty other things that are on the City Attorney's plate and that type of prioritization.

MOTION

Commissioner Lee: At this point, I would move that we make the recommendation in the

Committee report.

Chair Stinger: Let's read that for the record.

Commissioner Lee: Let's see, the motion would be the HRC formally recommends the City Council direct staff to study and study and submit a draft CEDAW ordinance for both the HRCs and City Councils consideration; which factors in this memo and guidance provided by this body – by the HRC and City Council that does two things. One, affirms the City of Palo Alto commitment to the principles of the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Discrimination Against Women and two, establishes a taskforce that conducts and oversees a gender analysis, establishes a taskforce as composition, reporting structure and responsibilities. So, that would be the motion on the floor. Again, it's having staff draft something with these things in mind and come back to us for review. That's the motion I have on the floor.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I support.

Chair Stinger: I have a motion and I have a second.

Ms. van der Zwaag: If she wants to speak to her second.

Chair Stinger: Yes, that's what I was just going to say.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: No, I was just wanted—I didn't realize...

Commissioner O'Nan: You just have the opportunity to...

Ms. van der Zwaag: You just have the opportunity to speak to your second as far as process is concerned.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Ok so I support.

Vice Chair Chen: Can I ask a question? Is about to direct city staff to study and submit a draft. I thought you had mentioned that for the City Council just to – to staff to study whether there are enough resources but not submit a draft.

Commissioner Lee: Or in drafting a CEDAW ordinance, one of the questions that they would consider would be what resources are available...

Vice Chair Chen: Oh, ok, within that.

Commissioner Lee: Yes and that would help them set up – that would help them make a recommendation as to what should be the taskforces composition, its structure and responsibilities.

Vice Chair Chen: Ok.

Commissioner Lee: So, they would come with a draft ordinance which sets up a taskforce after they figured out what resources are available and what they would recommend that they would dedicate.

Vice Chair Chen: Maybe we should probably put that in there so to clarify the issue.

Council Member Wolbach: Actually can I say something

Commissioner Lee: Yes.

Vice Chair Chen: Sorry.

Council Member Wolbach: I wonder if whether the words to study and submit are necessary. My guess is how this would go is if the motion passed, your recommendation comes to Council in a Staff Report, in that Staff Report staff will have the opportunity to explain to Council here are some of your options, here's how much we envision it might cost, a ballpark based on however much study staff has done by that point. Council can then take up your recommendation as you've recommended it, shoot it down entirely or alternate in some way. At that point, if we were to approve your recommendation, we would direct staff at that point to go and draft an ordinance. They probably wouldn't draft it before coming to us unless staff thought it was really easy in which case they might do a preliminary draft prior coming to Council but my guess is they would probably wait until they've received Council's go ahead. I think it's actually a fairly straightforward motion and I think study and submit probably does no harm.

Ms. van der Zwaag: It is a friendly amendment.

Council Member Wolbach: I'm not offering amendments nor voting.

Commissioner Lee: So, I guess my question is I mean to the extent that staff would be willing to answer all those questions in advance of Council directing them to do so. Right, this Commission doesn't really have the body – the authority to direct staff to do anything really.

Council Member Wolbach: Correct.

Commissioner Lee: Which is why we're asking Council to do it.

Council Member Wolbach: Correct, at least in my understanding.

Ms. van der Zwaag: This is your recommendation to Council. When Council deliberates this and they come with a recommendation at the end of that, they can certainly direct staff to do so. I mean I think what Council Member Wolbach says is you don't specifically have to put it here for Council to realize that's an option that they should direct staff to do so.

Commissioner Lee: What would the Council Member suggest in terms of revising the language in the motion?

Commissioner O'Nan: Oh, I'm sorry but wait a minute, we have a motion and a second, and don't we have to vote now and then we can make an amendment.

Chair Stinger: We can talk a friendly amendment.

Commissioner O'Nan: Oh, ok.

Council Member Wolbach: Well, I'm not offering amendments but I think for process you have your motion, your second and then you discuss it and everybody weighs in before you vote. Then once you vote it's done so the time to amend it would be in your discussion now. Oh, in that first line the words study and submit, I don't know if they are necessary but I don't know if they do any harm so I'm not really offering...

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1

Commissioner Lee: So, direct Staff to draft a CEDAW ordinance? That's fair.

Council Member Wolbach: Again, I'm just raising it as a question because I don't feel strongly about it and again, I'm – this is your ballgame right now.

Commissioner Lee: Do I have a nod from the rest of the Commission to get rid of those words? Does that strengthen things for the Commission at all?

Commissioner O'Nan: Can you read it back to us?

Commissioner Lee: The HRC firmly recommends that the City Council direct staff to draft a CEDAW ordinance for the HRC and City Council's consideration. Everything else remains intact.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2

Commissioner Alhassani: Can I offer an additional amendment? I'd like to be less prescriptive in getting it to Council. Even though, obviously, technically they can do what they want anyway but the way I would frame it is for point number two, I'd like to make point number two something more general in that City Council may decide they want to hire a staff member to do this analysis versus a taskforce, for example. I'd like to make it broader rather than establish a taskforce, something along the lines of to have city staff make a recommendation on a feasible way to do a gender analysis or present or come back to City Council with some ideas on how to do a gender analysis. Something broader so that maybe we might hire consultants, we might hire staff, we may do the taskforce but just be less prescriptive about it.

Commissioner Lee: How about I would propose change too to authorize a gender analysis, designates who will conduct and oversee said analysis and the scope and responsibilities; something to that extent.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think you would need to reread that or once all the corrections are made, staff recommends that you completely reread the recommendation so that the Commission

knows specifically what it's voting on.

Commissioner O'Nan: But also, to take Council Member Wolbach's point, should we have an ordinance drafted before we've done the gender analysis? I mean aren't we supposed to do that first and then have the ordinance? So, are two and one in the wrong order?

Commissioner Lee: Typically, you have the ordinance that sets up the body that does the gender analysis.

Commissioner O'Nan: Oh, I see.

Commissioner Lee: So, in coming back with a draft ordinance, they would tell us who should do the gender analysis, the scope, the responsibilities etc. etc. Is it the taskforce, is it a consultant is it staff?

Commissioner O'Nan: But then when do we have a CEDAW ordinance itself that states that we have gender equality?

Chair Stinger: We...

Ms. van der Zwaag: No...

Commissioner Lee: The...

Commissioner O'Nan: We don't...

Commissioner Lee: The CEDAW ordinance would set up the body and...

Commissioner O'Nan: That's -- oh, that's...

Commissioner Lee: ...that's what a CEDAW ordinance is.

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok.

Chair Stinger: But we do have the commitment as number one.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Or in this case, you said to set up the body just in keeping with Commissioner Alhassani's. It could maybe not set up the body but set up the goal of...

Commissioner Alhassani: Getting the analysis.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...getting the analysis.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would just say in the end I would that's really up to the Council to direct staff to do but I think just as far as getting clarity, obviously you all need clarity of what's specifically is in the recommendation...

Vice Chair Chen: Exactly, exactly.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...before you can give input.

Vice Chair Chen: The way this is written it's not clear at all. It sounds like the final ordinance is done there but it's not, it's like a preliminary survey and then the work put in. Eventually, we're going to have an ordinance written at the end but not at this step yet.

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, that's not correct. That's not – you want to...

Commissioner Lee: The step – this recommendation is asking Council to ask staff to draft an ordinance which authorizes a gender analysis and designates who does that. We come back with a draft ordinance, they would hopefully pass it, it becomes law, the gender analysis would be authorized and there might be a taskforce that does it, we do that analysis, we come back with recommendations.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think it would be to clarity, the 'we' I think may be confusing for folks as in the designated body designates

Commissioner Lee: The designated body, yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right...

Commissioner Lee: It could be consultants, it could be a taskforce.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... because in your recommendation you said the ordinance for the HRC and the City Council's considerations. So, I think just for complete clarity for everyone because there is a lot of question, like I said, whatever that there's...

Commissioner Lee: So, I envision one staff drafts a draft ordinance, it would be referred back to this Commission to weigh in upon and then the Council will review it

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's not – that's – Commissioner...

Commissioner Lee: Maybe that's the wrong way to do it.

Chair Stinger: What – let's see...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't believe that is a procedure, that it would come back to the HRC before and Council Member Wolbach looks like he wants to weigh in on that but I believe it would go straight from staff back to the Council.

Council Member Wolbach: Yes, as hesitant as I was about a question of changing the language earlier, the words 'HRC and' I would recommend that you, as the maker and seconder, remove those because I think it's time to hand it off to Council and staff. We could refer it at some point

some aspect back to the HRC but I think the HRC has enough on its plate and...

Commissioner Lee: Ok, fair enough.

Council Member Wolbach: ... it's time for the Council and staff to work out what the ordinance would be or would not be.

Chair Stinger: Directing staff here is the City Attorney?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Directing staff or that would be whatever staff. I think that would yet be determined what staff. Definitely, the drafting of the ordinance is the responsibility of the City Attorney. If there's any other background information that the City Attorney needs, then that would be whatever staff. That could be myself that could be me and a combination with members of our HR staff. I think that staff is yet to be determined based on what's needed.

Council Member Wolbach: Yes and sorry to keep chiming in but yes, generally when we refer something to staff, it's to the staff that reports to us. That's the City Manager, the City Attorney...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Who directs us to do it?

Council Member Wolbach: ...and occasionally City Clerk or the City Auditor so anyone under the City Attorneys or the City Managers chain of command, which includes Minka, could be tapped into if the City Manager delegates them that responsibility. It could also be that the City Manager and City Attorney bringing outside counsel or outside consultants to help with any aspects of anything we've directed. So, we usually don't – we actually don't stipulate and should stipulate as Council which members of staff work on something. That's not our...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, just the Council

Council Member Wolbach: ...we don't like to micro-manage like that.

Chair Stinger: My only reason for asking the question was we are directing – asking for a draft CEDAW ordinance and we were told as a Commission not to have a draft ordinance and I was reading this differently. For me the important words are the HRC formally recommends the City Council affirm the City of Palo Alto's commitment to the principles of the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Discrimination Against Women and establishes a taskforce that conducts and/or oversees a gender analysis, the compositions, reporting structures and responsibilities. I think that's really –you've captured or we've captured...

Commissioner Alhassani: We amended up to that point. It is just an amendment for point number two that

Ms. van der Zwaag: As a certain point we're just going to have Commissioner Lee reread it to see if it specifically addresses the points of concern that have come up. Commissioner Lee: So, let me...

Council Member Wolbach: The maker and the second – just I think...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes.

Council Member Wolbach: ...if – the Chair would have to enforce this but the maker and the seconder would need to accept the amendments

Commissioner Lee: Let me propose the following, the HRC formally recommends that the City Council direct staff to draft a CEDAW ordinance for the City Council's consideration which factors in this memo and guidance provided by the HRC and City Council that one, affirms the City of Palo Alto's commitment to the principles of the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Discrimination Against Women. Two: authorizes a gender analysis and designates a body for conducting and overseeing the analysis and its powers, scope, and responsibilities. Do you second that recommendation?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I can second.

Commissioner Lee: Discussion on it.

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes, sorry.

Commissioner O'Nan: I don't understand the "which factors in this memo and guidance part."

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #3

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes, yes, you probably can take that out.

Commissioner O'Nan: That doesn't make any sense.

Commissioner Alhassani: You can probably take it out; I don't think it's needed.

Commissioner Lee: So, the idea would be that in drafting the ordinance, they would take into consideration, well, they probably do this already but take into consideration the things that we've listed in the memo, any discussion that we've had here and any discussion that Council has. We're providing a little bit of guidance but certainly, Staff has discretion to draft it as they see fit.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well, I think...

Commissioner Lee: That's all that's saying.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think a compilation of this conversation would be included in the Staff Report, as well as the verbatim minutes of this meeting. So...

Commissioner Lee: Let me revise it then to make it clearer. I mean this is what I do for a living so let me change it, make it simpler as opposed to – the HRC formally recommends that the City

Council directs staff to draft a CEDAW ordinance for the City Council's consideration that one, affirms the City of Palo Alto's commitment to the principles of CEDAW and two, authorizes a gender analysis and designates a body to conduct and oversee the analysis and its powers, scopes, and responsibilities. So, it designates its powers, scope, and responsibilities if you're following the grammatical phrasing of it.

Commissioner O'Nan: To me that's a lot more clearer.

Vice Chair Chen: That's good, that's better.

Commissioner Lee: Are you ok with that as a second? Yes.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes, I support the second.

Commissioner Lee: Next time we should have Google Docs open so we can type this on the screen.

Commissioner Alhassani: We got to meet in the cool room, over there so we get the big screen...

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, the cool room.

Commissioner Alhassani: ... going and you know.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The HRC doesn't often have these deep dives into this type of subject so I can understand if we do more in the future, that staff will write it up like the City Clerk's Office does but it will certainly be correct in any official minutes at the meeting.

Commissioner Alhassani: I don't want to overdue minutia but...

Chair Stinger: Go for it.

Commissioner O'Nan: What?

Commissioner Alhassani: Technically, the City Council authorizes the study, not the staff, is that accurate?

Commissioner Lee: The ordinance would authorize the study.

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes...

Commissioner Alhassani: Yes so...

Commissioner O'Nan: ...and staff would be drafting the ordinance.

Commissioner Alhassani: Drafting the ordinance

Commissioner Lee: One and two is what the ordinance would say.

Commissioner O'Nan: No, I think we're good grammatically, I think so.

Chair Stinger: Can I call for a vote? Is there anybody else who would like to speak? Would you like too?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I'm good as proposed and I am very comfortable. I think it's a very good initiative and it will look very bad if it does not pass today.

Vice Chair Chen: Well we want to make it better.

Chair Stinger: Call for the vote, all in favor? Any opposed? Got unanimous.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

Commissioner Lee: I just wanted to thank everyone who came out. This is obviously one of the first steps so I hope I can count on your support moving forward. Obviously, Council still has to approve this so I'll be called upon all of you to help us move that forward.

Chair Stinger: I'll ask you exit quietly because we're running late and I want to catch us up but I have one more comment on the agenda item. I just wanted to thank Commissioner Lee for his passion and energy and diligence in getting this so far. We spent a lot of time and I continue to be the loyal opposition.

2. Consideration of updated recommendations in relation to Council Resolution #9653 -Reaffirming Palo Alto's Commitment to a Diverse, Supportive, Inclusive, and Protective Community.

Chair Stinger: I think we can move through agenda Item Two quickly if you can hang in just a little bit longer Commissioner O'Nan. I do have a request to end our meeting promptly but I would like to get to agenda Item Two and then we can see how we feel from that. Speaker cards, did you want them? Liz Ratner and she have left.

Commissioner O'Nan: Chair, can we just take a real quick break so Vice Chair can have a bio moment?

Chair Stinger: Yes, that would be great.

Commissioner O'Nan: I'm not feeling too bad, I think the cookies helped.

Chair Stinger: Agenda Item Two, consideration of the updated recommendations in relations to the Council Resolution #9653 which is again reaffirming Palo Alto's commitment to a diverse, supportive, inclusive and protective community. Just to give you some background on what we're doing and what I'm asking here. We have two Council dates...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh, no, I released the one.

Chair Stinger: Oh, ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, we're just – sorry, at one point we had talked about – because we didn't know when we'd have all these resolutions – I mean recommendations of going forward with an information report. We talked about this at our last meeting and then coming forward with a recommendation but since we knew this discussion was happening tonight, we are going forward with the recommendations based on your vote on this on April 2nd so there's the only one Council.

Chair Stinger: Oh, good.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes.

Chair Stinger: (inaudible – talking off mic) Sorry but I wanted to be able to communicate to Council the breath of the work that we have done this summer, the research that we did into the different programs and how we are now responding to their Council resolution. I also wanted to identify a capacity constraint that to do everything that we set out to do, where, we as a Commission of six, hopefully soon seven, have capacity constraints but we are certainly making demands on our staff. So, that one was objective of this piece and the other objective was to just to reinforce the immigration resolutions that we will ask Council to agree too. Just a reminder, we had initially, as a resolution subcommittee, said that we would monitor the progress on immigration and ask the Council to confirm with the City Attorney that all of our code was consistent with the legislation that's passed at the California State Senate level. Then we thought that the City Attorney could advise us and so we could have a stronger recommendation to Council but that is taking so long that it seemed like it was better to go back to Plan A and take it to Council. You've seen these recommendations before but I'll just reiterate what we want to do in our work plan is to ask Council to refer SB-54 to the City Attorney to make sure that all of our policies and procedures are consistent with SB-54. Also, sending a letter of endorsement to the State Senate -- to the author and that was the recommendation of our County Supervisor; that having sat in that seat, he particularly appreciated having letters of support from the different jurisdictions and endorse a resolution in support of refugee resettlement. That is a vote we have already taken and so it's included in here as the package that I'd like to send to Council. I think that we've done a lot of deep dives into the work of the Council, following up the Council recommendation or the resolution to us. They ask us for implementations, we have shown on the table here that we have been using as our work plan that we have policies that we need approval, the programs that we're starting and we'll be talking about them in agenda Item Three and some things that staff is doing on its own with other departments and with other staff within their department. When we do go to Council on the 2nd of April, staff will better be able to itemize their demands on their time and they will include in their report a resource impact statement that will flush this out. I think the rest of this we have seen several times and so I would just like to ask if I can have a vote that we take this to Council on the 2nd?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The actual vote is on the last page and maybe you want to read that out or make some modifications to it but just so we have some clarity as far as the motion that is being made, Chair Stinger.

Chair Stinger: Ok, thank you, that's a good suggestion.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Just the specificity would be something that speaks more, the HRC recommends that the City Council support the work as brought forth in the resolution or just there are people out there among you that maybe could wordsmith this a little bit more. I think it should be a little more but I think it should be a little more specific as far as that this is a response to Council Resolution #9653.

Chair Stinger: Let me also say that this work plan was intended to be our first pass. We wanted to do things that we felt were actionable within a certain time frame and that it all in our text.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think what staff will include in the report going forth to Council and I'd have to look if it's in here but the work of the resolution is really almost the calling card of the HRC of what issues that you were called to be looking out for in the community. So, I think it would be good for the Council to know these are specific recommendations you have, these are things that staff is committed to doing and these are things that the HRC is committed to doing and they are responding specifically to this resolution but the HRC has and will continue to keep these matters as part of the scope of the work that you have been doing and will continue to do.

Council Member Wolbach: I think that that's very well said. I don't think that there was anything in the Resolution #9653 that was radical. We meant it to be and I think we even said that we're reiterating we're reinforcing values that have been explicit or implicit in Palo Alto and some have been the implisive or explicit purview of this Commission. In my view, the really important part of that motion that night or the important part that is relevant for you was that Part B, again which I read earlier and won't repeat all. We wanted to really task the HRC to give homework to the HRC with no timeline, with no sunset, to bring to us recommendations for implementation measures and additional elements that should be considered. I think we do, hope as a Council, that the HRC will continue to refer back to this resolution and as recommendations occur to the HRC, that you will continue to bring recommendations like the one you just passed relevant to the various areas mentioned, recommendations for implementation measures, or as I mentioned earlier – the parts that we missed, the things we forgot. So, we really hope that staff and the HRC will continue to feel empowered by that resolution to be proactive and to bring recommendations to us. Some of our Board and Commissions more regularly bring recommendations to us. HRC does a lot of programmatic activities beyond what a lot of other Boards and Commissions do but we hope you'll continue for feel empowered to bring policy recommendations to us like what you just passed.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I want to echo just what you said Council Member, I think that the difference when the HRC looked at this is wow, we can do a lot ourselves. We don't want to burden the Council with 25-30 recommendations. I think there's difference... Council Member Wolbach: We want that burden.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I know, I think there's a difference of opinion there but they also wanted to show the Council that says we are willing to help carry this load in things that we specifically have done and will continue to do. So, on the HRC's behalf, just to let you know, it wasn't a

well, let's just do a response lite. It was more no, let's look what staff can do, let's look what we as a Commission can do and let's give them a first pass in these certain areas and they certainly expect to come back to you in other times as well.

Chair Stinger: What I would be hard-pressed to put up a count but we went through hundreds and picked what we thought we could do in the first year to be actionable and kick-start some things. Yes, we've got a backlog; we've got a database to come back to you and...

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, turn your microphone on.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. Shorthands, I forget to go out there. I have seen in the last couple months more people approaching me outside of the Commission meeting and in Commission meetings with ideas. So, I hope that our visibility increases and we will be able to extend the list of population segments that we want to serve. Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: If I could just make a brief comment. I joined the Commission after this resolution was passed and after the Commission started working on it. My read on it is that it gives us a broad mandate, it reinforces a broad mandate that we've already had and so I think moving forward, just given the scope of it, it would be appropriate for the Commission as a whole to consider it as opposed to having one Committee composed of only two or three members covering all these different areas. It kind of limits our ability to provide timely feedback to the Council under this mandate. So, I would hope moving forward that to the extent that we identify different groups or different topics we want to work on, we can refer that to separate Committees but one Committee shouldn't have jurisdiction over that entire resolution.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think that's the point now. That Committee was together to bring it to this point so the intention was that these issues would not only in the future continue to be discussed by a subcommittee. So, an Ad Hoc Subcommittee is Ad Hoc because it works on a project, it brings it to the body, and goes forward.

Chair Stinger: Just to reinforce that, in our work plan it says the recommendation subcommittee will bring forth the first round of programs and policies. That was supposed to be completed in Quarter 2 and then we disbanded because we are an Ad Hoc Committee and cannot continue. So, whether we rotate that or decide to do it all as a group, we can decide.

Commissioner Lee: Are we discussing these specific bullet point recommendations here or are we...

MOTION

Chair Stinger: The motion that I'd like to make is this that the HRC recommends the City Council support this work plan which was written in response to Council Resolution #9653. Also, that the City Council refer SB-54 to the City Attorney to confirm the city's policies and procedures are consistent with SB-54. Refer SB-31 to the City Attorney to confirm the City's policies and procedures are consistent and these are elaborated in the table in the text. We ask the City Council to endorse SB-54, endorse SB-31, support a resolution for refugee resettlement and

then I'll use your wording to adopt a CEDAW ordinance which I didn't have when I wrote this. Each of these we've talked about and voted on but it was the package that I wanted to ask for a vote.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, are you moving that motion?

Chair Stinger: That's the motion.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1

Commissioner Lee: I'll second it but I have a proposed friendly amendment.

Chair Stinger: Ok.

Commissioner Lee: To the first bullet point after confirm that city policies and procedures are consistent. I'd proposed that we add and to identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures that the City could adopt which criteria the use of city resources in connection with deportations.

Ms. van der Zwaag: But that's not the job the City Attorney. So, the specific recommendation here is to the City Attorney but it wouldn't be the City Attorney's job to offer any type of other recommendations. You could say 'and report his findings back to the City Council' and then the City Council at that point can ask if anything goes further but the City Attorney doesn't then start coming up with a ray of other policies and procedures.

Council Member Wolbach: Could change attorney to staff.

Commissioner Lee: Yes and direct staff to identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures.

Ms. van der Zwaag: And direct whom?

Commissioner Lee: Staff.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The City Attorney can't direct staff to do that. I mean...

Commissioner Lee: Referring to SB-54, City Attorney to confirm and to direct staff – City Council to direct staff to identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures. I'm saying SB-54 may not be the best we can do, there may be additional (Inaudible) that we as a city can do and so I'd like us to not only just confirm...

Ms. van der Zwaag: My just comment for identified, I would assume that there would be. I don't know, that's up to the HRC.

Chair Stinger: I'll comment on that. That was initially part of the immigration package that we were looking at and I have continued to reach out to the County Office of Immigration – Immigrant Affairs to ask that same question because they are more intimately involved in direct

communication with the legal side and the aide side and the counseling side. So, I would accept the amendment, I think I might ask if the wording would be appropriate 'and to direct staff to continually be on the alert – to continually...

Commissioner Lee: Identify options for additional and complementary policies for the city's consideration which (inaudible) use of city resources in connect with deportations.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2

Chair Stinger: Would you accept a friendly amendment to make it shorter? To continue...

Commissioner Lee: To identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures.

Chair Stinger: I'm sorry, what and complementary?

Commissioner Lee: To identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures that could be implemented by the city.

Chair Stinger: I would accept that.

Commissioner Lee: Presumably that would refer to the topic of SB-54 but we don't need to say that.

Chair Stinger: So, the bullets under the recommendation is 'refer SB-54 to the City Attorney to confirms that the city's policies and procedures are consistent and to direct Staff to continually identify options for additional and complementary procedures'.

Commissioner Lee: Policies...

Chair Stinger: Policies.

Commissioner Lee: Policies and procedures.

Chair Stinger: There's a motion and a second and a friendly amendment accepted. Is there any deliberation?

Commissioner O'Nan: I'm not wild about the addition. It's not clear which staff and which types of policies. I personally like things to be more clear and specific when we refer to Council. The original bullet point was very clear and very specific and then I think it kind of wanders a little bit. Also, the City Attorney's office is super backed up, it takes a really long time to get any kind of response and I feel like we keeping adding on, it's going to take even longer.

Commissioner Alhassani: I was going to say the same exact thing, is that staff isn't some blob that you say do this, do this, do this and then get something out. In fact, we're losing staff in the City of Palo Alto and actually, I have a bigger concern about that frankly in that every month or two I read about city staff leaving the city and I'm sure a part of it is burn out. Obviously I think

it's not a bad amendment, I we just spend an hour sending staff with a lot of homework to do and now we're sending more and we're one Commission out of, I don't know how many. I just want us to behave in the back of our mind that staff is human being who has to sit at a computer, who have to do research, who have to write things, who have to respond to constituents, who have to respond to Council, and we just have to have them in the back of our mind.

Commissioner Lee: I guess my response to that is again I think what we're charged with doing is if we believe that we should be doing something, we make that recommendation to Council and Council will weigh those resource issues with staff. I think it's beyond our mandate to take those particular considerations in mind and it's beyond our time to do so.

Chair Stinger: I would agree with that and I'd like to speak to that but I think it's also an obligation to be judicious. Since the first responsibility for that action was with the HRC, we could leave that as our responsibility to continue to monitor what the county is seeing in other cities.

Commissioner Lee: My sense is that the City Attorney is going to already do the work of ensuring that existing policies are consistent with state law. So, what I would like the city to do is to take that next step and identify additional ways that we can be a leader on this issue because just confirming that existing policy and procedures are consistent with state law, which they are probably under an obligation to do anyway, doesn't add much to what I imagine they are already doing. Other than it's a profound statement of saying that we've confirmed that yes, indeed we are following the state law.

Chair Stinger: In this environment, I think that visibility is important. Any other...

Commissioner Lee: I think it's important – while it's important for us to have symbols and to make that clear, again I think what Council is seeking from us are additional, concrete steps that we can take. I think that's what my friendly amendment seeks to do.

Commissioner O'Nan: To your point Commissioner Lee, you're not giving specific steps. You're saying staff, in general, should find in general policies that are in general complementary which is really hard to understand exactly what that means. It would be much more helpful to say, and direct staff to maintain a relationship with the County Office of Immigration and do quarterly checks to ensure – we need...

Commissioner Lee: Ok, I can make it specific and say reach out to the county of San Francisco and adopt everything that they've done. I think they are quite frankly leaders on all these issues; they were ten years ahead of us on CEDAW. So, if it was up to me, I'd say keep in touch with San Francisco and find out what they are doing to push the envelope.

Commissioner O'Nan: Right but San Francisco is much bigger City. Yes, it's a different city.

Commissioner Lee: Sure, but they are certainly lessons to be learned from what they are doing.

Chair Stinger: I guess I would go back and I don't want to use San Francisco as an example. The

CEDAW, their experience was they were too aggressive and they had to slow down so I want to keep this for Palo Alto's discussion. I've accepted the friendly amendment; I'd like to call for the vote.

Commissioner O'Nan: Could you read it back to us?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I just wanted to...

Commissioner O'Nan: Sorry, go ahead.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I just wanted to say for the refugee resettlement, is it ok if I don't vote yes or no? I would like not vote on a portion of the motion. I can support the...

Ms. van der Zwaag: That motion has already been passed by the HRC.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Oh, ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: This motion is just to include it in going forward to Council but that decision was made back in September.

Chair Stinger: Or October...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Or October/November...

Chair Stinger: ... and it was...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...at a meeting that you may not have been at but that

Chair Stinger: No, you were, I think it was unanimous or pretty close.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Oh, ok.

Chair Stinger: You seen that already.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think it would be helpful to reread it so then...

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, please read it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... at this point, since it has a second, then you either have to up or down on the way it's specifically written. Then at that point, you can go forward with changing it.

Council Member Wolbach: Do you mind if It?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Go ahead.

Council Member Wolbach: Sorry to throw a monkey wrench into things but I think it's fine to

pass it however you want but I think Commissioner O'Nan actually made a good point which is we were really looking to the HRC to make recommendations. Simple asking staff to look for recommendation is that we set standard practice in the city of always being on the lookout for new best practices, I think that's ok. To the degree that the HRC can be very clear this is a new practice, a new policy, a new procedure which we recommend City Council consider, I think that's more to the point of the original intent.

Chair Stinger: I'll read the motion. The HRC recommends that the City Council support this work plan prepared in response to Council Resolution #9653 and recommends that the City Council refers SB-54 to the City Attorney to confirm that city policy and procedures are consistent, to direct staff to continually identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures, referring SB-31 to the City Attorney to confirm that city policy and procedures are consistent with SB-31, endorses SB-54 and that would be – endorses SB-31, supports a resolution for refugee resettlement and adopts a CEDAW ordinance. I'll put in the proper text.

Vice Chair Chen: I just have a question about this so endorsing the two – SB-51 and 31, can we just put one sentence endorse this and that; SB-51 and SB-31. Is there any reason to separate it into two bullets?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't think that it would be the case in this matter but by separating it, it allows the Council to make a decision on one and not the other.

Vice Chair Chen: Ok, alright, ok, got it.

Chair Stinger: All – I'd like to call the vote, all in favor?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Can I not vote?

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can abstain.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes, I'd like to abstain.

Commissioner O'Nan: I vote no, I really don't like the add-on to the first bullet.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, I'm confused by the votes now.

Vice Chair Chen: I think the first vote wasn't the add-on.

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, it was to direct them to find a complementary policies

Council Member Wolbach: Microphones.

Commissioner O'Nan: I'm sorry, thank you. It's late, the cookies are wearing off. I just didn't like the add-on to the first bullet about directing staff to find the complementary

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think at this point staff would like to who voted yes, who voted no and who abstained. So, to the specific way in which it was read, who voted yes? Commissioner Lee: Aye.

Ms. van der Zwaag: One, two, three.

Commissioner Lee: And plus, the Chair?

Chair Stinger: No, I voted against the – after I heard the argument about the demands on staff, I changed my vote.

Commissioner Lee: So, who made the motion?

Commissioner Alhassani: Then I

Commissioner Lee: you made the motion though, right?

Chair Stinger: I accepted your friendly amendment.

Commissioner O'Nan: You voted against your own. I'm a little confused now.

Chair Stinger: I – can't I – I was convinced by your argument...

Ms. van der Zwaag: But then I think you wouldn't accept the friendly amendment then. Then you would not be in favor of Council -- Commissioner Lee's friendly amendment.

Chair Stinger: So, I can withdraw...

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can withdraw your support of it and then there's not a second to the motion so then we have to find another motion, get a second, discussion and have a vote.

Chair Stinger: My apologies, I did not realize that I could withdraw my second.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Microphone.

Council Member Wolbach: Actually, or she could just withdraw her support for the amendment and then the motion would stand without the amendment unless...

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's true, thank you.

Council Member Wolbach: unless the proposer of the amendment offers it as an unfriendly amendment in which case another Commissioner could second it if they support it.

Commissioner O'Nan: This is like Game of Thrones.

Commissioner Lee: Could you maybe undo everything I would propose something that I think

might...

Vice Chair Chen: Yes, let's undo everything because I'm confused.

Commissioner Lee: Do you want to withdraw your motion?

Chair Stinger: I withdrew my acceptance of the second with apologizes.

MOTION #1 FAILED WITH THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE SECONDER.

Commissioner Lee: I would move the recommendation as is but I would add a bullet point establishing an HRC Ad Hoc Committee to identify options for additional and complementary policies and procedures that compliment SB-54.

Ms. van der Zwaag: But that doesn't need to be part of that motion because this is a motion to Council and Council does not have to approve an Ad Hoc City HRC Commission.

Commissioner Lee: Ok so I'll make that a second motion later on.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can.

Commissioner Lee: So, I move the recommendation as written.

Chair Stinger: Let's see we've had a motion and a second...

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, who's the We don't have a second for the second one. Are you...

Commissioner Lee: I move to second.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh, ok.

Vice Chair Chen: Can you repeat the motion again. I move the recommendation as written.

Vice Chair Chen: As this, as written here?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That is correct.

Council Member Wolbach: Did you guys want to add that thing about the explicit reference to #9653?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes.

Chair Stinger: I – did you get that one...

Commissioner Alhassani: She read it

Chair Stinger: ... so you're right, it was as read, can we say as read?

MOTION #2

Commissioner Lee: I move the recommendation as written with the addition of a reference to – what number is it? 96...

Ms. van der Zwaag: 9653.

Commissioner Lee: ...53.

Chair Stinger: I second and if there is no discussion I will call the vote. All in favor?

Commissioner Lee: I'd like to make a second motion...

Chair Stinger: ... wait

Ms. van der Zwaag: Any opposed?

Chair Stinger: Any opposed? Any abstain?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I abstain.

Chair Stinger: 4-0. The motion is carried. Well, we'll go to...

Ms. van der Zwaag: One, two, three, four, five.

Council Member Wolbach: It's 5-0-1.

Ms. van der Zwaag: 5-0-1, zero against and one abstains.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0-1 WITH COMMISSIONER BRAHMBHATT ABSTAINING.

Chair Stinger: Where are those cookies? I think you started a comment once about knowing how to count to five? I clearly don't.

Commissioner Lee: I'd like to make a second motion to set up an HRC Ad Hoc Committee to identify whether there are any potential additional complementary policies and procedures that could be adopted by the City that compliments SB-54.

Commissioner O'Nan: Are we allowed to vote on something if it's not on the agenda?

Commissioner Lee: I mean its...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't think you need to vote on setting up an Ad Hoc Committee. You can just say...

Chair Stinger: Like the Chair can set up an Ad Hoc Committee or...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I believe so. That – I mean we set up Ad Hoc Committees for each of these items and I don't remember that we took a vote on them.

Chair Stinger: I – under monitor SB-54 that was part of what we were

Ms. van der Zwaag: The HRC can continue to have an agenda item related this matter. We can look at having it be specific enough because it can't just be continued response to the ordinance – I mean to the resolution because that would not be specific enough for the public to be able to come in and give comment. So, as we're doing agenda planning, if that's something that someone would like to recommend, as with all recommendations it needs a second. Then the leadership looks into agendizing that when it fits on the agenda or when we have the information that we need in order to have a productive conversation on the matter.

Chair Stinger: Thank you.

3. Status update on FY2018 work plan projects

Chair Stinger: How are we doing? Can we quickly go through agenda Item Three which is a quick update on our different projects?

Commissioner O'Nan: Ok, I'll give you five more minutes.

Chair Stinger: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Do you're projecting first.

Vice Chair Chen: Yes right.

Chair Stinger: I'm going to change my position, if we have five minutes, I'd like to suggest that we do agenda Items Four and Five and quickly do reports from officials and the input for next month's agenda and we will defer the status update unless there's something that – is there a...

Commissioner O'Nan: You know I think I'd like to just give a quick LGBTQ listening forum update...

Chair Stinger: Great.

Commissioner O'Nan: Just to make sure everyone knows about it and then whatever else we want to do. My colleagues on the Commission may be aware that we are working with the County Office of LGBTQ Affairs. They are a relatively new office and they are trying to touch base with all the cities in Santa Clara County and particularly want to make their presence known here in the north county where we're often a bit disconnected from country services. They did a listening forum recently in Mountain View, I attended and Chair Stinger attended, it was a really good event. They reached out to the LGBTQ community and many agencies that work with that community were there. The purpose was to introduce the mission and work of the county office but also to listen to what the concerns of the community are and what barriers to services they

feel exist. The idea being that the city would like to work better with that community to support them in feeling safe, welcome, included, and able to fully participate. We were very inspired by that and we are going to do our own Palo Alto LGBTQ listing forum on March 29th, which is Mehdi's birthday, in Mitchell Park Community Center from 7 to 9 in the evening. We are now lining up speakers; we have a strawman commitment from Joe Simitian that he'll at least kick off the event for us although he has another conflict later on that night. We're going to invite Council Members, the Mayor, the Vice Mayor and so forth to attend. We're going to talk to law enforcement to be there to also speak and we hope to get a good crowd of both LBGTQ members, their families, their friends, allies and agencies that serve them. So, I hope that my fellow Commissioners will make some time on their calendars to come by and support that event. I think one of the first times we've reached out directly to that community and it feels very timely.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, the flyers just finished so staff can send that our ASAP but we needed to have confirmation from our partners as to the flyer and the program.

Commissioner Lee: You said March 29th?

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: In the evening?

Chair Stinger: It's a Thursday, 7 to 9.

Council Member Wolbach: See you there.

Commissioner O'Nan: Yes, I'd love that.

Commissioner Lee: Is it in the evening?

Ms. van der Zwaag: 7 to 9.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: 7 to 9 Mitchell Park Community Center, El Palo Alto Room; the large room.

Chair Stinger: I am excited about the event and I'm excited about collaborating with the county to give and with county voice to some of the programs that they are instituting. I have found the county to be extremely helpful. As long as we've started this, Commissioner Chen, do you have any updates?

Vice Chair Chen: No, I don't want to say, it is too long and I'm half asleep.

Chair Stinger: Ok.

Vice Chair Chen: So, I'll wait to finish that.

Chair Stinger: Can I -- Commissioner Brahmbhatt?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes, I can defer for next time.

Chair Stinger: Ok.

4. Assignment of Liaisons

Chair Stinger: I would like to focus on that, assignment of liaisons is on the agenda. Commissioner Lee has asked if we could –Project Safety Net meets during the afternoons during his work day which is outside of Palo Alto and I'd like to see if we can have somebody step up to be the liaison to Project Safety Net.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, the fourth Thursday every month, 3:30 to 5:30, Rinconada Library; fourth Thursday. I don't think it's like you have to be there every time. I think this liaison is a commitment by the HRC to be involved in an issue so you know, you come as often as you are able to for the liaison relationship that you have.

Chair Stinger: If I hear no volunteers I will make some offline calls to make sure that we support the mature – the youth – the high school youth in our community.

Council Member Wolbach: You could always have a liaison and alternate.

Chair Stinger: I think we have the alternate, don't we?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes, I'm the alternate. I've been looking for the person to be there.

Chair Stinger: So, I will be reaching out to people.

5. Human Services Resource Allocation Process (HSRAP) site visits

Chair Stinger: Agenda Item Five is our HSRAP site visits. HSRAP is an every other year budget assessment and in the off year, this year, we try to do, we don't try to do, we do site visits. Usually, people pick two agencies that they'd like to know more about. It's not an audit to be really clear, it's a chance to become more familiar with the agencies so that when they make a proposal, you understand it better.

Ms. van der Zwaag: This is you can go by yourself or if one or two of you want to go together so this is a sheet that we'll pass around. It's just in the next couple months and staff would do an email – either give you the email address of our contact or – excuse me—or staff will do an email introduction for you. The purpose is again as the Chair has said, just to say thanks for what you do, you go, and you get a little tour of their site and their programs and so forth. It's not to say can you show me the books or anything like that so this is we're hoping that each Commissioner can at least go to at least one or two agencies.

Commissioner Lee: What is their general availability? Is it going to be during the workday? Would we have to take time off to go visit them or are they available in the evening or we can...

Commissioner O'Nan: Some are available in the evenings so for example, DreamCatchers has

tutorials that you can go and actually see the tutors working with the kids and get a tour of their facility. So, it will kind of depend on the nature of the agency.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, what we did last year is someone was happy to designate themselves as the lead. So then if you two say you want to go DreamCatchers and Commissioner Lee says he'll be the lead, then you'll find out your fellow Commissioners time availability and you'd get in touch with the agency and handle the communications between the two of you. So, if you're willing to play that role, if next to your name you could just put an L. It's a lot of fun.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I would like to look up and figure out which ones I'd be interested in. I mean I cannot...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: ...sign on this...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well, why don't we ask people that can sign up and we can distribute this via email as well.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Ok.

V. Reports from Officials

1. Commissioner Reports

Chair Stinger: Commissioner Reports?

Vice Chair Chen: I have been to a lot of functions so Dreamcatcher, you know the one way to find out is to drop in so they are not prepared for you and then find out the real thing. So, that's the way to do it right? Right, pop test?

Commissioner O'Nan: So, you're torturing our HSRAP recipients?

Vice Chair Chen: No, I'm just saying – well, I went to their Christmas party and then I talked to the tutors, I talked to the student's parents and it was a very good crowd. Then it was a very good meeting finding out what they are doing and it's very impressive. I think they've done a very good job.

Chair Stinger: I missed you. I must have gone after you.

Vice Chair Chen: Well, I was there an hour and I waited for you in there. I even brought food I didn't eat.

Commissioner O'Nan: I'd also like to share that Vice Chair Chen and I about a year and a half ago attended the first Adolescent Wellness Conference which was held down by the airport. It was a very good conference so they are redoing it; it's going to be every other year. This year it's going to be down in Santa Clara so we're going to split the duties. Commissioner Chen will be going to the Friday session and I'll be attending the Saturday session so we'll be reporting back

to the Commission on that.

Chair Stinger: I attended a meeting of the County Age Friendly committee and heard a report from Generations United about intergenerational activities. It was very interesting and one of the things that she particularly talked about that was very interesting and maybe the topic for quarters meeting is senior or mixed age – there's a better word for it, shared housing for seniors and younger people housing as a way to help seniors and help students who need access to the more affordable housing so we'll be pursuing that.

2. Council Liaison Report

Chair Stinger: The other Commissioner report is welcome to our Council liaison. Thank you and we're happy to have you here. Any reports for us?

Council Member Wolbach: Good to be back and I just want to say thanks for you very good discussion/deliberation on the CEDAW stuff. Sorry to weigh in so much but I think you got to a really good conclusion. The amendments improved it and I look forward to further policy recommendations from this Commission in pursuit of your mandate as it fits into the city's broader visions. Thanks.

3. Staff Liaison Report

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think the only thing I was going to report was another event which is at the end of March, the night before the LGBT event is the Age-Friendly Committee in collaboration with the Alzheimer's Association is having a dementia awareness event. Same place, Mitchell Park Community Center, Mary and I maybe will camp out and stay there for the second night but that event is 7 to 9 and that event is to give information about Alzheimer and other dementia relates issues and give the members of the public resources in order to best interface with friends, neighbors, loved ones with Alzheimer's. Mayor Kniss will be kicking off that event as she is very dedicated to the issue of Alzheimer's awareness and dementia awareness.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, March 8, 2018.

Chair Stinger: Plan the March meeting, other agenda items?

Commissioner Lee: I wanted to ask if the leadership team hadn't considered the agenda item that myself and Commissioner Brahmbhatt requested via email regarding a follow up to the RV presentation we were previously provided by staff.

Chair Stinger: In terms of the February meeting, we had not heard back from the City Attorney, and I thought we had a full agenda.

Commissioner Lee: So, I mean is it on the March agenda?

Chair Stinger: You can certainly suggest it.

Commissioner Lee: Can I make a recommendation...

Chair Stinger: Absolutely.

Commissioner Lee: ... that we add it to the March agenda.

Chair Stinger: Please.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You cannot make a recommendation that it's specifically on the March agenda, you can make a recommendation that you'd like to see it on an agenda. Then staff and leadership will put it on the agenda at the soonest possible meeting. I...

Commissioner Lee: Can the Commission vote to put something on a specific agenda?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I have not heard that specifically. It was moved and seconded so definitely it will be on an agenda. My point is unless we have the information to properly discuss it; I just don't want to have a discussion without the benefits of the question that you have framed that you want to talk. So, just to talk about it to say I want it on the agenda, we haven't heard from the City Attorney so it's a conversation in a void as well.

Commissioner Lee: Sure, could we get a timeline from the City Attorney as to when they think they can get around to answering the question?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I can request that.

Commissioner Lee: I mean I'm not expecting them to answer right away but an ETA would be I think appreciated.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok.

Commissioner Lee: I mean so it just doesn't fall into limbo forever.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I understand.

Commissioner Lee: Even if they say five months from now, at least that gives us a sense of when they'll get around to it.

Chair Stinger: I've had a request from Abilities United to give us a presentation. I guess they have some new programs. I am just going to list that. I don't know what our capacity is for presentations in March because I would like to refine our presentation to Council on April 2nd.

Ms. van der Zwaag: We need to get a second for that.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I second that. My son used Abilities United swimming program, it's a very good program and the Staff and the people, and they are awesome.

Chair Stinger: Great. The other piece that I asked for was a refinement of our presentation to Council on April 2nd. We are...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, staff will be writing that report so that report is not going to be reviewed by the HRC before it goes to Council. I mean if the HRC wants to discuss ok, who's

going to be there? What are some of the key points we'd like to make and so forth but staff will give a presentation. It will be a Staff Report but I definitely see that the HRC would be there and to be able to sit with staff to speak to your recommendations.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes because I think April 2nd is spring break week for the... Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't know what to say. It's very hard to get on a Council agenda. I think you're not on that one; it would get pushed back so I can sympathize to that. You know the HRC can make a decision that it doesn't want that date and staff can look for another one. All the Commissioners are not required to be there but if the HRC doesn't feel like that's a date that would work, staff would have to go back and request another date and to see another date that could be requested.

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: I think I'm the only one with the school going children. I think Mehdi's are still babies right?

Chair Stinger: Does April 2nd affect you at all?

Ms. Mary Constantino: Are they asking about the day of the HRC or the Council meeting?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The Council meeting.

Chair Stinger: The other thing that we had mentioned was an update from Healthy Cities, Healthy Communities. If we wanted to discuss their initiatives on the community to see if there are any that we were particularly interested in.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok so...

Chair Stinger: I'm just trying to go over the things that have come to us in the past. I wouldn't prioritize that but I don't want to lose it from the list.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right and staff could also see if that was the direction from that Committee that wanted to give a presentation to the HRC.

Chair Stinger: Thank you for your endurance. Thank you for staying and the meeting is adjourned.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.