

#### **HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION**

Thursday, July 12, 2018

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

## **ROLL CALL:**

Commissioners Present: Brahmbhatt, Kralik, Lee, O'Nan, Smith, Stinger, Xue

**Absent:** 

Council Liaison: Council Member Wolbach

**Staff:** Minka van der Zwaag, Mary Constantino

## I. ROLL CALL

Chair Stinger: Welcome, I'm glad to see everybody here. We are a full Commission and I welcome you to our July meeting. Roll call, please?

# II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

Chair Stinger: Agenda changes, requests, deletions?

Vice Chair O'Nan: I think we have one Chair. You wanted to change.

Chair Stinger: I do have one; I was just opening it up for others. I'm going to ask if we can switch two and three. Three is really the meat of our discussion and I'd like to make sure we have time for that if we have to cut anything short.

# **III.ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Chair Stinger: I have no oral communication cards.

#### IV. BUSINESS

1. Presentation by Molly Stump, City Attorney on the roles, responsibilities, and procedures of the Commission

Chair Stinger: We'll get right to business. Our first business is to follow up on our retreat. One of the questions that we asked at the retreat or that was asked by our facilitator was how can we

achieve the best outcomes and avoid the worst outcomes today? When we were asked that question, we as a body said we wanted to stay focused on our roles and jurisdiction and we wanted to establish our scope. So that brings us to our agenda Item 1 and our City Attorney Molly Stump. I know Molly sits on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor and I know that you spend a lot of evenings in these chambers but I know you from the Mayday Parade and other City events.

Ms. Minka van de Zwaag, Human Services Manager: Do you want to introduce Sabrina so she doesn't have to stay.

Chair Stinger: I will thank you. I'll just finish by saying that I am thrilled that we have your legal expertise tonight and your knowledge of the social fabric of our City. Before I turn the mic over to you, however, I wanted to introduce Sabrina Proctor to our Commissioners. Sabrina is our summer intern and she's doing a fabulous job on three projects if I'm correct?

Ms. van de Zwaag: Probably more but that's what we have right now.

Chair Stinger: They're all important but one of them is particularly near and dear to a subcommittee of us and that is the needs assessment for the LGBTQ listening community. We will be working to do the needs assessment to identify programs and prioritize them and bring recommendations to this Commission in September. So welcome Sabrina.

Ms. Sabrina Proctor: Thank you. I'm very excited to do this project all summer, thank you.

Chair Stinger: We're excited too. Thanks for coming and Molly?

Ms. Molly Stump, City Attorney: Great, well thank you so much for inviting me to spend some time with you this evening. I don't get to spend enough time with the City's Boards and Commissions. I try to visit one or two each year and it's always a delightful experience for me to hear from you, to be able to help you with some areas you have questions and to offer a little bit of perspective on the broader work that we do for the City. So maybe it makes sense for me to introduce myself for a moment. I'm Molly Stump, I am the City Attorney, I've been in this role for – coming up on 8-years now for the City of Palo Alto and I've been a public lawyer my entire life as a lawyer. I spent name years with the City of San Francisco doing a variety of projects for that City and then the Council did bring me on here 8-years ago. We have a full service in-house legal department on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of this building. You're welcome to come and visit us. We have eight lawyers and three non-lawyer staff and we also work with outside counsel on specialized areas and litigation defending litigation against the City. I personally spend most of my time with the City Council and the City Manager. Focusing on their policy priorities but members of my team do work with all the departments including quite a bit of work with the Community Services Department which in addition to supporting this Commission, has a lot of other goals and tasks and responsibilities; programs; services that are very important to the City. I took some time this afternoon just to knowing that I was going to come in and visit with you this evening to read through again your assignment language in our Municipal Code. I was really struck by the breadth of the areas of responsibility and the importance of this Commission. Not to pick favorites among one's children, I cannot imagine any set of issues that are as important to the fabric of this community as those that are charged to you to work on for the City so thank you for

your service. It's a big responsibility and it's very important to the Council and to the people of Palo Alto. Maybe just a couple of introductory comments and then it may be that Commissioners have questions and comments and we can have more of a dialog. I think in talking with the Staff, following up on your retreat, I think one theme is to help the Commission understand how your particular work fits in with the work of the City as a whole. Of course, you're Council Member liaison, Council Member Wolbach, is helping you do that as you go along with your work but just a few comments from my perspective. So, Palo Alto, of course, has a Council-Manager form of government and what that means is we are all on the same team. I have to say coming here from the City of San Francisco that was a revelation and a great relief. San Francisco is a City and a county and there are many Elected Officials imbedded into City government. It's a very, very large organization and it often feels like there are multiple competing teams and sub-teams there. That's not the case here. I don't report to the City Manager but the City Manager and I both report to the Council so we really are aligned in the work that we're doing. The Council, of course, sets policy and overall direction for the City partly through the adoption of the City's budget which is one of its most important responsibilities then through all of the items that the Council sees and provides input and direction to the City Manager throughout the year. The City Manager then directs the City's workforce including the Staff that supports this Commission. With some Commissions that can sometimes create a slightly awkward or a bit of tension where the advisory Commission has lots of ideas and interests you'd like to pursue but you have really no dedicated staff. You have a portion of the time of some wonderful public servants who also have many other duties. Those duties are directed by the City Manager who is pursuing the overall goals and programs that were set for him or her, him in this case, by the City Council. One thing that advisory Commissions need to be a little bit mindful of is not in a sense creating a tension in terms of directing the work of city staff in a way that may create an inconsistency or difference in priority from what they're being directed to do coming from the Council, to the Manager, to their department head etc. I know that's an area that you all may have found some tension around that because you have a lot of energy and ideas and you have a limited administrative ability to move forward with those as important as they are. A lot of your work is done through being the Council's eyes and ears in the community and you know being out there in the community, talking to folks, understanding what's going on, and what is of concern. Also expressing the Council's priorities around diversity, inclusiveness, fairness, and equity which have been expressed in a variety of ways and most recently through the Council's Resolution on inclusion there's a lot of work that you're able to do and your ordinance really speaks to that. It talks about talking to folks, listening, exercising your ability to pursue, being this access point for people and issues coming in and ultimately getting to the Council. Any sort of concrete programs that would involve dedication of City resources or funds, of course, those come out of this Commission as recommendations because the Commission, like all Palo Alto's Boards and Commissions, is advisory to the Council. I was just looking at your wonderful handbook. It's really quite extraordinary and I think it covers the key points about being an effective Commissioner. Be prepared, be respectful when you come and engage and ask questions and offer opinions and celebrate the fact that you will have differences of opinions and perspective. Hopefully, you will often reach consensus or a group approach that brings those things together where it doesn't -- you agree to disagree and move forward. You, of course, need to follow the Brown Act and your Staff will help you do that. We can answer any question through the Staff that may come up that are maybe more tricky then typical. You are also very fortunate to have a Council Member Liaison who is engaged with this Commission and attends and knows what's

going on and is a good and interested and dedicated Council Member both to the issues that this Commission is concerned with and then also with his fellow Council Members when they meet in this room. I think I'll stop there and how would you want to or maybe the Chair or the Staff liaison has a thought about how you'd like to use our time together this evening?

Chair Stinger: I'd like to open it up to questions if that's agreeable? Maybe we would each take a question and then turn it over to someone to the next person so that we each have a chance. Is that ok? Ok. Deepali, would you like to start?

Commissioner Brahmbhatt: Yes, no thank you, that was a good introduction. I don't have any questions.

Commissioner Kralik: I'll pass as well. Go ahead.

Chair Stinger: Commission Lee?

Commissioner Lee: I was wondering if you could provide some clarification regarding one of the areas where we have jurisdiction to make recommendations. I don't have the specific citation but one of them references us making recommendations to Council in terms of them taking a position on non-city legislation or other issues. I'm wondering if you could provide some clarification on that because there's always an interesting philosophical debate about our specific focus. Whether we should only focus on City of Palo Alto issues and what our role should be with respect to other issues within our shared community. Also, just state, regional, federal as it intersects with things of concern to the people who live in Palo Alto.

Ms. Stump: Right and thank you for raising that. That is an area of fair complexity so I would expect that most of the time that you are having an interest in state or federal legislation it's through the lens of how it affects the residents and citizens of this City. That's really where your charge is and that will happen quite frequently. There's another layer of complexity because the City has a pretty now well-developed legislative program and the Council is the one that speaks for the City directly to our state and federal congressional and state legislative delegations about the City's overall position on legislation. The Council does that in a variety of ways. There's an overall Council legislative set of positions that the Council revisits from time to time, I think about yearly, that has subtle positions that get adjusted each year but some of them you'll recognize. We wish to promote local control on issues of local concern, those kinds of things. That gets done on a proactive basis before the state legislative terms start and then, of course, as it is the case in Sacramento as in Washington, lots of unexpected things happen through the year and the Council tries to respond to them very quickly. Sometimes we have to take action so quickly that the City Manager will respond and then we'll get back to the Council as soon as possible. This Commission I noticed in your code does have some ability to actually articulate positions which is a little surprising frankly because again we are all one City. I think your code section says and quite rightly that if you were to do that you would need to be clear that you're speaking as a Commission and not on behalf of the City or the City Council. My suggestion to you would be if you – if it's an area of legislation that's not one of those last-minute emergencies but one where you are seeing something develop and you think the City ought to take a position on it. My suggestion to you would be to try to go through the City's regular legislative process.

Theirs is a staff person in the City Manager's Office who kind of vets' things and tees it up for the City Manager and then the Council. If you are able to make a recommendation to the Council to take a position and then the Council does that, I think that amplifies your voice potentially because you could then get a letter coming from the City Council signed by the City's Mayor. That's the kind of thing that the legislative analysis in Sacramento will, when they are analyzing a bill, they'll list for and against and they would list then the City of Palo Alto. I suspect that a subsidiary Commission may not make that list in the same way.

Commissioner Lee: Typically, how much lead time should we allocate if and when those instances come up?

Ms. Stump: As much as possible. The Council's agenda are very, very crowded and I know that you've experienced that. You're anxious to get your recommendations on the diversity and inclusion Resolution. I know that Council Member Wolbach is anxious for that as well and you did your work and you're queued up in the queue. Just towards the end of the legislative term in May and June Council was meeting even more than the once a week that they typically meet and with the agendas just packed with time-sensitive deadline driven matters so as much time as you can provide but we do have the ability to kind of jump onto the agenda relatively on short notice for a legislative item that has urgency.

Commissioner Lee: One follow-up question if the Chair wouldn't mind?

Chair Stinger: If it's related.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, it's related. I know this Commission makes recommendations on funding and often times the funding impacts students in our schools. So, there's been a philosophical debate as to whether the City should play a role in providing funding for those services. So, I'm wondering if you could provide any guidance on that.

Ms. Stump: Well the City has a variety of programs and services that serve Palo Alto school children. This is an area I think of concern and focus for the City Manager and the City Council as both desire to provide a certain set of services but also needing to be good stewards of tax payer's dollars. Frankly, the City, even as good of economic times as we are in, the City is in a position where it's being extremely careful about its budget. I know that through the budget process there's discussion about those kinds of items. I'm not sure how much value is added other than one of the challenges of frankly an advisory Commission that focuses on an area of particular concern. Yours is broad but it's still bounded but when you get to the City Council you have all of the City services and requirements including policing, including the storm drains and the electric power system and all of that so there are trade-offs that are being made frankly. You may see an issue as the highest of priorities amongst the things that you're looking at but then when the Manager and the Council have to do is to also put that together with all of the other needs that our residents have all the services and programs that we provide and the calculus may come out a little bit different.

Commissioner Lee: So, if both the City and the school district are funding a particular program that services students in the schools, is that something that is clearly within or outside our

advisory role as a City Commission?

Ms. Stump: It sounds like you have something specific in mind.

Commissioner Lee: Well I know that we provide funding for mental health service in the schools and often times there's a philosophical debate as to whether the City should put in its share or whether it should be fully paid for by the school district. I'm wondering if there's been any articulated philosophy on that from either the City Council or the City Manager.

Ms. Stump: Well again I think those are discussions that get explored between the City Manager and the Superintendent and then the Council Members and the School Board Members. I think that those kinds of budget type issues and financially driven issues you're probably not in the best position to add to that conversation because you don't have the full picture of those budgets before you and the various diverse types of programs that may be going into a conversation there.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Chair Stinger: I think maybe that's where my question comes in. We are an appointed body but we are advisory and I just kind of wonder where we are on a spectrum of governance. How much we can initiate; how much we can expect...

Ms. Stump: Right.

Chair Stinger: ...to do?

Ms. Stump: I mean you've just described it quite correctly which is that you're an important body and the City has provided a certain amount of resources to support your work. A lot of your work is really you jumping in and getting your hands fully in it as Commissioners because there just frankly isn't a depth of staff as there would be in a larger City. There might be a small staff to support the HRC or the Commission on the status of women etc. that you'd see that in larger Cities. We just aren't ever going to have that so you're doing a lot of that sort of work of talking to folks in the community, understanding community concerns, maybe doing some research, you're doing that work yourself and thank you for that. You are advisory on policy matters and so – but the Council wants to hear from you because you have more of an expertise, more time to delve into an area and they will put weight on the things that you say. You are also a place for Palo Altans to come to express their concerns and to be more fully heard than perhaps they can be at the Council. Where we may be dealing with a land use issue, a bridge that needs to get built, water pipes that need to be repaired, and we don't have perhaps the time to dedicate as much as you do to these issues.

Chair Stinger: You gave an example – if you don't mind if I follow up?

Vice Chair O'Nan: No.

Chair Stinger: You gave an example of the Commission on gender equality and I was going to

react to that and say but that's good work, that's fun work, I enjoy doing that. I wanted to think also about responsibility to communicate is there a responsibility to communicate to the Commission when there's an incident in the community? Do we have a role to play in that change if reaction and response?

Ms. Stump: Right so I think it is about talking, input and discussion. The Commission is not in the chain of command as it were between the City Council, the City Manager, and say the Chief of Police if there is an incident that may involve some policing aspect. There isn't an obligation and people may not even really fully think oh, we should communicate or work with our HRC because frankly, everyone is very busy, in faith, doing the work of the citizens. So, you might have to take a little initiative to get involved and to be out there talking to Palo Altans and engaging with the community really fostering that community engagement piece as much as possible. I mean I think when there's an interest in a dialog to the extent that it can happen. I know that's it's not just this Commission, I think all Commissions, can find it a little bit awkward talking as a multi-member body to another multi-member body. This is local government for you. There's not an easy way and that's part of the reason that many years ago the Council did set up a system of Council Member liaisons to Commissions to try to facilitate that conversation. You're fortunate that you have a Council Member who attends your meetings.

Chair Stinger: We know that, thank you. Commission O'Nan

Vice Chair O'Nan: Thank you for being with us tonight, Molly. I wanted to revisit the issue you brought up about staff time. There are times when we are interested in an issue, we might bring it up with Minka, she then has to escalate it up the chain, and that takes some time. There are times when we are directed to run things past, for example, your office and then sometimes it seems like it takes quite a while to really get a response. So, can you give us some guidance on what things should we handle ourselves using our own judgment? What things do we really need to vet with your office? How much should we have to run things up the chain via Minka? Is there a number of times a year that would be appropriate to make those kinds of requests? Is it – is there a time when it gets to be excessive, too much of a burden on Staff and we should be cognizant of that? Could you comment on that?

Ms. Stump: I think I can comment in a general way Commissioner. There are not a set number of times but I think you're correct in identifying there that you have to do prioritize. You will have more ideas and initiatives than there is Staff capacity and Council capacity to address. So, it does make sense for you to focus on the ones that you feel are most particularly important and where you can make a concrete impact. I would do those first. In terms of what issues need to be worked through to Minka's supervisors and managers or even to my office I think Minka is the best person to give you that advice on an issue by issue basis. I think she would bring issues to my office if they involved certainly City contracts or agreements, any financial items, any potential City liability. Sometimes the City does new programs and services that can create risk and we certainly do that with, our eyes wide open when the right folks, typically the Manager or the Council, decide that that's a risk worth taking. It does need an evaluation then and definition of that through the legal office. I think we really have to work that on a case by case and I'll just sort of say generally that I wish that we had the resources to be immediately on call for all of your initiatives. I know that we don't so we're doing our best.

Commissioner Xue: I don't have a question at the moment. I will pass.

Commissioner Smith: I want to go back to Commissioner Lee's question around the funding part since there is a significant part of our work every other year that we're dealing with grants and those things. Where do we get the right guidance to know if we're wasting our time? So, he's asking a question on the Board of Ed. and of the City Manager and stuff and we spent hours going through and vetting these grants and making those recommendations. Is that really a good use of this Commission's time or is there a way that we can vet these concerns before we start dealing with the grants?

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think what both Commissioners are referring to is all the applications are from community service type organizations and they are responding to the priority of needs. So, the audience for what these grants serve is a variety of members of the community and one is specifically funding a service on the school district campus. There has been a concern of the Commission for a while that for while we were paying more for the service than the school district was by significant portions. The provider of that service left and then the new provider of the service asked for substantially more. They received \$30,000 when the old grantee was getting \$100,000. There still lies a concern with staff and that was with when Rob de Geus was our Director, that was a great concern of his and members of the Commission that were on the Committee and it's already passed on to the new Commissioners as well is the responsibility of the City paying for a service that should be fully funded by the school district. I'm not sure if there are many other communities that pay for mental health services on the campus. So, this started with a history of the City helping to found Adolescent Counseling Services in the early vears when the school district wasn't able too. It just slowly over the years went to the large level that it is so we're kind of in this situation. It's kind of a historical situation so but I think what the Commissioners are referring to is there a question that the City is concerned about of paying for services on school campuses. As Molly said there's in the Recreation Department – I mean the City fully runs the middle school athletic program. The City brokers all the fields on all the school district campuses so there are a variety of services that the City already provides to the school district. Some are paid by fees, some are not paid by fees and that's a process that I know has been monitored by the executive leadership team of the City. I can't speak to any further details and I believe the Council has – might have had conversations about this in the past. I don't believe that there's ever been a philosophical decision of no we won't do so and if that's something that the Commission feels strongly about before is was a huge reduction in the request. That was something that was going to be elevated to Jim Keene and then, I want to say, Kevin Skelly but Max McGee. Then that need did not happen because of the new request so that's what they are speaking too.

Ms. Stump: The background is helpful so you're not alone, there are a number of services and it really does speak to the historically close relationship between the City and the school district. Both government entities, of course, greatly contributing to the quality of life in our town and we're very supportive of our school children. However, we also would like the school district to be responsible for as many things as it can because we have competing needs, as you're referencing, for our various pots of money. I think it would be perfectly fine when you make your recommendations if you wanted to include a note that you have maybe recommended funding this activity which has been funded in the past but it would be really wonderful to see

more of that responsibility shifted to the school district because there are other competing needs for those dollars. That might be one way to handle it if you have a concern about that but still wish to make the recommendation to do the funding.

Ms. van de Zwaag: That's actually how it went through last time Adolescent Counseling Service actually pulled the request for the money and that triggered the whole two HSRAP processes last year the Committee of which Commissioner O'Nan and other two Commissioners who are no longer here. They did include that...

Ms. van de Zwaag: You were on the second Committee but not the first one.

Commissioner Lee: Would the Commission be able to make the opposite recommendation as well if...

Ms. Stump: To no fund the services?

Commissioner Lee: No, if we felt like the City did have a role to play in funding those services as opposed to saying we're going to fund it this year but we'd like the school district to take on more of the burden. Could we do the opposite recommendation?

Ms. Stump: Sure, it's my understanding that the HSRAP is before you for your input.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Right so yes, it goes first to a subcommittee, then full Commission and that recommendation goes to finance. So, it's ultimately the Council's decision but the majority of the time they follow through with the HRC's recommendation. The only thing that they sometimes have conversations for is the funding amount.

Commissioner Lee: Ok so there hasn't been any previous guidance as to how we should be thinking of that particular issue?

Ms. van de Zwaag: No there has not.

Ms. Stump: Not as a categorical matter so again, you're going to need to have that debate yourselves and it sounds like there's a diversity of views which is appropriate so best of luck to you. I think that you are advisory and the Council, as Minka said, can make a different decision but they do put a lot of weight on what this Commission recommends.

Chair Stinger: Commissioner Kralik.

Commissioner Kralik: I heard that there was a new City Manager so I wondered if being a veteran City Attorney if you could comment on your thoughts about bringing on a new City Manager and how that is going to change the mission of the City in whatever respect as it would affect this Commission as you can perceive it?

Ms. Stump: Sure, well let me not be cagey so I'll offer a couple comments so first the legal part which is that there isn't a new City Manager today. Our our current City Manager Jim Keene has

indicated that he will be retiring at the end of the calendar year. The Council has then identified and indicated that our current Assistant City Manager, Ed Shikada, is their choice to then become City Manager in January. So, he's currently on our staff as the Utilities General Manager and Assistant City Manager and he'll then be moving to the City Manager position in January. That from my perspective, as one of the City's Executive Leaders, is really good news that the Council engage with that process timely too really make a clear direction for us as City staff and for the community about how the City is going to move forward and build on the great work that Jim Keene has done for 10-years as a City Manager. Ed Shikada is a fabulously dedicated and talented public servant and I've greatly enjoyed working with him as Assistant City Manager. I think he'll be a different City Manager but more in terms of perhaps styles and emphasis. The basic mission of the City, which I think you asked about, remains to serve the citizens as that the priority and direction are expressed from our City Council and that I think will continue unchanged.

Council Member Wolbach: Well actually I think that covers most of it. I'll just emphasize that in my view and if others disagree please offer alternative views. The way that I see it is that the City Council has two main roles, the primary being policy direction and the secondary but also important is an oversight because once you get past policy direction you get into the implementation of that policy. The City Manager along with the other Council Appointed Officers; the City Clerks, the City Auditor, and the City Attorney and all the 1,000 plus staff below them. The City staff from the highest level down handle implementation and so when it comes to what the policy direction is, the change in City Manager should not, in general, have a substantial impact in what the policy direction is of the City because that's set by the Council. So, there may be changes in the Council makeup after the next year but this change in City Manager should not substantially impact that. You know again as the – as each City Manager will have their own style to a certain degree, that may change how they go about the implementation. The City Manager like the City Attorney and the other Council Appointed Officers and our Boards and Commissions play an important role in providing their professional advice to the Council. So, to the degree that the City Manager provides guidance based on their experience, that will be an advisory role to the Council but our policy direction still does come from the Council.

Chair Stinger: I wanted to follow up with that a specific question but I'm more interested in the general answer. You mentioned the Council Resolution and one of the topics we were looking at was immigration. We specifically had a recommendation to or we still have a recommendation to endorse the state legislation. On one level to just endorse it but then also to write a letter to the state senates to say that we were supportive of that. That becomes an issue in this environment and I think we probably used every process going first to the City Attorney, then hoping that we would have a recommendation that would go to you after it was approved. I just wonder what the most efficient root would be if we had a subsequent piece of legislation we wanted to recommend endorsing.

Ms. Stump: So, your question is so you can weigh in on legislation when it's been introduced but hasn't been passed yet or in that case that was inactive legislation and your recommendation is to thank the legislature and to endorse also that policy.

Chair Stinger: Yeah, by the time we had our recommendations completed the state legislation SB-53 was actually two levels; the immigration and the religious registry were passed. We wanted to recommend that the City of Palo Alto go on record in saying that we are supportive of that. Acknowledge that there are perhaps downsides but we really felt that it was important to endorse that and I think we did this in so many different ways I'm getting confused. I think our first recommendation was to take it to the City Attorney's Office. Then subsequently we thought well maybe we could have those questions answered by one of the attorneys and submit it as a formal recommendation. So, I guess the question was do we come to you before or after the recommendation is put to Council?

Ms. Stump: When your recommendations are getting ready to go to Council the workflow will bring them through my office. So, if it's complex or controversial or it's not clear whether it's within the City's authority, it's good to ask Minka to do a quick check with us. We can do that on the phone just to make sure that you're on the right track and you don't spend time off in a direction that we're not permitted to go. This is a perfectly permissible recommendation that you've made, it's just a question of having the time to get it on to the Council's agenda. I have looked at it, Minka has looked at it so she looks at it first and then it comes to me. That will go to the Council this fall and I don't have a vote on the Council but I'd be surprised if they weren't supportive of that recommendation.

Chair Stinger: Thank you.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Can staff ask a question that is slightly related to that? I think what the Commission sometimes struggles with is what to do with what they hear. They have the authority to have a public forum on an issue that they are concerned about. They know they have the authority to send something to the Council to say can you please have a policy related to X, Y, Z issue or can you please pass a Resolution for X, Y issue. I said there's a level of just being able to provide the Council with an informational report on something that they're interested in or even on a quarterly basis going and speaking at oral communications. So, at least the more veteran members are – realize that those are kind of four areas of action. I think what would be helpful and this may not be completely in your scope of work but at what point should they pass it on to the Council? At what point have they done enough research or if staff is able to assist them, enough research to say yes, we think the Council should consider this policy? I mean how far along should they go before they are probably past the depth of their understanding of an issue? So, is there any guidance that Council Member Wolbach or you can give them Molly? They're to a point where they say we can talk about this some more, let's get some more experts in here to talk to us but is it to a point where we really are committed to this issue. We know this is what we think is a reasonable recommendation and maybe their recommendation to Council is to see if Council has an interest in something to actually have Council have the City Manager direct regular staff to actually look into it some more. So that's really, I think a fuzzy area to them as what is far enough or too far for them and at what point they should let something go onto Council?

Ms. Stump: You may have some thoughts on this. I think one area where it bears being very thoughtful before forwarding a recommendation is if you're imagining a new type of City service or activity that actually is going to require funding and ongoing Staffing. We really haven't been

in the mode of greatly expanding our services just for practical reasons. So that's a big ask and to the extent that you can address your concerns using public-private partnerships, using non-profit groups that are in the community, and then what you'd be asking for would be more of a policy and endorsement from Council that's a smaller ask.

Council Member Wolbach: I think that whether it is a recommendation to take a position on a piece of legislation or a recommendation to have a change in policy and how we implement things using the existing staff or recommendation to create a new service. When you feel that you're ready to make the recommendation, even at a high level, I think it's ok to make that recommendation and have it say we're going to send this off to Council. Especially if it's something that's going to require a lot of staff work because ultimately a lot of staff work is going to be a resource intensive by definition. That kind of direction is going to need to come from Council or we're going to have to say we endorse and we direct the City staff to spend those time resources on that issue. So especially if you're talking about something complex or something substantially new, I'd say send it to the Council with the recommendation that we would direct staff do it that we would adopt the new policy or the new program. Then we can hear the general direction that you're going and we can have a discussion about whether that's something we want to have staff to spend a lot of time on. If it's something where we say that's a great an idea and it needs to be flushed out more. We might direct staff to check in again maybe once more or periodically with the Commission for the development of the details.

Commissioner Lee: Following up with that is there a particular type or amount of legwork that would be inappropriate for us to do before the Council endorses something? So, you mentioned public-private partnerships or working with other agencies or non-profits in the City. If we had an idea to do in the Community and we were trying to identify potential partners in the community or potential resources in the community. Is it proper for either the Commission as a whole to go out and reach out to those folks or individual Commissioners to do that kind of legwork prior to either the Commission or the Council saying yes this is a priority? We'd actually want to do something about it. So, are there any parameters as to what we can't do as a Commission or individual Commissioners in terms of doing some of that legwork so that we're not burdening Staff time?

Ms. Stump: Yes, it's a great question and it's sort of more of an art than a science. I would think part of getting it right would be being clear in your preliminary conversations with interest groups who are working in an area. You don't want to confuse folks that you're speaking for the whole Commission or even for the whole City when you're speaking with them. You can say hey, would you be interested in blah blah blah if the City were to move in this direction so that people are aware that these are preliminary exploratory conversations. I think if you're able to do that and then come forward with some concrete practical suggestions on how to move forward on an issue that would be very welcomed by Council. Do you have anything to add?

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think that's – for me it's just being very clear that people are speaking either as an individual Commissioner or not on behalf of the City. Exactly what you said or not leading people to believe that something is further along than it is actually is. To be honest, I would add to it that I'd be very concerned of going pretty deep into something if that is not a consensus of the HRC that that's something that the Commission wants to be involved with so

that it's just the interest of one Commissioner. That could really, I think, impair relationships with partners if they have the idea that something that may be pending when it's a curiosity of a particular Commissioner so that's another area I have to add.

Ms. Stump: I think that's right and I think it's a wise comment. You know people come – to want to have these positions and you are chosen to have these positions because you have particular interest and background and skills. You keep those even once you're serving but not you're also a government official and in some ways that may cause you to have to moderate a little bit. Maybe is a little bit more deliberative and a little slower in your advocacy? I have seen folks come onto multi-member bodies, citizen advisory Commissions for example, who are very passionate about an issue and ended up feeling like there was too much tension between the positions they wanted to take; which they wanted to be very strong in advocacy versus being on the body needing to work for government. It just was too different and so they've said I don't want that government position. So, once you take this on you are in a sense now you are speaking for the community as a whole. You do have your particular knowledge and background in interest. You don't lose those but you do need to come together and act as a body as well.

Commissioner Lee: Right, thank you for that clarification. I know I make it clear when I meet with folks. Whether it's something I'm working on or just interested in or whether it's the Commission that's working on it so it's great to get that clarification.

Chair Stinger: We are about to wrap up. Are there any last questions, Commissioners?

Commissioner Xue: Quick question so you just mentioned when we speak or communicate with people we need to be more thoughtful; moderated. I'm new so I actually I'm a little bit nervous about the use of a different language; send out an email. What's the right approach to communicate with people when we participate at specific activities? For example, you mentioned we cannot randomly use the HRC to speak of our own opinion so I would like hear some advice or guidance.

Ms. Stump: One thing that it's ok to do is to identify yourself as an HRC Commissioner when you are speaking to folks in the community. You can introduce yourself, give your name and say I serve on the Human Rights Commission and then you can have your conversation. If there are particular questions that are concerning you about going to a particular meeting or doing a particular activity. I think in the beginning especially when you are new the staff will welcome a call and will be able to give you some quick feedback. You have an experiences Staff liaison who can help you.

Commissioner Xue: Thank you.

Chair Stinger: (inaudible – off mic)

Commissioner Smith: This question – I clearly identify myself as the Pastor of a Church and I do take stands based on that role. Do I need to preface a statement now as this is also not the opinion of the HRC because I can preface the statement if it's something controversial or something I have to take a stance on for the Church?

Ms. Stump: Well certainly not in the work that you're doing with your – the members of your organization or with other folks in the faith community. If it has to do with a City program.

Commissioner Smith: Ok.

Ms. Stump: That might be where you want to be clear.

Commissioner Smith: Ok, thank you so much.

Chair Stinger: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: Just to weigh in belief on this same item. This is something that we deal with on the City Council as well and I think it's an important question. If you are or if we, on the Council, are identifying ourselves as a member of the City Council when we're introducing ourselves or signing a letter or an email or being introduced at an event and then proceed to express our own personal views. At that point, I think it's important that we say speaking for myself. You'll notice that when I'm speaking to you even as the Council liaison, I'll often preface my opinions and views by saying speaking only as one member of the Council. Just to be very clear that even as a member of the Council I cannot speak for the Council as an entirety. That we can speak as a body by taking a vote and having a majority decision. In the same way, I really encourage members for the Commission to meet with people in the community as a member of the Commission and find opportunities to be our eyes and ears on the issues that you are tasked with supporting us and supporting the City on to meet with members of the community as individuals or with individuals, with groups, and identifying yourself as a member of the HRC primarily to listen. If you offer opinions to say speaking only as one member of the Commission or separately from my position on the Commission just as a person, as a resident, as a Pastor or an attorney or whatever; of course, what you can do in addition to that is to encourage people to participate in the more formal mechanisms where the Commission and the City hear from them as well; besides individual meetings and private meetings. To encourage them to come to forums and programs hosted by the HRC or co-hosted by the HRC, to come to HRC meetings and speak during public comment on particular items or in general or to have they're voiced heard directly by the Council at Council meetings or through written communications to the Council. I really do encourage you to use your role to identify yourself in pursuit of collecting more community input about these important issues and not to be hesitant to do that especially when you are focusing on listening and encouraging members of the public to participate.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. Thank you both very much, I appreciate it. If you have any closing comments, you've shared a lot with us and I'm really appreciative.

Ms. Stump: I am very appreciative of having the time to come and speak with you, share some thoughts, and thank you for your work. It's a little bit of a difficult time and I think this – the work that you're doing is particularly important to this community and to all of us right now. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: I really appreciate that coming from you particularly.

Vice Chair O'Nan: Thank you, Molly.

# 2. Follow up and debrief on the Human Relations Commission Retreat

[The Commission heard Item 3 first.]

[The Commission continued this item to a future meeting.]

#### 3. Further discussion on Liaison Roles and Commission Work Plans

Chair Stinger: We will move onto agenda Item 3. I'd like to begin with something that we had worked through at our retreat. We had meeting norms for the retreat and I've adapted them slightly for our Commission meetings and I think you all have them in front of you. I'm just going to take a second to read them. To respect other people's responses, to have clarity regarding and to stay focused on our role or jurisdiction which Molly has helped us with. To stick to our scope and that is a Palo Alto related lens. To put forward concrete ideas and those concrete ideas would be prepared having read the material that was distributed. To model civil discourse, active listening, receptive posture, being issues focused, and using factual data not anecdotal, think before speaking, constructive suggesting's, and a reminder 51% is a winning vote. Once a decision is made be supportive and then finally friend's cell phones off, put away and we will be a self-administering body and help each other manage to our norms. Now I'd like to ask you to look at the materials that are At Places. There are several pieces and one piece is the work plan for FY 19 - 2019 and that's just a summary of what we have on our plates already. I just want to emphasize as we go forward to think about what we'd like to add that we have already three program areas that are going forward. One of them will be completed at Quarter 1 but gender identity and gender equity will be big programs that will probably go through for four quarters. We have two funding cycles, five liaison and commitments and Council buddies. I'm excited to take on some new work and we usually have a balance of old and new but I also think we need to be cognizant of how much we can do in our volunteer time and extra time. I think the first thing that I want to do it thank you for participating in the retreat and in the follow-up materials we had a 100 percent. Each of us filled out the rating scales and admittedly they could have been more deliberative. There's some refinement needed but I'm going to ask that we hold any suggestions about the rating experience – about the matrices to later in the year. I think it worked well enough for this first time out and that we can focus now on what priority we'd like to formalize and look at more deeply. So, with that I'm going to ask you to turn to these two sheets; HRC new projects for consideration. There were six priorities that we listed on the retreat day and Nancy captured them. Some of us may have questions about how well they were captured or if we had more time we might have collapsed them and combined them in different ways. I chose not to edit them and circulated them for your review as we captured them at the retreat. I'd like to take each proposal one by one and I'll give an example. One proposal that was put forth was to create an HRC liaison position with PAUSD and when we weighted the points that each of us gave to that that received 41 points. That was the highest and so we're going to start with that. I'll ask Commissioner Lee in just a second to make a quick kick off statement. Then we, as a group, will decide whether that's something that staff has the capacity for, whether the Commission has the capacity for, and whether it's something we'd like to give to a

subcommittee to beef it up and bring it back to us in September. Let's take these potential new projects one by one and see which ones we want to add on, is that ok? Commissioner Lee?

Commissioner Lee: I think the most recent school renaming debate as well as just issues that have been lingering in the community have raised an interest at the school district level to establish some sort of body or point person at the district who could work on these issues on the same sort of issues that the HRC does but at the school district level. I attended one of the last School Board meetings of the year and the School Board did ask the Superintendent to go back and think about what structure, whether it's a body or a Committee or staff person, who would work on it. I think for now the if we wanted to set up a liaison between the HRC and the school district it would be just making sure that we keep in touch with them as they figure out for themselves what format or body they would want to establish to discuss and tackle these issues that we're tackling at a City level. Then depending on what they end up setting up we can come back and reevaluate whether we feel like we have a value-add to it and whether we have the bandwidth to support those joint efforts.

Chair Stinger: I did have one question. You asked that we have a liaison position with PAUSD. Is the intent that we would be a liaison with PAUSD or with the HRC Committee that the school district is proposing?

Commissioner Lee: I think I would initially propose that it would be to someone in the Superintendent's office. Once they figured out what body or who they want to designate to take on these responsibilities then we can come back and reevaluate whether we want to change the nature of that liaison positions to communicate primarily with that person or that body that they set up.

Commissioner Smith: I want to direct a question toward staff. Have we ever had any historical association with the Palo Alto School District? What was the success of it because it would seem to me, with all the integration that Molly talked about and you guys talked about funding and different things, it's surprising to me that there was never this kind of dialog before?

Ms. van de Zwaag: Right, I mean on a staff level the City is working with the school district on numerous fronts. I would say probably when there's issues of fields going on there might be someone from the school district staff that comes to our Parks and Recreation Commission. There is a Committee called the City School Liaison Committee which has two staff members and two Board of Eds. So, when there are issues that are – pardon?

Council Member Wolbach: Two Council Members.

Ms. van de Zwaag: That's what I meant to say, thank you; two Board of Ed; two Council Members. They meet monthly every two months to talk about issues together. I, to be honest, feel pretty uncomfortable with the HRC establishing a liaison relationship with PAUSD. You are the elected body of the City Council of the City of Palo Alto and you don't have any kind of advisory or legislative authority over the school district. I have a concern that seems way too broad. Now is it fine for if the school district creates an HRC type body that you have a collegial relationship on the topics that go on, I think that's fine. I think continuing to work with the

school district just as you work with the libraries or any type of non-profit in the community together on events but it – I do have a concern if it's HRC liaison in the Superintendent's Office. For me, I think it would have to be pretty specific for something that is in the very clear, nexus of responsibilities of the Commission. If Council Member Wolbach has anything to add he doesn't have to obviously but that's a concern of mine. It seemed to me when I saw it written the way it does, it set up a couple of concern lightbulbs for me.

Commissioner Lee: Would you be less concern if it was more of to our analogous body...

Ms. van de Zwaag: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: ... as the school district if and when...

Ms. van de Zwaag: Yes, I'd be...

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think that would be completely appropriate to share the knowledge and experience of those two groups together. I would be concerned because that body will also be a recommending body to the Board of Education. I would have a concern if one of our Commissioners was a voting member of something that was going back to the Board of Ed. but to maybe serve as a non...

Commissioner Lee: Ex-officio.

Ms. van de Zwaag: ...voting collaborative relationship, I think that would be appropriate. I'm not sure you have anything to add.

Council Member Wolbach: I think listening to this conversation I think you're heading down now a probably safer and more effective path. One thing I'm thinking about is how it would actually work? Would a member of this body sit in on their meetings? Would a member of that body then sit in on these meetings with me as a liaison? Would you propose – the Council and the Board of Education have a separate Liaison Committee. Would you be proposing that the HRC and the school district future equivalent to the HRC have their own parallel Liaison Committee? I don't have a strong recommendation among those but you might want to think about sending it up the chain to Council and respectfully maybe we ask the School Board as well to approve and formalize whatever that relationship might be. Until it's formalized, of course, again individuals are free to reach out to School Board Members because I think anyone on this Commission is a constituent of the School Board but in their own way.

Chair Stinger: I want to keep the discussion at a high plane for now so I'm going to make this recommendation that we rewrite this to say create an HRC non-voting liaison positions to an analogous body at PAUSD.

Commissioner Smith: Chairmen Stinger? Could we rephrase it in that we are watching the situation that we have somebody just check in to see how their body is developing?

Chair Stinger: That's what I was going to put for the action item; was that we ask somebody to watch and that person would be responsible for presenting options for that connection to go forward. What I will ask each of you to do before we leave tonight is indicate which topics you're interested in and then we'll make the assignments. I'm going to move on, trying again to stay at that top level, but we will assume that that is something that we are looking at. I'll put that note. Another priority proposed was to develop a format for the HRC community conversations and to host three conversations that have wide appeal and I'd like to speak to that. I think this actually folds in a number of the proposals from below and allows us to tailor something that unique to Palo Alto. We have technology that I think we can get some different approaches and we have some content issues that are suggested here. Some of the things we talked about at our retreat were focusing on what does it mean to be inclusive, what is racism today, and how do you bridge the generation gap when you're new to America? We have topics here of gender equity, different readings, and I think we could put together a Committee to look at doing a format that would increase community awareness, be fun, and challenge people so I would like to propose that we that.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Chair Stinger what are you effectively looking is a way to make these events a lot easier so are you looking to create, for lack of better words, type of formula? Like if we do certain events a year it will either be speaker forum, this forum, this forum? Because you know what we've tended to do in the past is the HRC has had a lot of these events and some of the elements are the same and some are similar. I think for Staff it would be easier if there was some kind of streamlined template to use. That if it strays past the template, maybe that's not the resources we have to do. Maybe the HRC does one kind of out of the box event and the other ones the topics and the format stick pretty strictly to the template. That's just my observation as staff, that's where I think it would be helpful for the conversation to lie. So, if something comes forward we could say does it fit in our template with the amount of Staff time or HRC time that it would take to put this on? Should it be our special event, you know a special different event of the year or are they all going to fit in the template? So that, not every topic comes to us and we have think oh, how are we going to do this? I think that would be pretty time efficient.

Chair Stinger: You used the word that I wanted to use, was template. I think that the community would benefit from knowing what they were coming too and some repetition of methodology would be beneficial for the community and for staff and the Commission.

Commissioner Smith: Two points, Chair, is when we were at the retreat there were other towns that do a similar activity. I believe Mountain View was the one. Why don't we ask them what they do? It works, why reinvent the wheel?

Vice Chair O'Nan: Well we've done that but for a variety of reasons my colleagues here and past colleagues just couldn't really see how to translate it for Palo Alto. I have to admit I didn't fully agree with that but yes, Mountain View has a great format called Civility Round Table and I definitely think that we could take a lot of learns from them.

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think the difference, Commissioner Smith, is that very intentionally sets up a statement and the topics is could Ferguson happen here or something similar to that to try to get

two very opposing points. That might be the three types of conversations you want to have. What I see more with this HRC and you all can make it different is it was more of the domestic violence, the impulsivity bias, the veteran summit, was more of a sharing of information. It was more of a community conversation on a wider topic that wasn't set up to be – I'm not saying not controversial but it was...

Commissioner Smith: It wasn't confrontational.

Ms. van de Zwaag: It was a little confrontational. That one seems to ask for people to be on two sides of the room where the HRC events have more been about you know this is an issue our community is struggling with or our community may not know it's there. Domestic violence was perfect; I think the tagline was it does happen here so it had a little bit different purpose. I do think that there is definitely worth in looking at templates that other communities have used. The Civility Round Table is a great program and if Palo Alto wants to do it, staff will definitely support it. We just need to be understanding of the type events that this Commission would like to support and what kind of templates best supports that.

Commissioner Smith: Thank you so much. I really do believe that we don't have to reinvent the wheel here. There is somebody in the Bay or in this country that has this thing worked out so I think we can find the template. The second part is we had a recommendation of doing some community polling I think it was the first thing on the ones that didn't get through. It was the one that scored 34 so maybe using that to get some of the topics because we all have our own biases, our own blinders, our own preferences, and if whether it's social media, email, or whatever. Just asking the community what's a topic we want to – you wanted to discuss? Even if it's only one of the three meetings in the year.

Ms. van de Zwaag: That's what I thought would be pretty fun. If the HRC had through its experience had a couple and then put something on the City's Facebook page or some type of Next Door hey, if the HRC wants to do one more what would you like to see?

Commissioner Kralik: I'm a baseball fan so ties usually go to the runner and it says a minimum of 34. Since that was my idea I appreciate that note, thank you.

Chair Stinger: I just want to note that the ones that scored beneath 34 are almost universally folded into the topics above and so I think we're going to see a lot more adoption.

Commissioner Smith: I'll volunteer to be the champion for this because I do believe having community discussions bases are critical.

Chair Stinger: We will note that down. I want to try one more to see if we think we have the bandwidth to take on one more and I know my colleague is going to say two more and that's good too. One of the ideas was to partner with or communicate with the tech industry to cosupport policies and decisions; gender equity; gender identity might be one. Did you want to talk to that?

Commissioner Lee: Yes, I've been thinking about that particular idea in these last couple of

weeks. I'm wondering if an easier way for us to approach that might be just to set up a roundtable of diversity officers in the various companies who work in Palo Alto. Not necessarily have a specific project in mind but I wouldn't even call it an advisory body because it wouldn't necessarily be that formal. Just convene these people occasionally just so that we know that we all exist and that we're all working on these issues together. So that when opportunities do arise we have those connections already and we can learn best practices or find opportunities for a joint effort. I don't know, that was my initial thought on that.

Vice Chair O'Nan: My experience with people at that level is that they are very busy and they are very focused on their company and they are often not that plugged into or connected with the larger community. I think without a specific goal or project or timeframe in mind it would be hard to convene that number of busy people at some regular interval just to get together and connect. There would have to be focused on something. We could do a one-time event and maybe invite some of these folks to be panelists, like a discussion panel but again, time-limited, very specific, and we'd have to really sell it. Sell the idea to them and their company would have to probably endorse it or understand it or give them the time to participate so it's a little bit more complicated.

Commissioner Lee: Would you recommend that we come with a set goal in mind or in that first meeting see if there's something that the group collectively comes up with in terms of what they want to work towards?

Vice Chair O'Nan: I think we should not go vague to them. We should go to them and say hey, we're really concerned about the lack of gender equity in Silicon Valley and there've been some – a lot of really negative press around companies like Uber for example. We know your companies are really working on these issues. Would you like to have a community forum with us and really talk about what your efforts are? So, in other words, it's a chance for them to share what they're doing. That is a by-in for them because it's like ok; I'm going to differentiate my company from some of the companies that are not getting such great press. Now I will have a chance to example the great efforts and strides that we are making. Then we can talk about the challenges that still remain so we could also partner with Stanford Professors. You know people who are sending their students out into this world and talk about gender equity problems in academia and then how that feeds into the lanes that women and other unrepresented minorities get tracked into in tech so there's different things that we can do. We have to kind of make it attractive to them in some way because they're going to spend their time and they don't want to go there and look bad. You know like my company is an epic fail, you know thanks for letting me share that in public. No, that's not going to work so I do think we'll have to frame it, sell it, make it attractive, get the press there so those companies are like yes, we're for runners in this, we're pioneers and you know we're on the edge on this.

Commissioner Lee: I really like that, thank you.

Commissioner Smith: Not to be contrary but it sounds like we're trying to invent the trap for something we haven't found yet. I think if we had an issue that we could engage the tech companies on and have a track record to say hey, this is what we're doing. It would be instantly attractive to pull them into that but to your point, I think to get diversity heads, to get probably

10 to 15 invitations a quarter to speak places, to come and sit with us on a new adventure. I just don't see us pulling them in and really getting them together around it. That's just a thought.

Commissioner Lee: Without getting too deep into the weeds because I know we're trying to keep it high level. I think our gender equity work if and when the Council decides to let us do something about it that might be one possible topic within the umbrella of topics that we talk about within this Commission where we could engage these folks.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Yes, I would almost suggest waiting...

Commissioner Lee: Waiting.

Ms. van de Zwaag: ...for direction because I would hate for these organizations to think that we are trying to inform or dictate policies into their private organizations. I think that was a concern of mine when I saw it the way it is. You know co-support policies and decisions and I think that's really something I would wat for the Council's direction on. If the Council does decide to go forward with CEDAW then I would look for how the Council decides to implement that.

Commissioner Lee: Well and I was originally thinking about it in a softer way of more of just sharing best practices and knowledge. I mean there's certainly a potential to go stronger on that but at least initially my thought was to be like more collaborative and just sharing best practices.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Right and I think it might be the cart in front of the horse. If you have this conversation and the Council like I said, says go forward with CEDAW and they have five key priorities or 3 key priorities and that's not one of them. It seems like it's this interesting coprocess so that was my concern when I saw it.

Commissioner Lee: Maybe it's something that we could investigate and have some ideas on if and when the Council decides that this is something that we should work on. Should we do some of the research or...

Vice Chair O'Nan: Yes, I think we could do that. Also, to go – to revisit my idea about maybe leveraging Stanford because a follow – a project that sort of falls under this umbrella would be to invite someone like Cynthia Lee who teaches Computer Science at Stanford and talks a lot about the lack of gender equity. My colleague Commissioner Smith knows her too or of her as well. That might be an effective way to launch a conversation and getting some publicity around that. Then maybe we can build on that and then reach out to people in tech and say hey, we talked to a Stanford Professor around these issues and here's where we are so, if you want to come and share what your company is doing about this and then that will tend to get people a little bit more interested in participating.

Commissioner Smith: I would almost recommend that we look at partnering with Cynthia Lee because she's trying to do a conference around a lot of these issues this year. So maybe in this approach, we say hey, let's have a conversation with her and see how we can come alongside and partner with her. I know that she's very passionate about this work.

Vice Chair O'Nan: With her contacts that might give us segue into some of these other ideas that you have Commissioner Lee without us having to start from scratch. You know we might be able to build on a relationship we established and then we'll have a partnership both with Stanford and possibly with representatives from tech. So that's a real synergy that we could use.

Chair Stinger: I really like that idea of combining those two. I looked at this and I guess I didn't read it thoroughly enough but I looked at it as an opportunity to picks some brains with our LGBTQ listening forum for example. There's some recommendations and I thought having access to some diversity officers, not necessarily on a panel but one by one could help us understand the issues in the workforce and the value – validity of the recommendations that we might come forward with. If we could build that relationship...

Commissioner Lee: I think it might be a useful tool strategy that we could incorporate in different things that we do. Whether it's an LGBTQ assessment or an event or I see it as having fingers in multiple areas and not necessarily just a standalone by any means.

Chair Stinger: For right now can we combine those two and we'll allow a subcommittee to give some foundation and some definition?

Commissioner Lee: So, putting it under the Cynthia Lee one?

Chair Stinger: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Chair Stinger: Co-Chair O'Nan, would you like to talk about researching ADA standards?

Vice Chair O'Nan: Yes, thank you, Chair Stinger. My idea for this project is a little bit different from some of the other projects that we will be discussing tonight. It comes from a personal passion for me. So, a few years ago I became very disabled by inflammatory arthritis that destroyed my hip joints and for a while, I really couldn't walk. At that time, I experienced Palo Alto in a new way as a disabled person and I was very dismayed to find that Palo Alto was not a very accessible community when you are truly, truly disabled. I was fortunate enough to at least partially recover. I rode my bike here tonight which is a big journey for me but other people are not as lucky and we do have a very large and growing population of seniors. That population tends to have more mobility issues, more disabilities. What I'm finding is although the City complies with the ADA which is the American's with Disabilities Act. It complies with the minimum standards which are great but those minimum standards are maybe not realistic for this community. I think this community might need to start thinking about exceeding those standards in order to truly serve the needs of the people who live here. I'd like to look into this a little bit more. I'd like to understand the law better, I'd like to talk to people on the City staff who are in charge of complying with those laws, I'd like to get a little more data on the demographics of the people who live here, and then come back to you with some kind of report and possibly make some recommendations to the full Commission. Then see if we want to either send a report onto Council with some recommendations or pass some sort of Resolution. Maybe meet with individual Council Members to educate them around this issue if that's appropriate. I think those

are next steps that we'll kind of have to figure out but for now, I think this project would largely fall on my shoulders to go and do some groundwork to kind of figure out where we are in terms of the law, our compliance, our ability to maybe do more than what the law requires, and whether that's necessary. I can't build everything on my personal anecdotal experience obviously. This would be something I would be working on as a research project and then I would bring it back to you all to get your opinions and see where we want to go from there.

Commissioner Lee: My only initial – sorry.

Commissioner Kralik: I just wanted to second that. I know at the retreat I talked about the fact that I now have some hip issues and it is a different lens. I think you're very right that there are minimum standards and then there's sort of practical reality. I think transportation is one that I would hope that you could focus on even simple things like trying to get into a vehicle when you have arthritis and sometimes you can't get in on the right side. You have to get in on the left side depending on what ails you. I do think that when we are trying to attract people to the City to take advantage of the City services. Transportation is absolutely key to the elder population who's stopped driving and may have physical issues. I just would like to say I applaud that interest and I think transportation would be one area that I would hope could be covered. Thank you.

Commissioner Lee: My initial suggestion would be somewhere down the road I think there might be possible collaborations with the Planning and Transportation Commission. Whether it's us giving them a presentation or having a joint discussion with them but I see a potential for some sort of collaboration down the road. So that would be my initial suggestion.

Vice Chair O'Nan: That may be possible. I think Minka and Valerie have already suggested working with the Senior Friendly Dementia Friendly City Subcommittee that we already have because some issues regarding disabled people will overlap with the issues facing that subcommittee. So again, I'm hoping to start making connections and contacts and interview and talk to the right people and kind of see where that takes me.

Chair Stinger: It's...

Vice Chair O'Nan: I think Minka has a comment.

Ms. van de Zwaag: I said that's exactly what I was going to suggest because I saw you are listed as the new liaison to the Age-Friendly Committee and they've worked through several of their projects so they are ripe to taking on somethings. I think they'll – you'll find some affinity on that group. I'll send you an email about it later (inaudible).

Vice Chair O'Nan: Thank you, Minka.

Chair Stinger: Another piece of this that I like is that we try to balance continuing projects and new projects. What you have done is said I'm going to do the research and bring back a well-funded – well-founded proposal. I like that sequence so when we look at your recommendations we will be in a better position to understand them and I think that's fabulous. If I'm reading this

correctly right now we've really not made to big ask of Staff. The liaison position is something we're exploring and looking at. The template is something that we might need staff time with. We're exploring the liaison with the tech industry and the Stanford experts. Your program, researching ADA standards goes alone. If people think we have capacity for two more I'd like to ask Commissioner Lee to take one and that would be the response to the community interest and recognize the name of Fred Yamamoto.

Commissioner Lee: I think this one overlaps with a lot of the other ideas listed including engaging with our Chinese and Indian immigrant communities, as well as just ongoing efforts to reach out to the Welcoming America effort. I think the school renaming debate has highlighted the need for us in our community to really engage with folks who may be newer to our community and who may not necessarily have been the traditional groups that we have focused on in the past. I see this as there's opportunities to address the larger issues generally speaking whether it's through programs or events but also if there is a community interest in taking a specific short-term action and recognizing Fred Yamamoto; whether it's renaming a park or some other way of recognizing him. I think that would be a short-term one-off sort of solution but engaging the larger issue in communities that the most recent school renaming debate highlighted.

Commissioner Smith: I have a question for staff. I know in African American History Month we honored about 6 or 7 people here. What is the process to getting Council to honor somebody like an Asian American in May for Fred Yamamoto? Could we make that recommendation from the HRC?

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think you certainly can. I think the African American month started with a conversation with one of our Council Members and an East Palo Alto Council Members at an engagement. Then that idea blossomed into I think we've been a 2-year event. I'm not sure if we're onto our 3<sup>rd</sup> year for that event so that could be a recommendation. I mean you can make a recommendation for a proclamation for someone and that doesn't have to be something that's huge. That's done at the very early part of the Council under something called Special Orders of the Day so the HRC can make a proclamation. Just as we do for Commissioners that go off the Commission but if you're looking for asking the Council to have a special recognition ceremony during different months. My thought would be how many recognitions months would there be and how deep that recommendation would be?

Commissioner Smith: Well I would recommend to this Commission that we look at as part of what we're doing with engaging Asian American/ Indian Americans and having some level of recognition very much like African American History Month where we not just recognizing one person but a group of individuals that have given their time and effort to our community and really made an impact. It's obvious the insidious and almost underlying tones that were used in that argument that we have to highlight that people are giving a significant part to our community.

Chair Stinger: That might fit under the umbrella of Welcoming America where we're focusing on different immigrant's stories and the struggles that they've overcome and the lessons that they have taught us about American values. That will be in September of this year. I'd like to take a

crack at summarizing where we are.

Commissioner Smith: Chair?

Chair Stinger: I'm sorry.

Commissioner Smith: One thing that I want to do is I would encourage this Commission to decouple ethnicity and immigration because by saying a group is an immigrant group, it's two different arguments that they're proposing.

Chair Stinger: Thank you.

Commissioner Smith: So, I would be very careful on as we develop whatever our recommendations are, decoupling those two because one charge is a different kind of energy. There are people that are second generation, third generation of Asian descent in our community, that add value to our community that are not immigrants, and we need to decouple I think that.

Chair Stinger: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: Just to echo that I think our 2016 December Resolution specifically highlighted ancestry and also country of origin and immigration status all as separate items.

Vice Chair O'Nan: I wanted to add that this item, it makes me a little uncomfortable. I'm afraid that Fred Yamamoto and his contribution, not just to Palo Alto but to our country, kind of got made into a symbolic issue and set off kind of an internal battle between the Japanese American community and the Chinese American community locally. I think I would like to see the Commission focus on this broader issue you know of why was there so much animosity around that between those two different Asian cultural groups? I'm not sure turning Fred Yamamoto into a symbol is going to really address the root of that problem which is a deep, difficult problem that needs to be handled with a great deal of sensitivity. I just want us to be aware of that not that Fred Yamamoto wasn't an American hero because he was and he was a Japanese American who experienced the internment camps. There's something else bubbling beneath the surface here that could be very appropriate for us to reach out to both those communities about but we need to figure out a way to do that. I don't want to just do a band aide symbolic gesture.

Commissioner Lee: No and that's sort of why I suggested that there might be a more immediate short-term action we could take in response to the school renaming but that there are larger issues. I mean it's not even Japanese American versus the Chinese American issues. It's a bit more nuanced and I think it was very interesting. You know I'm a third generation Chinese American and there are particular segments of say the Chinese immigrant population which held different views. So, there are multiple layers to it which I think are larger issues that I think we need to address. I feel like there needs to be a more immediate perhaps direct response that heals some of the tension that arose in our community in direct response to this but also, as you mentioned, try to tackle some of the larger issues. Of course, we'll be very as sensitive as we can to that.

Commissioner Smith: I think you bring up a great point Commissioner O'Nan, that Asian-American is not a monolithic group. I think however we approach it even in those Chinese descent there is significant differences among different groups. So, I think we have to have a very sophisticated approach and I think just highlighting Fred Yamamoto as the Asian is probably the worst thing we can do. I think looking for people from different backgrounds and different things and making it more of a broader – meeting different constituencies would be a better approach and a little bit more sophisticated instead of a very black and white approach.

Commissioner Kralik: I just wanted to know if someone could edify me on how this Commission came to consider honoring this individual. Was this individual someone who lived out the values that the Commission is meant to support in terms of the local community? I had trouble with this and I didn't know if this was really within our purview as a Human Relations Commission. Perhaps because I wasn't edified on his story so maybe someone who proposed this might edify us about that?

Commissioner Lee: Did we want to do that now or I'd be happy to maybe at a further meeting or offline.

Chair Stinger: Offline, that would be really...

Commissioner Smith: Can I say it would be good to get it on the record for the Commission and so that (crosstalk)...

Commissioner Kralik: Yes, just in brief.

Commissioner Smith: ... so that if anybody every looks back they know why we did this.

Commissioner Kralik: Yes, why is it that this person was brought out as...

Commissioner Lee: Sure, so in the process of the school district trying to rename two of the middle schools, they looked at various historical Palo Altans who made significant contributions. So, Fred Yamamoto was a second-generation Japanese- American, went to Palo Alto High School, served in the US Army, was interned so it's sort of his service despite the fact that he was classified as other during WWII which led the School Renaming Committee unanimously recommend him for one of the renaming schools.

Vice Chair O'Nan: He died in action...

Commissioner Lee: He died in action.

Vice Chair O'Nan: ... during WWII. Despite having been interned he still fought for this country.

Commissioner Lee: As a result of that recommendation a diverse arose in our community of those of both Japanese and Chinses descent who supported it and those who didn't. The School Board ended up not adopting that as one of the recommended names out of that though both

groups had this idea that perhaps we should honor him in a different way. One example that they gave was renaming a City park after him and so...

Commissioner Kralik: Is that something that we do?

Commissioner Lee: Well certainly the City would have the purview to name of its parks after something and that recommendation could come from the Commission.

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think that recommendation I think when we've talked about this in the past that Members of the Human Relations Commission could be in dialog with Members of the Park and Recreation Commission. I think that would be more appropriately come from that Commission.

Commissioner Lee: I mean ideally it would be a joint recommendation – well it might be...

Ms. van de Zwaag: It could be a joint recommendation but I would feel very uncomfortable unless there was dialog with the Parks and Recreation Commission. That would be a little bit of an overstep from the Human Relations Commission so it is the Human Relations Commission responding to a situation in the community that's started at the school district...

Commissioner Smith: I...

Ms. van de Zwaag: ... in this instance.

Commissioner Smith: I think Commissioner O'Nan said that at best when you look at the tension in the community it is something that as a Human Relations Commission has to address. It's something that bubbling underneath and I want to pick my words very carefully. In a population that we have not focused on in any significant way as far as how we speak to multiple populations I should say, not a singular but multiple population. So, do I think we need to have a response to the issue? Yes. I don't think just naming a park but I think the Commission needs to have a more in-depth response to this because there are a lot of constituencies that need to come to the table.

Commissioner Lee: Well so I would see this as sort of Step 1 or one of the steps we would take.

Commissioner Smith: Ok.

Commissioner Lee: Certainly, this was an idea that has been floated in the community which seems to have broad consensus on both sides of that particular issue. So, I would see it as one short term immediate action we can do but again the larger issues are things that this Commission needs to address in a sophisticated and concerted effort.

Chair Stinger: I'm going to call this discussion. I think there's still a lot of controversy or uncertainty about that but the idea of folding that response as a short term and a longer term under the Welcoming American; or the inclusive public engagement which was our way of talking about being an inclusive sociality for ethnicities. Extending that might be a way to look at

that more in depth.

Commissioner Smith: I would like to recommend that this becomes its own subgenre because there are a lot of different cultural norms that don't fall under our regular programing. I think it is Commissioner when he said something very insightful at our retreat. He said in my culture we didn't even know how to participate in government or conversation. It's not a simple let's just hold a program for a group. There's has to be a lot of bridge building, relationship building, conversations, getting community leaders, and respected people at the table...

Chair Stinger: I in no way was short cutting the process. I was looking for an inclusive category to be inclusive, to do the work and come back with some in depth thinking about how we are much more thoughtful and rigorous in our approach to the diverse ethnicities in the community. On one hand I'm excited about the way we've gone forward but on the other hand I'm a little scared. This is a huge plate. I would like to propose that we come back to looking at a non-voting liaison position; one is a template for fostering community conversations, partnering with the tech industry and exploring conversations with Stanford, disability issues, and then the ethnicities. I guess I'd like people to indicate their interests in subcommittees and we use this time between July and September to look at more proposals. I think we may find that our plate is to full but we would benefit by having some more in-depth work or some more in-depth ideas. So, looking at what would be the goal, the mission, and the vision if you will and then what would be some options to go forward. Maybe the upside and downside of different options but know more commitment than that. Does that make sense? Do you think we could do that?

Vice Chair O'Nan: I'm not sure I understand you.

Chair Stinger: I'd like to have people express their interests in those five categories.

Commissioner Smith: I ended up with four categories.

Chair Stinger: Oh, did I count wrong? I'm sorry.

Commissioner Smith: We have the HRC liaison position with PAUSD.

Chair Stinger: That's one.

Commissioner Smith: We have the community meeting three times year.

Chair Stinger: Two.

Commissioner Smith: We have the partner with tech and gender equity joined together because we're going to reach out to Cynthia Lee. Then we had the response to the Yamamoto and then engage with immigrant and ethnic communities as the last one.

Vice Chair O'Nan: Also my ADA.

Commissioner Smith: And your ADA, I'm sorry. I marked that as a personal research project

because you had asked for responses on who was going to do them and you had already committed to it.

Vice Chair O'Nan: Right but the full Commission – oops. The full Commission would then have to respond to whatever I bring back so it will end up being on our plate.

Commissioner Smith: Ok.

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think what Chair Stinger is looking for and for the new Commissioners, in the past we've had kind of a just a simple worksheet when you had work plan items; like what are you thinking of doing? What resources would you need? What format where you thinking about? It was just a way of having the subgroups think through something that is a suggestion to see how really feasible it is. So, I think at this point using that form but really honing in on what you would like to do and then with the understanding you would bring that back in September. At that point there's still may be some hard conversations saying ok, you've flushed it out a little bit, thanks for sharing that. We can only take on two of those or we can take on three of those or if someone has a passion to do all that extra work but I think that the commitment is now. I think it's good that we've compressed some together. I think once we have a sense of a deeper depth, you know the scope of times something would take, and to look at it a little more fully. I think at that point you'd be able to make a better decision to say you know, that sounded like a great idea. Thank you for flushing it out. I don't think we could take that on this year or you know what? Let's look at it mid-year because something else we thought of might not take as much time or it just may not happen.

Chair Stinger: I think you'll remember at the retreat when we were asked what things we need from the Commission. I said I needed some boundaries that I'm app to take on more than I can really manage or well I'm just apt to say yes when I need somebody to point out the limitations. Given that, if I'm afraid about the amount of work that we're looking at I think it says something. Each of these is so important and I'd really like to give it a try. So, if you would indicate your first choice and your willingness to serve on other Committees.

Vice Chair O'Nan: Could I just add one thing, Chair?

Chair Stinger: Please.

Vice Chair O'Nan: About the second category which is developing a format for the community conversations to be held three times a year. That's something I feel the entire Commission has to buy into. Normally we operate on a subcommittee level and two or three people work on a project but that's a huge community facing project. It's too big of a burden to dump on two or three people. Basically, the way I see it is we would as a Commission have to come up with a template and then probably two of us at a time would have to agree to do one of those events. You know you're up, we're up, you're up and then we're done so nobody would have to do it more than once a year...

Chair Stinger: I think that...

Vice Chair O'Nan: ... but pretty much everybody would have to agree to take a turn. Either to be planning it, leading it, wing manning it, you know whatever you want to call it. If – it can't just be like the same two or three people all the time doing that project.

Commissioner Lee: My understanding was that the Committee would form the format of it but they wouldn't necessarily plan the three events.

Chair Stinger: That was my intention.

Vice Chair O'Nan: Oh ok, that – yes but – ok, that would be ok.

Commissioner Smith: I have...

Chair Stinger: The question you raised is the question we will ask in September. Do we have...

Commissioner Smith: The bandwidth. I have a question for staff. Two summers ago, we did a whole research project on how to do community meetings.

Ms. van de Zwaag: We did it for a very specific type of community meeting but there's lessons learned from that.

Commissioner Smith: There was about 50 or 30 examples if I remember correctly.

Ms. van de Zwaag: There were, yes. Very specific to having community conversations on issues of bias and...

Commissioner Smith: Is there any way that we can use that research as...

Ms. van de Zwaag: Certainly.

Commissioner Smith: ...the foundational piece...

Ms. van de Zwaag: Certainly.

Commissioner Smith: ...because there was – I don't remember the details of it but I do remember there was a lot of a different format in there to start the discussion.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Right and the intern wrote a report on the different formats that we still have somewhere.

Chair Stinger: Ok.

## V. Reports from Officials

## 1. Commissioner Reports

Chair Stinger: I would like to skip Item 2 and move to Reports from Officials. Commissioner

reports?

Vice Chair O'Nan: Well I'd like to remind everybody that Kara, which is one of our new HSRAP grantees, is a non-profit that does grief counseling, has an annual summer camp for children who have lost a parent or a sibling. The camp is free, it's funded by a private grant and we have been all invited to go up to camp. It's called Camp Erin, it's up in Livermore, I believe it's July 21<sup>st</sup> and so Jim Santucci the Executive Director of Kara would welcome any and all Human Relations Commissioners who would like to visit. We will get a VIP tour of the camp and get to see the kids at some of their activities. I think we have to go in the morning and then we have lunch there and then I think it's until early afternoon I believe. So, I have not yet responded to Jim's invitation but I'm going to see if I can clear my schedule for that Saturday and go. So, if anyone wants to go and possibly carpool. Please keep it in mind and hopefully at least a couple of us can make it up there.

Commissioner Smith: What was the date?

Vice Chair O'Nan: I think it's July 21st, Saturday.

Chair Stinger: I have two things to mention. First a reminder that August 20ths is our – isn't it on? Is August 20<sup>th</sup> is our Council date and all are welcome and expected to support the recommendations that came out of the Commission this winter as we take them to Council. The other is good news. As former Commissioner Mehdi Alhassani listened to the presentation from La Comida, he noted that they wanted a van to transport food from one site to another and he worked within Palantir to get a van donated to La Comida. So, we will think Palantir and Mehdi or Commissioner Alhassani in May – in September. Those are my two updates. Any other Commissioner reports?

## 2. Council Liaison Report

Chair Stinger: Council Liaison, anything to say?

# 3. Staff Liaison Report

Chair Stinger: Staff?

Ms. van de Zwaag: The only thing is I wanted to bring the Commission's attention is to an At Place memo regarding an update on the City's response to the anti-LGBT posters. That is the information that I have to date on this issue. You could read it through and if you have further questions you can feel free to email me. The City is very pleased that the Commission already had a subcommittee in place to address these issues and looks forward to your work on this issue in the upcoming months.

Commissioner Lee: Thank you for putting together that memo. I appreciate it.

# VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, September 13, 2018.

Chair Stinger: We have a holiday in August and we'll reconvene in September. Tentative agenda for that meeting? Items that we'd like included?

Vice Chair O'Nan: Ok so we're not going to discuss liaison roles today so should we do that in September?

Chair Stinger: I did circulate in the materials At Place you're right, thank you Vice Chair O'Nan. I made a first pass at assigning liaisons based on the requests that people had submitted and they're at your place. I think maybe Mary, could you send a contact person...

Ms. Mary Constantino: Oh yes.

Chair Stinger: ...name and I will speak to each of you about the Council liaisons. I don't think need to do that as a Commission.

Ms. van de Zwaag: May I ask a question? So, on the senior dementia friendly we have Vice Chair O'Nan and Commissioner Kralik. May I maybe make a suggestion for Commissioner Kralik to consider being the liaison to Avenidas and that only involves maybe meeting with them once or twice a year to get a sense of what are the senior issues that are important in the community. It's nothing more than once or twice a year so if you want to consider that then we would have each of the positions full. So, I'm not expecting an answer now but I just had that thought.

Chair Stinger: Thank you and we can talk about that off line.

Commissioner Smith: Random question, can we get a contact list of all the Commissioners?

Ms. Constantino: I will forward you the information.

Commissioner Smith: Yes. Thank you.

Chair Stinger: Thank you. We will clearly want to have a debrief on our Council presentation in September and we'll want to look at each of our ongoing projects, the statues of them and the proposals for moving forward on new projects. The other thing that I would suggest is that we have HSRAP coming up in the mid-year and I think we need to do needs assessment, review a survey in September...

Ms. van de Zwaag: Thank you for reminding me. Yes, that needs to be on the agenda to review the manner in which we will do a needs assessment or maybe an in-depth survey to our non-profit providers. I'm glad you wrote that down. I had that but didn't have it on it right now.

Chair Stinger: Anything else?

Ms. van de Zwaag: It's pretty full.

Chair Stinger: It's a very full schedule.

Ms. van de Zwaag: Mary just said you've got like seven items there

Ms. van de Zwaag: ...so we'll need to talk.

Chair Stinger: I was looking at this and thinking I need to ask people how late they can stay.

That's a really...

Commissioner Lee: How about two meetings in September?

Chair Stinger: We will deal with that.

Ms. van de Zwaag: I think we'll need to just judicious in our conversations.

Chair Stinger: I think maybe what I will do is ask a few people to present some ideas and we'll just take a few ideas rather than try to do everything. Unless anybody has any final words we're ready for vacation and I hope you all have a good August. Travel safe.

Vice Chair O'Nan: Thank you Chair.

Commissioner Smith: Thank you, you too.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.