

HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Thursday, June 13, 2019

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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Kralik, Lee, Regehr, Stinger

Absent: Savage, Smith, and Xue

Council Liaison: Council Member Kou

Staff: Minka van der Zwaag, Mary Constantino

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Kralik: The meeting will come to order, it's not 7:02 pm. I want to welcome distinguished guests, our Council Member Lydia Kou.

Council Member Kou: Oh, thank you.

Chair Kralik: Thank you for coming. We'll have the roll call.

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

Chair Kralik: Agenda changes, requests, or deletions? Does anyone have anything they'd like to add; delete?

III.ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Kralik: Ok, we'll move on to oral communications from the public. I don't have any comment cards so we'll proceed to the business of the meeting.

Ms. Minka van der Zwaag, Human Services Manager: Can I just do a quick interjection Chair?

Chair Kralik: Please.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok, I'd like to introduce Kristen O'Kane, she is my new supervisor but was my supervisor in the past. She is the Community Services Department Director and is new...

Chair Kralik: Welcome Kristen.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... to that role but many years with the City in leadership positions.

Chair Kralik: Alright, we're happy to have you here, thank you.

IV. BUSINESS

1. Transportation Learning Series – Presentation by the representative of the City of Palo Alto's Planning and Community Environment

Chair Kralik: This is the Transportation Learning Series Item Number One. It's a presentation by the representative of the City of Palo Alto's Planning and Community Environment and Staff has a discussion. So, please go right ahead.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Great, well I'm really happy to have my two colleagues here; Chantal and Sylvia from City Manager's Office and Transportation Division. So, they are going to come and give us a presentation on the many transportation services that the City offers the community.

Ms. Chantal Gaines: And we have a computer flashing. Good evening, thank you...

Chair Kralik: Tell us a little bit about yourselves when you start your presentation so we know who you are.

Ms. Gaines: Absolutely, thank you for that good tee up. Good evening, thank you for having us here. My name is Chantal Cotton-Gaines and I'm an Assistant to the City Manager for the City of Palo Alto and right now I'm serving as our Manager for Transportation Services while we're recruiting for the Chief Transportation Official. So, we'll talk a little bit when we go into the presentation about where transportation is, etc. but that gives you a context of why I'm sitting here today and I'll let Sylvia introduce herself.

Ms. Sylvia Star-Lack: Hi, I'm Sylvia Star-Lack, Transportation Programs or Planning Manager. I'm not really sure which or both.

Ms. Gaines: Just pick a (inaudible).

Ms. Star-Lack: I oversee the Safe Routes to School Team, Transportation Planning, coordination with regional transportation and planning organizations like VTA, MTC, ABAG, and what else am I doing? Development review; some other things; that's a good list.

Chair Kralik: Well thank you very much for coming and we look forward to the presentation. Go right ahead, please.

Ms. Gaines: Thank you so we have a fairly short presentation. Our understanding was that you guys wanted a little orientation about where we are with transportation as well as to answer

questions that you may have as part of your learning series. So, I'll go through this relatively quickly and then we can just engage in Q&A. So, the first part is we, for the first time, have a couple of pages in the budget book that are solely dedicated to transportation. We previously were part of the Planning and Community Environment Department. The City Manager is working with the City Council through this budget period to pull transportation out to be its own office that reports directly to the City Manager. Some of that is just reflecting the Council priority of transportation over at least the last 6-years. There's been at least one priority each year related to transportation for the Council and some high priority projects and so we're just trying to be responsible and reflective of that. So, if you love going through budget books, the pages most relevant to transportation operations are 283-294 of the proposed budgets. In the pages related to transportation in the budget, we made a Mission Statement and a purpose for transportation. I'll just read it; I don't like reading slides but I'll read these ones. It's fairly short. So, Office of Transportation's Mission is to preserve and enhance the quality of the Palo Alto residents, visitors, and businesses by providing efficient and cost-efficient transportation services for all modes of transportation. Our purpose is to provide the safety of the users of all modes of transportation, reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, address congestion, and reduce through traffic and non-resident parking in Palo Alto neighborhoods, leading to an integrated transportation system that serves local, regional, and intercity travel. So, I read both of those to you just because it hits at the idea that we're trying to think about people movement here in all modes and how we do that most efficiently. The three goals we outlined for this upcoming year because it's a year of transition for us, we tried to set some goals that were realistic knowing that we'll have some key staffing changes happening in the earlier part of this fiscal year. One of which is the Chief Transportation Official, getting that person's role filled. So, we have one role that designing and implementing transportation services that meet the needs of our residents. That's the core of what we do. That's really where everything falls in our work. The second is ensuring that services are delivered efficiently and continue to improve. Trying to really get better metrics that help us understand the services and what improvement would look like. So, we're trying to think about data and things like that. The last one is most important is increasing the professional capacity of the members of our Office of Transportation. Without people, we can't really get the work done and we have some positions that we've requested in the budget and I think they will be there. On Monday we'll see if they stay in there and then we'll be working on hiring those positions, getting those people up to speed, and really just trying to use this year to get our team ready to go. So, the next couple of slides focus on our initiatives, programs, and projects. We have a lot of things in the works, some things that are in the works but changing, and others that are big initiatives that are just good to know about and then our staff development and recruitment activities. The next couple of slides just give more info on that. I'm going to breeze through a lot of these but activities that are previously approved and are in progress are the Safe Routes to School 5-year Plan. That is a really robust program and Sylvia can definitely address any specifics about that. Our citywide traffic signal operations and Middlefield North traffic calming improvements; this is just the day to day work that we're doing. The traffic signals work if they don't work there's a problem, so this is just a lot of the work that our unit is doing on a regular basis. The Council has approved an extension to the Bike and Scooter Share Program. So, we're working on those guidelines and trying to work on getting that implemented. Updating the Transportation Impact Fee, that was just adopted by Council to be more responsive to some of the projects that we know we have coming up. The projects that are being implemented right now; Cal. Ave. Parking Garage and the Charleston/Arastradero

Corridor Project. So those are some of the larger projects that have been approved and are currently underway and some of the things that have been approved and are being re-evaluated; the Bike Boulevard Implementation. What most people know of as Ross Road, the changes there, and we received a lot of community input on that project. We stopped it before finishing Phase One. So, we're getting data and bringing a report back to Council in the fall. That's really trying to have an overview and a conversation about what was implemented and some of the responses and then also focusing on what we will do to implement other parts of that project. The second one is El Camino and Embarcadero Enhanced Bikeway Project. That one's on hold because it relates to our grade separation efforts. Big activities, grade separation, it's essentially separating the road from the rail. That was a short description of that for those that aren't in it every day like me and we have four crossings in Palo Alto that are currently not grade separated. We're doing a lot of work related to trying to get those designed for each of those grade separations. The other one is an evaluation and revisions of the Residential Preferential Parking Program. We have difficulty administering that program and we hear a lot of information from the public about ways we can improve that program. So, we have taken a report to Council recently and are trying to implement some of the recommendations from that report and revising our community engagement process. We learned a lot from the Bike Boulevard experience of things that people would prefer us to do in our community engagement. So, we're using some of those lessons learned to think about how we can engage the community in a way that's most effective for future projects. Then lastly, I mentioned before data collection opportunities. I'm going to turn it over to you just so it's not only me talking.

Ms. Star-Lack: Alright, so the other thing that I oversee is the shuttle. Our shuttles are currently provided by a vendor. The City does not own or operate the shuttles. That contract is coming to an end and we are currently, and have been actually for the past couple years, assessing potential shuttle changes. It could be routes, it could be destinations, and it could be data collection for the shuttle, the whole shuttle program. We are noticing that lately there have been some challenges for the shuttle in terms of reliability. Partly due to increased labor costs and the shuttle's vendor ability to retain drivers because of those costs and also local traffic effects shuttle reliability. Obviously, if we're in a booming economic time we get more traffic and then we have some issues so we're looking at all of that. We're currently in a procurement process to renew the cross-town service that we currently oversee. There's another shuttle in town, the shuttle that goes on Embarcadero, that one is not overseen by us. That is overseen by the Bike Caltrain; basically, through the Joint Powers Board for Caltrain. The one that we are looking at is a crosstown shuttle and so that procurement process will renew the currently cross-town service and will look at a possible extension of the current cross-town route. We're using this procurement to find out how much it costs now because of the increased labor costs that I mentioned. Also, we're looking to price an additional South Palo Alto route on the Charleston/Arastradero corridor and to some new locations. That would potentially start when VTA reduces its current service to Palo Alto once they realign their service when BART opens up to San Jose. So, there's a big service change happening once that BART connection happens.

Ms. Gaines: I believe this is our last slide; just additional information about staff development, ongoing. We're always looking for ways to help our staff be better at their work. We're currently recruiting for the Chief Transportation Official as well as a Senior Transportation Planner who will help with some of the development review and other assignments. Then the two requested in

the budget that are referenced; our Parking Manager to help implement some of those recommendations I previously spoke of as well as a Senior Engineer serving as a manager for engineering staff. That is the end of our formal presentation so we are available to answer any questions and again thank you for letting us been here and present.

Chair Kralik: Thank you, Chantel, thank you, Sylvia. Are there questions from the Commissioners? Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: Hi, thank you so much for coming. I was wondering if you could give us a sense of what are some of the challenges that particular communities within Palo Alto are facing? In particular seniors, folks with limited vision or other disabilities. What are some of the challenges that they are facing? What is the department doing to try to tackle some of those issues and make sure that those folks have the ability to get around town and live very vibrant lives?

Ms. Star-Lack: So, we sometimes will get calls from residents who have those challenges and our shuttle is a fixed route shuttle. So, we end up having to refer to VTA to provide para-transit services. I know that for a while VTA's para-transit services weren't very good. I think their para-transit service is back up and running. So, that's good but our shuttle is a fixed route shuttle run by contractors. So, it is ADA accessible but we don't have a particular disability program for the shuttle.

Commissioner Lee: The folks that are calling you, do they tend to be in a particular area within the City or a particular distance from the existing fixed schedule.

Ms. Star-Lack: No, there's one particular resident who had some vision issues and was using transit to get around. What he actually needed was an audible signal to get across El Camino which is actually not in our jurisdiction. It's actually Caltrans so we worked with Caltrans to get the signal put in for him so that he could take transit and then get to where he needed to go.

Chair Kralik: In your presentation, I didn't see a lot of metric information that would describe your provision of services to how many people. I just wondered are there numbers that we could understand. I'll just give an example; you talked about the bike pads that you had put in. I mean you said you were going to share some information and counting. Is there someone out there who characterizes in numbers how many people use your transportation routes?

Ms. Star-Lack: (inaudible – off mic)

Ms. Gains: Go for it.

Ms. Star-Lack: So, we didn't bring that. One of our challenges is to put all of that data into one location and we are going to do that. We have it by program basically so I know all the numbers on the Safe Routes Program. For example, there are 12,000 students in the Palo Alto Unified School District, fully 1/3 of them arrive by bike to school so that's 4,000 youth cyclists in town which is an outrageous number. When you break it down – so that's K through 12. When you break it down by school level that works out to 45 percent of high school students, 50 percent of

middle school students, and then I forget what the number is for elementary. If you look at that's just biking, so if you look at all active modes so biking, walking, I think we even threw in carpooling and everything. We're at 67 percent I think for the whole district across all the grades. We like to say that we're at Amsterdam levels of biking amongst the youth. If anybody's traveled to Scandinavia or parts of Europe, we have that level of biking and walking but without that level of infrastructure. So, we're always looking to improve the infrastructure for the youth.

Chair Kralik: And how about the shuttle?

Ms. Gaines: So I was going to add on also for other information that we have in terms of data is if we're doing a project in a certain area, we're always going to have infrastructure set up there to do counts. Trying to factor in bike, pedestrian, and vehicular usage of those streets; usually project specific. Within the next year or so we are thinking about what data that we need and I think really trying to enhance that were we can. We realize that we have some data and don't have other pieces of data that would be useful. In terms of the shuttle, we do have ridership information but this past year's ridership information is not our strongest. We had a couple of issues I think that lead to that so as we're doing the procurement process, we are really trying to factor in how to make sure that the vendor that's selected can get us the data that we need because that's a critical number for us to know how we're doing with that program. Of interest, when transportation just had one line as part of the PCE Budget in years prior, the one metric there was the shuttle ridership data. So, for us, if you think of it that way too, it's really important to make sure that we have solid data going forward because we actually can track that over the years to know if we're growing or not in ridership usage.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: I had a couple of questions. First, thank you, having needed the shuttle and used it I really appreciate having the service. Thank you. The first question I had was on the communication around Ross Road. You said you've learned a lot and I wondered what you'd learned because I think that's transferable information. How you get any Committee in the City to get input is difficult and I've wondered what you've learned.

Ms. Gaines: A lot is the high level. One of the pieces of feedback that I think was most useful, two that come top of mind for me. Halfway through the project started doing temporary installations which were things on the street that helped people actually see what it would feel like once the street was completed. We didn't start by doing that and I think that would have maybe given us some earlier insight but it was the hay-wattle I think is what it's called. It started falling apart; Straw- wattle that is what it's called. It started falling apart so in the future we'll try to find something that holds a little more but the idea is a temporary installation that you can touch, see, feel and know when I get here when walking, on my bicycle, in my car, this is how I would have to maneuver this part of the road. That was actually a lesson learned that we applied then to Charleston/Arastradero and it helped in the earlier parts of that project because the staff, working with the community, realized some of the particular design elements were not fully needed as designed. So, they made changed to the design based off people interacting with those temporary pieces. The other thing that we learned is if there's a long period of time between when a project starts and when we break ground, we have to bring the community along with us

better than we did in this particular situation in terms of what are those updates look like, how do we inform people, soon it's coming and here's the design or we're breaking ground in a week. We had ways of notifying the public but we can improve on those. Just so that people can stay aware and know what's going to come before they see the construction crews mobilize and then really start to say wait a second, what's happening on my street; which is when we all really pay attention of course. It's a lesson for us that maybe we need to think of some additional ways to inform people before that happens. So those are just two examples.

Commissioner Stinger: And my second...

Ms. Gaines: Microphone.

Commissioner Stinger: My second question was how do you set your goals for projects? Do you do a strategic plan like interview people in the community? Is it your engineers who top down, bottom up?

Ms. Star-Lack: Yes, it depends on what mode we're looking at so, for example, we have a bike plan that was adopted by the Council in 2012. We've been steadily working to build out what's in that plan. It depends on our signal operations, that's done by our traffic engineers. They are looking to make sure delays are minimized and speeds are maximized if appropriate depending on what the streets are. So, it depends on what it is that we're looking at.

Commissioner Lee: Could I piggyback on that question?

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, let me just comment because I remember that that bike plan was driven a lot by citizen input.

Ms. Star-Lack: Yes, there was a lot.

Commissioner Lee: So, in particular when I come to things like audible crossing signals or having the curbs that folks in wheelchairs can use. What is the process in terms of identifying which intersections are the highest need and setting that schedule given that there are different jurisdictions involved and you alluded to Caltrans dealing with El Camino? So, go to that specific mode, do you go about identifying (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Ms. Star-Lack: Right so it depends on the context. For example, schools that have students with different disabilities might call us and say hey, we need an audible signal for example. I'm just making this up but for example outside Green Middle school because we have a student that needs to get across Middlefield at California and so they'll call us and then we'll figure out how to put it in. We have one person who does signals who does that kind of signal work; you know programming and that person also does a bunch of other stuff too.

Ms. Gaines: Are you talking about 311?

Ms. Star-Lack: Yes, the other way that we do this is through our 311 services; 311 app. I don't know if you have the app on your phone.

Commissioner Lee: Yep.

Ms. Star-Lack: Yes, I use that all the time.

Commissioner Lee: I mean are there particular criteria that you use? Like if you get a 311 ping or someone calls in, how do you figure out whether you're going to actually make that change? I mean I'm guessing you don't have unlimited resources, right?

Ms. Star-Lack: Correct, correct. So, it really depends on context so we're going to try not to put an audible signal in where it's all residential. You know what I mean? If someone needs it, then we will do it but we try to figure out where it makes sense. So, yes, that's probably a better question for our engineer.

Commissioner Lee: And when someone calls and it's on a street not governed by the City like Caltrans, do you...

Ms. Star-Lack: We refer.

Commissioner Lee: ...refer that?

Ms. Star-Lack: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, because I've spoken with at least one agency that deals with folks with disabilities and they don't have a clear sense of if there was a list of intersections that would get either new or updated audible signals. They certainly have their own list of things that they would like to see improved. Some intersections have outdated signals or don't have signals so.

Ms. Star-Lack: Well, they should send us their list.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Regehr, did you have a question? Ok. Alright, does staff? Questions? Ok.

Commissioner Stinger: Can I ask one more question?

Chair Kralik: Sure.

Commissioner Stinger: It might actually question...

Chair Kralik: It will cost you.

Commissioner Stinger: It will cost me. Ok, thank you. This is actually a question for staff. When we did the senior survey, was its input to this?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The shuttle service.

Commissioner Stinger: The shuttle service.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes. I think I told Sylvia and Chantal about that in the email is when they did the shuttle survey 2-years ago? 3-years ago? The Commission met with the former shuttle manager and to really enhance hearing from certain populations in the City. So, the HRC actually did a big push, they went out to at least five to six sites that serve seniors. I think through their efforts they got over 250 additional surveys in from seniors, low-income seniors, non-English speaking seniors, and I know when we went to the presentation by the contractor that was doing the shuttle survey, basically said the highest audience they heard from was seniors and the needs for teens. So, just to let you know, I mean that's a real way in which in the HRC can add value to City Staff is being able to reach out into some of these vulnerable and marginized populations that they have contacts with or have an infinity to serving; to have their voices because just listing it on the City website or even emails out to some of these organizations don't seem to go very far. They have the passion to get the word out.

Chair Kralik: So, I take it you guys would be open to our contacts in the future to identify those needs. Thank you so much for coming. We really appreciate it.

Council Member Kou: Gabe, could I ask a question, please?

Chair Kralik: Oh, sure, please.

Council Member Kou: I was just curious; do you find that the disabled use the shuttle?

Ms. Gaines: I don't have a sense of that but we can try to factor that in for sure for the new contract; to try to see if they can more gradually break that data down for us and we'll see if we have anything from the past.

Council Member Kou: Yes, I was just wondering how the buses would be configured and whether they can accommodate the functional needs persons.

Ms. Gaines: Like a wheelchair?

Council Member Kou: Yes, a wheelchair or even if they're near Abilities United because they're on Middlefield, right, the cross down? So, would there be or do they usually have their own vans? I'm not really sure so that was just something just to clarify.

Ms. Star-Lack: The vans are wheelchair accessible.

Council Member Kou: They are wheelchair...

Ms. Star-Lack: The vans have, yes, we made sure and it's been that way.

Council Member Kou: Oh ok, that's good to know.

Ms. Star-Lack: I can't answer your question about how many...

Council Member Kou: How many, ok; usage, ok, thank you.

Ms. Gaines: Not disclosing information but all the bids we've seen for the new shuttle providers are all talking about the shuttles that have lifts in them as well. I think that was in our RFP.

Ms. Star-Lack: It's a requirement, it's a requirement.

Chair Kralik: Well we feel honored to have you have our guest and thank you so much for informing us. We look forward to contacting you and partnership with the City. Thanks so much.

Ms. Star-Lack: Thanks for your help with the transit survey. Before we are acting on that, that's the document that we're using for our current procurement so your input is actually be acted upon right now. Thanks.

Ms. Gaines: Thank you all, it's been a pleasure.

2. Discussion and input on draft HRC Endorsement Guidelines and Procedures – Stinger and Staff

Chair Kralik: Our next business item is the discussion and input on the draft HRC Endorsement Guidelines and Procedures. We'll ask Staff and Commissioner Stinger to give us some context. As you know we set out with this task to have a set of guidelines and procedures that's and something that also can be followed simply. So, we want to thank Commissioner Stinger and Staff members who put this draft proposal together. I understand there are a number of steps in the consideration of it, including our input. So, Commissioner Stinger and Minka, please go right ahead.

Commissioner Stinger: I'll just make a few comments. I basically took this on because I was voluntold, Chair asked me to do it, and I said I would. Then when I got serious about it, my interest was to leverage partners in the community to extend our outreach but also to qualify the partners that we were working with to make sure that the affiliations were promoting the same values that we were promoting. With working with other groups that are going through the same exercise and it just echoed for me how much there is to be gained by having a consistent, efficient procedure. Just say it quickly that we did look at generic forms from other organizations from the county but basically relied on common sense and experience. This was reviewed by the legal staff. We were process heavy I think my input was basically process heavy but we had some good input from the legal Staff that helped us just focus the direction as well. I'll turn it over to Staff.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Great, Commissioner Stinger has covered some of the things but really the goal was just to have an easy to follow, clear process for when members of the public or Commissioners wanted to bring the items covered by these guidelines forward. We wanted it to be something that was easy enough to once they were done filling out the form, it expended no more than 5 to 10-minutes and that people felt like what they were reading they had a good sense of what was covered, how the review process would handle, and that they felt that it would be a fair and straight forward policy. The HRC has no policy that covered things such as this before.

A couple of years ago the HRC, before maybe some of you were on the Commission, passed a policy to recognized contributions to a supportive community. So, this was more of if there was for instances that there's a local hotel and they always give free space to non-profits when they wanted to meet there or there was an individual in the community that went above and beyond on serving their fellow residents. There was ability by the HRC to recognize that person so that's was the only slightly related policy that we had on the books. As the Commissioner said we tried to think how are we going to go about this? I checked with other HRCs. I did hear back from a fellow HRC and they had not implemented the policy but they had some of their liaison staff think about good questions to ask. So, we really used that as the framework for this policy and just thinking about what are these good questions that are to ask and how do they make sense in the context of Palo Alto HRC with requests that have come before you as all? As far as initial staff, there is internal staff in my department that has looked at it. Legal department didn't really review it, as only just to look it and give some early comments. What we're trying to do at this point is just to get your initial feedback on the document. Valerie and I will be happy to answer any questions. This is just our first and best effort to get your input. Once you have given your input and you feel this is a document that you feel good about then we'll go through internal City review; mainly for the fact that, wanting to check that what's included is under the purview of the HRC's responsibility and processes are correct or how does this align with maybe other endorsement policies that either a City department has or maybe if the Council has a policy. Just so that everything is in alignment. So before it goes through that review, they're really looking to you and say ok, with your suggestions, would this meet your needs and then it will go through those reviews, it will come back to you all, and then we will go from there. I'm not going to go through it and say what do you think about this section, what do you think about this section. I just wanted to open it up to see what you thought and Commissioner Stinger and I are here to answer any of your questions. If you think why did you put that in there or why didn't you put that in there? So, I think I'll stop at that point and just be available for questions.

Chair Kralik: I do have a question about something and really, it's just to ask your explanation of it and that's the process for consideration, the designation of a reviewer. I think it's a wonderful idea; this is something that we talked about. I think as we grappled with it before because there's a limitation on the number of Commissioners that review these things. The Brown Act could come into play if we're all doing it at the same time. So, I really like what you've done here which is you have a set location for the applications to come into the staff and a designated reviewer. I just wondered what's your input about how workable that is? That's something I envisioned which was one person.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, we tried to follow your model.

Chair Kralik: Sure.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You had talked about the reviewer concept. I think this is one of those things where we all need, to be honest. It's like the Emerging Needs Funds where it looks really good on paper and we might have to test it out for a little bit to see in practicality how it works and if there's tweaking to this part of it. We might come back to the Commission after 4 to 6-months and say hey, this part is working, this part isn't working. The thought really was to follow your directions saying ok, if someone reviews it and just as far as to qualification. If it's something

simple that doesn't need to go back to the HRC, let them work with staff and approve that application. If it was something a little more involved then it comes back to the full Commission to be reviewed. Like I say, going off of your leadership here and we are hopeful that this process works. What we were hoping not to do is, like with the Emerging Needs Fund, every time there's an application having to call two people together and scheduling and that. Since that's a quarterly deadline that isn't really burdensome but depending on the volume of applications, we get we don't think having a system where you have to call multiple people together to do a first pass on this. Theoretically, I mean I can do a first pass on this and then have it go to the HRC but the real hope for this process is to empower the HRC and give that role to a Commissioner who wanted to serve in that capacity.

Chair Kralik: When you go to the detail of receiving these applications, I mean is there something you envision in terms of a website submittal or how do you anticipate people would approach?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Pretty low key, it's on the back page. It's either email it to Mary, fax it to us or mail it to us. We would have a system of logging everything we get in, making a designation for the outcome whether it's by the reviewer or the full HRC. If there are communications that needs to take place with any of the applicants, staff would take care of that. We definitely would have a clear list of who has applied.

Chair Kralik: That's nice, thanks so much.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok, thank you.

Commissioner Regehr: I have just a question because I'm new, what is action? It's on here saying action; does that mean we're voting on it?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, I hear you. The action tonight could just be to be in agreement to send your collective comments onto to be reviewed. At one point the thought was perhaps the HRC if they were ready to make changes and approve them but as I went through internal review it became apparent that that review needed to happen after the input of the HRC. So, tonight there will be no action or you can consider that your action will be to send your collective comments on. At times there are things that are listed on action on the agenda, that does not require you to take an action or you'll be in violation of the agenda.

Commissioner Regehr: Ok, that (inaudible) and then how do I know when we're voting on something that's not action? Does it – you know what I'm saying?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Usually if the Commission does not plan on making a decision, often it will just say discussion as you see on Agenda Item Number One.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, ok.

Chair Kralik: Any thoughts about the proposal?

Commissioner Regehr: I just have a couple of questions since I am new.

Chair Kralik: Please.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm just trying to figure out are we creating a problem – what is the problem? Why are we doing this?

Ms. van der Zwaag: What I heard is that when requests came in, the problem this is trying to solve is that a couple of things. One is that all requests that come in, whoever makes them can feel like they are being considered and reviewed in a consistent, straight forward, and fair process. So, it's not like oh, this year someone from the public came and asked the HRC to consider this Resolution or this year someone on the Commission asked for something to be considered and it didn't get on the agenda or it took two meetings to decide. Last year it only took one meeting to decide. The feeling was that it would be a really good idea to say ok, what are the types of requests that come before this group? What are the ways in which this group and even staff wrote this, this is your policy? I just did this as a service to you. This is for your input. What works best for the Commission? What information does the Commission need and what kind of guidelines does the Commission want to set down to consider these types of requests? So, that everyone who makes them knows ahead of time and during the process what's going to happen and that it's in a straight forward and consistent manner.

Chair Kralik: So, I guess to that I might add to that. So, the premise of the question is that there was a problem. In fact, it's a little bit different from my point of view and that is as a new Chair I have the initiative of wanting to have robust recognition in the community of events, folks, and organization that live out the mission of the Human Relations Commission. I have three proposals here, one is that it be a robust program, that it be workable, and that it be fair. I want it to be systematic about this because in the past it has not been robust. There hasn't been a lot of recognition and we have wonderful groups who deserve it. I want to have out Commission put its imprint in the community on those groups, individuals, and events. So, it's more an initiative than it is a problem. It's a change of direction if you will and maybe Commissioner Stinger might want to give her impressions as the former Chair about it too because she also drafted it. Your thoughts about why we put together that program other than I asked you.

Commissioner Stinger: I really thought of it in the context of other organizations that I'm part of, going through the same exercise that a lot of partnerships are proposed. I really like your language; robust; workable; fair. To be able to make sure that that partnership helps us promotes our mission and that our partner is constantly respected in the community. That we're choosing our partners well. That quite didn't make sense. I'm trying to say that we serve ourselves and that we are careful about who we partner with so there are no unintended consequences.

Commissioner Regehr: So, has there been a problem where we're affiliating ourselves – I mean I'm just trying to figure out – being that I'm new but also that this is my background. Community Studies was my major in college and this is what I've always worked my entire life on is getting community involvement. You don't make a robust community by having them fill out a form that's in English. You are not going to get a robust community involvement by filling out a form. That's my own worry is, was there problems in the past that are making us...

Chair Kralik: Well, that's why we have you here.

Commissioner Regehr: I mean I'm just concerned that this is...

Chair Kralik: No, that's a great concern and it's important to express it. I think you should be open about it because I think one of the questions that I how are you going to receive the input. What you're identifying is that without really intending it, it this program may not meet the needs that we've set out because the forms too difficult. It may not be in the number of languages and that's a great input. So, that's why your thoughts are very welcome.

Commissioner Regehr: Thank you and I was just concerned about the work meaningful. I don't know you didn't want to nitpick but I trust who we all are but the times changed and what is going to be meaningful? That's really not our role is to be meaningful, it's also to be non-discriminatory. What might not be meaningful to one person might be meaningful to the other commissioner or do you know what I'm saying? Is that we have one Commissioner and it's a 1-year term...

Chair Kralik: So, just be more specific with your thoughts. You're looking at something that says one Commissioner and you said that you're looking at something that's meaningful. Where are you looking just so that we can follow?

Commissioner Regehr: I'm reading on key objectives, to reach in the community and the second point, to provide a meaningful support.

Chair Kralik: Ok and your thought would be to say?

Commissioner Regehr: I think having someone that has a passion and then we say fill out this form and we'll get back to you is...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can you say what you mean by have a passion because it's not the role of the HRC to say oh, you have a program. The HRC support might be, for instance, the League of Women Voters just had an event, a local event, and they were looking to see if the HRC might want to endorse the event to further the reach of the HRC to work on issues of implicit bias. So, they would have come to us and say is the HRC willing to endorse the event? A little over a year ago for several meetings, we had groups that say oh, will the HRC consider this Resolution and the HRC was a little bit taken aback. They said, ok, a Resolution, ok so what should we do first? Should we have the person come and speak to our meeting? Should we do this, should we do that? So, for me it's more of looking at some of these issues that have already – it's not like the HRC is going to be seeking out programs into the community to support ongoing programs or having those people come to us. It's looking at some of the situations that they have been approached with and finding a way to say ok when these types of approaches happen, we know the process that we will take to consider it. So, if someone says hey, will the HRC consider this local Resolution where the Palo Alto helps the Homeless Collation and in 2-months it's going to be Help the Homeless Month. Will the HRC pass a Resolution for Help the Homeless Month? Then the HRC just consistently knows if you come to us with those kinds of requests these are the three things we're going to do to consider that. In the past, it was like well, what do we do?

How do they come to us? Do we have to ask the Council for permission if it's just ours? So, it's just trying to think through some of those situations and...

Commissioner Lee: So, this is not an issue of publicity, its people who know that they can come to us with these requests.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, I don't except that this is going to be anything that's going to be in the paper and say hey, the HRC is doing this, please come to us. This is to give a voice and process to things that you have experienced in the past and when they've come to you, I know in the leadership team it's like well, how do we do this? Do we need to do this and this and this? This might be a page and a half too long. We were given an assignment and I know I expressed a desire to initiate this. I will clearly speak to that. I've been thinking about doing this for a couple of years but I'm not wedded to it being two pages. I just think if you want to say these are the five steps that the HRC will follow so that if this does happen people can say oh, we know what to do.

Chair Kralik: The word meaningful, Commissioner Regehr, is one that I think we would welcome your comments on if there's another word; thoughtful or logistically supportive. It could be a number of different things but I think your close reading of this document is very welcomed. Commissioner Lee, go right ahead, please.

Commissioner Lee: For me I think that the way that the process should be in my opinion is if a group or person comes to the Commission or comes to an individual Commissioner and says we'd like the Commission to get involved with this; whether it's a letter of support, a Resolution, or a combination of some sort. I believe that there can be a very simple process for this. If there are one or two Commissioners who strongly support what that group is asking for, I think two Commissioners saying this is important to be on the agenda. I think that should mean that it's on the agenda and that could take different forms depending on what is being asked. In some cases, I may feel comfortable writing a Resolution in support of the topic that was brought to me. In other situations that group may have a Resolution that they want us to consider. In other cases, I may want to learn more about what they want us to take a position on and so I may want to schedule a learning series or a presentation of some sort. So, I think it's really on the onus of the individual Commissioner, two Commissioners, who the item was brought to or whoever. In the case where they come in public comment and present something to us if there are one or two of us who really resonates with what they are asking. I think the process, as it is or could be, is robust enough to enable us to put those things on the agenda. To be honest, over the last couple months I've tried to bring things to the Commission for consideration and I felt like they have just not been placed on the agenda. In my understanding of how things worked in practice was that if two Commissioners supported something it should be on the agenda.

Chair Kralik: Yes, let me answer that because I think part of leadership is, we've addressed some of those issues and we had trouble practically because as you were circulating some of these issues, gaining support from one member or another. The next thing that happened is we took it up in the leadership meeting and we had two other people who are on the Commission serving in leadership and it became impractical. So, the workability aspect of this program was really designed to facilitate, not to stop what you had. Now you have conflated two issues which is the

issue of putting something on the agenda and I don't think this changes that at all. It is a recognition policy and it's talking about how to be robust and fair and workable. The specific thing that happened the first time I had a leadership meeting was that we had four Commissioners that had reviewed and commented on a Resolution that you had drafted; which ended up with our contact in the City for legal advice as to whether or not we had violated the Brown Act. What that engendered was the inability to proceed with the item that you had suggested.

Commissioner Lee: Well, we actually did proceed with it in a different form though.

Chair Kralik: But we did not put it on, the Resolution and so what we decided was we need to be fair to Steve Lee. We need to get his... (crosstalk)

Commissioner Lee: I mean I guess what I'm saying (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: ...energies supplemented into a process that's going to be robust.

Commissioner Lee: I mean I think this process contemplates things being on the agenda, right? I mean if the Commission is going to take a position on something to support group it needs four members of the Commission to support it at a public meeting. So, the question is, how do we want to get it to the Commission? My understanding of prior practice is that if two Commissioners wanted something, it would be on the agenda. That's what I did but then when it got to leadership, my understanding was that there were some questions about whether we wanted it on the agenda. So, it ended up involving unintentionally more people than the two that I thought was needed to get it on the agenda.

Commissioner Regehr: Can I ask a question? Sorry.

Chair Kralik: Well, in any event, what I'd like to say to you is that the intent of it is actually to supplement your energies to be more effective at handling your requests (crosstalk)

Commissioner Regehr: Can I ask a question.

Chair Kralik: Well in any event.

Commissioner Lee: I don't question your intent. (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: I think conflation though; the conflation though is not there. This does not change the two-person agendizement of issues at all. Go ahead, please.

Commissioner Regehr: I just want to ask a question because I didn't see anything about who leaders are. I don't understand this leadership team.

Chair Kralik: Yes, that's something that we have to orient you to the Commission.

Commissioner Regehr: Well, there's nothing in here about a leadership team in here. This is the handbook and I'm just concerned that there are only seven of us and I don't...

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's just the title that used for the Chair and the Vice Chair when they meet with staff to do agenda planning.

Commissioner Regehr: So, two but you said four Commissioners.

Chair Kralik: Well, Steven is talking about a specific item that created a problem and it's road blocked him unintentionally.

Commissioner Lee: So, let me explained what happened, so I had drafted a Resolution for Lunar New Year. I had asked Commissioner Xue if he would be my second Commissioner on it. At the time that I forwarded it to leadership, we had two members of the Commission who were interested in doing it. I believe subsequently Commissioner Xue was uncomfortable with it so I sought out a second Commissioner but because the Chair and Vice Chair had discussed it in leadership that created four total; myself; Commissioner Xue; the Chair; Commissioner Smith. If we had a process in place that said any time there are two it would automatically be on the agenda, what should have happened is if Commissioner Xue had withdrawn his support I sort of would have had the ability to go to one other Commissioner without any Brown Act Implications. So, my (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Let's not conflate the issues, Steven...

Commissioner Lee: Sure, but my recommendation (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: ... and we've got to keep this short because...

Commissioner Lee: My recommendation for the process moving forward is I disagree with the idea that we have one Commissioner vetting all of these things.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Commissioner Lee: I don't want that process to be a screen to things that the Commission may consider because you know one Commissioner may think something is appropriate or not appropriate whereas the majority of the Commission may think the opposite.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Chair Kralik, Council Member Kou would like to say something.

Chair Kralik: Please, go right ahead.

Council Member Kou: So, I think this is very similar to what Council has in terms of an idea coming forward or something requested by the public. What you do is if you're going to write a – it's going to be similar to a Colleague's Memo. So, what you do is you write it and you ask for a second person in order to support you on it but that's it. That's it. You hand it over to staff, staff goes through what they need to do, and then it comes back on and it's for the entire group to

decide. So, but now what I'm hearing is that it comes back no matter what and then the group decides whether to move it forward or not. Is that how...

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's how right, so this is a draft so if the process for consideration does not meet the needs of the HRC, that certainly could be changed. I still would advocate for a process that everybody could look at and say I know once I do X, Y will happen but if the thought of this group is that every single application – just once people look at this and go, oh yes, what am I looking for? I'm looking for the HRC to endorse that event. Ok, this will cover that. Ok, oh gosh, they won't provide free space, that's too bad. Ok, let me fill this out, let me give it to them, and then if the goal is that it gets straight on the agenda and that's the will of the full Commission, that's fine. In theory does a Commissioner themselves need to fill out this form? No, they could do it through the agenda-setting process but I was hoping just for a common agreement that says ok, yes, these items are to be covered. Those are the limitations, these are the criteria, and we've all agreed to do that, let's go forward. So that...

Council Member Kou: And basically, not to reinvent the wheel every single time.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Not to reinvent the wheel so that next quarter – what I don't want to happen as staff is that one Chairperson has a real liberal view of something. Next year the Chair is a little stricter with the agenda and there's some common understanding ok, what will we look at?

Commissioner Lee: Well, the words can change depending on the conversation of the Commission. That concern doesn't go away by having the policy because policy can change. You know if we get two new Commissioners, they can change the policy.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well, they can request that it be agendize.

Chair Kralik: Can we recognize Commissioner Stinger, please?

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, there were two points of clarification. This is directed to events that somebody external to the Commission wants to support. So, I think it's separate from one of us saying we want to recognize.

Commissioner Lee: So, for instance, the ABCs of LGBTQ event that they planned at Fletcher. If one of the Commissioners wanted to co-endorse that event, would that go through this process or no?

Commissioner Stinger: That would have to come from that group.

Chair Kralik: That specific item did not have a second if I recall. Staff?

Ms. van der Zwaag: No but what we're saying in this policy is that if that's the will of this group we're saying that if that specific event at Fletcher wanted the HRC to co-endorse it, they need to ask for it. That the HRC could not just say hey, I know about this, let's endorse that. I know about that, I endorse that. The group has to actually ask for them to be endorsed. Not that they find out oh, look, the HRC endorsed our event and they didn't request it. When I had a

conversation with another HRC about this, the concern they had is the HRC themselves will only know about certain events because we only have feelers in so many communities. So, what if it was just events in the LGBT and the African American community that you heard about and those were the ones that you endorse because you were endorsing that without that group asking for an endorsement. Other groups in the community can say wait a minute; they've never reached out offer their endorsement to us. So, the subcommittee and the advice that we got from other Commission is if groups in the community have an event that they would like the HRC to endorse, they need to request it.

Commissioner Lee: But they would... (crosstalk)

Ms. van der Zwaag: The precaution is we should not be going out and saying hey, we'll endorse your event without having a real partnership in the event. If you're on the Planning Commission but just not hey, I heard about that event, we should co-sponsor that.

Commissioner Lee: (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Excuse me, let me just recognize...

Council Member Kou: Excuse me.

Chair Kralik: Yes, let's recognize Commissioner Regehr, she has a follow-up question.

Commissioner Regehr: So that was my original question and it was saying there wasn't really any problem so obviously there have been problems. I feel that our job is for the community. I mean that's what our designation is, it's for the community, and to be honest hardly anybody in the community knows about the Human Relations Commission. So, my point is that I think just saying that we're doing our job promoting Human Relations Commission and what we do. So, to all of a sudden to put it on organizations to say, who might not even know that we exist or might not feel that their event is meaningful. They might not even apply because one they don't know about us and two I think that was a problem, which was my original question.

Chair Kralik: We're going to go ahead and wrap up with one final question. I'd just like to say one thing about the discussion and that is we've been talking about being robust and one of the things that this process does is it doesn't require a single Commissioner to ask for this endorsement. It's any member of the public, single member of the public, and I think that is a lot more community based than having the suggestion of one or two Commissioners who know certain groups. This is input that is broad and open.

Commissioner Lee: The community can each come to either one of us and ask us to put it on the agenda, right?

Chair Kralik: Yes, and also but this opens it up to the community.

Commissioner Lee: By publicizing it.

Chair Kralik: Well, just by the fact that all they have to do is request so it's much broader. I'll have one final comment each Commissioner because we're going to move onto our next agenda (crosstalk)

Commissioner Lee: Can I ask for some clarification from Council Member Kou? In terms of how the Council does things, hypothetically you and Council Member DuBois wrote a Colleague's Memo; staff does its job; it gets agendize. At any point does the Mayor or Vice Mayor, do they weigh in or change your Colleague's Memo or determine when it's on the agenda? How does that work?

Council Member Kou: I just want to first preference it by saying that HRC itself as a Commission, there may be guidelines and protocols that is set forth by the Human Relations Commission from the past. I haven't read those. On the Council itself, naturally when a Colleague's Memo does go through, yes it's vetted by the City Manager, by the City Attorney, and there are a lot of changes that go through it before it gets onto a calendar.

Commissioner Lee: Well, do the original authors have to say oh I agree with this change or can the City Manager make a lateral change (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Council Member Kou: They make suggestions on changes in order for it to go through but I don't know. First and for most, I think that the Human Relations needs to have their own set of rules. They might mirror it in some way to what Council does; however, I think that you still go by the guidelines and protocols that are stated for you in your Policy Book and to have staff as your guides. Secondly, I just want to say I was hearing and I was starting to get concerned that it sounded like maybe one HRC Commissioner would go out and advocate for something and then put the HRC's name on it. I certainly hope that is not so.

Commissioner Lee: No, that's not the case.

Council Member Kou: I mean I was hearing that and I just want to make sure that that has not happened because then it would not do well.

Commissioner Lee: Let me just address that. I make it really clear in all of my individual work that I am speaking as an individual Commissioner. I go out of my way to add disclaimers to everything that I say and on my public Facebook page. If people mis-interrupt it as such and I hear about it, I correct it but when individual Council Members go and advocate on a particular issue. The assumption should be that it's that individual Council Member as opposed to (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Ok, we want to stay on point to the – Steven...

Commissioner Lee: In terms of the Mayor and Vice Mayor...

Chair Kralik: We need to...

Commissioner Lee: ... though can you elaborate as to are they involved in the Colleague's

Memo process at all?

Council Member Kou: They're not involved. We'd be having a Brown Act violation if they're... Commissioner Lee: So, my suggestion would be...

Council Member Kou: Leadership, leadership, which is the Mayor and the Vice Mayor, they do discuss the agenda.

Commissioner Lee: So, they get to decide when it happens?

Council Member Kou: Yes, I mean the agenda is set by them and the staff. When they have more priority stuff...

Chair Kralik: Steven, we're getting... (crosstalk)

Commissioner Lee: My final thought would be that we mirror the Colleague's Memo structure that would be my final comment.

Chair Kralik: Alright, thanks. Alright, Commissioner Regehr final comment.

Commissioner Regehr: My final comment

Chair Kralik: You can go ahead, please.

Commissioner Regehr: My final comment, if this is my final comment? We're never going to addressed again.

Chair Kralik: No, no, no, we got to end the meeting item.

Commissioner Regehr: No, I mean is this going to be addressed again?

Chair Kralik: I think we'll do it in a second. We're...

Council Member Kou: Turn on your microphone.

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, I'm sorry, thank you. I guess my concern is the process for consideration. I don't think that's going to bring a robust.. The robust – if you could answer how you think this is going to be robust getting the community involved? Is that a problem in the past, nobody's been involved or? So, I had a question, it wasn't final.

Chair Kralik: Right, sure, good question.

Commissioner Stinger: Good question. I just wanted to react to a couple of things that I heard. I think your comment about HRC being unknown is really valid but I want to separate promotion of what we accomplish and what we are trying to do from our endorsement of events. I think we need to work on both but they aren't necessarily interwoven. I wanted to comment on the

Colleague's Memo. I understand that to be something more topical of an issue to Council they need to bring two or three Council Members to bring it forward. Such as a Colleague's Memo that you brought forward, was it this past Monday? I'm getting my weeks confused. That was a real issue for discussion and there's some real meat in there. This is more of an endorsement of a subsequent event and so I think that they're two separate conversations and then finally, the meaningful support. There's a strategy in a linguistic or a word choice and you can challenge both of them. By meaningful, what I was hoping to communicate there was that the rigger of the process would mean that if the HRC's logo was on a League event or a Lunar New Year event, it would communicate something. We have a way to go, you're right, to make that meaningful. If it's just you get it and you print it, it's like a bubble gum machine. You just ask for it and you get it. It dilutes the meaningfulness of it or value of it. There's also a chance that we would do something quickly and associate with an organization that had a political agenda or a candidate's approval. We'd get ourselves into a situation where we did not belong and I want to avoid...

MOTION #1

Chair Kralik: Let me suggest a motion for the Commission meeting here tonight. The motion would be that each of the individual Commissioners submits their comments to staff regarding this draft policy for staff to review and consider along with Commissioner Stinger. Can I get a second to that motion?

SECOND

Commissioner Stinger: I would second that.

Chair Kralik: Ok, any discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Lee: So, I don't understand why that needs a motion? If folks have thoughts, they can send them to staff, right? Are you asking that we bring it back at another meeting?

Chair Kralik: I'm just asking that we have a motion that Commissioners can review and provide comments on this draft to staff.

Commissioner Lee: That doesn't require a motion though. Am I wrong or?

MOTION AMENDED

Chair Kralik: But the point of making the motion is to formally indicate that we have reviewed it as a Commission and to set up the process so that we can present a second draft. So, maybe I can amend it by saying the motion would also be for staff and Commissioner Stinger to present a second draft of this policy based on those comments at our next meeting.

Commissioner Lee: To the Commission?

Chair Kralik: To the Commission.

Commissioner Lee: Is it your intention that the City Manager's Offices and City Attorney's Office review it again or would they wait until we talked about it?

Chair Kralik: Let me get a second on that motion and then we can have that discussion. Just would you second that?

Commissioner Stinger: Sure, second.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, the...

Commissioner Stinger: The second holds.

Chair Kralik: Ok, alright.

Ms. van der Zwaag: My intention with staff would not for it to be routed internally until the document reflected the wished of the HRC.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, that's fine.

Chair Kralik: All in favor?

MOTION #1 FAILED 2-2

Chair Kralik: Ok so we have a 2-2 vote. It didn't carry.

Ms. van der Zwaag: It didn't carry so.

Chair Kralik: I'm not sure where we are on the policy at this point. I guess we just have to move forward with something else as a...

Commissioner Stinger: Can I make a second...

Chair Kralik: Motion? Sure.

MOTION #2

Commissioner Stinger: ... motion? That we first take it at a top level and decide whether we want a policy to guide our response to organizations in the community to come to us...

Chair Kralik: I thought we did that and I thought we voted on asking you and the staff to create the policy and to present it.

Commissioner Stinger: Ok.

Chair Kralik: So, we've (crosstalk) taken that step already and that's the end result so.

MOTION #2 WITHDRAWN

Commissioner Regehr: Can I just say thank you for both of you and thank you for the work.

Commissioner Stinger: Oh, that's ok. No, I'm trying to decide what the next step is.

Chair Kralik: Well, we'll have to think about that. At this point, it's stopped.

MOTION #3

Commissioner Lee: I would make a motion that the Committee of one, I guess Commissioner Stinger consider a policy that incorporates elements of the Council's Colleague's Memo process. I hear what you're saying in terms of it's used for more substitutive things but I think it can be useful here. To consider that process as well as what is it today? The tradition of having two Commissioners put something on the agenda.

Ms. van der Zwaag: And I hear you Commissioner Lee and I'm trying to understand this from your lens. I almost think by adopting that you're actually making it harder on yourself in the end because Colleague's Memos are really for a substantive issue. A lot of these things are just not substantive issues; it's just to have a process. Let's check five boxes and it will go forward and everybody checks the same five boxes and it gets forward and you put something on the agenda, you get a second. Colleague's Memos, they're significant work. I would ask Council Member Kou and Council Member DuBois the amount of time they spent on that Colleague's Memo. Probably up to 50-60 hours just on that issue and I think that concept is really great for your programs and initiatives. I was actually going to suggest that for the retreat this Saturday, as a way of really thinking about and bringing substantive issues to the HRC. I see this as if you want to have a Resolution on the agenda, you still only need that second but there's just this framework that is given to this. So, I think this sets a little bit of framework to it but my concern is you're actually going to make it more difficult.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, I...

Chair Kralik: Yes, Steven, we need to move onto the next item.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, fine.

Chair Kralik: I think discussing something, not on the agenda is probably not what we want to do.

Commissioner Lee: That is on the agenda, what we're talking about.

Chair Kralik: We'll we're talking about input on this draft and I think we've had it.

Council Member Kou: By the way, our Colleague's Memo took $4\frac{1}{2}$ -months – 5-months to get to where it got too. So, it took a long time and a lot of discussion. At the same time, I do want to

say that you do have to be cognizant about your staff member who's going to be looking at all of this. So that's - yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The hope with this is the will of the HRC. The real hope of this document is that it would not be a barrier. It would just give voice to a process that would be workable to all and it doesn't specifically look like this but that was the intention.

Chair Kralik: Ok, the Chair recognized Commissioner Stinger and Minka your hard work on this. It satisfied everything that I wanted and of course, this is a Commission and we've had the vote.

3. Update and next steps from the LGBTQ Subcommittee

Chair Kralik: So, we'll forward to the update of the LGBTQ subcommittee; Commissioners Stinger and Lee.

Commissioner Stinger: Ok, I think this will be more upbeat. It's a status report, let's see, on the second meeting of the LGBTQ+ Working Summit. Does it show up there or?

Ms. Mary Constantino: Well, I'm trying too. I'm putting this in here and it's not coming up as a...

Commissioner Stinger: Well, ok, I can – it was just the fun – for fun.

Ms. Constantino: I mean it's not...

Commissioner Stinger: I'll just speak to it.

Ms. Constantino: ...showing a file. What I'm looking for usually comes up here as a..

Commissioner Stinger: I'm going to just slowly ramble to say what we wanted to do was give you a summary of the outcomes. For the new Commissioner, I'll say that this focus was on the LGBTQ + community was one of several outcomes from the Resolution that was passed in 2016. We have looked at gender and religious communities and ethnicities and this was all part of that. Now we have started reporting this is as a standalone item but it originally it was not. It was part of a larger effort. We have a group of about 30 people from...

Ms. Constantino: If you want to tell me which one it is I have your files.

Commissioner Stinger: Oh, good, thank you. Presentation Meeting Two. Thank you. So, we have two meetings, we summarized the first meeting prior to this and I will not do that again today. Then we had a second meeting. I want to say at the first meeting the whole group came to five focus areas and the purpose of the meeting was to bring decision makers together from the key service providers. At that first meeting, we all came together and focused on five areas. Thank you. This is representative of people from county and City government, City and school librarians, service providers, and faith-based communities. Thank you. The focus areas we chose were visibility for the community, activities for the community, education and training,

operational structures, and space. Thank you. We explored a lot of different options at our first meeting and I can do those with you separately. I want to focus on the progress that was made at the second meeting and the activities that you'll start to see this summer. The first is the family movie night that the City and Family Services have organized for July 20th. That will be a short cartoon and a film in Mitchell Park and we have a performer who's going to host us. I'm really excited, that will be the kickoff event as well as a standalone event. Thank you. The City staff is looking at ways it can leverage existing events like the May Fete by specifically outreaching to the different organizations in our working summit to encourage their involvement, participation in the Chili Cookoff, better outreach in catalogs, and better communication of programs. In March of last year, a group with ACS, Adolescent Counseling Service, put together a program for middle schoolers and their parents and it was well received. It was then requested to be delivered to even younger children and the same group is working on delivering that program a year later in March 2020. Also, as part of this, the library is on this Committee and they continue to highlight resources during Pride Month, to have movies. They're showing -- I just blanked on the movie.

Commissioner Lee: Matilda.

Commissioner Stinger: No. Separately the library is showing Love Simon.

Commissioner Lee: When is that scheduled for?

Commissioner Stinger: Middle of this Pride Month. It's part of the library's outreach to young people. What we've called operational structures is organizational efforts to do sensitivity training, look at the gender-inclusive language, and representatives of human service, the family Y and ACS have had their first planning meeting. They will deliver a program in November of this year; early November. The target audience will be the Staff of City department and community organizations.

Commissioner Lee: I think there are two components thereof operational structures. One of them is training the front-line staff folks who interact with members of the community and making sure that they have all the training and knowledge that they need to do so in an inclusive fashion. I think the second category was really geared more towards the leaders of the organization and when they do strategic planning or looking at policies and procedures. Do they have the mindset and knowledge set to think are all of these policies as inclusive as they can be? Are there best practices that the City has that organizations can model or vice versa. So, really just encouraging each entity to be even better than they are.

Commissioner Stinger: I didn't include that because I didn't see any progress yet but we'll revisit that in our August meeting. Thank you. Then I neglected to label this space. Space is obviously the biggest need of this community and in our first meeting; we didn't have the right people from Joe Simitian's office in attendance. So, we sort of tabled it and it became a focal point of our second meeting. There are at least two activities going on right now during their budgeting process. The first is we're going to do it in the reverse order. They're proposing a grant program to organizations. It will be pop-ups and startups so that they have a better way of really assessing what sticks. A lot of people say we need things and they do but when we actually look at the

programs, we have no pilots to say this really works. So, they are putting together a grant program so that on a small effort we can fund different groups that are trying to deliver health services, deliver dental services, doing a community art program, and do a theater program. Through that really be able to validate this was the program, this number of people attended, this was the outcome and have better justification for a subsequent, permanent space application. The other thing the county is helping with is bringing all of us together to survey the organization, to clarify our needs for space and what might be available. We had some good, exciting offers of space at that meeting and we're going to pursue those. We will meet again, our third meeting will be in August, and we have at least these agenda item to formalize a statement of goals. Informally we've used the words, we want to be local, it's a local pride effort, and its family oriented. Separating ourselves from San Francisco's Pride in June, San Jose's Pride in August, we're doing a family Pride in July. We want to assess our initial efforts and then to Steven's strong point, we need to continue to develop programming. Each of these action areas had a wealth of descriptors that we want to follow up on and we'll continue that effort in August. We want to look for sustainable structure for a North County group. With staff, we've been a central agendizing and calendaring group and it's great to do and we're happy to do it but it has to be subsumed by another organization. That was it, yes.

Chair Kralik: Are there questions?

Commissioner Lee: The only thing that I would add to what Commissioner Stinger mentioned. I mean the goal here is to really do more with less. There are so many great things going on in our community; whether they're events being planned by City departments or the various non-profit agencies that we fund. So, the idea is just to get everyone together to work more collaboratively and figure out how we can achieve more together than individually. So, if like the whole is greater than some of its parts and so there are some things that we, as a Commission, can do but there are certain limitations to that. I think our goal is to really be conveners of this group and really just encourage them to do that collaboration. Hopefully down the road, it will become self-running or self-supporting. There are obviously some aspects that the City may get involved depending on staff availability and subject matter. Certainly, the operational structures, if we determine that there are trainings or policies and procedures that need to be updated or changed. That would be something that's more City focused but the idea is to use our convening power to get these organizations to do more on top of what they are already doing.

Chair Kralik: Well I think Commissioner Stinger and Commissioner Lee have done an exceptional job, along with staff, in creating these working group meetings which have brought high power people on these issues together and make great progress so it's wonderful. I would say that if staff can forward information to our new Commissioner about the past meetings, any kind of presentations to bring her up to date. I would just suggest that attend it because it's really amazing.

Commissioner Regehr: I was – can I?

Chair Kralik: Sure.

Commissioner Regehr: I was going to say thank you because I did go to the large event at Fletcher and I thought it was just very, very – not only where there high-powered people there but there was also teenagers and librarians and staff and teachers. I just thought it was a very community and also informative so thank you. I guess the question that I have since both of you are doing this, what would have been a process to have since that was one your priorities of the Human Relations, to have been endorsed any of these; the Fletcher thing or these movies? Since you both are working on it and you are saying we. Is that we, you personally or I'm just confused.

Chair Kralik: Let me clarify the question. The Fletcher event was a separate event run by the school. This event that we're talking about, it's a community working group invitation by the HRC, organization by the HRC to bring together very high-powered people who are addressing this issue. Maybe Commissioner Stinger can describe it a little bit further but...

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, let me just background it.

Chair Kralik: ...we held those meetings at the Art Center, separate from Fletcher. That is a completely separate issue.

Commissioner Regehr: But it's the general question on all these topics.

Commissioner Stinger: Well, just a little bit of the history. It was an area that we wanted to explore when we were working through where our focus was and with the county, we did a Listening Forum and surfaced some needs. Then we did some surveys and focus group work and decided that we wanted to continue and so it became a priority for last fiscal year. Yes, that's where it was. We looked at several different ways to approach our priority and then through multiple coffees and discussions we came up with this working group and identified the players and invited them. I think what I said at the meeting and I said in my review in the first time was be careful what you ask for. We wanted 30 power people in a room and we got them and then you had to deliver. It's just the excitement around this initiative, bringing people together and having them say I didn't know I had so many people I could work with has just been very satisfying.

Commissioner Lee: So, really, we've just been facilitators and conveners so none of the events have had the HRC's name on it other than the sense that we brought the folks together and mentioned that these are things we should perhaps work together on. So, I think out of that we have three events that are sort of going on in the Pride month time frame. We have the libraries Love Simon screening, Project Safety Net is maybe next week or the following week they're doing a youth empowerment panel for Pride month, and then there's the Matilda one that Recreation Services with Family Services?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Family and Children.

Commissioner Lee: Family and Children, FCS. So, we've really brought them together and we're helping with publicity but we haven't really put our actual stamp on it so to speak in term of our name.

Chair Kralik: Does our City Council Member have a thought or comment about this program? I know you attended one of the events. I think I met you there for the first time actually.

Council Member Kou: I don't remember. I attend a lot of events, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Stinger: Me too.

Council Member Kou: But thank you for all of what you guys did so no questions.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Council Member Kou: Thank you so much, Gabe.

Chair Kralik: Well, congratulations and we look forward to that next session.

4. Planning for additional community conversations

Chair Kralik: Planning for additional community conversations, Commissioner Stinger and Smith is the next action item.

Commissioner Stinger: I'm going to present this in Commissioner Smith's absence but it is his topic. Well, I'm going to present in his absence. We have been meeting informally to debrief on the Jenifer Eberhardt Bias Forum that was sponsored by the League of Women Voters and the AME Zion Church. I was involved in that as part of the League and so I'm wearing double hats. The follow-up and feedback from that event was high interest in more community and interactive events. So, I'm bringing a proposal to the Commission because I want you to be aware of the direction we're taking and proposed implementation. I will request your agreement with our theme and our goals going forward. The proposal is to host a series of four community events that promote civility and compassion, promotes civil conversations, and help work through an impasse with civility. The theme that we have roughly worked out is core competencies for a resilient community and the goal is to engage in productive conversations. We want to grow the community's competencies in four areas which are how we got the four forums. Speaking and we're looking when silence is golden and how you frame values and listening enough to be changed, personal responsibilities in a democracy, and compassion and civility in Palo Alto. The implementation that we've talked about is mixing it up over four events. We think we will start with an academic or an intellectual speaker and then one or two experiential formats. We've identified some theater groups, some improv groups, and debate groups and thought about round table discussions for the subsequent events. For event one, we're looking at a lecture format followed by panel discussion. Our target is mid-August to mid-September and the speakers that we're targeting will talk about framing values to get through an impasse, speaking to your values, and having empathy for opposing views. The way that we would like to divide the labor is the host would be AME Zion Congregation because that worked so well for the Jennifer Eberhardt lecture. The invitation, the organization of the guest speakers is the League and we would hope that the publicity would come from the HRC. The subsequent events would be really tailored after the first event and take some direction from the first event so that's what we've been working on.

Chair Kralik: May I ask a question?

Commissioner Stinger: Please.

Chair Kralik: So, one of the things that I wanted to say is that I attended the community conversation event at the Art Center, the same place that you held the working group. I really like that because that's a City property and it is something that I think it's important to have a very good venue. I don't know much about the AME venue but I do think it's important to control the venue, to have the ability to have parking, and to do all those things. In terms of the HRC, I would like to see us use that venue more. It was just a very nice venue both for the LGBTQ and for the community conversation. Is there any resistance to that because I think that would really help us to kind of go with what we know as going to be successful? I do want everyone to come from the community at large and I think finding the Art Center is a lot easier. It's something that is open to us. I would really put a preference to keeping it there.

Commissioner Stinger: You know that I like to do the events in the Art Center, they've been very hospitable to us, and they're easy to work it, it shows what we can do as a community. The reason we used AME Zion for the first event was that the HRC wasn't involved in it. So, we went...

Chair Kralik: Right, that's what I'm saying. Once we get into the involvement, I would prefer...

Commissioner Stinger: I think I – we could offer that.

Chair Kralik: Yes, your thought Commissioner?

Commissioner Regehr: I just personally just think that if we are representing the City in some ways as an HRC. I think that if we continue to pick one religious organization, I think that we need to not do that. I mean I feel that we should open it up to other – you know I just feel like if we're having a topic at a church that sends some messages to some people that they might not feel comfortable going to that. I'm just concerned about other religions but I think the Art Center would be an excellent choice or any public space that the City is sponsoring.

Chair Kralik: If you haven't been to AME Zion it's a comfortable church. My son and I went and we had a lot of fun but...

Commissioner Regehr: I'm not saying...

Chair Kralik: ...the point is that we have a successful venue.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm saying as a policy I don't think we should have it at any religious...

Chair Kralik: Oh, that's good input to have, I appreciate your input.

Commissioner Regehr: That's my only point is that people might – if we had at a mosque some people might not feel comfortable there. I'm just saying that we should try to steer away from having it at a religious spot. That's my feeling.

Chair Kralik: Yes, I didn't have that comment but thank you for the comment. Your thoughts Commissioner Stinger?

Commissioner Stinger: I guess I'd like to maybe change my ask. If the HRC wants to be a sponsor then I think we could propose the Art Center. We couldn't propose the Art Center when we were not involved.

Chair Kralik: Right, I agree.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You could but you wouldn't have gotten it for free.

Commissioner Stinger: You are right, we couldn't afford it and so the church was available and it fits very well for the Jenifer Eberhardt who spoke on Bias.

Chair Kralik: Yes, I think you've been so successful with the Art Center. Commissioner Lee, any thoughts about this?

Commissioner Lee: Could you repeat the four topics again?

Commissioner Stinger: This is a draft. I will repeat them but it might waver. Speaking; Listening; Personal Responsibility in a Democracy; Compassion and Civility in Palo Alto Locally.

Commissioner Lee: And the idea is to have these events be more interactive than the last one?

Commissioner Stinger: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, my initial thought is I'm having a difficult time conceptualizing how such a broad topic would be interactive. The topic seems very broad so I'm just having a hard time picturing what the event would look like. Do you have any additional insight (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: I take it that you're only presenting the theme and the goals at this point.

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, and the...

Chair Kralik: And the topics.

Commissioner Stinger: ... first event would be a lecture format.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Commissioner Stinger: We have some speakers that (inaudible) – at Stanford that we can

(inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Commissioner Lee: Yes, I mean I think they're all good for lecture format but if...

Commissioner Stinger: ...and then we would have a panel afterward.

Commissioner Lee: Oh, gotcha, ok.

Commissioner Smith: We'll feed a topic depending on the speaker.

Commissioner Lee: So, are you asking that we approve these four events tonight or are we going to do that at the retreat?

Chair Kralik: No, I think we can move forward with an action if we have a motion. I'd ask Commissioner Stinger to...

Commissioner Stinger: If I would make a motion? Thank you.

Chair Kralik: If you could use your microphone so everyone can hear you.

MOTION

Commissioner Stinger: I would make a motion that the HRC collaborate with the League of Women Voters and the AME Zion Church to present a series of community conversations. The first one would be in mid-August to mid-September.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can I ask just as staff a clarification? So, would this be an HRC event and these two entities would assist just as in other events where other community groups assisted or is this League and the AME Zion's event with the HRC assisting? I'm trying to understand that a little bit more and also that has a lot to do with the venue as well. If it's their event then they would have to fill out the City's co-sponsorship information to try to get their event considered for complimentary space but if it's an HRC event and they are working with the HRC to put on the event then it looks different. It's my understanding that the community conversations were an HRC initiative but that what's the word I'm thinking for? The initial event was not and each aspect of these scenarios is completely fine. I just wanted to have staff have clarity on that.

Chair Kralik: I just want to interject. I think based on the discussions that we've had; I would feel more comfortable that the Commission would move forward with its initiative to hold community conversations with the theme and the goals and the proposed topics to be held at the Art Center as a sole entity sponsoring it. It's possible we could take on co-sponsors but I want to do that vote here. That would be my comment is to do it as a Commission enterprise. I don't know if Commissioner Stinger wants to amend her motion but maybe think about that.

Commissioner Stinger: Organically this has evolved with three organizations working together with some overlap. Commissioner Smith is Pastor Smith and has brought his congregation along, the League is the League and I'm sitting in two roles. If I was sitting in your seat or your seat, I

would say it's a Commission community conversation and we can invite other people to support us but as it's evolved it's an equal partnership. I'm not sure we can do this without the League. They just have some really strong access to speakers so I would propose that the Commission take a more active role in this than it did in the initial event and that we use the Art Center and its maybe co-sponsored by the League rather than an endorsement by the League.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner Lee: Would it be a continuation of the gender equity community conversation or is it a brand-new series?

Commissioner Stinger: We did not take that question up because it's a brand-new series.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Just for semantics, so the League and the Church can decide they want to offer their co-sponsorship but the HRC is not allowed to authorize a co-sponsorship because in the City's language co-sponsorship means a gifting of City resources.

Commissioner Stinger: I forgot that, thank you.

Commissioner Lee: It would be co-endorsement, right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: It would be...

Commissioner Lee: Or organizing.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... a partnership. I mean...

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, I think we could just do...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... just say the Palo Alto Human Relations Commission in partnership with blah blah blah blah blah blah blah.

Commissioner Stinger: That would be better wording.

Chair Kralik: Ok, would you like to reword the motion? Take your time.

Commissioner Stinger: Thank you, I want to make sure I get all the words correctly. That the Human Relations Commission with the partnership of AME Zion Church and the League of Women Voters sponsor a community conversation of four series program.

Commissioner Lee: Do you want to say organize instead of sponsor?

Commissioner Stinger: Thank you or host or plan.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think host might be better than – well, no, host implies I think we'll coorganize, we'll organize and the co is implied.

MOTION RESTATED

Commissioner Stinger: Ok. That the HRC organize with the League of Women Voters and the AME Zion Church a series of four community events with the initial event scheduled for mid-August to mid-September. Can you read it back to me?

Ms. Constantino: I know I didn't get it all but it says HRC, the Human Relations Commission, with the partnership of AME Zion Church host a community...

Ms. van der Zwaag: And the League of Women Voters.

Ms. Constantino: And the League of Women Voters host a community conversation and then I put on the fourth...

Ms. van der Zwaag: A series of community conversations. I don't think the motion needs to be specific to dates or times or names. A series of community – and if you want to give a general title on...

Commissioner Stinger: Core Competencies for a Resilient Community.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you.

Chair Kralik: Yes, to be held at the Art Center. If I could add that to the...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't think that needs to be unless there's a concern.

Chair Kralik: Yes, there was and I want to get the votes...

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

Chair Kralik: ... because it's the HRC's location and I think one of our members has objected to another location. I think it's important to keep that.

Commissioner Stinger: I have already addressed this but the reason that we used that location before because we were not involved and we couldn't afford it.

SECOND

Chair Kralik: Understood. I will second your motion. We'll have a discussion. Go ahead, Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm just kind of new to this so I'm just trying to figure out when you pick one place of worship, have you ever had any other people come in and start saying well why didn't you talk to us or this seems like you're being biased? I'm just curious.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I can't recall in my seven or eight years with the HRC that it's ever been at a house of worship. So, the first event that Commissioner Stinger is referring to was not an HRC event.

Commissioner Regehr: Ok and you don't think the public is – you know I'm just concerned that this is...

Ms. van der Zwaag: But it won't be. The...

Chair Kralik: The motion is...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... is not to hold it, it's to hold it at the Art Center.

Commissioner Regehr: But wasn't – but aren't we co-hosting?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Do you have a concern that a religious organization is part of the partnership?

Commissioner Regehr: I just don't know that it would be a problem. I don't have a problem with it but I'm just thinking as a Commissioner when we're bringing in other religious organizations and we've only brought in this same one. Even though we didn't sponsor this first one, I'm just concerned that we're hosting it with one religious organization and is anybody else going to wonder why weren't we asked?

Chair Kralik: I think it's a good point. I think from that discussion purposes we should be open to recognizing other partners. I think it's a fair point because you don't want to be inclusive to – maybe there's a different group besides League of Women Voters. I mean we want to be the prime movers behind this community conversation, and we want to hold it on our turf which is our Art Center venue. We want to be open to partnership with the community and groups that recognize the value of what we're doing.

Commissioner Regehr: I just think the League of Women Voters is a neutral party in some ways.

Chair Kralik: I don't know them so that's great if you know them.

Commissioner Regehr: But I mean religious organizations aren't a neutral party. That's my only concern is that...

Chair Kralik: Well, uncivility, I mean many religious organizations might want to partner with us because of the theme and the goals that have been expressed. I think you'd recognize that. Your thought?

Commissioner Stinger: When we were doing the Being Different Together series we reached out to a number of religious and ethnic communities. I would love the opportunity to...

Chair Kralik: Recognize their partnership.

Commissioner Stinger: ... and bring more of them in to partner with us.

Chair Kralik: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Maybe one possible solution is on the event invite for the first one it says if you are interested in partnering with us on a future community conversation, please contact...

Chair Kralik: That's a very nice idea.

Commissioner Lee: That way it's not just whoever we know but anyone who sees the marketing.

Chair Kralik: Any further thoughts on that?

MOTION AMENDED

Commissioner Stinger: Well I guess I would amend the motion to say that we would expand the partnership or be more inclusive in the partnerships that host or that sponsor...

Chair Kralik: The partner with the Human Relations...

Commissioner Stinger: Partner with us.

Chair Kralik: ...Commission on the event. Ok, well that's great. I will second that. I'd like to hold the vote if we can at this point? All in favor say aye. All against say nay.

MOTION FAILED 3-1 WITH COMMISSIONERS SAVAGE, SMITH, AND XUE ABSENT.

Chair Kralik: Ok, we have a 3-1. I think 3-1 carries, is that right?

Commissioner Lee: No, you need four votes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, you need four votes to carry any...

Chair Kralik: Ok, well then, we don't have the votes for it tonight but thank you very much for this item.

Commissioner Lee: I wonder if I could just say I'm going to vote for it at the retreat but I would like the entire Commission to decide what our work plan would be for the coming year. So, I'm going to vote for it at the retreat.

Chair Kralik: That's good; I understand why you voted against it. That's ok.

5. Vote by Commission whether to hold a July 2019 HRC meeting

MOTION #1

Chair Kralik: We're going to go to Item Number Five, the vote by our Commission as to whether to hold a July HRC meeting. This is an agenda for this particular reason that neither of our staff members can attend the next meeting in July and so that puts a heavy burden on a substitute to create an agenda and move forward. Initially, when this was promoted, I was not able to make the meeting, I am now thankfully but I understand that we're going to need a quorum. So, that's why I wanted to vote on it so the motion would be to not hold a July HRC meeting and is there a second for that?

SECOND

[Commissioner Regehr raised her hand]

Chair Kralik: Ok, we have a second so we'll open it up for discussion. Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: On Page 3, I mean I did read all this and it says that the Commission shall establish a regular time and place of meeting and shall hold at least one meeting per month.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, and I checked with the City Attorney and he acknowledged that. He said the safest way to go about is if the Commission chooses not to have a meeting during a month is to take a vote and that is the reason why it is on the agenda.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: Can I ask if staff is available other times during July or is it all of July is pretty bad?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I'm gone for 3-weeks, Mary is here and our Department Director Kristen said if the vote was taken to hold the meeting she would be here.

Chair Kralik: Ok, any further discussion? Alright, Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: I guess because I am new, I'm just kind of excited and I think right after our retreat we're all going to be gearing towards stuff. I'm just concerned that we're going to be having a retreat and then we're going to wait. If we don't bring it up at the retreat this other issue that we just voted on, your first event is in August right? I just concerned that if we don't meet in July and we don't...

Commissioner Lee: We don't get through it at the retreat.

Commissioner Regehr: We don't get through it, I would...

Chair Kralik: Does the person making a motion have to vote in favor of it?

Commissioner Lee: You can withdraw your motion.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You mean the person who – not specifically I don't think there's a rule on that.

Chair Kralik: Ok and we had a second so ok. So, we'll take a vote. All in favor of not holding a meeting in July say aye.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The problem is unless you are unanimous in anything, nothing is going to carry but the opposite will – let me think. So, if you vote...

Chair Kralik: All against.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... to cancel a meeting and that doesn't pass unanimously because there's only four of you – let me see. If you vote to cancel it then that means by default the meeting will happen.

Chair Kralik: Right. So, all against? Three. Alright.

MOTION FAILED WITH A VOTE OF 1-3 WITH COMMISSIONER SAVAGE, SMITH, AND XUE ABSENT.

MOTION #2

Commissioner Lee: So, I guess a new motion that we have a July meeting but the specific week be determined by the Chair in consult with staff to see which week would work best.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I'm gone for three out of the four weeks.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so that would be my motion. That we have a July meeting but I'm flexible on that meeting date.

Chair Kralik: Is there a second on that motion?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't think you specifically need to vote for when it might happen. That we can do it an internal poll....

Chair Kralik: We can do a poll.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I know that when I spoke to Kristen, she was available that night.

Chair Kralik: Sure.

V. Reports from Officials

1. Commissioner Reports

Chair Kralik: Ok, we'll go to Commissioner Reports. Anyone who would like to give a report of their activities in the community? Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: A couple of updates, so Commissioner Smith and I did finalize the letter regarding the counties ICE policy that the Commission voted on at the last meeting. We

transmitted that to the County Board of Supervisors. I believe there was a note to the Commission as well?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right and I do have a comment about that when you're...

Commissioner Lee: Ok. The county ended up voting unanimously not to change the policy so hopefully, we had some influence in that but I think there was a lot of community support for the eventual action on that.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Just the comment and the procedure that I received back from the City Manager is that those type of letters that go to outside bodies need to be signed by the Chair of the Commission and not list individual Commissioner's names or contact information. So, in the future that the Commission does that it doesn't mean that you all can't draft it...

Commissioner Lee: Sure.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... but the Chair needs to be the person who signs it.

Commissioner Lee: Just for point of clarification, if the Chair is hypothetically uncomfortable signing it, they can delegate that to the Vice Chair, right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The Chair is signing on behalf of the Commission. The Chair is not signing that they are in agreement with what is listed but in their role as the Chair they are signing on behalf of.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, well I just want to - ok, so they have to sign it even if they are uncomfortable signing it?

Ms. van der Zwaag: When I asked that specific question the reply back was – because I know that Chair Kralik was the dissenting vote and they said they are doing that in their role as the Chair but that it's not specifically understood that they had to...

Commissioner Lee: And that's a policy set by the City, right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That is a protocol that is set by the City, yes.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, great. Yep, so we sent that off. Let's see, I met with Sarah from Downtown Streets Team. She's the Palo Alto Case Manager and just generally speaking how we might work together to address the RV situation and just the large homelessness situation in our county and in our community. I did want to make sure that folks know that I was recently appointed to the VTA Citizen Advisory Committee. So, if there are any issues with VTA as it intersects with say seniors in our community or folks with disabilities feel free to reach out to me. I'm happy to represent North County. I sort of represent the, I guess special services kind of category as opposed to business and labor. So, all the community interest, I sort of represent that category. I attended the DreamCatchers potluck which was great. They do fantastic work in our schools to address the achievement gap. I met with Chief Jonsen to talk about a verity of issues. He did mention that housing is a particular issue and it's affecting the department's ability to fill ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with

Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with

a lot of vacancies. His indication was there were a lot of the things that he would want to work on that sort of would be of interest to this Commission, the impediment to that is the staffing issue. So, once he has those positions filled, he has all these great initiatives that he would want to work on with us or that we would love him to work on. He did mention that the Body Camera Policy would be coming back to the Commission sometime in fall or winter. So, they stayed true to their word in terms of bringing that back to the Commission for our review after their Citizen Committee has reviewed it. So, that's great. I'm glad that the Commission reviewed it the first time and provided our feedback and will continue to do so the second time around. I also met with a volunteer from the YMCA and he's very interested in piloting a program with some of the neighborhood associations including Mid-Town, which I serve on, in terms of finding ways to welcome new neighbors to our community. So, I know that was something of particular interest to this Commission. We worked with the Y last year on – is it Welcome to America or Welcoming...

Commissioner Stinger: Welcoming America.

Commissioner Lee: Welcoming America Week so it seems like it's an extension of an initiative on that same theme. So, if anyone is interested in working on that, we can talk about that as a Commission or if you want to work on it individually let me know. I met with our two new Commissioners, Commissioner Patty and Daryl, and had very constructive conversations. I met with Commissioner Smith and Stinger. I did meet with the Executive Director of Magical Bridge earlier in the week to just talk about ways that our community and our City can further support families with disabilities. I think they were founded in Palo Alto and so I think anything that we can do to continue to support them in their initiative to make our community more inclusive would be great. Let's see, the last thing that I would mention is I attended a community meeting on the ADA Transition Plan that the City is working on updating. They held three community meetings, I believe they just had sort of a handful of folks attending that and they're soliciting feedback through the survey that Minka has sent around. It seems like they've got a pretty good response rate so far; 50 or, so right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: 38 of those were from ones that came from the Avenidas and Senior Friendship Day; Chinese language speaking folks that responded to the translated survey.

Commissioner Lee: So that transition plan will be updated this summer and I believe Council will be reviewing it sometime in the fall or winter time. I attended the Project Safety Net meeting, that was great, and they mentioned that they were planning the Pride Panel. I feel like I did a bunch of other things but I'm not going to go through all of them.

Chair Kralik: I hope someone fed you and gave you some cookies along the way. Commissioner Stinger, go right ahead, please.

Commissioner Stinger: I just wanted to say that I attended the Healthy Cities meeting and there were some good questions about how it might best go forward in the next fiscal year. One of the things that the Y talked about was the Welcoming America Program and asked if we would participate... thank you. Asked if we would participate again and I would certainly like to continue that effort. If anybody wants to join me, I'll circulate the calendar.

Chair Kralik: Thanks so much. Commissioner Regehr and first of all, welcome...

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, thank you.

Chair Kralik: ... to our Commission.

Commissioner Regehr: Thank you.

Chair Kralik: Thank you for your careful thoughtful comments and also for your well-considered votes tonight. It was very helpful to move things forward and we do appreciate your presence. Thank you for coming to your first meeting.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm honored actually.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Commissioner Regehr: I guess my question is since I've never been a Commissioner, I have attended things but I've only attended them because of me.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, I think they're looking for items that you attended in your role as a Commissioner or that for a topic for an idea that you wanted to come back with but mostly in your role as a Commissioner. I think a lot of folks are...

Commissioner Regehr: Right because I was looking at this list...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, invested in a lot of community efforts.

Chair Kralik: There's also an opportunity during the offsite this weekend, we'll be asking for your interest in being a liaison to various groups in the community.

Commissioner Regehr: Like this sheet kind of?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Correct.

Chair Kralik: And – right and in that capacity, if you attend one of their meetings and they voice concerns or whatever, you can inform us of the work that you've done.

Commissioner Regehr: So, I should do that at the retreat?

Chair Kralik: Well, yes.

Commissioner Regehr: I'll do that.

Chair Kralik: But if you have anything that you want to share right now, that's fine.

Commissioner Regehr: No, I just feel honored to be here and all the work that you guys do so I want to thank you all for everything that – thank you.

Chair Kralik: Welcome. My report...

Commissioner Regehr: But I do have...

Chair Kralik: ... go ahead, please.

Commissioner Regehr: Since a Council Members here. I've always been interested in the unhoused and vehicle dwellers. So, I'm wondering since you are here, at some point can you give a talk or something about your proposal and what the City Council – like what we could do to help.

Chair Kralik: We're going to have a Council Liaison report in 1-minute; in 30-seconds.

Commissioner Regehr: Ok, so that's...

Chair Kralik: Hang on just a second.

Commissioner Regehr: So, because since we're having the retreat, I think it'd be kind of nice to know on Saturday.

Chair Kralik: So, staff has been working feverishly on the retreat and has worked with our past organizer to come up with a very good agenda. I think the excitement that I have is really to focus ourselves on initiatives and goals with those initiatives. The second thing that I would say is that we're also excited to really take on this discussion about process because there are ways in which we can act as a Commission to further along our initiatives that may not be involving staff time other than agendizing. It could be bringing in a speaker to help us so I've looked at a couple of other models of Human Relations Commissions and I think the first comment that I got from Commissioner Regehr was about the website. How do we fashion a message in our website to the community that we're concerned with these initiatives that fall within our purpose? What goals do we have and how are we coming up with that? So those are the two main points and hopefully, we'll have good food and a good location. If you don't have children, to wake up in the morning, Steve is going to take us on a Magical Bridge tour. My kids have to get to dance and soccer so I think I'll show up on time. We're really excited to have that. The other thing to say as liaison to the mediation group, there was a lot of excitement at the mediation group. They have brought on some new members last year that were presented here and they continue to work on the issue of diversity which was identified by Commissioner Smith and Commissioner Lee. Their focus is on that. They want to know our Commission members and I think that's an important thing that came out of that meeting including our new members so we'll try to make sure that they do that. They have a function in August that is a social function which I think we'll secure invitations too. They had met with both Commissioner Smith and Lee, they were productive meetings, and I think that's a really good group. I was a member of that group so I know all the work that they put in to be good mediators.

2. Council Liaison Report

Chair Kralik: We'll go to the Council Liaison report and Council Member Kou?

Council Member Kou: Thank you, Chair, and welcome Commissioner Regehr. So I don't know if I've ever told you, speaking about mediators; Palo Alto Mediation Program. So, I was a mediator with the Palo Alto Mediation Program and have learned a lot from it but after my 10years as a mediator, I was also one of their customers. I was a landlord and was taken to mediation and I lost so very fair. Even though I know where they were coming from, you know having the inside track. So, I just thought I'd share that. On the Council side, I think 2-days ago, my days are all getting rolled into one. The School Board numbers reported that the City School Liaison Committee discussed at their Board meeting the wireless antenna placements which the City had made a policy of. At that meeting, they have discussed that they needed to have the wireless antennas on wood poles a certain distance away from schools and from homes since there are reports of possible health effects. So there has been studies done that there could be so they've discussed it and then they're going to go and vote on it. At the second reading they're going to get a Resolution through. I'm sure that will be presented to Council and as you mentioned Commissioner Regehr and thank you to both Commissioner Lee and Regehr for attending the Council meeting about Council Member DuBois and my RV/Vehicle Dwellers Parking Program. It's a Colleague's Memo and it was voted to move forward to be reviewed and discussed at Policy and Services; date still to be determined. I'm going to have to think about your question about how the HRC can help out and I hope to come up with something for the retreat.

Commissioner Stinger: That would be wonderful.

Commissioner Lee: If people ask us should we just refer them to you and Tom? I've had one community member ask how they can help out.

Council Member Kou: I've had a number of phone calls and at this point, we haven't quite figured it out how they can help out. Definitely, let me think about that. Yes, thank you. Also, with regards to our RV and Vehicle Dweller Safe Parking Program, at the state level, there's an Assembly Bill that has been introduced, AB-516. That's a bit concerning because it's statewide legislation where we are not allowed to enforce our laws. So, officers would not be able to give citations and we would be no longer allowed to impose penalties. We would not really be able to - without enforcing our ordinances there might be reasons for people who don't have a driver license so the vehicle is not registered. So, there is a whole slew of things that we would not as a Municipality we won't be able to enforce. So, that's a little bit concerning coming from statewide as state legislation. Also, recently we went through our Cubberley Community Center Master Plan. We discussed it and it was a little bit controversial where there has been discussion about housing on the site; at the City site. As you know the City owns only 8-acres of that and the remaining belongs to the school district. The school district at this point is not ready to move forward with their plan. They really haven't made a decision on what they're going to do, if they need it, etc. but naturally the City is rearing to go with our side of it. It's our one last chunk of land, yes thank you for that, and it's one of our bigger pieces. So, as a growing City we're starting to see less and less useable community space for social use. So, there's some discussion. It's been moved to move forward to get Environmental Impact Study so we'll see from that what happens. At this point, there's a proposal for 112 units on the 525 San Antonio site plus the Greendell and also for the study to take a look at 112 units on the City portion of the land.

Commissioner Lee: Can I ask a question about Cubberley? So, if we, as a Commission, hear a need for a community space say for perhaps for LGBTQ folks or if we hear a need from a senior group or mental health group. What is the best way for the Commission to communicate that need to either the City or to Council in terms of community space at a future Cubberley?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Are you asking for complimentary space or are just asking that when those spaces are leased, that they would know who they could contact to be considered for a spot?

Commissioner Lee: Probably both.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Leasing happens through the City's real estate division.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, that would be that aspect of it.

Commissioner Lee: Is it kind of first come, first served kind of thing?

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, it's a whole application, review, and I don't know exactly how real estate handles that but that's a process that they handle. Staff and Community Services are involved but real estate does those lease agreements. For the other one, that would I believe have to come either as a proposal from staff or the proposal to the HRC and my understanding a Council decision to waive fees for a program to be there. The thing is most of those spots are brokered through that process, what's left over are certain wings or rooms that are available for hourly rental.

Commissioner Lee: Gotcha. So, if we just – if we had just a general sense, like not – we didn't have a specific group or a specific project but we had a sense that there was a need for more X space for seniors or more Y space for this. Is there a process or the best time for us to provide that feedback to anyone in the City or to the Council?

Council Member Kou: You know with the design of Cubberley, it doesn't say specifically for groups, and it's just this general area and then it just depends like Minka was saying. When you want to have the use then you would have to go through the process through the Real Estate Department or the Leasing Department. Right now, it's just – we're designing – they're designing spaces for...

Commissioner Lee: It's quite a while out.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Are you asking for now or in the future?

Commissioner Lee: No, I just want to make sure that we don't miss the opportunity. I'm sure it will be many years down the road from here but is there a particular process or timing for when we should provide that feedback?

Council Member Kou: I know say for example there's a cardiac arrest...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Cardiac Rehab.

Council Member Kou: Rehab, not arrest right? cardiac Rehab. It's under senior wellness so it's within that department, right? So, it's not so much that it's just for them but it's within the senior wellness.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, thank you.

Chair Kralik: Something to explore. We're going to move onto...

Commissioner Regehr: Wait, wait...

Commissioner Stinger: Can I...

Commissioner Regehr: I just wanted to – oh go ahead, you were – go ahead.

Commissioner Stinger: I just wanted to ask, the Environmental Impact Report that the City is funding. If the School Board – is the School Board sharing that expense even though their schedule is delayed?

Council Member Kou: They're half – I believe they're half and half if I remember correctly. Yeah, they are sharing although their land is bigger. I thought I'd add that.

Commissioner Stinger: Got it.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: I was going to say that I thought when you spoke about San Antonio at that City Council meeting, the mental health aspect of not having – I mean displacing the karate with the kids. I thought that was really meaningful because as a human relations person I think that when you're thinking about housing, you're also thinking about who you're displacing. I really appreciated that you brought that in. Also, about who are we really serving because part of our mission is serving certain economics too and diversity and I just wanted to thank you for your...

Council Member Kou: Thank you. So, there are two different sites.

Commissioner Regehr: (inaudible – off mic)

Council Member Kou: Ok, yeah. Thank you so much, yes.

3. Staff Liaison Report

Chair Kralik: We move to the tentative agenda – oh, I'm sorry, the Staff report we've got.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's ok that you skip me because I don't have anything to add.

Chair Kralik: Ok, great.

Commissioner Lee: Can I ask the Chair; is there an update on the most recent Emerging Needs application that was decided by the City Manager and (inaudible)?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you for bringing that up, that was on my list that I left on the printer. The Council agenda was to two-fold to get that on the agenda before they parted so that will be hopefully on the agenda when they come back in August. There has been a slight change, which you all cannot really discuss so if that's concerning to you then it will have to come back to the HRC, is that in discussions with an expert in distribution of such funds. There was thinking that there should be a set aside in the funding for emergency needs. So the proposal is that would be 20 percent of the total so at least that we know as we're going through the year. With the expansion of the funding to have the hope for emerging needs, that will have a lot more open category to be able to fund new endeavors in the community. The concern was that there would not be fund left over for emergency needs as they came up. In speaking with this consultant who was the Executive Director of a major foundation in the valley for many years she suggested that there should be a set aside in there for emergency needs so we don't get to a certain point of the year and that doesn't happen. The policy would also give discretion that if we get to a certain point and no emergencies have happened that our department Director has the discretion to spend all of it on other things. So, if the Commission wishes to have a discussion on that, then that will have to be re-agendize for August. So, then it wouldn't go to Council until then and the hope is that it will go on the Consent Agenda. This is a revision to the Emerging Needs Fun application so a policy so that is what staff is at this point bringing forward. Unless there is specific opposition to that by the HRC then it would have to come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Lee: Was there an application that was recently reviewed?

Ms. van der Zwaag: We didn't receive any.

Commissioner Lee: Oh, we didn't receive any.

Ms. van der Zwaag: We didn't receive any. I was really hoping with your help that we would get something. We didn't receive one.

Commissioner Lee: We didn't receive on from Magical Bridge or?

Ms. van der Zwaag: There was one from the Magical Bridge the previous session and that request was denied.

Commissioner Lee: And we have \$40,000.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That was two Commissioners on that Committee, yes.

Commissioner Lee: There's \$40,000 left, that's going to go back to the City what, in June?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That will go back to the General Fund but it will be – I can't think of the right word.

Council Member Kou: Re-appropriated.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you. Re-appropriated so as of July 1st, it will be \$50,000 again.

Commissioner Lee: It doesn't stack up?

Ms. van der Zwaag: It doesn't stack up, no. You would have \$250,000 by then.

Commissioner Lee: So we're losing it in effect because we haven't spent it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: In effect that is correct and that is one of the reasons why the Commission wanted to add the other additional criteria to the fund in the hopes of increasing the ability to distribute these to worthy causes in the community.

Commissioner Lee: Are we allowed to ask our Council Liaison if she has any thoughts on that or is that...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't...

Commissioner Lee: ...(inaudible)(crosstalk)

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... she has not seen any report on that and I don't think that would be appropriate.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, that's fine, that's fine.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, July 11, 2019.

Chair Kralik: We're going to move next to the tentative agenda for the next regular meeting currently scheduled for Thursday, July 11th. Any Commissioner input on that meeting?

Commissioner Lee: So, I have two requests I believe. I'd like to request that we consider the ADA Transition Plan; whether it's the draft plan or just getting a presentation on what those efforts are ongoing. The ADA is a human rights law aimed at ensuring that folks of all abilities have access to public programs and facilities. I think that is right up our alley as sort of the Human Rights Commission in Palo Alto and as advocates for folks with disabilities.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Is your goal to have input on that plan because I think there was already a conversation between you and...

Commissioner Lee: Sure. Yes so...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... Commissioner DuBois on that. So, are you just interested in having an informational report?

Commissioner Lee: I'm interested in both. I'll see what I can get for the Commission if there are votes to have input on it then great. If not then I'll (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Ms. van der Zwaag: But the direction was already that it would go straight to Council. That's the concern that I have regarding your...

Commissioner Lee: Well the Commission can still provide input though if they wanted to on its own even if they were not asked.

Ms. van der Zwaag: They can provide input; yes, they could provide input for the same items that the community is being asked to provide input.

Commissioner Lee: So, do we want to take them one by one or?

Chair Kralik: Yes, well, maybe you could state that a little more clearly as to what you're trying to do and what the topic is.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so I'd like on our next agenda to be the ADA Transition Plan. I'd like the Commission to provide our input on the draft plan that is being put together for Council; as well as providing additional opportunities for members of the public to come and provide their feedback. I know attendance at the three community meetings was very low. I attended the first one where there were three people total and the other two meetings; I believe had no members of the community in attendance.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think I still need a little bit more clarity because I'm following Council's direction that the plan would go straight to Council so, if you could provide some more background and I could check on the direction that I received.

Commissioner Lee: So, I request a presentation on the ADA Transition Plan if the plan is ready by then; a presentation on the plan. If not, just on the process and then...

Chair Kralik: Who would give that Steven?

Commissioner Lee: The...

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's Public Works.

Commissioner Lee: ... engineering. Public Works.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Public Works Engineering.

Chair Kralik: Ok and is that plan something that's written that other people have?

Ms. van der Zwaag: They did a specific survey and then they are in the process of soliciting community input on priorities. There's a plan that's probably this big of improvements that are related to ADA. Someone went out and surveyed every single nook and cranny for every City facility.

Chair Kralik: Very nice.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, they're asking the public's help in just prioritizing it and then they will take that and they've been instructed to go to Council I believe two times with an initial report and maybe get Council input and a final report.

Chair Kralik: So, do we have something that the public would comment on, is my question?

Ms. van der Zwaag: They could...

Chair Kralik: Or just the issue more broader?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The public comment period is done on June 28th.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's the public comment period that they are legally asked to give comment during a certain period and that is from the email that I sent you that ends at that time.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, I'm just responding to an offline conversation that the Commissioner had with Council Member DuBois requesting that it come to this Commission. He stated that it was going straight to Council so I am not saying no, because that is not my role. I am just as staff listening to the direction that I have been given; that this item would go straight to Council.

Commissioner Lee: Well, I believe that is his opinion. He's not able to provide direction as an individual Council Member, right? That's his understanding of the current process. That would be his recommendation, right, that it goes straight to Council?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well all I can say at this point if this is something that goes forward, that my role as staff is that I would, as I do with anything that gets a second, is I will look into it. If it's a decision that I don't feel like is within my scope to make, I would just go to my department Director who goes to the City Manager. So, my job is not to not get something on your agenda but if I know something has been flagged before then my role as staff is just to do what I need to do on my end.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: I'm coming in the middle of something and I'm not quite sure how firm this ground is. I think we've gotten some emails from staff that there's some survey work that we can do?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's correct.

Commissioner Stinger: I would entertain doing the survey work so that we have something to bring to the table but I don't know that I have anything to bring to the table. A learning series on ADA and what the City is doing might be useful but in terms of responding to the specific proposal, I think we're a little late to the game.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: Oh I don't want to talk.

Chair Kralik: Oh, you breathed and so I naturally thought that you had something that was going to come out so I was trying to be...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can you turn on your microphone, please?

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, I wasn't going to talk.

Chair Kralik: Ok, great.

Commissioner Regehr: I guess I'm trying to figure this out is that people with disabilities, have we ever thought about having communication by Skype because this is like a one-time – you know what I mean? It seems like we're all – they're watching us, people can watch us but there's no correspondence. I mean if someone is disabled or has a disabled child and its night and you have other children. I mean I'm just thinking...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think that's interesting; I think that's separate from this conversation.

Commissioner Regehr: But we're talking about getting input and surveys. I'm just...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Commissioner Regehr: But didn't you say surveys? That they instructed us to have a survey?

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, no, we were not instructed to have a survey. The Public Works Department is having a survey and Human Services offered to help get the word out to their survey to different audiences and they were provided with information. That email might have gone out before you were on the Commission; I can resend it out, to send this survey to who you want. The project is not ours; the project is the Public Works Department. As a courtesy and with the time, I was able to provide to offer this extra assistance. That's what I've done but it was not the sole responsibility of this Commission to get responses to that survey. The Commission has the opportunity on this specific survey to say hey, this is happening. This is here. Send it to everybody you know in your circle to help provide feedback to the City on this important item it's just as a courtesy to the HRC that I say hey, do you want to be part of this effort? Just as the HRC years ago helped with the transportation survey.

Chair Kralik: Ok Commissioner Lee, this is your topic and based on that discussion do you have

an alternative, reformulated topic that you would like to get a second on for the next meeting?

Commissioner Lee: Yes, let me provide some additional background so that it's clear what I'm asking for. So, the current process, the public comment process, is ongoing. It ends at what, June 28th and so during that process in what may have been 2 to 3-months? 2 to 3-month process the City held three community meetings, there were about three or four community members attending. There's also a survey that people can submit their suggestions for priority locations that they believe should be on the plan in terms of updating them to comply with ADA. People can submit that survey through the end of June – June 28th.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's the public comment period.

Commissioner Lee: Public comment period. Staff, based on the public comment that they receive through the survey or through the meetings are going to be using that to update the actual plan with the list of priorities and schedule. The plan, as I understand it, it exists already but it doesn't actually have a list of priorities or a schedule. I think most cities haven't had that piece of it yet and so I'm asking that when the plan is updated with the community feedback, that that draft that we have the opportunity to have that presented to us and we have an opportunity to provide feedback if any. You know we may agree completely with what Staff has drafted but I feel like there hasn't been enough community outreach on this. While we can't turn back the clock in terms of the pre-update, the pre-drafting community outreach, there's an element of post-drafting outreach that we can do as a Commission prior to going to Council.

Chair Kralik: Is...

Ms. van der Zwaag: But if the instruction from the Public Works – I'm not – like I said, it sounds like I'm debating and I'm not trying too. I'm just trying to add additional context. I don't think I specifically answer your question. I'm just going off the feedback I was given but if the instruction from that project is that it's going to Council. That doesn't specifically mean just because two Commissioners have made a motion and a second to see it, that all of a sudden that process is required to come to the HRC.

Commissioner Lee: No, I'm not saying that we require it but I would ask them that we invite them to come to our Commission and present it. It won't stop that process.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think they would have too, if their instruction is not to do so they would probably want to check in with the Council or the City Manager regarding that request.

Commissioner Lee: I would like us to at least ask for that.

Chair Kralik: Ok so let's see if there is a second to your topic. Is there a second here at this present moment? Is there a second to that topic? Ok.

Commissioner Regehr: Oh yes, I second it because that's our mission. That is our mission to enhance inclusion... (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Ok, so you have a second. Alright...

Commissioner Regehr: ... so I second.

Chair Kralik: ... let's go onto your next topic.

[many people started talking at once]

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, I will check.

Commissioner Lee: Can we vote on that or no?

Chair Kralik: No, you have a second, we don't have to vote.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You don't have to vote on it. You got a second.

Commissioner Lee: Can I ask that we actually vote on it to put it on the agenda?

Commissioner Regehr: It is on the agenda, isn't it?

Commissioner Lee: Well we need four people to put it on the agenda.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, no, you need two people to make the motion and then I will go forward with doing due diligence to investigate getting this on the agenda.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, that's fine.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can't vote to force it to be on a specific agenda.

Commissioner Lee: Can I vote that we extend the invitation to them?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't think you need to do so. You have a second so then I will promise to do due diligence to do that. Now, it would be helpful for me if you want to frame your specific ask and have it written down because my notes probably don't adequately reflect it.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, do you want me to do that now or can I do that later?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think if you could send me an email that would be helpful.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, I will do that.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Then I would be happy to be in dialog with Public Works Staff who would probably have to be in dialog because if there's a certain workflow that's set out; now, can they come and give an informational; hey, this is what an ADA plan. If you're specifically asking to have a certain type of action by the HRC that's included in a process, that's the part that I would like to check into.

Commissioner Lee: I mean I would envision that this would be very similar to the ICE discussion. Us weighing in on the ICE Policy didn't stop the county process but it allowed us to weigh in on it. So, it would be sort of an invitation, they don't have to come if they don't want to, to present on what their draft update is. If the Commission has thoughts and would like to convey those thoughts to Council, we can.

Chair Kralik: Well, let me just say on the ICE Policy that good faith and staff cannot be questioned. They invited the speaker and secured the speaker. So, imagine staff is going to use good faith to pursue this next one.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's what I promised.

Chair Kralik: So, do you have another topic.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, AB-516.

Chair Kralik: Say again, ABA?

Commissioner Lee: AB-516 that Council Member Kou had mentioned.

Commissioner Regehr: About the state law.

Commissioner Stinger: 156?

Commissioner Lee: It's 516?

Council Member Kou: 516.

Commissioner Lee: 516; AB-516.

Chair Kralik: And what's your thought about the item?

Commissioner Lee: I would just like us to look at it and see if we want to endorse or oppose it. One of our charges under the Municipal Code is that we can take positions on legislation.

Ms. van der Zwaag: As long as the Council doesn't.

Commissioner Lee: As long as the Council...

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's saying that we'd have to check in they're looking into (inaudible). (crosstalk)

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so as long as Council hasn't.

Chair Kralik: Ok, so is there a second for that? Is there a second?

Council Member Kou: May I just say something? So, Council did take a position on anything that is top-down governance, Council has opposed. As a matter of fact, we have a letter on that. I'll have Ed send that to you Minka.

Chair Kralik: Ok, so...

Commissioner Regehr: So, then we can't do it then.

Chair Kralik: Well you can second it and subject to staff's receipt.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, as with everything I'll do due diligence.

Commissioner Regehr: And you're going on vacation.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes

Chair Kralik: Steven, how we doing? We going to get home or...

Commissioner Regehr: Well, I have some too though.

Chair Kralik: Sure, that's what I'm saying.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would like to be cautious to folks that this is agenda setting for the July meeting. I would be cautious that you are two days away from a retreat and the first one, I can see it as something that is timely but some of these may be things that you want to consider as some of your projects and initiatives. So, I'd hate to suggest six things tonight (this is just offering feedback) and then some of these I would suggest that you consider bringing to the retreat where you can have a discussion. If the three other members that were there and then we come back with eight tentative agenda items for the July meeting, which staff will not have time to prepare for and these all sound like quite involved things, that would be my caution as staff. My observation.

Commissioner Stinger: Let me just clarify the process?

Chair Kralik: Say that one more time.

Commissioner Stinger: Can I ask for a question of clarification?

Chair Kralik: Please.

Commissioner Stinger: I thought when we put agenda items out, it was like a wish list...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes.

Commissioner Stinger: ... and I was looking to leadership to prioritize them.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That is correct.

Commissioner Stinger: So, we will get to this at some point but it is your job 2-weeks before the meeting to...

Chair Kralik: It's on our list.

Commissioner Stinger: Yes but you'll...

Chair Kralik: I just want to know how long Steven's list is because...(crosstalk)

Commissioner Lee: I'll leave it at those two and AB-516 I personally would see it as a one-time action item. I don't envision it as a long-term project which is why I'm asking to put it on the agenda now as opposed waiting to discuss it on Saturday.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think that the Chair has a vision for the retreat that includes projects and initiatives so that not everything that comes up at the retreat is something that needs three people to do so.

Chair Kralik: Is there a second on the AB-516? I think the answer was yes so, the next topic Steven.

Commissioner Lee: That's it.

Chair Kralik: Ok, we'll recognize Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: I'll differ.

Chair Kralik: Ok, Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, I was just going to...

Chair Kralik: By the way, can you help me with the pronunciation?

Commissioner Regehr: Regehr.

Chair Kralik: Regehr, ok.

Commissioner Regehr: That's ok.

Chair Kralik: See that, I'm glad I asked. I went the whole night; I went 2 hours and 20 minutes so sorry about that.

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, no, it's fine, fine.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Commissioner Regehr: I was just wondering if we could revisit the Business Item Number Four which was voted down, the planning for additional community conversations. If we could put that back on the agenda or?

Commissioner Lee: At the retreat?

Commissioner Regehr: But then will it be too late to put on the agenda?

Commissioner Lee: We can authorize it at the retreat, right?

Commissioner Stinger: If we have a holding...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I don't think we have something specifically as an action item at the retreat. It's...

Chair Kralik: It can live a new life as an initiative of our Commission that's identified at the retreat but then if we're talking about the specifics of planning for community conversation...

Commissioner Regehr: And endorsing.

Chair Kralik: ... and endorsing, we'd have to re-agendize that. Is there a second?

Commissioner Stinger: Could we do an update on Work Plan items...

Chair Kralik: Right.

Commissioner Stinger: ... and then if these become a work plan item, I will be able to bring it back.

Chair Kralik: Right...

Commissioner Regehr: Where we can vote?

Chair Kralik: ...I think that's the way to do it, sure.

Commissioner Regehr: Could we vote on that then at the next meeting in July?

Commissioner Stinger: An update and voting on...

Commissioner Regehr: On the endorsement.

Commissioner Stinger: ... all work plan items. Whatever we choose as a work plan.

Commissioner Regehr: We're not talking about this as a work plan because we're asking in order to get the free space at the Art Center, we had to be the host. So, it's not a work plan as much as it is hosting?

Commissioner Lee: Are we approving the work plan at the retreat or does that require a subsequent vote at a second meeting?

Ms. van der Zwaag: You know I'm not, to be honest, remembering in the past that every single thing that you do, you needed to vote on it. Someone would come and say hey, we're doing this series and when it came to a decision to pass an opinion about something or when it came to a decision to forward to Council, you'd vote on it. I don't remember specifically that every time someone came you would vote an up or a down on their event idea.

Commissioner Lee: I mean if we're putting our name on something though, that's an action by the Commission.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think this is different because it's a collaboration...

Commissioner Lee: A collaboration, yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... of the three and it's – but...

Commissioner Regehr: I was just thinking if we're going to take an action on endorsing and then being the host, which is what you're saying then it is an action item. Then we do have to vote to put our name on it? Not the work plan.

Chair Kralik: Ok, so I hear Commissioner Regehr saying that she would like to put on the agenda the Item Number Four again. Is there a second to that? Ok, we have a second so we'll consider it. Anything else? Ok.

Commissioner Lee: Can I provide a clarification real quick? On AB-516, if staff determines that we're not able to take a position on it as a Commission. Would you be able to ask if we are able to send our suggestion to Council on it? If that's a different permutation.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok, right.

Chair Kralik: Alright, the next item on the list is Number Seven, Adjournment and I happily adjourn this lovely meeting. Thank you so much for your attention, thoughtfulness, and consideration of all these issues.

Commissioner Stinger: Thank you for your Chairmanship.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.