

HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Thursday, August 8, 2019

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

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Kralik, Lee, Regehr, Savage, Stinger, Xue

Absent: Smith

Staff: Minka van der Zwaag, Mary Constantino

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Kralik: Good evening and welcome to the Human Relations Commission Regular Meeting of August the 8th, 2019. We'll begin with the roll call.

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

III.ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Kralik: We're not going to call on members of the public who were invited to address the Commission during this period that's reserved for oral communications. Do we have any speakers? We do, ok.

Ms. Constantino: This is for Item Number Two.

Chair Kralik: Oh, for Item Number Two. Ok, so we can hear it. Go right ahead Mr. Gordon; Sam Gordon. Won't you address us over the microphone? Just press it so that we can hear you loud and clear. Thank you for coming, especially with a tie. That's kind of you.

Mr. Sam Gordon: May names Samuel Gordon, I'm an attorney, and I represent Gustavo Alvarez. As some of you are aware, he's been the victim of some police brutality in your community. I understand this Commission's mission statement is to protect those who are vulnerable in your society. I think this is something the Committee should address and investigate and come up with an action plan about. It's not unique, it's something that's happened a lot, and based on our investigation I think this is a problem in your community. This is the type of forum and organization that can help fix that problem. So, I would just encourage you to put this on an item for your next meeting and if you have any questions, I'm here and happy to answer them.

Chair Kralik: I think it would help in your statement if you'd give us a little bit of the background so that the members of the public...

Mr. Gordon: Of course.

Chair Kralik: ... listening could be informed of your thoughts about this event.

Mr. Gordon: So, a civil rights complaint has been filed on behalf of Gustavo Alvarez. He is a member of your community; he lives in the Buena Vista mobile home park. He was attached by Palo Alto police officers. He was unlawful detained, his door was broke down, and he was a victim of felony assault. Officers lied about the investigation. The criminal charges that they tried to pursue were dismissed. The criminal charges were dismissed based on officer conduct and the lack of reasonable suspicion they had moving forward. The case is still pending but when you dig a little deeper and kind of move forward with the behavior, the practices, and policies of your police department it's a much bigger issue. It's something that should be attacked on a community basis. This isn't an isolated incident and so that's why I'm here. I think it should be addressed by a Committee like this and I think...

Chair Kralik: When did this occur Mr. Gordon?

Mr. Gordon: This happened 2018.

Chair Kralik: And when in 2018?

Mr. Gordon: February.

Chair Kralik: February, ok, and the present status is that there is a...

Mr. Gordon: The case is pending.

Chair Kralik: ...civil suit?

Mr. Gordon: Correct. Criminal charges have been dismissed; there is a civil rights suit that is still pending.

Chair Kralik: Ok. Thank you so much for coming in, we appreciate it.

Mr. Gordon: No problem.

Commissioner Lee: Mr. Chair, just for some brief context, a video came out recently and it was widely reported in the last month or so.

Commissioner Regehr: We received it.

Commissioner Lee: Yes.

Chair Kralik: Alright, thank you so much. That's wonderful to get the full story behind it and I think we'll give consideration. Ok, thanks so much.

Ms. Minka van der Zwaag: So, Chair, our speaker is here from the VTA.

Chair Kralik: Fantastic.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, Karen I think we have...

IV. BUSINESS

1. Transportation Learning Series – Presentation by representatives of the Santa Clara County Transportation Authority (VTA)

Chair Kralik: The next item is the Transportation Learning Series presentation by members or representatives of the Santa Clara County Transportation Authority. Staff is going to give the introduction to the item so we'll turn it over to Minka. Thank you, Minka.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you, Chair. So, we're pleased to have Karen from the VTA, one of their Public Information Officers, come to give you a presentation on a variety of their programs. Also, she has specific information on the services and programs for vulnerable populations in our community. So, she has a PowerPoint that was distributed to you ahead of time and after her presentation, she'll be happy to answer all your questions. We appreciate you coming up all the way from San Jose so thank you.

Ms. Karen Gauss: Thank you. Again, my name is Karen Gauss, I'm a community outreach supervisor at VTA, I'm happy to be here, and answer your questions at the end of the PowerPoint. I will be concise and brief. To quote from Hamlet, "Brevity is the soul of wit" so hopefully my presentation will be lightweight and informative. I'm sure you're aware that VTA operates bus and light rail transit service in Santa Clara County. I'd like to tell you some more details about how we accommodate lots of different kinds of people with different abilities in the county and also some projects that we fund and build that you may not be aware of. VTA does make a lot of efforts to make transit accessible for folks. We try to have different ways that people can pay their fair. We offer lower cost fairs to youth, seniors, and the disabled. A lot of that happens through Clipper Card and also through some apps on smartphones that allow people to pay their fair that way. We are modifying some of our routes and frequencies. We are also in a financial bind at the moment and we are adapting to be more cost-effective. So, physically on our buses, we provide level boarding and these ramps that fold out on the buses. Likewise, with light rail, the platform is level to the train. When you walk in there is no step and there's a very small gap. We offer priority seating, wheelchair-accessible space, and we also operate paratransit in our county; typically for folks who need to get to recurring medical appointments and I can provide more information if folks would like to know more about paratransit. Specifically, in what I do to provide clear public information, we do a lot of translation of our materials. When we don't have space or it's not appropriate to translate everything, on say like a construction notice, we do provide a language blurb. I can show you an example of that that says typically in five languages if you cannot read this in your language, we can translate it for you for free.

Please call this telephone number and there are folks at our on-site customer service call center that speak different languages and if there's a language we can't cover with our own staff we use a call-in translation service that provides live translation over the telephone. I make an effort specifically what I do for construction and rider notices to use graphics and symbols; circle slash, bicycle icons. So, that folks who be illiterate or don't speak English can understand based on the graphic and based on maps. New VTA, our Staff is kind of ramping up to make our website and our written materials accessible to screen readers for folks who are visually impaired and use a computer program to read out loud the website or the materials that are of interest to them. We also do trip planning workshops for groups and seniors so, to touch on kind of diversity, inclusion, and just having a nice spirit of not discriminating against folks. We do clearly list out protected characteristics of folks that we would never discriminate against when it comes to job applications or interacting with the public. We update this in our equal opportunity statement that our General Manager signs every year and to this list, this year, we've added political officiations. So, you can't discriminate against co-workers or in a hiring practice based on that; in addition to the list that you see here. In addition to operating bus and light rail transit in our community, we do operate, fund and build may other projects that I'm sure you have seen out and about, but may not know that VTA funds those projects. A great example is the BART extension to San Jose starting with Milpitas and Berryessa which should open later this year. I grew up in Milpitas, I have the largest foam finger of anyone, and I'll be there the day they open that station. It's gorgeous, it has public art, and for the moment it's spotlessly clean. So, I encourage folks to pay attention to that when that hits the news probably around Christmas time. So, the Milpitas and Berryessa stations will open together and VTA is funding and building the four additional stations that will run through downtown San Jose and Santa Clara. Those till take another decade to build. They will have to get out the big boring machine and it's quite the endeavor. These are two color photos of the Milpitas BART station on the left and the Berryessa station on the right. You may be familiar with the flea market area in San Jose. That's where the Berryessa station is. It's very close to downtown San Jose. The 237 Express Lanes is a pretty cool project. VTA funded and built all those ramps to carry people from Fremont through Milpitas to 237. We operate those lanes. We have a control room at our headquarters were folks monitor with the video cameras how busy those lanes are and make sure the dynamic toll is charging folks the right amount based on how crowded it is. Those lanes will be extended to Matilda and should open later this year. Also, around the Matilda area, we're reorganizing a lot of the ramps and the travel patterns through there. We're adding bike lanes; we've closed a little piece of Moffett Park Drive that will turn into a bike-only path. So, it's very busy through there. Right now, it's a mess, but it should open next year and hopefully reduce congestion in that area. The Tambien Station is a good example of one of several places where VTA owns land near a transit facility and in this case, there's both light rail and Caltrain near Tambien. In lieu of a very large, half paved half dirt parking lot that is free for folks, VTA can use that land for what I think is a better purpose; to develop it for mixed-use housing and commercial. The details of that kind of thing are not yet solidified but it will bring more people to the area. Folks will get to live right next to transit. We feel it's a better use of space and it should increase ridership and we're doing that in several other locations. Another project that VTA spearheaded is the 85 Guide Way Study. So, individually Cities like Campbell, Cupertino, and Saratoga cannot decide on their own how to use the median, grass area, of Highway 85. VTA, as the congestion management agency for the whole county and we think more regionally, we can build consensus and provide a lot of data and study that are to provide the best option in that case; as opposed to maybe one City's

preference for light rail just because they think light rail is cool. It looks like the preferred alternative for this corridor is going to be some kind of bus lane. Potentially VTA only buses or shared corporate and VTA buses. VTA has three Complete Street Corridors Studies in Santa Clara County. One is on Story Keys, another is the Tasman Corridor, and a third is Bascom Avenue. These are corridors that tend to be automobile focused. Tasman does have light rail but VTA is in a really good position to provide an overlaying plan for the area. So, that as those corridors are improved, they accommodate all modes, and it builds consensus. Again, for example, the Tasman project crosses Milpitas, North San Jose, Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara. The Bascom corridor encompasses San Jose, parts of the unincorporated county area, Campbell, and then San Jose again. So, there's more information on our website and these are pretty exciting projects as we try to incorporate bus lanes and bike facilities. More for biking, VTA does the Countywide Bike Plan every 6 or 7-years and we do the Countywide Bike Map. We fund and build pretty fun projects like the Mary Street Bridge and the Burgas Bridge and some of these nice bike connections. In my group, we cover everything that VTA does. We try to stay fresh and in the know with all that's being constructed and planned and discussed and we share it with the public. We do all the construction notices and planning meeting notices. We moderate public meetings; we help collect feedback so that the projects fit the community and that the community has by-in and feels informed. That, in my view, is a very key thing to have successful projects when the community is aware and behind what we're doing. This is a photo of our group, aren't we cute? So, if you have any questions, if you'd like more information on a specific project, feel free to fire away. I'm all ears.

Chair Kralik: Could you tell us a little bit about yourself and how you came to work at VTA and tell us what you enjoy most about working there?

Ms. Gauss: Sure, kind of career path thing. Well, I'm originally from Milpitas, I grew up in the '80s and 90's, I remember the VTA and Caltrans building all these freeway ramps and light rail in our valley. In my family, we're kind of bicycle nerds and transit geeks but I didn't come into transportation right away. I wish I had gotten there sooner. I did my undergraduate degree at UC Santa Cruz in Linguistics. I went to France for 3-years to teach English and travel and ride all kinds of trains. Then I came back and I worked with International students for 8-years in Michigan and in Texas. While I was in Texas, I found urban planning and transportation and I did my Masters in Urban Planning at Texas A&M. Then, I sold all of my stuff and went to Asia for a year traveling and India and all kinds of crazy places by myself. Then when I came back, I worked in a little town called Willits up in Mendocino County. They needed a town planner so I did what I could for Willits. They needed someone to write a grant for a well water project. That was during the drought and Willits is basically a water utility. They sell water to the town and that's pretty much what City Hall does. They have 4,000 people in Willits, so I worked there and then I ended up working at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission again, in water in a public relations aspect. I met folks there who introduced me to the job that I have now at VTA.

Chair Kralik: What are some of your challenges today? You mentioned funding was one.

Ms. Gauss: I think the VTA is challenged with the funding because we're in this wicked problem where we live in a valley that has sprawled and that developed at a time when cars were the way to get around. I think as a region or all the cities individually, if they had kept their towns very

compact and gone taller instead of wider. I think transportation would be a more financially viable endeavor. I can quote Jane Jacobs and a lot of other folks who've studied this sort of thing; they can put a figure on it that transportation is viable and healthy when you have 60 dwelling units per acre or higher. That's a little fact that I keep in my pocket all the time. That when you have single-family homes with driveways and wide boulevards, you have maybe fewer than 10-dwelling units per acre and it just makes it hard to fill a bus and to have a bus every 5 or 10-minutes which would be useful. I've lived in cities where you have buses and trains that run that frequently. So, frequently that you don't need a schedule and that is a really sweet spot to be in. When folks can just walk out their door and not need a schedule and they can just get on a train or get on a bus. I think it will be a long time coming before places like Sunnyvale or San Jose or Morgan Hill have that kind of density. So, here we are, operating a train that's sprawled out into this kind of a landscape and it's very expensive to maintain. The ridership is just low, so that's the challenge.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Regehr, please.

Commissioner Regehr: I have a couple of questions. One is when the City of Palo Alto is building or do they work with you because I just remember how a bunch of seniors from the housing on San Antonio were complaining that there wasn't any buses there for a while. So, when they're building low-income housing or any type of housing, does the City contact you before they start because that is an issue now on San Antonio too? People are complaining about you're building something but is there going to be transportation. The developers, they say sure but do the developers and stuff do they...

Ms. Gauss: They – we hope that they do...

Commissioner Regehr: But do...

Ms. Gauss: ... and a lot of times they do. I believe that that would be the trigger for us to find out that a new development is coming. Is either the City sees the plans and gives us a call or the developer contacts us.

Commissioner Regehr: Does that happen in Palo Alto very often?

Ms. Gauss: I would have to check with our land use...

Commissioner Regehr: Because I would be interested because people have been complaining about it.

Ms. Gauss: Yes, we have a land-use transportation integration team, LUTI, the LUTI team, and they're the planners at VTA. They review development proposals and the earlier they get in on it the better. I'm not aware of their whole portfolio that they are reviewing, but projects come to mind like the City Place development across from Levi Stadium. They're going to get rid of a big golf course and some land that's kind of underutilized right across from the stadium. VTA has been reviewing that document I want to say for a couple of years now. They want to put a driveway and a light and they want cars to be able to cross our light rail. We're not very happy about that for safety and transit priority reasons.

Commissioner Regehr: But they contacted you?

Ms. Gauss: They contacted us...

Commissioner Regehr: But I'm just concerned about...

Ms. Gauss: ... and we are happy to meet with them and we...

Commissioner Regehr: If people are contacting you from the City, from our City, to...

Ms. Gauss: We would love it, please call, yes.

Commissioner Regehr: Because also for the bike lanes and on the bike, I was just wondering if anybody...

Ms. Gauss: Yes, during construction we would love to know about these things because we like to review the plan. We comment on the driveways, the setbacks, the density, the amount of parking, and then from a practical point, we want to make sure our buses can operate. If there are vehicles there for construction that is going to block the street or if a bike lane gets blocked or a bus stop needs to be moved. We can make a temporary bus stop, we can notify our passengers, and there are a lot of things that we can do to try to ease the growing pains of construction and new development.

Commissioner Lee: So, from a timing perspective, does transit always follow development or is there any cases where you add a line or add a stop in the hopes that housing is developed in that area? Is there always housing/transit or...

Ms. Gauss: I think it's smarter too...

Commissioner Lee: ... I mean what is the process there?

Ms. Gauss: ... to build density and then know how many people are there and then reorient the transit, if that makes sense. It should be a ridership driven decision. I think the past folks had a "we'll build it and we hope people will come" kind of attitude. I think of that when I ride light rail and I pass empty fields. I mean riding in a million-dollar, billion-dollar train vehicle and there's just nothing there and then over time, I feel like folks will build next to light rail or next to a bus route.

Commissioner Lee: Does VTA have any particular policies or guarantees that they make to cities? If you build X density of housing, we will put a VTA stop here or there. Are there any criterion in terms of cities do build housing that VTA will match it with transit?

Ms. Gauss: I am not aware of a correlation like that. We do have a threshold for let's say canceling a bus route if there's a minimum number of boarding per hour. I can't remember what that is. It's pretty low. It's maybe 15 boardings per hour and bus routes that have fewer than that are on the cusp of not being very viable routes. We do have routes that have higher boarding and it would be smarter say to add another bus to like 522 because it's going to have people versus a

bus that's going to have 10 boardings per hour or less. So, but I see what you're getting at, we have enough people who are crying out for transit, please send more buses. I don't know it's hard to measure based on, I think, number of units or number of occupants or number of jobs and then to tell us that that's going to fill a bus or that that's going to yield 20 boardings per hour. Therefore, we should send a bus that's going to run all day long along a corridor because there's one apartment building that got added. That would be hard to figure out but that's a discussion I think for our transportation land use team.

Commissioner Lee: What would be the best way for us to communicate? If we are hearing from members of our community that they would like either additional stops or more frequent stops. What is the best way for us to communicate that and are there particular numbers that we should try to collect? How can we be good advocates for people in the community who rely on public transit and how can we be a partner with VTA in terms of providing the need or justification for a planner (crosstalk)...

Ms. Gauss: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: ... or keeping...

Ms. Gauss: I think it would be a good step to set up a meeting and I can provide you with a name of our main transportation transit planner. Then maybe they can reevaluate the things that they look at when they are planning transportation and where it's crowded and where the needs lie.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Xue.

Vice Chair Qifeng: I think Commissioner Savage...(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Oh, sorry, Commissioner Savage, go right ahead.

Commissioner Savage: Never mind me. (crosstalk)

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can you two turn off your mics? That makes Commissioner (inaudible).

Commissioner Savage: Just a question about the Clipper Card, how far north and how far south does that take you?

Ms. Gauss: Clipper Card is actually very widespread. It's not only used by VTA and we go from Gilroy up to Palo Alto. It's also used by AC Transit, SamTrans, Muni, BART, Caltrain, the ferries, I want to say...

Commissioner Regehr: Trolleys.

Ms. Gauss: The trolleys? I think the old-time Rice a Roni Trolleys don't take Clipper, but the historic trolleys on Market Street and Muni and BART all take Clipper.

Commissioner Savage: So, the Smart Train up in San Rafael?

Ms. Gauss: I believe smart, yep, in Marin County takes Clipper. Santa Cruz Metro does not.

Commissioner Savage: So, Gilroy is the furthest point south for Clipper?

Ms. Gauss: For VTA. No, not for Clipper but for VTA.

Commissioner Savage: Ok.

Ms. Gauss: I'm not sure is MST, the Monterey-Salinas Transit, they may take Clipper. I can't remember.

Commissioner Savage: Ok, thank you.

Ms. Gauss: Sure.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Xue.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Thank you very much for the presentation. I have a very quick question regarding whether we could leverage technology to engage the communication between the riders and the drivers; especially for the senior folks. When, for example, the family member could plan the trip, we could use the smartphone, send a text message, the driver receives it. We have iPad or whatever device you've got; the driver could remind the senior folks it's time to get off. So, I don't know whether that's feasible or not.

Ms. Gauss: I see where you're coming from and I like your train of thought. I feel like there are – there is a potential for maybe increasing technology to help folks. The drivers, however, are limited that they cannot be distracted by a screen as part of the safety regulations.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Sure, sure.

Ms. Gauss: So, they're not allowed to look at any phone...

Vice Chair Qifeng: I see.

Ms. Gauss: ...while they're on duty and sitting in the chair. So, I think there could be ways for technology to remind folks where their stop is. I think maybe if they're planning their trip in Google Maps, Google knows where you are and where you plan to go. That might help folks know where to get off the bus.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Sure, that's definitely. I was using the VTA quite frequently 2-years ago so I knew how beneficial to the folks that commute through it. However, for some of the people, they don't recognize where to get off, they miss a stop. That's a major issue, especially for seniors.

Ms. Gauss: Absolutely.

Vice Chair Qifeng: So, that's why I asked that question.

Ms. Gauss: There are technologies that we do use. There are some bus stops that have signage that tells you when the next bus is coming and I find that very helpful and we use to not have that. We do provide a lot of data to Google Maps, Apple Maps, and these different trip planning resources. There's Transit App, there's a lot of different ones so folks can see where the train is coming or where their bus is and how long their trip is going to take.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Great, thank you.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: Thank you. I enjoyed hearing the variety of aspects that you are challenged by and I just wondered, could you talk about your current strategy? Thank you. There's highway maintenance, mass transit, implementing new technologies. Where's the balance or where's the focus in?

Ms. Gauss: I feel like VTA is trying to spread out and do a lot of things. We are not only the transit provider but we're also the congestion management agency for Santa Clara County. Sometimes those two things are conflicting and I feel like the funding comes from a lot of different sources and inherently, that makes a lack of focus. There's funding for highways, there's funding for express lanes, there's things that Caltrans wants to do on roadways. We get sale tax money to fund transit and a lot of times maintenance and cleaning the vehicles lacks funding. VTA would love to do that but the funding isn't there but there's funding for roadways in Matilda and studying 85. So, yes, if you're noticing a lack of focus, you're not off base. I see the same thing.

Commissioner Stinger: It sounds like it's hard to be the master of your destiny.

Ms. Gauss: Yes.

Commissioner Stinger: I had another question if I can. What mechanisms do you have to collaborate with other counties? So, if my dentist is in Redwood City, it doesn't help me that the VTA's charter stops at Town and Country.

Ms. Gauss: Yes, Clipper Card is a really great coordinated effort that you can use the same fare payment mechanism to change from VTA to a SamTrans bus or to get on Caltrain. We also coordinate with the regional bodies like MTC for roadway projects. We are coordinating with FastTrack and Bay Area Toll Authority and the other express lane operators in Alameda County and Contra Costa County. So, when an express lane crosses from Fremont to Milpitas, we are all coordinated and we have monthly conference calls. So, you may not see that aspect but I feel like there is a great effort to coordinate regionally in the larger region of the multi-county area. It is a challenge.

Commissioner Lee: Related to that particular question, does the VTA have a goal in terms when there are overlapping systems – if my VTA bus stops at 9 o'clock are there a goal in terms of how close that is in terms of me connecting to another transit agency and when their bus or their train leaves? Is there a goal as to how close that window is?

Ms. Gauss: I don't know if there's a window goal in mind but I do know the scheduling folks really do try to coordinate with bus, light rail, Caltrain. There's a lot of coordination that goes into the Mountain View station area for the different trains and buses. Same things for Diridon and then also when BART – well as BART is coming online further south we're reorienting the buses that go to Warm Springs; like the R181 Bus no longer goes to Fremont, it goes to Warm Springs. There was some overlap for several months before that change happened. Then when Milpitas and Berryessa open, the 181 will shrink back again so the buses make sense and then also the timing of the schedules is there to help people. We do try to make that connection convenient.

Commissioner Lee: What is the biggest challenge you think in terms of trying to coordinate the schedules of all these agencies? Is it just a matter of funding and there not being enough say buses or not enough things to align them? What is sort of the biggest challenge in terms of schedule?

Ms. Gauss: I would love to have our scheduling guy here with me, he's fantastic. His name is Kermit, really easy to remember. He would be fascinating if you would like to talk to him, but I think there are several limiting factors that just in the scheduling. We may run the 522 every so often and Caltrain runs every hour so it's just a math problem of finding the common denominator so the bus can meet the train. Then we're back to the problem of number of boarding per hour. If there's trains every 30-minutes and the buses are empty, we wouldn't run buses in addition just because we want to meet the train. We might want to run the buses when they're viable and have people. So, there's a lot going on, it's quite dynamic.

Chair Kralik: We have one final question from Commissioner Regehr who wants to...

Commissioner Regehr: Hi. I have a question...(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: ...(inaudible)

Commissioner Regehr: ... about – oh sorry – about the overnight bus and I was wondering how it went in the winter and if you know the breakdown of how many people from Palo Alto were getting on that bus?

Ms. Gauss: I don't. I can find out and...(crosstalk)

Commissioner Regehr: I would know how many people from Palo Alto.

Ms. Gauss: ...hand that information back to you.

Commissioner Regehr: How is it going since it was canceled and then be brought back?

Ms. Gauss: It was never canceled but it was proposed to be canceled overnight. There were plans to try to outreach to those folks and provide them with services. That's another wicked problem and VTA's there in the middle trying to be helpful. We're not a housing provider for the county, we do transportation. So, we're the recipient I guess of this problem that folks are

struggling to have housing and they rely on the bus in the middle of the night and during the winter. VTA has tried other strategies of opening our park and ride lots to folks who can bring a vehicle and need a place to stay for the night. That is a tricky situation also. Yes, you've hit the most difficult problem I think that we face and there are a lot of conversations at VTA about homelessness and it's not an easy one to solve. I can get you some data... (crosstalk)

Commissioner Regehr: So, if you could that would be wonderful.

Ms. Gauss: ... if you need to know ridership numbers...(crosstalk)

Commissioner Regehr: From Palo Alto.

Ms. Gauss: ... at 3 o'clock in the morning at Palo Alto and if that's going up and down, who's using it. Yes, I can get that to you.

Commissioner Regehr: Great, thank you.

Chair Kralik: Karen, you have a wonderfully rich background. We're enlightened by your experience said and we're grateful to have you tonight.

Ms. Gauss: You're welcome.

Chair Kralik: Thank you very much.

Ms. Gauss: You're very welcome.

2. Finalizing initiatives and goals for the 2019/2020 work plan and initial process for Project Development Implementation and Scheduling

Chair Kralik: The Commission will move to the second business item; finalizing initiatives and goals for the Work Plan. Let me just say that in the July meeting we rolled up our sleeves and worked very hard on this. The result was this wonderful table that was produced by our facilitator which I did not find any errata that I needed to make any changes too. There were members of the Commission that were not present at that meeting. If you are one of them, I would like to hear from you first as to whether or not your assignments that we surmised from your participation in the offsite in June were correct or if you have changes to those. We did our best to reflect what we knew to be leadership roles when absent Commissioners had proposed an initiative. So, if there's anyone that was not present in July if you have any concerns, I may have signed you up. Commissioner Xue.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Thank you, Chair. I was unfortunately not here but I reviewed the summary very carefully. I do believe this is a wonderful summary so it basically captured what we discussed during the retreat. So, I don't have any concerns based on my assignment. I don't know who else was not here; I cannot speak for them of course so I fully support this. However, when I look through all the initiatives, I do believe we have quite a few. If we could prioritize

some of them that would be wonderful to help us to focus a little bit more. So, just one suggestion, that's it. Thank you.

[Several Commissioners spoke off mic]

Commissioner Savage: Yes, it all looks fine.

Chair Kralik: Alright, I had originally thought that we could vote on this as an excepted set of initiatives and goals. So, I would be open to having a motion from one of our Commissioners as to accepting this.

Commissioner Regehr: Can I...

Commissioner Lee: So, Mr. Chair, I had a couple of comments and...

Chair Kralik: Please, go right ahead.

Commissioner Lee: ...(crosstalk)(inaudible) prior to voting.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: So, with regard to the childcare initiative, I just want to make sure that I'm reading the goals adequately. I think one of the things that I was primarily interested in was exploring the possibility of the City offering childcare at critical community meetings like City Council meetings, Commissions meetings. Things like the Cubberley design process would have been a good example. I know a lot of cities are looking at that sort of model and are starting to adopt it. So, that was sort of the principle goal that I had in mind with childcare. I do like the goal – the other goals listed but I just want to make sure that first one was inclusive of...

Chair Kralik: So, following that discussion, just identify it for our discussion here. Are you on which page?

Commissioner Lee: I'm on Page 5.

Chair Kralik: Ok and that would be...

Commissioner Lee: Under childcare.

Chair Kralik: Alright and...

Commissioner Lee: So, I'm ok with the four goals here, but I want to make sure that one of them – my primary goal was to explore childcare at City-related meetings. So, that folks with kids can engage in the civic and community process. I'm ok with the other goals but I would...

Chair Kralik: Would that fall into Number Two? Could that fall into Number Two?

Commissioner Lee: Yes, we could be just maybe add that as a parenthetical or a comma there because I just want to be clear that childcare, not only generally speaking, how do we make sure that we have childcare. (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: What was your proposed parenthetical number to read?

Commissioner Lee: Include childcare at City meetings and events.

Chair Kralik: Inclusive of childcare at City meetings and events?

Commissioner Lee: Yes, at important City meetings and events.

Chair Kralik: It could say at – just general.

Commissioner Lee: Yes.

Chair Kralik: At City meeting and events.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Got this Mary? Do you have this?

Chair Kralik: Very well. Commissioner Regehr, you have a comment?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh actually, I wanted to make a comment just in regards to all of these. So the question before the Commission tonight is an approval of this Work Plan. So, this is an approval of this Work Plan with the knowledge that you have of these issues at this moment. So, in regards to Commissioner Lee's question, I believe that each of you and as staff, when I read a lot of these and I listened to the July tape. I can say that's happening or I can tell you something about that or I can tell you something about that. That's not exactly right so what I just want is that the Commission understands that these are your initial thoughts or questions, but as you go into this you'll be able to say when it comes to the HRC the first time and you're able to say hey, this is my thinking about this. This is what I plan to explore, these are some of the questions I may have. Then you can say actually, what I put on the draft agenda, you know that's already being done by someone or I've rethought it and this is what I'm really looking for. I'm saying that before you vote on it just so you understand that everybody is under the understanding that it's going to look a little bit different. Some of these questions might be totally different. I think the commitment is that these will be explored, thoughts brought back to the HRC with how you'd like to proceed, getting feedback from your colleagues, maybe something is of concern that you didn't know was a concern or something isn't a concern that you weren't. So, this is just kind of a commitment to – that you want to make to explore these and that's what I just wanted to clarify for you all.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: On Page 1, under children, I just want to be clear that it says Palo Alto Adoption of Standards for a Child-Centered Community. It's really a specific initiative, it's from

UNICEF. It says the Child-Friendly Cities Initiative. We apply for and so, it's not just a willy-nilly type of process project.

Chair Kralik: Since you're leading it, I would be hard-pressed to say that it's willy-nilly. I know that you came from a position of knowledge and strength.

Commissioner Regehr: It's a process and it's connected to the UNICEF and the UN. That's why I'm just saying is that its...

Chair Kralik: Yes, we're grateful to have you working on it...

Commissioner Regehr: Ok, thank you.

Chair Kralik: ...and leading it. Commissioner Stinger, did you have any errata edits, etc.?

Commissioner Stinger: No edits but a comment, I want to follow up with Minka's comment. I think it's great to explore pieces but some of that feels to me like that's what we should have done going into the retreat. I think it might help to have two levels of a few priorities that we are really committed to deliver this year. Then some other areas that we want to explore and perhaps we can get some traction on it this year or take an up or down vote, but that they are exploratory topics separate out. So, that we know where our focus is and what we really want to put our name on and our commitment to Council.

Chair Kralik: Let me answer that this way; is in accepting this Work Plan initiatives and goals, we have added a page at the end that talks a little bit about the process. One of the reasons we did that is that sometimes folks felt, in my discussions that if an issue was simple or could be pushed forward in a straightforward manner through presentation, discussion, and decision as an example, that we not limit the number of topics. There will be a natural prioritization that in large part depends on the energy and focus of the leaders of each of these initiatives. It's something that will move forward. When we get into a situation of conflicting time or efforts that Staff notices, I think we should be open to discussing it and talking about prioritization. Of course, naturally, I'll give you an example, the LGBTQ, is well on its way. It is well through this workflow into follow on projects, meetings, etc. and the end result has shown up in the form of proposals; informal or formal. So, I think one of the things that really helps is that we get informed about an issue. I think we should be very open, especially if we have an initiative to having the presentation available as a start. Then if it appears that we have broader issues that we would get into, such as projects, then that's something that we could add. If you look at the list itself, you'll see that there are some spaces where there's no project identified at present. So, that will give you a present hint as to some of these initiatives are not that far along and I think that's kind of the natural thing. It's a natural course of process flow. I wanted to ask a question of the Commissioners if I may. We had a gentlemen tonight who talked a little bit about police relations. He had pointed out his client apparently had a bad experience, is in the context now of a lawsuit, but I do see on Page Number 4 that in terms of Public Safety and improved communications we have exploring and addressing distrust between minorities and police. I just wondered if we could broaden that statement to indicate between members of the public and the police; including minorities. Is there anyone that has a comment on that?

Commissioner Savage: Yes, as it is it's a limiting statement...

Chair Kralik: Yes.

Commissioner Savage: ...so I agree with you.

Chair Kralik: So, I might suggest an edit that says between members of the public and police. Ok? So, that was my one edit. Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: I want to echo the Vice Chair's concerns in terms of just how lengthy the Work Plan currently is and admittedly, quite a few of these are things with my name on that. So, I'd be very interested in the Chair's thoughts in terms of what the scheduling process would look like and what the current schedule looks like for the rest of the year. That might give us some context in which to gauge do we want to approve the entire Work Plan, do we want to streamline it down a bit, and do we want to prioritize it? I think having a sense of what the current schedule looks like for the next 12-months; as well as what the Chair envision the process might be in terms of if we have a straight-forward presentation, how and when we could put that on the agenda versus a more complex thing. I think having that discussion might help eliminate what we want to approve in terms of the Work Plan.

Chair Kralik: I would answer that this way, is that I never envision this document as being the Work Plan. I envisioned it as being a list of broad initiatives and goals with the Work Plan coming from the specific projects that are present. So, it's broader than the Work Plan in essence and I envisioned it as an exercise in identifying issues that we could communicate to the public as being initiatives of the Commission with specific goals of the Commission. Now, the Work Plan is something that develops from it. There are projects on here that would go on a Work Plan but if you wanted to add a project to sort of change the prioritization, I think that's something that would come through the leadership team and staff based on your proposals. So, as an example, let's just suppose that there was a meeting of the LGBTQ Needs Assessment Group. You would basically say that I want to put that on the agenda and we have in mind for these specific goals and projects three meetings this year. That's something that Commissioner Lee and Stinger would communicate up through the Commission and staff. So, I don't want this to be a limiting document. I want it to be a broad statement of initiatives and goals. In terms of the projects, those are things that are presently identified for active work, but if there comes a time when you want to add a project to change the prioritization, I think that's something that we, as a Commission, should delve into.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can I say something? I think because of the number of them and I realize that they are not all listed. I think as staff and for the operations of the Commission, my observation would be that it would be helpful to me, as we did last time, if we can say I'll be ready in October or a quarter. What's hard and what doesn't feel good to many Commissioners is at the end of the meeting saying this is the time, I need to tell them that I'll be ready in 2-months and I think it'd be helpful, as much as possible, if folks can look through their items and however mechanism that the Chair thinks is appropriate to do so to have some indication. Is this in the fall is this in the winter, is this July and so forth so that people can anticipate when they should be

ready. Then there's this feeling of I got to be there, that they have to make a statement at the end of the meeting to get it on the agenda. So, that's an observation, what the Commission chooses to do with that, that's the will of the Commission and the Chair.

Chair Kralik: Let me answer that if I can?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Sure.

Chair Kralik: In the Public Safety item, as an example where we're talking about this, Commissioner Savage and Smith are on that. My thought process would be that those two Commissioners would communicate with staff as to what they might plan to explore and address distrust. Do they plan a public meeting at the Art Center? Is that something that they would like to do? So, they would raise that with staff and at that point, they might say that we're targeting a December date for a forum and we're going to have these three speakers, etc. Then those, if you will, projects would then come into the Commission for consideration.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think I was hoping, as staff, that there's at least some pre-estimate of the Commissioners being able to say, at this month I think I'll be ready to talk about it for the first time because if I'm the arbitrary of getting...

Chair Kralik: No, it would be – Yes, no, it would come...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...Commissioner's input between meetings of when they want to get on the agenda. I would say that would be a challenging process. I think as you all know staff definitely has any input on that, but that's I think more as things come up every month. I'm not sure what you're going to come with at the end of the meeting. I think if you have this idea and being able, with the best of intentions, say either you do this during a Commission meeting or after tonight you send me, then I review that with the Chair and Vice Chair, and say yes. If you're just coming to me, I might get five for November and nothing for January. I think if people can let us know when they think they might be ready for the first time if they think it is complex or simple, and then as the leadership team, we can say hey, we created a document like Commissioner Stinger did last time. We had seven for October; hey, Commissioner Lee, can you go a month later or something like that. That's what I would suggest for your consideration.

Commissioner Lee: Or to give an example of this, so under the parks and rec initiative, Commissioner Regehr and I met with Kristen O'Kane to talk about some of the initial work that they're doing in terms of exploring ways to ensure that our parks and rec programming are more inclusive; both at Rinconada Pool but also just summer and school day programming. She had indicated that likely those initial draft plans might be ready sometime after October. So, the general timeline on that would be perhaps November/December. Whereas something like police, I think the Police Chief had previously indicated to me that he was going to be ready to bring back the body cam policy for our input sometime this fall/winter time. So, having a sense of when things come up gives each individual Commissioner working on a project, as Minka indicated, some predictability of like ok, yes, we will get to it in this 2 or 3-month timeframe. I can prepare in advance, have it ready, and so I would be supportive – I would only be comfortable approving something tonight if it included some sort of timeframe. It doesn't

necessarily need to be specific months but if we can give 2 or 3-month periods to each initiative. That would give me some comfort that this is everything that we're taking on is more manageable.

Commissioner Savage: Oh, well not addressing your comment but just back to Page 4 under Public Safety where the project details are. I would suggest we remove the word distrust and replace it with communication. It just has a bunch of negative implications on that. I mean if that's what we find it, fine, but I'd like it to just say explore and address communications between.

Chair Kralik: Ok. May I ask a question? Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Regehr go right ahead.

Commissioner Regehr: Go ahead, go ahead.

Chair Kralik: I was going to ask a question on Page 6, at the bottom, if anyone recalled this Needs Assessment informing building choices of the City? Who was the Commissioner that had proposed that?

Commissioner Lee: That was mine and that came out of the LGBTQ work that Commissioner Stinger and I did, but it applied across all of the topical areas that the Commission addresses. You know we often find in presentation like we had today – well, not this specific one but in other presentations. In other presentations, we often hear from groups about the need for space. So, that they can provide the services and programming that targets the populations and communities that our Commission is particularly concerned about. As our City starts planning for things like Cubberley and other spaces I think that's an opportunity for our Commission to weigh-in and advise Council and say we've seen and heard that there's a need for X or for Y. So, we hope that they will reserve or take that into consideration when they build out or program those spaces so that's what that item is.

Commissioner Stinger: Actually, I had a different take on it. Maybe they are complimentary, but I was thinking about our strategic priorities when we look at something like CDBG or our HSRAP. That it's been about 5-years since these was an in-depth needs assessment of the community. We had talked about perhaps framing that and getting an outside professional to really...

Ms. van der Zwaag: And staff is advocating for that as well so you know that's something that's already in my bailiwick of trying to advocate for a Needs Assessment. That could possibly address several depending on how it is framed. You don't want it too big, but if it's something that we're able to make happen it could address some of the other interesting questions the Commission has indicated.

Commissioner Lee: I thought what Commissioner Stinger mentioned fell under the we lumped it under on Page 4, under public health.

Chair Kralik: We did.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so that's where I thought we had left it.

Chair Kralik: So, Steven, if it's alright with you what I'd like to do, is put under projects, conduct assessments of space needs, if that's ok? Just so I understand exactly what that is I'm going to assign you as the lead on that and then I'll add Staff as support. Is that ok with everyone? Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Lee: Well, so that – sorry, go ahead.

Commissioner Regehr: No, I'll let that go.

Commissioner Lee: I think for this one, I mean I'm happy to lead it but I think it's going to require a lot of buy-in from the Commission. So, as we are going about doing our individual initiatives, as we are hearing things from groups if there's some way that we can consolidate those thoughts. So that if a new space was coming online, maybe you were working on a Health Initiative and you heard for a particular health service or the Vice Chair was working with seniors and heard for a particular space for seniors. So, a lot of it's going to feed in from the individual initiatives we work on.

Chair Kralik: I think it's a good item, we're happy to have you lead it. Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: I just have some questions. If there's nothing down for a project, are we voting on projects or you know what I mean? I'm just confused of when I could start...

Commissioner Savage: Working.

Commissioner Regehr: ...working? So, I'm just trying to figure out some of the things that there's not projects...

Chair Kralik: We do have to vote on this set of initiatives and goals and the framework of the Work Plan.

Commissioner Regehr: But what I'm saying is like, under Climate Change, I have quite a few projects but there's nothing there and then under mental health, I have a timely thing even though I'm not on there. I have just some other ideas and I just don't know how I implement and how I...

Chair Kralik: I believe it is ok for people who are on an initiative to begin work because the initiative is there, the goals are there. You may end up identifying projects that we don't know about. That could come in a framework of the workflow as something that happens. For example, if it's a complex issue, after a presentation and discussion. So, looking at the workflow you will see for example presentation, discussion, single-issue agenda item, projects and initiatives, project planning, implementation.

Commissioner Regehr: But I guess what I'm saying is like for Climate Change I've been working because of the straw and the ban of the straws and everything. I've been working with

the Zero Waste. The whole thing was an idea to have it at Farmers Markets and that is a project but how do I - I'm sorry. So, that is a project but how do I get that going but I also have it under the aspects of Human Relations instead of just me? I mean it seems like we should vote on projects.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, here's my response to your question because I thought about the exact same thing Commissioner. Is that the wise counsel of the Chair is ves; these are initiatives and goals. That's what you're voting on tonight. As I mentioned earlier, you're going to come into some of these things and say, some of your assumptions were wrong, some of them were different because what happened this time usually what happens is with these kinds of goals and initiatives – as did last year, there's this filtering that takes places that, is this within the realm of authority of the HRC? Do we have the bandwidth? There's these filters that take place. I think this year how I see it is you have all of these broad ranges of ideas. So, then you have your area, Climate Change, and some projects you're thinking of. Then you collect those ideas and those projects and then you get a time on the agenda and then you present; these are the things I'm thinking about, these are how I feel like it fits in with the scope and authority, this is what I would like to do, and then people can ask you questions, you can refine it, they could possibly say I have concerns of that may not fall within the scope of the HRC or I'm not sure if we have the time do that all. There's still some refining that happens. I don't think this was a call that all 75 projects that people have, that it's just going to happen. That's what this first step is, is you have these initial ideas, you have these thoughts, and then it comes, you do a presentation and a discussion. The result of that discussion could be you're charged to go forward and say I'm going to do A, B, and C. So, there's still that refining that happens when you come back to the HRC. Once you've explored any of these areas you're going to come back for the first time and say hey, I've explored it, these are my thoughts, this is what I'd like to do, let's chat about it, you get the by-in of your fellow Commissioners, you might get some challenges, you might get some great jobs, but then at the end of that they said ok, we are charging you to go forward with that. That's how I envisioned it.

Commissioner Regehr: Can I say one more thing? I feel that some other Commissions that they have subcommittees and also if this is the case, I feel like things aren't going to get done. I mean I feel like maybe if we're going to vote on that plan then maybe we should have more than one meeting a month. I don't see how each of us has all of these projects and if we have to wait for it all to be approved by being on the agenda. There's no way we're going to get hardly anything done this year if we have to wait to be on the agenda to...

Chair Kralik: Steven called me and said he's going to camp out at my house with the kids.

Commissioner Regehr: I understand, I just think that it's May – it's been May...

Chair Kralik: No, I understand. No, I...

Commissioner Regehr: ... it's been four – I mean May, June, July, and August, by the time it will be September, 4-months before we even start doing anything.

Chair Kralik: Well, we always look back, for example, at the end of the cycle which will be next

May and see how we progressed with the Work Plan. What I think is really important is information and exposing this group to informed information about a particular initiative. This is meant really to give you the green light to start work on these initiatives and goals. The other thing is I like this format. I was going to ask that someone rewrite it but I don't think we should. I think we should publish this particular chart and then if we move forward on that chart and projects get identified. We can update the chart and we can vote to update the chart or initiative or goal. We could indicate, for example, that after reviewing and discussing it Commissioner Smith and Xue have decided that the community connection loneliness item is something that we can't address in this particular year because of X, Y, and Z and we can remove it if we need to remove it. So, it's meant to push us forward that is how I see it.

Commissioner Regehr: But I think there's a good reason to have a green light but I also think that we need to understand what the green light is, what the rules are. I mean I think as a Commission we need to think about our name being on things and do we all agree on this?

Chair Kralik: That's why we're here tonight. If your name is on something you don't want to be on...

Commissioner Regehr: No for example, community connection there's no project but I have quite a few projects that I think would be great on this. I think that...

Chair Kralik: That's something that we can hear from you and we can update. There are Commissioner updates, Commissioner reports.

Commissioner Regehr: My point is, what Minka was saying, is that I think that a green light is great but...

Ms. van der Zwaag: understand what it means.

Commissioner Regehr: ...you have to understand what it means. Maybe...

Chair Kralik: If there's a specific project that you have in mind then at that point you can present that to the Commission and we can say we'd like to have that project as the subcommittee. The difficulty we have is we can't have too many people discussing things, unfortunately. We have limitations under the law about how many Commissioners talk about different things and so...

Commissioner Regehr: I guess I'm looking how do we do the seal of approval of Human Relations Commission when it's not just a Patty Regehr project? You know what I'm saying? How do you get...

Commissioner Lee: I mean well...

Ms. van der Zwaag: How I – go ahead, Commissioner.

Commissioner Lee: I mean as an example, last year on our Work Plan we said that we wanted to do a series of Community Conversations. So, I don't think we actually voted on the Work Plan but there was someone who was saying that we wanted to do Community Conversations. The

specific Community Conversations were great but the Commission never actually came around and voted to say yes, we want to do a Community Conversation on X topic, go ahead, and use our name. Whereas there are other times where we actually agendize items where there was this community event, we want to be involved with, let's vote to put HRC on it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: But in that example, I think in retrospect there was concern by some Commissioners that those individual ideas didn't come forward. So, I...

Commissioner Lee: I think that's the issue that we're trying to figure out. If you have a...

Chair Kralik: Let me ask the former Chairs to give their impressions of this issue because I think it's important to have their perspective. Commissioner Savage.

Commissioner Savage: Well, first off Commissioner Regehr, you sound a little bit overwhelmed.

Commissioner Regehr: Oh no.

Commissioner Savage: No?

Commissioner Regehr: No.

Commissioner Savage: Oh, ok.

Commissioner Regehr: Overwhelmed with what? No, I don't feel overwhelmed with all, I'm just very energetic and I just want to get a lot of things done.

Commissioner Savage: So, overwhelmed is not oh I call it overwhelming but I don't think there's anything wrong – I mean, first of all, there are quite a few areas here. You know it is all over the place and we do need to refine some things so that they're manageable for the year. My experience is things they come to be. For instance, I'll use the example of the Public Safety Initiative. I envision Commissioner Smith and I going and talking to the Chief, seeing what he has to say, bring those back comments back here, and then depending on what is said, we go forward. You know there are a lot of unknowns in all of this but just if we begin the basic work it will fall into place. Trust me on that.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Stinger your thoughts.

Commissioner Stinger: I'm hung up on your comment Commissioner Lee. I really think that we usually have brought projects back to the full Commission for approval. I think that's really important because even if an individual is taking something forward and making good progress. It's the name of the Commission that's upfront and in public. So, I feel like they need to have some routine scheduling and know ahead of time so that we don't come up with an October meeting with 10 topics on it. We certainly don't want to micromanage but we do need to be concerned with our image and...

Chair Kralik: There's a level of trust here...

Commissioner Stinger: There's a high level.

Chair Kralik: ... that people who are on these as leads and supports will communicate with the Commission. The difficulty we have is that we don't want to stop work but we do want to promote a communication at meetings and I think there are a couple of opportunities. One is the Commissioner reports is a great opportunity on the agenda because any Commissioner that's lead of an initiative can say on the Complete Census County 2020 Initiative, I met with Commissioner Savage, and we identified a project that we'd like to pursue. Then that could go on the agenda. Another way is to communicate that through staff. The difficulty that we have is the leadership team has two Commissioners. So, you have a two Commissioner item and then what happens is that Minka will tell me or Commissioner Xue to get off the line and then we kind of have to move forward from there. I think we have to have a level of trust amongst ourselves of being communicative. If you have a specific issue on Climate Change and you're proposing some policy related to plastic versus paper straws, you've identified that project, and you could either stick that on the agenda with staff or have a speaker come in and talk or you could do that through the Commissioner reports. The trust item is that we ask that you do keep us all informed so that any kind of misunderstanding about approval or direction does not develop.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think the concern with doing it at Commissioner Reports is since you can't have a discussion. You can have a statement but if there's a Work Plan item and Commissioner Savage says well, I've been working on this and I'm doing this, this and this and everybody is going whoa. We like the general topic but we have a concern about that and we'd like to discuss it. During Commissioner Reports that can't happen so I think what Commissioner Stinger was saying is if someone's doing something in the name of the HRC, what is the agreed-upon process that you have decided upon? I thought it was this, to bring it back and say hey, these are my thoughts, I'd like to do A, B, and C and not hey, I'm doing A, B, and C. That's an observation by staff.

Chair Kralik: Absolutely right. No, that's absolutely right and you're much more limited, as you've mentioned, in Commissioner Reports. You have a broad perspective in terms of discussion that you can gain through the input of other Commissioners when it's listed as an agenda item. That also can happen through information. I think the final slide here is meant to the following thing. It's meant really to challenge ourselves to operate from a base of information. To operate projects from a perspective that's balanced on both sides of an issue and enables us to move forward with a decision and maybe an action step. Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: I think maybe we need to approach it from both ends. I think this gives us license to put together an information base and direct our activities from a knowledge base and from familiarity from the community. At the same time, I think we need to be conscious of what we are bringing to the Commission for discussion and review; even on a logistical level. I mean I can see Commissioner Lee and I having a plan to have meetings in September and October and they may demand a lot of ground help from the staff. Then Commissioner Regehr might say wait a second, I had planned to ask staff to help me do a literature search of introductions and I was going to have that happen the end of October. We just need to be conscious of how much we're impacting staff, how much we're impacting each other. Frequently at an event, we'll want support from everybody else and we don't want to have two HRC events on October 15th. If we

can avoid that by reviewing our Work Plan... (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Let me make a suggestion on the last page (inaudible – turned off mic) – lead...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Your microphone.

Chair Kralik: Which may lead to refinements to the Work Plan throughout the year and that way it is identifying this process as a means of refinement so that we move forward in an educated way.

Commissioner Lee: I guess my concern is I'm fine with the workflow as is but let's say I have three straight forward and two complex initiatives that me and another Commissioner wants to bring to the Commission that requires either discussion or action on something. I'm just having difficulty anticipating when each of those five items would actually get agendize. So, typically the way that I've operated is I have a list of things that I would suggest for next agenda but that's kind of very Ad Hoc and disorganized. It doesn't give Staff or the Commission any visibility into what I'm thinking and what we're working on at any given time. So, I really think we need to think more critically, like how do we schedule things? How do we divide time up? I mean throwing some ideas out there; I mean there's seven of us. Maybe at each meeting, two Commissioners have half an hour and that means each Commissioner has an agenda item every 3-months or something like that. You can pair up with folks to come on your time or something like that or we say this month is dedicated to this topic area so be ready to have whether it's the beginning of a – the straight forward process or complex process. Is there are any... (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Is there a present issue that you have?

Commissioner Lee: I have a bunch of things that I'd love for us to discuss and take action on in the next couple of months. I just don't have any sense as to how and when we should schedule them because we have so many things to do.

Commissioner Regehr: Yes, can I just...

Commissioner Lee: So, that's what I'm struggling with.

Commissioner Regehr: We're talking not knowing and we're trying to make a plan without really knowing what we're dealing with. I mean, for example, it seems like it would have been much faster for us to just say, ok, if we're going to vote on this Complete Census County. That's Stinger and Savage, what's your project? Then we know do we need more information or can they just start? Child, Patti – Regehr and Lee; Community connection -- you know I mean it just seems like we could just down very quickly and see what the projects are and see if it has to be on the agenda or if we...

Chair Kralik: No, that's not what we're doing tonight. Tonight, we're basically finalizing initiatives and goals.

Commissioner Regehr: But what I'm saying is we're talking about projects in some ways and...

Chair Kralik: I think that has to be – that has to be discussed by the people on an initiative.

Commissioner Regehr: Yes but what I'm saying is that we're talking about the process of approving project right now. That's what you guys were all discussing and it seems like...

Chair Kralik: Well, as you look at the process flow for example, we recognize we have to operate from a level of information that's educated. So, in large part, we focused on the first meeting as being presentations and discussion. That's kind of how we would do it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, I would agree with the Chair. In relation to your comment Commissioner Regehr, I think once you do that kind of thinking and investigation with you and your partner if you have one. At that point, the project you thought you might do could be completely different and I guess I think that some of you have something in mind but that might change once you do investigations. So, I think what the Chair is saying is yes, we have these initiatives, we have these thoughts, you say this is what I want to accomplish with this thought, but I think I might need to know a little more about it to tell you hey, this I what I think the HRC should consider doing.

Commissioner Regehr: So, I guess my feeling is that when I presented this at the retreat and in June and July, I had a very clear idea of what I wanted to do. I was very educated or I would have brought it up and now I just feel like I didn't join the Commission to be entertained by educational information. I've been living in this community for a long time and I was appointed by the City Council because of my knowledge and I mean all bring something to the table. It's already September almost. I mean by the time we start doing anything and I've already brought up my – I mean that seems it should have been at the retreat about our educational things and education and...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would just look at it a little bit differently. How I see it is not that you're saying let me tell you everything I know about it. It is like based on what I know about this, this is what I want to do and plan on doing and answer anybody else's questions. Your end goal is not to educate everybody about your topic. You still want to have in pack on these specific projects so the goal is not the education. The presentation is to be able to say to the Commissioners, this is what I'm doing, this is what I know about it, and is there anything further? Most of these don't have projects or if they have projects, they're extremely vague.

Chair Kralik: Well, let me try to build you up a little bit Commissioner Regehr and echo your thoughts about being appointed. We're happy you're here, of course. One of the things that we did at the retreat was we listened to your initiatives, we listened to your goals, we identified you as a leader and/or support person on those. So, I think once we do that, once we vote on this document, you should feel comfortable that we have adopted the initiatives and the goals and the projects as listed. Also, you should feel comfortable that as you begin your work on those through this process that's been identified on Page 7. That you may want to communicate to us some refinement and based on that process, we're comfortable considering. So, I think we want your voice to be heard in that regard. I think if we could vote on this tonight and I think it would be heard and we would acknowledge it.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm not...

Chair Kralik: It is August but I would say this, that you've hit the ground running and this would enable you to keep running (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Commissioner Regehr: Ok, I guess my other comment is that on the community connection loneliness. I do have some project ideas and since Smith hasn't been here since our retreat, I would like to be part of that team.

Commissioner Stinger: Well, you could be. It's a Committee of three is workable or...

Chair Kralik: Ok, we could ask Commissioner Xue if he would like you to take his place on that. How would you feel about that?

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, no, no, no, I don't – no, no.

Chair Kralik: Well, let's ask and get his input because I think sometimes if you have Committees of three, they have their own outside work and activities. He was not here for the last meeting due to summer vacation and travel. So, would you feel comfortable Commissioner?

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, I'll pull myself off then because I think you have a tremendous impact on this. I wasn't meaning to eliminate someone. I was just trying to help implement. I'll withdraw my wanting to be on it if you're not on it.

Vice Chair Qifeng: So, I haven't spoken to anybody yet so let me give some of my thoughts regarding the process. In the retreat, we identified our initiatives in July, so some of the Commissioners came together, discussed the initiatives, come up with this comprehensive summary. Then in this meeting are supposed to approve the initiative so the Commissioners associated with the initiatives can start work on it. Bring back the information to our staff, then communicate with the leadership so we will put on them on the agenda. For example, like Commissioner Lee mentioned, we can allocate 30-minutes for each team or maybe we can put the five topics each 10-minutes which would allow us to present the information we collect. Then all the Commissioners would give some feedback. Just approve a project, move forward, and make us on the same page. I understand Patti's concern. If we don't have the formal process, how do we know the project is going to work out? How soon can we get started? So, that's my thinking. I don't know whether that's conflicting with the Chair's decision (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: It doesn't conflict at all. I think...

Vice Chair Qifeng: What about Minka? Would that...

Chair Kralik: I don't think it conflicts at all. At this point, what I would say to that is if we can accept this document as our Work Plan and I have several changes that we made. I can go through it. It's on Page 4 in the project of Public Safety. We're going to list the projects as explore and address communication between members of the public and police. In Page 5...

Commissioner Lee: Could I ask that I be added as a third to that Committee?

Chair Kralik: You can. There's nothing wrong with that.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Chair Kralik: The one thing that I would say is that we would probably want to list you as a support role if that's ok?

Commissioner Lee: Yes, Yes, that's what I meant as a third.

Chair Kralik: Ok. That's fine.

Commissioner Regehr: So, I have a question back on community connection. I have a next – back to my community – why...

Chair Kralik: Would you let me finish this particular thing that I'm listing just...

Commissioner Regehr: Sure.

Chair Kralik: ... unless you have an item that you want to edit.

Commissioner Regehr: Well, I did want to edit this...

Chair Kralik: Ok, go right ahead.

Commissioner Regehr: Back to about Smith and Xue being on the lead and support and your suggestion that he gets eliminated. Did you say he gets taken off if I was on here?

Chair Kralik: I would eliminate the Vice Chair.

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, no, didn't you say...

Commissioner Lee: Well, because Patti wanted to be a third person on that.

Chair Kralik: That's right. I said I would approach him and find out if he would be open to that and/or trading it out. I...

Commissioner Regehr: Right and...

Commissioner Regehr: (inaudible – off mic)

Chair Kralik: He hasn't commented yet because he wasn't here when he was identified.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, what I'm saying is I don't want him traded out but I noticed that other places you have...

Chair Kralik: Your microphone.

Commissioner Regehr: Oh. I was just saying that back to that same point, is I don't know why he has to be traded out when other member interests have two people on them.

Chair Kralik: The goal of having two people on an item was two-fold. One, so that people wouldn't be overwhelmed, second because if there are two people on that item then the entire leadership, the Chair, and the Vice Chair, could discuss a matter. In particular instance...

Commissioner Lee: So, a point of clarification.

Chair Kralik: ...because Commissioner Xue is one of the Vice Chairs, it wouldn't make a difference. So, if you would like to be on that as a support person, we would be open to having you.

Commissioner Regehr: Yes. I just didn't want him to be – I wanted to be included, not have someone eliminated.

Chair Kralik: Ok, so do you feel comfortable adding yourself to that one?

Commissioner Regehr: The community connection?

Chair Kralik: Yes.

Commissioner Regehr: Yes, yes.

Chair Kralik: Ok, then...

Commissioner Lee: Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairmen. Having a Committee...

Chair Kralik: You can call me Gabe or...

Commissioner Lee: A point of clarification for something that the Chair said. So, having a Committee of two, under your interruption, doesn't necessarily mean the entire leadership team could be involved because that's still four. My interruption is that in terms of agendizing, that's not an issue. If you were to actually discuss the issue then that would be an issue, but putting it on an agenda -- having a Committee of two plus two on leadership does not prevent you from discussing putting it on the agenda.

Chair Kralik: Right.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's correct but if there's a discussion that's a little bit further. What have they been working on?

Commissioner Lee: Sure.

Ms. van der Zwaag: If it's like should we do blah, blah? Should we have it this month or next month then that's not a Brown Act (crosstalk)...

Commissioner Lee: In terms of just saying hey leadership (crosstalk)

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... but if they're saying hey, what have they been working on, tell me the information? Oh, I thought blah, blah, blah, then that becomes a concern.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, Yes. So, really there's no less of a need to have a Committee of two versus three. I do not understand the need for two as opposed to three.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Correct, if you're thinking specifically of Brown Act issues...

Commissioner Lee: There's no Brown Act issues.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...there's no Brown Act issues in a Committee meeting until you get more than three. There're no issues with the Brown Act if these are just Ad Hoc Committees. If you determine that you want to make this a standing Committee then they have to be noticed, agendize, minutes and all that.

Commissioner Lee: So, do you have an Ad Hoc Committee of three and they say we want to put something on the agenda. The two-member leadership team can discuss putting it on the agenda without discussing the substance of the item.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That is correct.

Commissioner Lee: So – ok, so really that does not implicate anything – any need to have two-member Committee. We can have three-member Committees.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That is correct.

Chair Kralik: We welcome interest, Steven.

Commissioner Lee: I just want to make sure that the rules are clear here.

Chair Kralik: But also, I – just to let you know I thought that we were pulling teeth to get people to sign up last time. Maybe there are a lot of items here so you know; you have to pick the ones you think you can make progress on. I mean some people have looked at this and said this is a big list. It sure is but the people that signed up as lead and support say I care enough about this to really work at it, to try to make efforts to reach the goals of an initiative, and that's what you're doing when you sign up.

Commissioner Lee: I'd like to suggest that before we approve it if we could just go through the initiatives really quickly and assign maybe 2 to 3-month time periods in which during that 2 or 3-month period that item would be given priority in terms of agenda-setting. Assuming that there's nothing that would require to...

Chair Kralik: Let me do this. Let me first get the present document as edited by our discussion on the table and then I'm going to call for a motion to see if we can accept it as is. I think it's

going to take us a long time to get into timeframes and I think that's not something I anticipated discussing tonight. We've had a lot of opportunities to talk these things through but that sounds like that might be more than we can really - Yes.

Commissioner Lee: If there are some items that are shovel ready, would we be able to add the timeline to it tonight and as we go along, as folks do work on it, they're like ok, it may be shovel ready in 3-months from now. So, let's update the Work Plan to include that timeframe because there's some items here that...

Chair Kralik: I'm not prepared presently to entertain a discussion of timeframes because it's going to take us to long tonight. What I am prepared to do is to allow people to discuss it, to suggest it, and certainly, this document as it's listed here indicates that the workflow below may lead to refinements to the Work Plan. The timing can be one of those refinements. I'm open to saying that. Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: But I think you had made a distinction between this was a statement of initiatives and the Work Plan was separate. It would – you might want to just be really clear on what – we're focusing on this document tonight.

Chair Kralik: I kind of am ok now with the word...

Commissioner Stinger: Oh, ok.

Chair Kralik: ... Work Plan. Initially, I was giving color to my intent but as the discussion rolled around, I think everybody...

Commissioner Stinger: Ok, that's fine.

Chair Kralik: ... is clear that we're adopting the language and the language here indicates also preliminary. So, we're going to accept this document as a direction forward.

Commissioner Lee: When we did the Work Plan...

Commissioner Stinger: Can I...

Commissioner Lee: ... last year, did we actually have a timeline for it, right? In terms of what quarter each item would generally be spoken for or addressed?

Commissioner Stinger: And the assigned people.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so I mean I know things are preliminary, they may change, and folks may not know when they would like to do it. I would suggest that as part of this process and adopting it tonight that we take the extra effort to try to assign some general time parameters around it because I think it's going to help us down the road.

Chair Kralik: I mean the general parameter that is presently there is that the folks that have

signed up as lead and support are going to lead these initiatives and to try to make progress on these goals in this year which is through next May. If you have updates to that, that comes by way of working through the HRC workflow then those can be proposed and can be included in the document and updated. I have no trouble with that.

Commissioner Lee: So, if for instance...

Chair Kralik: In other words, I just don't think tonight is something that we could accomplish. It's just too long of a discussion and I'm not prepared to do it.

Commissioner Lee: Do you anticipate having that discussion at another meeting or it going to be on sort of an Ad Hoc basis?

Chair Kralik: Well, I anticipate the folks that have the member's interest in an item...

Commissioner Lee: So, there's not going to be...

Chair Kralik: Hold on, let me finish.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Chair Kralik: They would suggest projects that have specific timelines and they could come to the Commission and say we have this project and the timeframe for this project is X. Ok? We'd like to have one community discussion with the police in January. They could come up with that timeline and that could be added to this Work Plan.

Commissioner Regehr: Steve, if I may ask, what problem do you see – why do you want to – why are pushing for this?

Commissioner Lee: Well, for instance, let's take the police department; let's say hypothetically that Commissioner Savage's Committee wanted to do something in January. If we wanted to actually do that, we as a Commission would need to take action to approve that in advance of January. So, part of planning an event or an initiative requires that we know the timeline. On some of the issue-specific ones like homelessness, I'm not anticipating an event but more of a discussion and a recommendation to Council on something. So, if I knew in advance, I could bring this up in October as a straight forward proposal where we do a presentation, we discuss a specific recommendation, we pass or we don't pass it. That gives me some visibility in terms of yes, I need to have all my ducks in a row before October or I'm working on a housing issue for discussion...

Chair Kralik: That's something that I think you have to do as a subcommittee and the point that I would make to you is this. That if you leave it open at present – let's suppose you have a wonderful speaker that comes across on a particular issue; housing or whatever it is; homelessness. That person is available to us and we can agendize it and push forward an initiative by having a presentation.

Commissioner Lee: I mean my experience in the past is when things have come up last minute like that, it's been very difficult to agendize them.

Commissioner Regehr: I somewhat – I understand (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: I don't know how to speak to that. Let's have input from...

Commissioner Stinger: I was going to...

Chair Kralik: ... Commissioner Stinger because she was the prior Chair.

Commissioner Stinger: Where I was going with our meeting flow tonight and I think it would be ideal to have times and projects and specification, but I think we have neither the time nor the information to do it. I was going to suggest that we do the edits, vote on the package, and take it as an assignment to each Chair to submit to Mary, to staff, our rough timeline. We can consolidate that and then we can really see something in front of us in September. So, I would be working in isolation saying this is what I want to do, but to discuss...

Chair Kralik: As it occurs, right? So, in other words, if someone comes up with a new timing, they could put it on there and work through Mary and we could update that timing.

Commissioner Stinger: I was just thinking that if I worked in isolation but then we had a discussion about the draft consolidated plans. We could start to say ok, there are too many things in January. I'll pull back or go ahead.

Chair Kralik: Unless there's an objection, what I'm going to do to button this up now is I'm going to read through the edits that I have based on our discussion. I'm going to ask that a motion be made along the lines of Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: May I make an edit too? I think the next line item; you were on Public Safety...

Commissioner Regehr: Can we just start from the front page?

Chair Kralik: Yes, we're going to go from...

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, I thought we had.

Chair Kralik: ...Page 1 we've added Commissioner Regehr to the community connection item as a support Commissioner.

Commissioner Regehr: I have one more. Again, back to the children, the Palo Alto adoption standard for a child-centered community I was very specific on it's a UNICEF Child-Friendly Cities Initiative.

Chair Kralik: Ok, is there a language change you would like to make there?

Commissioner Regehr: Yes, instead of a Palo Alto adoption of standards for a child-centered community. It's to get accreditation as a Child-Friendly City through UNICEF.

Chair Kralik: Ok, I'll put in parenthesis gaining...

Commissioner Regehr: Accreditation...

Chair Kralik: ... accreditation...

Commissioner Regehr: ... as a Child Friend City.

Chair Kralik: ... as a Child-Friendly City under?

Commissioner Regehr: UNICEF.

Chair Kralik: Ok. Alright, any other changes to Page 1? We'll move onto Page 2, there were no changes. Page 3 there were no changes. On Page 4, Commissioner Savage updated the project to read as follows; explore and address communication between members of the public and police.

Commissioner Lee: And I was added as a support.

Chair Kralik: And Commissioner Lee is added as a support. On Page 5...

Commissioner Stinger: On Page 4, please. I went back to my notes from the retreat and I had specifically asked for a method for understanding human service needs beyond public health. I wonder if we can say...

Chair Kralik: Where is that?

Commissioner Stinger: Public health, number three.

Chair Kralik: Yes.

Commissioner Stinger: I see that in the transcription between the retreat and now this has been defined to be public health but I meant it to be human services. I'd like to amend that to say develop a method for understanding human service needs in the City.

Chair Kralik: Human service needs.

Commissioner Lee: And actually, I would like to withdraw from that particular initiative...

Chair Kralik: So, withdrawn.

Commissioner Lee: ...if Commissioner Stinger would like to join that one.

Commissioner Stinger: I would be interested in one and three.

Chair Kralik: Right, so we'll add you as a lead because that would be...

Commissioner Stinger: In one and three.

Chair Kralik: Yes.

Commissioner Stinger: Not so much two.

Chair Kralik: Well, we'll just put that there. Ok, great. So, that's all for Page 4 and Page 5...

Commissioner Lee: Actually, looking at mental health I think we can remove that. I think we can do that through some of our...

Chair Kralik: Where are you?

Commissioner Lee: On Page 4 at the bottom, mental health. Just to make it streamlined I'd probably remove that one, that initiative and just do it through our liaison relationships and in our – I don't think that needs to be a Commission...

Commissioner Regehr: I just – I'll put my name on it then if you do want to take your name off.

Chair Kralik: And I'm happy to work with you on it.

Commissioner Lee: Sounds good.

Commissioner Regehr: On mental health?

Chair Kralik: Yes, you'll be the lead, I'll be the support ok?

Commissioner Regehr: Ok.

Chair Kralik: Alright, so edited. Now on Page 5, under number two goal of the Childcare Initiative, there's a parenthetical added; It says inclusive of childcare at City meetings and events.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, thank you.

Chair Kralik: On Page 6 at the bottom, Needs Assessment under the projects it's edited to read conduct or conduct assessment of space needs and that's Commissioner Lee and staff. Then on the final page, second line at the top, it is going to read Commissioner's appreciate the workflow below may lead to refinements of the Work Plan throughout the year. I would just suggest that we entertain a motion from Commissioner Stinger because she had it ready to go.

MOTION

Commissioner Stinger: I move that we adopt the Palo Alto Human Relations draft 2019-2020

Work Plan as updated August 8th.

Chair Kralik: Can I have a second, please?

SECOND

Commissioner Regehr: I second.

Chair Kralik: All in favor? Motion carries unanimously. There's one absent member.

MOTION PASSED 6-0 WITH COMMISSIONER SMITH ABSENT

3. Update on Community Conversations Series and consideration of HRC involvement

Chair Kralik: Alright, we'll move on then to update on Community Conversation Series and consideration of HRC involvement; Smith and Stinger action. Let me give a little bit of the background of this. At the last meeting, there were only four members of the Commission that discussed this particular item, the vote was 2-2 to move forward on a specific issue, and so this update is something that we're informed about based on that prior discussion of the Commission. Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to bring this back to the HRC because of individual conversations that I had. I wanted the Commission to be aware of our direction and offer an opportunity to the Commission to share and hosting in the publicity. I'll make it clear that the heavy lifting has been done. It's almost really a naming opportunity that's before you. I just wanted to add that when I requested this as an agenda item for this meeting, there was a choice of two locations; the Art Center and the AME Zion Church. The thinking was to use the Art Center but a decision was made by the Committee which is basically the League of Women Voters in the church right now to use the church. That decision was made because we had publicity deadlines and we couldn't take a risk waiting for a vote so, just starting the conversation with that on the table. We could look at rotating venues because we're proposing a series but I'm getting ahead of myself so let me background a little bit. The League and the University of AME Zion Church presented the author Jennifer Eberhardt on May 1st and she was speaking about her book, Biased: Uncovering the Hidden Prejudice in the Shapes and how that Shapes was we See and Think and Do. The event was held at the church and it was very successful in terms of attendance. We had about 100 to 150, we filled the church, and the followup and the feedback from the event was that there was interest in more community-wide or active events. So, the Committee working has put together a proposal that has been excepted by the Committee at the church and the League of Women Voters to host a series of three to four community events between September 2019 and March or April of 2020 and basically leveraging the first event we had with Jennifer Eberhardt. The sequence would move through four topics and move – it would be a different presentation format. We'll have an arch from a lecture to more community participation. The goal is to engage and practice productive dialogs, taking on hard discussions, working through the impasse, and promoting civility and compassion, particularly in community conversation. The first event has been scheduled for September 18th, the speaker is Robb Willer, and he's a Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Phycology,

and Organizational Behavior at Stanford. Our particular interest in Professor Willer is that he is Director of the Laboratory for Polarization and Social Change and he's also the Director of the Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society. He is an outstanding speaker and we feel really fortunate to have him. So, I wanted you to be aware of what we were doing, ask if you were interested in co-sponsors with the group of civic, educational, and faith communities.

Commissioner Regehr: I have a question in regards to when we decided about it being at the Art Center. Are you saying that advertisement was already out at that point?

Commissioner Stinger: No, it was a no vote and so I did not have the support of the Commission to take that forward.

Chair Kralik: I mean in all fairness it was a 2-2 vote. We didn't have four Commissioners to vote in favor.

Commissioner Stinger: Right so...

Chair Kralik: Rather than say it's a no.

Commissioner Stinger: Fair, but we need four and the challenge was to get a unanimous vote that evening. So, I took it as I did not have the Commission's four votes.

Commissioner Regehr: But I thought it was a recommendation that – I'm trying to figure out why it can't be at the Art Center.

Commissioner Stinger: I'm not sure how to answer that. Logistically or why we chose not to use the Art Center?

Chair Kralik: Let me help a little bit, just to frame the discussion a little bit. I think there was a discussion about holding this event or all four events at the AME Zion Church and there were a couple of reasons for that. I think Staff had some input on the discussion as well. As I understand this particular update, Commissioner Stinger is identifying that the first of the series would be there but that the Art Center would be available for other ones. As would other venues depending on who would like to co-sponsor it. So, could you clarify that for us so we can understand it?

Commissioner Stinger: That's exactly right. I can't say it any better than that. Commissioner Regehr, I just didn't feel like I had the Commission's support at that point and as a Committee, we were going ahead and trying to book a speaker and make our publication deadlines this week prior to this meeting.

Commissioner Regehr: So, in September where is it going to be?

Commissioner Stinger: It's at the AME Church with Professor Willer.

Commissioner Regehr: The third one? The next one?

Commissioner Stinger: We haven't gotten that far yet because we haven't had a vote.

Commissioner Regehr: Who hasn't voted?

Chair Kralik: So, at the last meeting I think we only were talking about one event. Now Commissioner Stinger is doing a couple of things. First, she's bringing forward this item in a new transformative position of proposing four events of Community Conversation. Presently sponsored by AME Zion and the League of Women Voters and who? Of Palo Alto, right? Instead of having one event at the church it's now going to be a series of four events. The church is going to host the first one. The Art Center is available to us for the other three but we may hold one of them at the Art Center. It could be that there's another venue depending on who else would like to sponsor. What we talked about, if I recall it right, is that we wanted other people to be able to impact this particular issue and sponsor it. So...

Commissioner Regehr: I disagree. When I brought that issue up at being at the Zion, I specifically said that as a Human Relation Commission representing everyone. That I felt very uncomfortable with the same organization, the same church, holding it again. Then we had a discussion that how it would be more inclusive if we had it at the Art Center because that doesn't eliminate religious groups and then someone said well, people felt comfortable there. I said that's not the point. I still don't feel comfortable having our name on it if it's again being – and we don't know.

Chair Kralik: Ok, so let's move onto other comments. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Regehr: So, I'm just saying is that wasn't...(crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: I got it. No...

Commissioner Regehr: It's like it was very specific.

Chair Kralik: Nothing wrong with having your input. Commissioner Lee, your light is on.

Commissioner Lee: Can you give us a sense about what the topics of the events are? I mean I understand that it's Community Conversations, how do we have dialog but are their specific topic areas... (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Commissioner Stinger: Well, the progression that we've talked about is trying to grow community's competency in four areas. Speaking is the first focus and we're talking about speaking in terms of bridging the ideological divide, overcoming polarity, framing values, to find common ground. That is where his research has focused.

Commissioner Lee: So, that's the first one?

Commissioner Stinger: Yes and then we're looking at listening and we don't have a speaker lined up for that and then personal responsibility in a democracy and the idea that you can't be silent and then compassion and civility in Palo Alto; bringing it home.

Commissioner Lee: So, it's a very general topic as opposed to Mountain View? They had a civility roundtable around housing so this is very much...

Commissioner Stinger: This is more process...

Commissioner Lee: Process, ok.

Commissioner Stinger: ...with the idea that we have very opposite polls and we make assumptions about what you think and what I think based on very little.

Commissioner Lee: Sorry, what is the fourth one? The fourth topic.

Commissioner Stinger: Compassion and civility.

Commissioner Lee: Compassion and civility. Thank you.

Chair Kralik: Let me just ask staff. Staff, you had input at that meeting when we took this up and you were indicating that there were some limitations out there on sponsorship, etc. if we were to hold an event at the church. I forgot exactly what your point was?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I'm trying to remember what you're referring too. I mean there's nothing that says the HRC cannot put its name on a secular event for the event is located in a religious institution.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The City itself may think differently about that but if it's the HRC and if it's a secular topic but just the place in which it's being held is a religious institution. There's nothing, to the best of our knowledge, that the HRC could not do that.

Chair Kralik: So, in any kind of a contemplated action here, what's fair play for the Commission in terms of voting on this item?

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

Commissioner Regehr: Sorry, you said something about the Art Center. That if we endorse it that we could get the Art Center.

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, the HRC has no ability to waive fees.

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, no, right, right.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The only thing if they were to get the Art Center as an event it would have to be hosted by the Office of Human Services. The Office of Human Services will not be, after discussion, hosting an event at a religious location. So, we are not able to do so but the HRC is able to if it's specifically listed, the HRC. Now, at this point I think it has to be a decision by the 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 government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Chair if you want to endorse it since we don't specifically have an endorsement policy right now. The HRC can't use language such as co-sponsor because co-sponsor in City terms means a waiver of fees for a City location. So, at this point how the lens I would suggest that you look at this is if you are considering this, that you are part of this event, your part of the planning of this event so in de facto it is an HRC event. Now, would have to be ok with the League of Women Voters and the AME Zion. When the HRC did the Being Different Together Series that was a series along with the community that was the HRC. It was AME Zion, it was a Jewish Rabbi, it was the library, and it was a collation of different groups in the community to do a secular event. At that time, it just happened that they were all at the Art Center.

Chair Kralik: So, in this present situation that we're in as to September event, is it fair play for the Commissioner to endorse that event?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The Commission can make yes, you can as my understanding as staff, that endorsements you are looking for a policy and maybe re-bring a policy to consider endorsements. You clearly have the authority at this moment to say yes, we want to endorse this event or not.

Commissioner Regehr: Can I ask for clarification on the vote last time when it was 2-2, what were we voting on? Do you remember because I thought it was whether or not continuation? I don't think you can vote again. I don't think can...

Commissioner Lee: So, I remember voting no on it because I wanted us to discuss it at the retreat in terms of whether it would be on the Work Plan. So, that's the only reason why I voted no.

Chair Kralik: We're going to just take a brief pause, maybe we can have a drink of water and Mary can look up the agenda item the last time. I think it also really depends on how any motion would be framed, but I would say this that I believe Commissioner Regehr is right that if this is the same thing...

Commissioner Stinger: Then that would be fair.

Chair Kralik: ... then we really can't vote again. If it isn't the same thing, if there's some substantial change then that would be different. I don't know that for example, the speaker was identified the last time.

Commissioner Stinger: No, we just...

Commissioner Regehr: The place was.

Chair Kralik: The place sure was and your objection is noted too that. If you were to vote no because it's held at a place, that would be ok.

Commissioner Stinger: My notes were that – if I stuck to my notes I was asking for agreement with our theme and goals. It was very general.

[several people started talking off mic]

Commissioner Regehr: But what was it?

[several people talking off mic]

Commissioner Stinger: I just want to be clear that I understand your position and I have argued in our Committee both sides of the same coin. We had some good reasons to have it at the AME Zion Church and some good reason to have it at the Art Center. Basically, it was a matter of calendar. We needed to get some documents done this week.

Commissioner Regehr: Do you know if you have tried any other places of worship?

Commissioner Stinger: The League of Women Voters has held its meetings at Beth Am.

Commissioner Regehr: I mean for this series.

Commissioner Stinger: No, we have not. We could but the Committee has not stretched that far.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Xue has input.

Vice Chair Qifeng: So, after hearing the discussion I'll give you some of my feedback regarding the event last time I attended. I felt that was a wonderful event. In terms of the church, as a Christian, I don't have issue. If I were you, I would approve this event. I support this one because we, as a community, we have to be open. We need to listen to good speakers and how they share their opinions regarding specific issues. So, that's how we can learn. In terms of resource, sometimes we do have some limitations. Think about it, the face or the effort for the Commissioners. I feel at a certain point we do need to compromise a little bit, so I certainly understand Commissioner Regehr's point of view as I support that part). However, sometimes we need to consider the limited resource to make this thing happen.

Chair Kralik: Yes and let me build on that comment by saying this. One of the discussions was not necessarily negative about that location, it was more positive. It was trying to build the community by allowing other groups to also be sponsors/endorsers of an event and being open to holding those events in a variety of places. I do take Commissioner Stinger's point here that there were exigencies at present, given the prior vote, in which there were only four Commissioners here. So, they have to move forward, but I think the underlying intent is to do just that. To be broader, to allow others to either co-sponsor and/or endorse and being open about it. So, I think we're kind of moving in the same direction but I acknowledge Commissioner Regehr's issue.

Commissioner Stinger: I do as well. One part of the discussion that we had as a Committee was where would be get the most diverse audience? We went back and forth on that and then what we realized is that we were really just making assumptions. We have no idea and if we did start to move the event around to different venues, we could start looking at the demographics, and see how we really get a diverse audience if the venue is at all a factor in the attraction.

Commissioner Regehr: I think my point wasn't that I was against the Christian Church at all. That wasn't my point. My point was that if the City has the same thing, that they don't put their name on something that's a religious organization. Minka had a much better way of explaining it and so I just feel that if we're putting our name on Human Relation Commission and talking about open dialog that if a venue is the same venue every time, it's showing something; whether we mean to or not. I guess that's my concern is that some people might not feel comfortable being...

Ms. van der Zwaag: (inaudible -off mic)

Commissioner Regehr: Yes, some people might not feel – and that is my point was that I don't feel comfortable.

Chair Kralik: Ok, let's go this...

Commissioner Stinger: Can I just make...

Chair Kralik: ...let just ask for input from the staff if there is one...

Commissioner Regehr: Yes, what had we vote...

Chair Kralik: ...and then we're going to move forward and ask for a motion.

Commissioner Stinger: I just want to be clear that the event with the author was not an HRC event. It was the two co-hosts.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Staff is not going to weigh in. This is a decision that the HRC needs to make as all of your decisions so I'm not going to weigh in on that. I mean if the question is what the motion was last time. The motion was that the HRC organize with the League of Women Voters and AME Zion Church a series of four community events with the initial event scheduled for mid-August to mid-September. It wasn't a very refined motion.

Commissioner Regehr: What was the motion?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's what I just read to you.

Chair Kralik: Yes, they read the verbatim.

Commissioner Regehr: When was that though?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That was at the June meeting.

Chair Kralik: June meeting.

Ms. van der Zwaag: June meeting.

Chair Kralik: Let's do this. Steven, you have some input? Go ahead.

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so I did look up the rules of Parliamentary Procedure. Typically, a motion to reconsider has to be made at the same meeting by someone on the prevailing side of the motion, but a body can vote to suspend the rules by 2/3s votes, so five out of the seven, in order to do a motion to reconsider at a later meeting.

Chair Kralik: Yes...

Commissioner Lee: So, we can still consider this one Parliamentary standpoint if we would want to and I would support that motion to proceed.

Chair Kralik: I think from my perspective that we should make this motion very specific to the speaker so that it's changed in substantial part because the last motion was very vague. I think what I'd like to do is to ask Commissioner Stinger to formulate a motion for our consideration of this specific speaker and as an endorsement of the HRC of the speaking event.

Commissioner Regehr: I object because I'm not objecting to the speaker. So, if we make a motion for the speaker that means where ever the speaker is speaking...

Chair Kralik: No, it will have the event in the location so you can vote no if you want.

Commissioner Regehr: You said the speaker.

Chair Kralik: Yes, but with a specific speaker.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, it's – listening to Commissioner Lee, I think you have to his vote first...

Commissioner Lee: Yes, so maybe...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... and the vote to suspend the last vote and then you can vote on the new thing.

Commissioner Lee: So, if the Chair...

Chair Kralik: I don't think that we're reconsidering it.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, you do because you took a vote on this.

Commissioner Regehr: Right.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, according to...

Chair Kralik: On this particular speaker. That's why I'm trying to...

Commissioner Lee: But it's the same event though.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I believe that the spirit of the motion from last time would...

Chair Kralik: Overlaps.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... require you to take this preliminary decision.

Chair Kralik: Ok, so let's go ahead. Steven?

MOTION #1

Commissioner Lee: I move to suspend the rules to enable a motion to reconsider on the subject motion.

Chair Kralik: Is there a second?

SECOND

Commissioner Stinger: I can second.

Commissioner Lee: Ok and this requires...

Commissioner Stinger: I second.

Commissioner Lee: ...five out of the seven.

Chair Kralik: Ok, discussion? Ok, not hearing any. All in favor say aye?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can you raise your hands, please? I'm sorry. So, 6-1 so it does pass.

Chair Kralik: 5-1.

Commissioner Lee: 5-1.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Sorry, I'm sorry.

MOTION #1 PASSED 5-1 WITH COMMISSIONER SMITH ABSENT

Commissioner Lee: 5-1 so we've suspended the rules so I ask someone on the prevailing side of the last motion...

Chair Kralik: No one approved, it failed right? It was 2-2.

Commissioner Lee: ...two meetings – well, because it fails so someone in the know.

Chair Kralik: I see, good for you, good for you.

MOTION #2

Commissioner Lee: So, I move to reconsider the endorsement with this modification that the HRC endorse the Community Conversation Series with the caveat that the September 19th is the first event? The 18th is the first event. With the caveat that at least two of the four events are at City location, at a City venue. Was that fair Commissioner Regehr? And that (crosstalk)...

Commissioner Regehr: I don't know. I'm not looking for fairness.

Chair Kralik: Well, hold on, let's get a second first and then discuss.

Commissioner Regehr: So, no, I – he asked if it's fair.

Commissioner Lee: Ok.

Chair Kralik: Can we have a second?

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT AND SECOND

Commissioner Stinger: Can I amend it to say a different location?

Commissioner Lee: Different location, that's fine. As long as two of the events are at a different location.

Chair Kralik: Ok so now open for discussion. Alright, not hearing...

Commissioner Regehr: Well, I do have an open for discussion of clarity because a different location would be good, but I think it could still be a different location but still could be a Christian church and that would be considered a different location.

Chair Kralik: It's broad.

Commissioner Regehr: I don't know how to...

Chair Kralik: Different location means different than the AME Zion.

Commissioner Regehr: Right and I don't want to make things saying I have something against Christians or AMC. I'm just saying if you say different location, it would be...

Chair Kralik: Any other comment.

Commissioner Regehr: Presbyterian.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Support for the friendly amendment?

Chair Kralik: Yes, no, Yes, any other comment first though? No? No, other comments. Is there any amendments that would help secure this...?

MOTION #2 WITHDRAWN

MOTION #3

Commissioner Lee: So let me back up and say I made a mistake. We need to vote just on the motion to reconsider first and then we can do the specific motion. So, I move to reconsider.

SECOND

Commissioner Stinger: I second.

Chair Kralik: All in favor? I thought we did this once.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I thought we did that.

Commissioner Lee: We did just to suspend the rules. There're three motions, we need to suspend the rules, and then we need too...

Chair Kralik: Ok, we did suspend the rules and reconsider but we can – yes.

Commissioner Lee: To suspend the rules for the purpose of that but then we need to vote on...

Chair Kralik: Fair enough Steven.

Commissioner Lee: Sorry.

Chair Kralik: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Ok so...

Chair Kralik: Not only are you our poet laureate, you're our parliamentarian.

Commissioner Lee: I'm very nerdy about these things.

Chair Kralik: Ok, we have a second. All in favor?

MOTION #3 PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH COMMISSIONER SMITH ABSENT

Chair Kralik: Alright, now we'd like to further ask for an action item to endorse this specific event and the series of events that are presently presented by the AME Zion and League of Women Voters.

MOTION #4

Commissioner Lee: So, I would move that we endorse the series with the caveat that at least two

events be at secular locations. Would you be in support of that motion?

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, I wanted the option to have non-secular, non-City locations and I don't have one in mind but...

Commissioner Lee: So, it's just (crosstalk) non-secular so that could be City or none.

Commissioner Stinger: It could be a gymnasium or a park or I don't know what it is but I just wanted that freedom.

Commissioner Lee: So, non-secular.

Chair Kralik: So, what is the motion, Steven?

Commissioner Lee: To endorse the entire series with a caveat that at least two of the four events have to be at non-secular locations.

Chair Kralik: Non-secular or secular?

Commissioner Lee: I'm sorry, it's late. Non-religious, secular...

Commissioner Regehr: Well, no.

Commissioner Lee: Wait or you could do either one.

Commissioner Regehr: No.

Chair Kralik: You would like two of the events to be at secular locations.

Commissioner Lee: At secular locations, yes, yes, yes, yes.

Chair Kralik: Ok, meaning as an example the Art Center...

Commissioner Lee: Yes.

Chair Kralik: ... or a gymnasium...

Commissioner Lee: Gymnasium.

Chair Kralik: Or – right. So, is there a second to that motion?

SECOND

Commissioner Stinger: I would second that.

Chair Kralik: Ok. Discussion?

Commissioner Regehr: Again, you said that you couldn't change the location because of publicity. So, does that mean that things have already been – when is it? September 19th? So, stuff's already been mailed out, right? So, our name wouldn't be on anything anyway.

Commissioner Stinger: Not on the first pass.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, so...

Chair Kralik: But if someone were to publicize it.

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, I don't want to change the location because we're already gone forward with the date.

Commissioner Regehr: I guess what I'm saying is that if we voted for agreement, I don't know how to say it. I know you said but the intent of it was to say we didn't want the next series to be at the Zion Church. So, I guess my point is that I would feel comfortable if we said we would endorse it as the next three because they've already had...

Commissioner Lee: I think...

Commissioner Regehr: ...that discussion. I mean...

Chair Kralik: I particularly would like to endorse something I understand so this is my discussion point. I think Commissioner Stinger has identified the speaker at the present one. I know nothing about the other speakers beyond a broad description.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm talking about location.

Chair Kralik: Right and so what I would...

Commissioner Regehr: So, I'm saying that some people might not feel comfortable again, going to the same place...

Chair Kralik: Right.

Commissioner Regehr: ...and we don't know but I don't feel comfortable endorsing. I would feel comfortable endorsing like the next three series location if we knew what they were.

Chair Kralik: Right and I'm making a different point which is when I'm voting on this particular item, we're voting on a series of Community Conversations but I don't know what they are. So, what I would...

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, I see what you're saying.

Chair Kralik: ...like is I would...

Commissioner Stinger: (off mic) I think you need to either specify the location or the speaker or both. All I can do is say that September 18th we have a speaker and (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Commissioner Regehr: We are both agreeing.

Commissioner Lee: So, let me...

Chair Kralik: We are agreeing and I think it's a different point though. I mean one point is we want to limit the location but I think we can do that by voting on one event and agreeing to endorse that event. Then with respect to the other events, we would know in advance their subject matter and their location and we could take another vote. So, what I would propose is that we ask the movant to reframe the motion so that the HRC endorses this event in September and that's it.

Commissioner Lee: So, personally I'm comfortable endorsing or no or Yes, endorsing the entire series at this point. As a potential compromise, I think maybe the first motion I make is I'll adjust it to say that it's contingent on three of the four events being at secular locations. We can have that vote, it if doesn't pass then I can make another motion to say two of the four.

Commissioner Regehr: But...

Commissioner Lee: So, I think that's the compromise that I'm willing to make.

Commissioner Regehr: But you're missing the Chair's point.

Chair Kralik: That's alright; he's allowed to miss (crosstalk)...

Commissioner Lee: No, I understand. I would prefer just to have the vote done now instead of having to come back every time to vote on it.

Chair Kralik: I was doing my best to support Commissioner Regehr and to make her feel like in this context there's reasons. When you endorse something it's important to know what it is you're endorsing.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, if you don't know who the speakers are.

Commissioner Lee: I mean given the topics I'm confident that Commissioner Stinger will represent us well and I'm willing to authorize her to go forward with that discretion. I'm comfortable with that given the topics.

Commissioner Stinger: Thank you. Thank you and thank you. I need to thank you for entertaining this discussion and a lesson in Parliamentary Procedure which I didn't realize I was going to open up so much...

Chair Kralik: We'll be fact-checked on that later.

Commissioner Stinger: ...and I appreciate – Yes. I do think that the League through its history of providing speakers to the community has a solid reputation. I expect that this will be a good event and I don't want to over-promise. I'm being conservative and I probably should be going into a sales mode but I do think that this is an opportunity for the HRC to have its name associated with a good event. I would like to offer that to the Commission.

Chair Kralik: I was going to ask if Commissioner Savage and Commissioner Xue might comment on this. Your microphone.

Commissioner Savage: There's been enormous amount of discussion and not much progress. I think what Commissioner Stinger is doing is good. We have to, as you said, trust her judgment and I personally don't have any problem with the church but I understand there could be in other's minds. As far as the venue, whatever you can get. Venues are not easy to come by and so whatever you can find is fine with me.

Chair Kralik: And so, does that mean that you're ok holding all four at the AME Zion Church or?

Commissioner Savage: I don't have a real problem other than I don't think we would get a lot of people after the first or second or third one. The point is to put them around the City so others are conveniently located depending on where you live.

Chair Kralik: So, the present motion is saying three others or two is that right?

Commissioner Lee: Currently it's two, I haven't amended it yet.

Chair Kralik: Ok, alright, Commissioner Xue.

Vice Chair Qifeng: No further comment after hearing all the discussion. Thank you.

Chair Kralik: Alright, so we'll go ahead and do a vote on the motion.

MOTION AMENDED

Commissioner Lee: So, I'm going to amend my motion to say three out of the four have to be at secular locations. If that doesn't pass then I will make the motion with two locations.

Chair Kralik: Ok, do we second for that amendment...

Commissioner Lee: For three of the four...

Chair Kralik: ... or do we want to move forward on the first one. Is there a second to that amendment?

SECOND

Commissioner Regehr: Second.

Chair Kralik: Now at this point...

Commissioner Lee: So, we vote on the three.

Chair Kralik: We vote on the amendment, is that what we're going to do? Ok, so all in favor say

aye.

Commissioner Regehr: Can you repeat what it is so...

MOTION RESTATED

Commissioner Lee: So, the HRC endorses the...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Community Conversations series...

Commissioner Lee: ... Community Conversation series on the condition that three of the four

events are at a secular location. So, I vote aye.

Chair Kralik: All in favor? Carries unanimously. Ok, that's done so let's go to...

Commissioner Stinger: I actually did not vote for...

Commissioner Regehr: Yes, she didn't vote.

Chair Kralik: Oh, what – I saw that.

Commissioner Stinger: I'm sorry, I should have – but it still carries.

Commissioner Lee: So, it's 5-1. (crosstalk)

Chair Kralik: Did you vote in favor or not?

Commissioner Stinger: I did not.

Chair Kralik: Oh ok.

Commissioner Stinger: It's 5 to 1.

Chair Kralik: Alright, sure. Alright, so we would endorse as long as those other ones are there.

MOTION #4 PASSED 5-1 WITH COMMISSIONER SMITH ABSENT.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right but there's still the question that the group that's organizing it can choose to say thank you but no thank you. We will just go on without your endorsement and we'll host all the events at the AME Zion Church.

Chair Kralik: It's a free country.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Commissioner Stinger needs to have that conversation with her Committee and communicate that back.

Commissioner Stinger: It's a post mortem but my reservation was there are non-Christian environments that we now are precluded from using like Beth Am which three out of...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right so what you voted on right now is the rest of them have to be at a secular location. So, if a Mosque or a Beth Am or another Jewish congregation would like to host if they wanted your endorsement that they would be precluded from doing so.

Chair Kralik: Well, we voted. I think we voted with our eyes open and it's carried and so we'll move forward.

Commissioner Regehr: Well, it is what it is.

Commissioner Lee: Unless you want to reconsider?

Chair Kralik: No, no, no, I don't want to reconsider, I want to move forward.

4. Discussion on HRC Liaisons

Chair Kralik: We want to discuss liaisons. I'm going to be very quick about this. The most important thing is to fill out liaison information. Staff has told me that the way that this is usually done is whoever is interested in being liaison gets to be a liaison unless there are too many people in that framework. So, if it's like five people want to be liaison to the police it's problematic.

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's usually that people say what they're interested in doing and then the Chairperson or the leadership goes back and then they look at ok, how many people do we have doing what? Can I...

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, I'm sorry.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ... please? Thank you. Then there's say oh, we have too many on this and sometimes there's some conversation. Hey, you signed up for this and this and then there's a decision made by the Chair and that's what they go forward with. It's usually not a huge issue that five people sign up. Sometimes there's two people and then often there the Chair will say I designate so and so as the lead and so and so as the second person for that.

Chair Kralik: Ok and the other thing that happened in the context of signing up is that Commissioner Regehr identified other groups that we could have liaisons too. I will just tell you that my own reaction to that is great if there are groups that someone feels like they're close too, that they want to be the liaison too, wonderful. So, I don't have a problem with that. I think staff can inform that inquiry a little bit by suggesting that in the past we had that and it hasn't worked out or how those things are. What I will endeavor to do is to give feedback in advance of 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 government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

presenting the final list at the next meeting, ok? Alright, so that's discussion.

Commissioner Lee: Sorry, so will we be voting on the liaisons at the September meeting then? Approve them?

Chair Kralik: We will. We sure will.

Commissioner Lee: Fantastic.

Chair Kralik: Now, the Commissioner reports.

Commissioner Regehr: So, can I just ask about the discussion on HRC liaisons, can we discuss what mine were that I wanted – were thinking about liaisons on the discussion?

Chair Kralik: Well, my intent...

Commissioner Regehr: Because that was my...

Chair Kralik: My intent was to open up and give visibility to the process and the process is that we have asked each Commissioner to look at the current list and to identify which groups they would like to be the liaison and to give that input to Staff. Unfortunately, not everyone has done it.

Commissioner Regehr: So, I did – at the retreat and then I asked to be on the agenda to add it in June and then July and we haven't had any discussion of what the liaisons that I think we – besides just the sheet.

Chair Kralik: Basically, what I said is that if you identify different groups that you would like to be the liaison for, outside of the list, that I'm going to entertain that and assign you based upon your interest in those other groups.

Commissioner Regehr: Well, it's not just saying me but I'm just wondering when will that entertainment happen?

Chair Kralik: What will happen there will be a list with those groups and a name assigned to those groups. Because you have raised new ones, your name will be attached to those.

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, no, but that wasn't my point. My point was why – at the retreat when we were handed this, I said why are we limited to this?

Chair Kralik: You're not.

Commissioner Regehr: Then when I asked to have a discussion of it on the agenda I'm not necessarily saying that I have to be on that liaison. I just think that we should have the discussion of...

Chair Kralik: Go right ahead, go right ahead.

Commissioner Regehr: That's all I'm saying.

Chair Kralik: Here we are, yes, this is it.

Commissioner Regehr: Ok so for example, the Library Commission would be a good one because that has to do with a lot of homelessness. I think a liaison through the library for mental health. I think a Parks and Rec liaison would be an important one to have. So, when do we have that discussion?

Chair Kralik: I'm open to that. I think...

Commissioner Regehr: Or if anybody else has another liaison that they think would be good.

Commissioner Lee: I mean certainly I have some liaisons that I would propose and I'll submit that through staff. I would not oppose the addition of additional liaison ships. So, in terms of the discussion as to whether we want to add or not add them, at September I'm going to say thumbs up on that.

Chair Kralik: Yes, I mean I think we took your list as a list that we should present to the full Commission for liaisons. If you do not feel comfortable being that liaison could you please make that clear.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think some of them though were topics and not entities.

Commissioner Regehr: No, we never had a discussion because it was never on the agenda. I just said that I wanted to discuss liaison positions and add more. I didn't specifically say which ones they were.

Chair Kralik: Ok, now I'm very confused, maybe staff can clarify for me. I thought there were specific groups like the Library Commission.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Some of them were specific groups that were in Commissioner Regehr's and somewhere just general topics. So, I can just give input as to why the ones that are currently on the list are currently on the list and the responsibilities that we have in general given to those who have signed up for the liaison relationships and how that differs from partnering with groups on projects and initiatives. So, I can give that information now or I...

Commissioner Lee: What's an example of topic liaison?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well, I mean on Commissioner Regehr's list was Zero Waste, Housing liaison, mental health liaison. Those are topics, those aren't specific agencies.

Commissioner Lee: So, my initial thoughts on that would be to the extent that we have adopted the Work Plan. So, I think perhaps Commissioner...

Commissioner Savage: Savage.

Commissioner Lee: Savage and Smith are working on police relation and so it might make sense for them to be the liaison. So, you kind of marry them together, right? So, I would hope whoever assigned to a particular initiative would be our spokesperson or our liaison to those groups that address that particular initiative.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, in the past what it's been is its groups that we've had a historical relationship so that would be PAPD or Palo Alto Mediation Program. Major City initiatives that the HRC has made a decision to be involved with so in the past that's Healthy Cities, Project Safety Net, Senior and Dementia Friendly or major providers of a service for a vital population. Avenidas is the major provider of senior services, who used to be the recipient of HSRAP but now has a major contract with the City to provide those services. So, there was a clear connection between the scope and the charge of the HRC. Now, for instance, the library, so Commissioner Stinger had an event last year that was in relation to one of the HRC initiatives. You worked with the library in several events so it was kind of a working relationship more than a specific liaison-ship. I mean how we've taken the liaison is that you meet with that leader at least once a year and if they have meetings you attend them as possible. They are working on issues of clients that may be of interest to the HRC and you look for ways the HRC to be involved in their work as appropriate by bringing some of those issues back to the Commission. I mean my concern is with a robust Work Plan for this year and I know even with this liaison, there are some of you that went every month to the meeting which is not a requirement and some of you it was just a big commitment. So, my concern as staff is just being able to fulfill some of these responsibilities and then the agency feeling ok, this is a liaison. What is my relationship with them? Do I have an obligation to them since they're a liaison? So, those are just things for you all to think about in your deliberation. I'm just here to give you background information.

Commissioner Regehr: So, I would like to have a Parks and Rec liaison because and a library liaison. Being that sustainability and climate is one of the four priorities of the City Council this year, I think we should have some king of liaison to sustainability and...

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, are you asking for a liaison-ship to those Commissions? Are you asking that to be a liaison to a Staff member in that department?

Commissioner Regehr: Well, it's liaisons like when you're the liaison to the police department. Isn't the liaison to the police department?

Commissioner Savage: Right but it's not a Commission. Keep in mind...

Commissioner Regehr: Right.

Commissioner Savage: ... City Council has a liaison...

Commissioner Regehr: Right, I know.

Commissioner Savage: ... this Commission has a City Council member.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think the difference with the police department, that's actually quite unique in that years ago and it's still, the police department would come to the HRC with major

initiatives. So, there was a special connection between the police department and the HRC so that was a specific historical relationship. I'm - so.

Commissioner Stinger: I'd like to comment having sat on the Library Advisory Commission so I'll use that as an example but I think it's projectable to some of the other Commissions. The range of their responsibilities is broad and I'm not interested in the cataloging or the staffing or the budgeting decisions any longer. I see your point. The homelessness in the library is a topic and I think I could identify a Commissioner or a staff person or a Director of Libraries and offer to work together on a specific project; which I guess I'm repeating what Minka just said. I think a liaison-ship might not serve my needs very well and it might not serve their needs. I think having – if I reverse it, having people sit around this table from the library, from Parks and Rec to being a liaison to us might not really serve their interests. I think if we have a subcommittee that or if we take our projects like Welcome Week would be an example that I'm working on. We're working with the library, we're working with the Art Center, and I think we make more progress teaming up with one or two people on a specific objective.

Chair Kralik: There might be a lot of confusion with that, adding a liaison-ship to a Commission, because there is a City Council Member who's the liaison to the Human Relations Commission. Then there's a City Council Member that's the liaison to the Library Commission. So this does not in any way by not having a liaison, it doesn't restrict interaction between what I heard from Commissioner Lee, which I liked, is that now that we have this Work Plan. Now that we have this issue identification you could, as a member of that group working on that specific item, say to a Library Commissioner or say to a staff member of the library, I'm at the HRC and I'm thinking about something that might affect you. What do you think about that and maybe something might develop from that. That's a little bit different that say for example with HSRAP funding where we fund a group and we want to have a liaison with that group. I don't know if we or if we have a relationship it's a start.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would not suggest having a liaison to one HSRAP group and not the others.

Commissioner Regehr: No, no.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That is...

Chair Kralik: That would be tough right?

Commissioner Regehr: Right, conflict.

Chair Kralik: What groups I mean if we have a liaison-ship to let's say the police department, should we have a liaison to the fire department?

Ms. van der Zwaag: No if by virtue of the history that I've told you about. There has been no historical relationship between the HRC. I mean the issues of the HRC cross-section with those of the police department and historically the relationship of the police department coming to the HRC or people coming to the HRC on police issues.

Chair Kralik: Let me give you an example, so in my neighborhood, we have a sidewalk and there was an elderly Chinese woman who tripped, went face-first into the sidewalk. So, I'm with my son, I pull over my car, I call up 911 and who shows up? It's the fire department in a big fire truck and they don't have anybody that can speak to this woman. So, was that a Human Relationship issue about interacting with a member of the public to try to understand how she's feeling? She's sprawled on the sidewalk and we're trying to give her instructions. I have my 12-year old son who's taken some Chinese in his school trying to help her and to communicate with her. Well, I mean isn't it important to have in the fire department...

Ms. van der Zwaag: That doesn't mean that...

Chair Kralik: I'm just trying to propose something to you. I would like the Library Commission, that's one...

Ms. van der Zwaag: But that doesn't...

Chair Kralik: ...thing but there's a City group like that, wouldn't it be important for the HRC to interact with them and say hey, can you have the ability to talk to an immigrant community in a specific language to enable them...

Ms. van der Zwaag: But you can invite them to a meeting.

Chair Kralik: ... to be safe.

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can invite them to our meeting and say...

Chair Kralik: I'm just trying to be open to what Commissioner Regehr is saying. I'm trying to say to Commissioner Regehr Yes, there are groups in which we should propose having a relationship. I see that as a Human Relations issue. There's an inability for people to communicate. Your thoughts.

Commissioner Lee: I mean think one of the benefits of having a liaison is instead of having seven Commissioners all reach out to the Police Chief. Ideally, we do it through Commissioner Savage and Commissioner Smith right? So, there may be certain groups or certain things where that makes sense like Parks and Rec either the Commission or the staff. I feel like that might work well for a liaison or the Committee that we set up here. Whereas library, perhaps not because we interface with them in so many different ways; whether it's the Welcome Week or other projects. So, that might not lend itself well to having one funnel so to speak so I think we just have to be thoughtful in terms does it mix? Do the issues that that group potentially brings up, does it make sense to have one person from the Commission representing us and funneling those requests or is it two multi-dimensional?

Vice Chair Qifeng: Definitely, lots of good discussion. My quick question is we are talking about establishing the liaison-ship with different groups. Did we talk to them before we discussed here? Are they willing to accept? You know we're new so, for example, the fire department, it's very important for us to chime in but did we contact them to get their agreement to have one of

us to sit in their meeting? So, I think it's a two-way dialog so I don't know; the staff may give us some input on that.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well, some of these you're not sitting in their meetings like Project Safety Net. Some you're sitting in their meetings, some you're just keeping abreast of the topics that they're working on by meeting with leadership. So, I mean the fire department or the police department doesn't have meetings where you would specifically sit in but you might be in dialog with a staff member on an occasional basis. Without being a liaison there's nothing to say that I can't call Chief Blackshire and say hey a representative of the HRC would like to meet with you. Can you meet with them? So, whether you decide to do this is one thing or the other but it doesn't preclude some of the conversations that you might hope to gain from it.

Commissioner Savage: Right, I agree. It's a noble thought to want to be a liaison to all these different Commissions but a phone call can work just as well.

Commissioner Regehr: Let me just say, I'm not saying Commissions. I'm saying like a library liaison would be towards the library; the department. Well, who is it? It doesn't specify like Avenidas. I mean it says but I mean I guess that was your point is these are already established. So, how did you once get Amy to be...

Ms. van der Zwaag: She's the Executive Director.

Commissioner Regehr: Ok so then maybe the Executive Director of Library or the Park and Rec. I mean the Parks and Rec we've had a lot of discussion...

Commissioner Savage: Yes, as an HRC Member you have the freedom to add that.

Commissioner Regehr: So, why do we have any liaisons?

Chair Kralik: I don't think that the fact there's some a group like a Commission precludes us from having liaisons. So, for example, the police have a Citizen's Commission; a citizens group; it's an advisory group — my neighbors on that. He goes and he meets with the police Chief every so often and they talk about discussions and other issues like that. I just brought up that example because it was fresh in my mind but it was a little tough. I mean this poor woman was just flat on her face on the sidewalk and there was just this total inability to communicate. She could have had a very serious injury and yet, it's not something that happened because I saw her the next day. She was able to walk and everything was ok, but I mean she could have been in shock. There are a lot of things that can happen when you fall flat on your face. Personally, I've done it and it happened.

Commissioner Stinger: Yes, that's not fun.

Chair Kralik: It was just so evident we needed to do something and so I don't think that it's limiting. It is important to fill the present slots because those are active, historical groups that we interact with, and there is an expectation on both sides as Commissioner Xue said. I'm open to addressing other ones and very open to that. My own suggestion is that we add the fire department but we can talk about that at the next meeting too. I don't think we have to limit it

here.

Commissioner Lee: Can I ask though about the historical one? So, some of our liaisons are to the Council and certainly, I mean I don't even remember who I'm assigned too but I regularly talk with some of the Members of Council. The ones who have the time to engage with or who are interested in engaging with me and I'm certain that other Commissioners do so as well. So, in that particular context, I'm not quite sure how much value there is in continuing to have specific HRC liaisons to Council Members given that. Certain Council Members may not be interested in having a liaison to them. I mean that's why Council designates its own liaison to the Commission. So, I mean Commissioner Regehr brought up this good point about well if we can all engage with whoever we want as we are working on our initiatives then perhaps the premise of having liaisons needs to be reconsidered. I mean maybe with regards to HSRAP it makes particular sense because they are getting funding but in terms of engaging with other groups or individuals in the City on other issues, non-funding issues, I don't know if having liaisons makes sense. I'm just thinking out loud here.

Chair Kralik: What I'd like to do is I'd like to get everybody's input to staff and then have this as another discussion follow next time. Actually, we had a very healthy discussion so thank you, Commissioner Regehr.

V. REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS

1. Commissioner Reports

Chair Kralik: Let's move onto the reports from the Commissioners. I'll just go around the room and start with Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: Understanding it's late, I do have some things that I want to share. The LGBTQ community that we've organized through the LGBTQ Summit had two events; a family movie night in the park and a café at Avenidas. At the café, Joe Simitian spoke and said some really nice words and I have some video and photographs from that. Basically, his message was we start with little steps. In the 90's somebody came to him and said we really need a senior facility in Palo Alto. So, he had a meeting and a couple people came and he said: and look where I am now. We've had a renovation and he said from little steps big things grown. He was very complimentary. Then we had Assemblyman Marc Berman write a Certificate of Recognition that I'm going to read to you quickly. "Congratulations on the opening of Avenidas Intergenerational LGBTQ Café, which came out of the work of the Palo Alto Human Relations Commission's LGBTQ+ Working Summit, a result of the Palo Alto City Council's 2016 Resolution prioritizing a diverse, inclusive, supportive, and protective community. Thank you for your efforts to create a warm and welcoming space for the LGBTQ community in Palo Alto" signed Marc Burman.

Commissioner Lee: Can we be sure to send a copy of that to Council.

Chair Kralik: We should really put that on our website too. That's wonderful recognition, Valerie.

Commissioner Stinger: I thought it was really exciting.

Chair Kralik: Great, great job.

Commissioner Lee: I didn't realize we got mentioned. I just thought it was just Avenidas so that's great then.

Chair Kralik: Yes, congratulations to you to Steven. That's really good work.

Commissioner Stinger: So, we had one event and now we have a second and you'll get this in your email I hope tomorrow or Friday.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, I have copies for you.

Commissioner Stinger: Steven and I will be holding a meeting with the Steering Committee in August basically looking at a structure so that we can pass this on, make it a sustainable effort, and then we will have another Working Summit in September, I think on the 11th. We'll be working there on working with the county on budgeting and following up on some more space issues. I'll share that agenda with you separately. Then I also wanted to talk about the Welcome Week with the Y. We're going to continue with some of the programs that we had last year. There will be a – I hope I get this right – an opening with the Avenidas Moon Festival and there will be a closing ceremony with the first or the Friday events at the Art Center. In between, there are walks and story times and potlucks and one of the things that I'll be working on with you Patti is we're going to tailor a walk to small immigrant-owned businesses focusing on California Avenue and Mid-town.

Chair Kralik: Thank you very much. Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: We got the invitation as all of us to go to the memorial for the man that was murdered at – Tim – I forget his last name – at the...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Buena Vista.

Commissioner Regehr: ...at Bouena Vista and I went to his memorial and I just want to say that his mother was really grateful and the Friends of Buena Vista just said thank you for – it was very moving. His father is already working on a park but they're going to put another bench.

Chair Kralik: I know that we all appreciate that you took that time. Thank you for doing that.

Commissioner Regehr: Also, an update on the person that I was working with Joe Simitian's Office about that was being evicted from Buena Vista Trailer Park. Everything is fine and the person was very grateful.

Chair Kralik: Good, good. Commissioner Savage.

Commissioner Savage: Nothing to report right now.

Chair Kralik: Ok, Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: So, Commissioner Regehr and I met with Kristen O'Neil to talk about...

Ms. van der Zwaag: O'Kane.

Commissioner Lee: O'Kane. Did I say, O'Neil? O'Kane to talk about their plans and as I mentioned earlier likely around October/November she will be ready to come and involve us and get our feedback on some of those draft plans. I also attended...

Commissioner Regehr: Oh, can I add? She also was saying because remember all the parents were coming about Rinconada Pool? They've been taking action on that and she said that in a couple of weeks that there's going to be a plan for people to be able to swim.

Commissioner Lee: To have access, to be able to change.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, in a couple of weeks.

Commissioner Lee: At least a temporary...

Commissioner Regehr: A temporary solution.

Commissioner Lee: They're working on a long-term solution and that's what she will come with her Work Plan as well as more inclusive programming October/November time frame.

Commissioner Regehr: This is from the retreat when those families came.

Chair Kralik: That's great follow up. Thank you.

Commissioner Lee: I attended National Night Out earlier this week that was great. I did want to point out I did have some conversations with some of our firefighters and police officers. One of the things that came up was just how the housing crisis was impacting them. Ouite a few of them live quite far away from our community. One of them, in fact, lives out in Sacramento and so it's becoming quite evident that the housing crisis is impacting the ability of our public safety officers to live in or near the community that they serve. Our job as a Commission is to – when we feel particular groups are not benefiting in the public or private resources, including housing, that's certainly within our purview. I mean it also has impacts in terms of if an emergency would come up, the time it would take to get the entire force out here, so I just wanted to point that out. National Night Out is a day to celebrate those connections and their service but at the same time, I just wanted to point out that there is still much work to be done in terms of honoring that service and enabling those folks to live in the communities that they serve. The Avenidas event was great. I did want to give props to Minka and her team for translating the Tenant Guide. It's now available in Spanish and Chinese. I've begun sharing that with folks in the Chinese community but if you know other groups in the Spanish or Chinese speaking community let them know that the Tenant Guide is now translated into those languages. Patty and I also met with the Santa Clara Therapeutic Recreation Department as part of our initial research into what other Cities are doing in terms of more inclusive programming, so that was very insightful. I met 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

government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

with the volunteer at the Y for an unrelated Welcome initiative. They have reached out to a couple of the neighborhood associations to figure out ways to get neighborhoods to reach out to new residents. Sort of a different kind of welcoming than the other effort that we're doing but I may pass it along to Commissioner Stinger because that might have a lot of common nexus to it. I think the only other thing is next Wednesday I'm going to ACS; they're going to give me a tour of their facility. They do it every couple of weeks and so that's the next available one. So, if anybody would like to join me, I'd be happy to carpool with you there. Yes, that's it.

Chair Kralik: Thank you, Steven. Commissioner Xue.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Nothing to report at this moment. Thank you.

Chair Kralik: Ok.

2. Council Liaison Report

3. Staff Liaison Report

Chair Kralik: I will move onto the Staff Liaison report.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok, I have a couple of things. One, the Emerging Needs Fund is going on August 19th to Council. The plan now is on the Consent Calendar so unless it's pulled it will just be decided upon with the other items that are on the Consent Calendar. CEDAW was going to go in October, now it's going to go in November and the reason it's going to go in November is that the hope is that in September I will bring to you an overview of staff's recommendations. At that time, I'm not asking the HRC to amend my recommendations or staff's recommendations. It's to give the HRC an opportunity to provide comment on that, if they would like to, in the form of a letter to the Policy and Services Committee. That could possibly, I'd have to see, be included in the Packet that is provided to them At Places. So, I moved the meeting back so if I'm able to come in September and you do have specific feedback and that feedback if it's in the form of a letter, would need to be approved by the full HRC. That could still happen in October and be part of the Packet that the Policy and Services Committee would see.

Commissioner Lee: Would the HRC be able to authorize a letter at the September meeting in very much the same way that we did with the county ICE Policy where we talked about it and then authorized me and Commissioner Smith to author a letter on the concerns that we have?

Ms. van der Zwaag: They can give you permission to write a letter under certain parameters but the letter needs to be signed by the Chair.

Commissioner Lee: Sure.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, if that's the choice of the HRC at the next meeting or if they make the choice if there is a response, that it come back at the October meeting. I just wanted to give enough timing for that to happen.

Commissioner Lee: I just want to make sure that the agenda item is described as an action in case

the Commission does decide...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I appreciate that.

Commissioner Lee: Ok, great, thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Ok and then the Council HRC joint study session is now slated for October 21st so to see you all there on October 21st.

Chair Kralik: That's a Saturday.

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, it should be a Monday night. If I got the date wrong...

Chair Kralik: Monday night, ok.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes.

Chair Kralik: Where's it going to be held?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Council Chambers or in this room. It depends on what the Council would like to do.

Commissioner Savage: Is that a definite date? The 21st.

Ms. van der Zwaag: At this point. Now we've been scheduled and we've been rescheduled before. So, the process in that is that the Chair and the Vice Chair and I and my Director meet with the Mayor and the Vice Mayor to talk about the agenda ahead of time. So, gentlemen, expect to get communication with me. That will probably happen in September. I don't want to say which one just because I think it's an invitation-only event so only of our HSRAP donors is having a donor appreciation event that I am not able to go too. So, it's on September 17th so if there is a Commissioner who likes to go, maybe a Commissioner and a partner or maybe two Commissioners. So if that's something that's of interest to you, you can let me know.

Commissioner Regehr: Minka, I'm sorry, I just don't know what all these abbreviations mean.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, HSRAP is the grant program that the HRC gives recommendations too. It's a Human Services Resource Allocation Process so it's one of the grantees that was voted on by the Commission back in May. So, this is one of the grantees...

Commissioner Lee: You were there, you were there.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...in the program that the HRC gives voice too.

Commissioner Regehr: So, I appreciate your invitation but wouldn't that be seen as a...

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, it's a donor appreciation event so you can just on behalf of the City so if

they say thank you to the City for your support, there's a representative from the HRC here.

Commissioner Savage: At what time is that event?

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's 7 to 8:30.

Commissioner Savage: PM?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, on September 17th. Whatever the night of the week that is.

Ms. Constantino: It's a Tuesday.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, if someone is interested, they can call me. That's all I have, thank you for your time.

Chair Kralik: Ok, we're going to move on...

Commissioner Regehr: I just have a question is – Minka? How often does the City Council liaison get I mean how often do we get a new person?

Ms. van der Zwaag: They usually do that on an annual basis. If someone leaves, the term of the Council is usually different than the term of the HRC. Someone will say hey, my person left, should I just take the new person? I will be honest that we've had this for years and some people are able to meet their liaison like once just to scheduling concerns. It's not something that has been incredibly robust in that all – you're always able to meet with your liaison.

Commissioner Lee: Are you talking about our one on one liaison or the liaison to the Commission?

Commissioner Regehr: The Commission...

Commissioner Lee: Like Tom?

Commissioner Regehr: Tom, Yes.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, so as I explained at the beginning of the meeting but not everyone was here. So, Commissioner DuBois wants to let people know that due to the reduced size of the Council and his increased responsibilities that he is not able to make all of the meetings. If there is a specific meeting that we especially would like him at that's something that I look at the agenda and have discussions with the Chair and the Vice Chair about. He's also very kindly on other occasions asked his backup, which is Council Member Kou, to be at some of the meetings. So, you know when they set up these relationships that there's not a requirement by the Council Member to be at every single meeting just due to so many competing interests. He is definitely interested in the subject and what's going on at the HRC but just because of the myriad of commitments that he has as a Council Member he is not able to make every meeting.

Commissioner Lee: Council Member Kou also has a scheduling conflict for this time as well, right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: It could be, I have not heard that specifically.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, September 12, 2019

Chair Kralik: Move to consider the agenda for the next regular meeting which is Thursday, September 12th. I'll first ask staff if there are any agenda items that are on there now.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right.

Chair Kralik: That will help us to clarify if we need to add.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Sure, so it looks like the staff CEDAW report overview, liaisons, CDBG needs to come to give the CAPER Report. So, the CAPER Report – CDBG is the Community Development Block Grant Program, it's the other funding program that the HRC gives voice to as far as review. The CAPER is – I can't tell you what the acronym – it's Consolidated Action Plan Executive Report. That's probably not correct but it's a report that they are responsible to provide to the Housing and Urban Development Department; also known as HUD. They bring that to the HRC for your review so those are the items. Mary put Work Plan but I'm not sure...

Ms. Constantino: They talked about bringing the Work Plan next time (crosstalk).

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh, so that...

Chair Kralik: I think we'll put it as part of the Packet so that everyone can see what we voted on tonight.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right and then that's what we have at this moment.

[Several Commissioners started talking at once]

Chair Kralik: There's one I'd like to add...

Ms. van der Zwaag: I'm sorry.

Chair Kralik: ... which is the...

Ms. van der Zwaag: ACS is coming next month with their report on vaping. So, that's already five items.

Chair Kralik: Ok and then there's another issue which was some time, I think it was at the June meeting, Valerie had brought up this written policy on endorsements, etc. There were comments, there was a 2-2 vote so it didn't carry but staff is able to reference some of those comments and feels that it could be brought up again by the process that Steven has suggested. So, that might be

something that we do again.

Commissioner Regehr: I have a problem with people not coming to the Human Relations Commission and people that are attending, we discuss it, we vote and then we have to do it again because we have more Commissioners. It seems like if you're not here, tough, you should be here and you should vote. I mean it's like if four people show up then that vote – we shouldn't re-carry – have another discussion hoping that it's going to be passed again. I mean I just feel like I come...

Chair Kralik: Let me just respond to that, ok? So, in this specific instance – I understand your point of view, I was there, but you may not have been part of the vote that set up the fact that everyone voted to have this policy and for Valerie to work with staff to write it. So, we're kind of in a weird situation now because we presented a policy that was not accepted but yet we have the prior vote which said we should have a policy. So, now we're in a little bit of limbo. Maybe Valerie wants to give her thoughts about it but I do think we should follow through to present a policy based on the initial vote.

Commissioner Regehr: But you did present policy and was voted down.

Commissioner Stinger: I think the parallel might be if you look at – I can't even say it – Planning and Transportation and they're asked to do a Zoning Policy and it's not accepted. They still come back with the revisions based on the discussion. If it's something that we want, then I think I can't come back with the same policy. I made my best attempt, now I'll have to factor in the comments that were made, and...

Commissioner Regehr: But I'm not sure what the motion was. Was the motion not to pass it or was the motion to revise it?

Ms. van der Zwaag: You know I think at this late hour what I would suggest is that staff would look into the specifics of both the initial vote and the other vote. I think at this point there are assumptions or surmising and I would rather just look at the initial and the subsequent. It was my understanding to share with the Chairs is that there was a direction to come up with a policy but that the policy that came up with was – did not meet the needs of those Commissioners. So, that same policy...

Chair Kralik: Will not be represented.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...would not be represented. We will look at some feedback and make revisions to it and go forward. That was my understanding.

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

Chair Kralik: Does that give you more comfort or not?

Commissioner Regehr: I'm not looking for comfort. I'm just looking for...

government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Chair Kralik: I think your vote was respected.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to

Commissioner Regehr: No, no, what I'm saying is that I don't know what we voted on that last time. So, it seems like we vote on something and then we decided well, we didn't get the votes or we're going to change it a little and I don't like that process.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I hear you.

Commissioner Lee: I mean my recollection of the meeting was that the vote was whether we wanted to give our feedback back to Commissioner Stinger to revise the policy and my understanding was that that failed as opposed to – I don't think we voted on the policy. We're voting on whether we wanted to send that feedback back. So, since it didn't have four votes that process died. The first vote that we took up was maybe we should look into a policy but I don't think we voted and said if we don't have a policy then we can't do any endorsements. It was just like this is something we're interested in looking into.

Ms. van der Zwaag: So, staff will look into that.

Chair Kralik: Let me go around the room and ask if there's any other proposed agenda items starting with Commissioner Stinger.

Commissioner Stinger: Nothing, thank you.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: Do you think Valerie, that in September you'll know what the other locations and speakers are for the series?

Commissioner Stinger: I would think not, maybe a 30 percent chance.

Commissioner Regehr: I was just thinking that we...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Well, a vote was already taken that could just be under Commissioner Reports.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Savage.

Commissioner Savage: Was there anything done with Council Buddies this year? Are we...

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, that...

Commissioner Lee: That's part of liaisons.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's part of liaisons so in that process I will distribute the list to say this is what I know so far. Yes, inadvertently the buddy part got left off.

Commissioner Savage: Ok and also on the back of the comment card, can we just review those for next week? I mean for next month.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think staff will review and be in contact with the Clerk's Office and can report back.

Commissioner Savage: Ok but also to educate us to make sure that we're following the rules as well.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, I think that could be during the staff report.

Commissioner Savage: Ok, that's it.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Lee.

Commissioner Lee: So, I have a couple of items, so the ADA Transition Plan is going to Council on September 9th. Vice Mayor Fine just told me before the meeting. I'm disappointed that the Commission won't be able to weigh in prior it going to Council and prior to it being adopted. With that being said I think at some point the Commission should weigh in on the final report that is approved because it's going to be a living document in terms of when are we going to update all of our facilities over the next 20-30-years. So, I think there's value in us weigh in on that sometime after September. I think there's tremendous interest in it given all of the people who came to our retreat. The other item would be – again, this is maybe September/October timeframe; November timeframe. The county published their Homelessness Point in Time Count so I would love to have a presentation on that but also consideration of a recommendation that the Council declare a shelter crisis in Palo Alto under AB-932. A lot of cities in the region have made such a declaration and when cities make that declaration it enables them to access State funding and reduce some of the building and code requirements as cities try to address the homelessness issue so, a presentation on the Point in Time but also discussion on a declaration of a shelter crisis under 932.

Chair Kralik: Do any of these items fall under initiatives that you're a member of the leadership or the support?

Commissioner Lee: Yes, I mean homelessness is on the list. ADA, I think I'm the only person on the ADA one. Let's see, I think at a previous meeting I had requested an agenda item on AB-516 which Council Member Kou had mentioned and it sort of falls under the bucket of homelessness as well. The most pressing one though, I would like a discussion in light of our joint meeting with Council in terms of potential agenda items. I left with the Commission as a whole to weigh in on the items that we'd like to discuss with Council. So, frequently do we get a chance to meet and discuss with the entire Council. I think the last time we did it was the first summer that I had joined and so having the entire Commission weigh in that would be...

Ms. van der Zwaag: No, I think we usually have the – that's true. The month before you have your joint study session; you usually just talk about the format and who's going to talk about what. So, we're already at one, two, three, four, five, six items and that doesn't...

Commissioner Lee: Well, so the most pressing one would be the joint meeting. The other topics may be October/November/ December time frame. Wait, the joint meeting is in October?

Ms. van der Zwaag: The joint meeting is in October so if you wanted you would need to discuss it in September.

Commissioner Lee: In September so that's the most time-sensitive one.

Commissioner Regehr: I think the housing during wintertime; I think we should do that sooner.

Commissioner Lee: Yes. I think the last thing – sorry, again this is not urgent for the September meeting. Again, the police department indicated that they would be coming back to us sometimes this winter with their body camera and maybe that's something our liaison...

Commissioner Savage: That's winter.

Commissioner Lee: Winter, we're not there yet but just to give as much visibility to Staff and leadership as to what's coming in the pipeline, I think is helpful.

Chair Kralik: Commissioner Xue's excitement is palpable.

Commissioner Lee: Great.

Vice Chair Qifeng: Only one may be potential agenda, so recently we heard a lot about the shooting so I would like to have something on the agenda down the road. If not in September maybe October or November to see how we can get us prepared – educated.

Ms. van der Zwaag: On what specifically?

Vice Chair Qifeng: Shooting. Remember the gun shootings that the...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh, so are you asking for active shooter training? I'm not...

Vice Chair Qifeng: No, no, just education. To share some information with us.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can I continue holding it?

Commissioner Regehr: (inaudible – off mic)

Ms. van der Zwaag: Can I – I'm still confused as to what you're looking for.

Vice Chair Qifeng: I'm looking for some; for example, what just triggered this kind of incident? So, how we can, as a Commission, get us ready in case that kind of thing happens in the neighborhood or that stuff. We cannot rule out those kinds of things happening in the neighborhoods. For example, the incident that occurred in Sunnyvale; the car incident so, we need to understand what's going on there. I don't know how to put it.

Commissioner Regehr: So, are you talking about for us – how to...

Chair Kralik: Hold on just a second. So, I think we have that input and I'll second it. So, that we try to find someone that can talk to us about public safety that relates to some of the shootings incidents that have occurred in the United States.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I think instead of trying to discuss it tonight, I think it has a first and a second that the makers of the motion and the second could just refine their thinking. That's what I've asked of Commissioners...

Chair Kralik: And that's what we'll do.

Ms. van der Zwaag: ...before and then get back to me. I'm thinking of the late hour.

Commissioner Regehr: So, do we need to second Steven's, all of his agenda items since...

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, if it's not specifically part of the Work Plan that is correct. If it's not a part of a Work Plan it does need a second.

Chair Kralik: That's why I clarified that were they included in the Work Plan.

Commissioner Regehr: So because we never seconded any of them.

Chair Kralik: They're in the Work Plan.

Commissioner Lee: So, even if they're on the Work Plan though, if we wanted to agendize them and the majority of the Commission wanted to put it on a set agenda we could vote on it though, right?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would say AB-516 I do not see as part of the Work Plan but you could...

Commissioner Lee: Ok, Yes, so can I have a motion on AB-516? That's the piece of legislation that Council Member Kou mentioned in terms of restricting locale police departments ability to ticket and tow vehicles under a number of situations; including whether they've been there more than 72-hours. I consider it as part of the Homelessness Initiative but I'm happy to vote on it separately.

Commissioner Regehr: So, are we saying support it to be on the agenda for September?

Ms. van der Zwaag: There's no way it can be.

Commissioner Savage: We've got too many items.

Commissioner Lee: Can we place it on the October agenda?

Ms. van der Zwaag: You can give it as a suggestion and then you and I can be in dialog about it.

Chair Kralik: Let me just say one last...

Commissioner Regehr: So, I second it.

Chair Kralik: ...thing. Got it. One last thing to say to you about that Steven is that if you're part of the Homelessness Initiative you have the green light to try to find somebody to speak about it or to frame what it is that you want to do. So, maybe you want...

Commissioner Lee: Well, on AB-516 I found the author of it.

Chair Kralik: Right, so that's great and that's how you should do that. Communicate with staff.

Commissioner Lee: I have already.

Chair Kralik: Ok, good.

Ms. van der Zwaag: We need to be in more dialog together. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Lee: Yes, we'll talk but in terms of the Point in Time Count, I'd be happy to work with the Staff to identify who can come and speak on those. I mean that's more...

Chair Kralik: We'd really appreciate that effort. I'm going to adjourn the meeting, thank you, guys.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:24 p.m.