

DRAFT

HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Thursday, January 14, 2021

7:00 PM

REGULAR MEETING

****BY VIRTUAL TELECONFERENCE ONLY***

Commissioners Present: de Tourreil, Regehr, Savage, Smith, Stinger

Absent:

Council Liaison: Council Member Stone

Staff: Minka van der Zwaag, Mary Constantino

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Smith: Good evening, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the Human Relations Commission of the City of Palo Alto, the regular meeting on January 14, 2021. We're grateful for everybody here. Staff, can you please do roll call?

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

Chair Smith: Are there any agenda changes, requests or deletions?

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Smith: We are grateful that at the beginning of the new year we have been assigned a brand-new Council Liaison We have the newly elected, newly-inducted Council Member Greer Stone with us, so we're grateful that he's joined us this evening. It is a tradition of this Commission that the Chair serves a one-year term that goes from January to December. I am grateful for the time that I've been allowed to lead this Commission. At this time, being the first piece of business, I will have staff go through the election process. Then I will open up for Public Comment.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Chair Smith, there is Oral Communications for items that are not on the agenda.

Chair Smith: Okay, I'm sorry. I was moving too fast. All right, does anybody want to talk about anything that's not on the agenda? You can simply raise your hand, and staff will get to you. You will have two minutes, or if you're on a phone, you can hit *9. Is that correct, staff?

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's correct. [preparing for speakers on Zoom] Okay. The first speaker is Aram James. Aram, you have, I believe it's three minutes. Are you on the line, Aram?

Mr. Aram James: Yes, I am. How are you?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Good. Go ahead, please. You have three minutes.

Mr. James: Okay, I'm going to read a letter to the *Daily Post*, dated Friday, July 24, 2009. The author is one Jeannette [phonetic] Andrews, and at the time she wrote it she was 87 years of age. "Dear Editor, President Obama got it right when he stated that the police officer behaved stupidly when the officer arrested and handcuffed a prominent black Harvard professor who was trying to get into his own home, but who was able to fully identify himself with a valid driver's license and identification from Harvard. Do we have racial profiling by the police here in Palo Alto? You bet. I've lived in Palo Alto for 60 years, during which I have witnessed many incidents of racial profiling, beginning when my son was ten years old. He and a black school friend were riding their bicycles on a Palo Alto street. They were stopped by a police officer who didn't even approach my son, who is white. Rather, he immediately stopped the young black friend, accusing him of having stolen his bicycle. This young friend, a star athlete, later graduated from college, got a fine job, and is now retired with a good pension, and is still our treasured friend. Often, I think of the courage it takes for a young black person to step out of the door, knowing he may expect racial slurs and discrimination. We, the white community, need to examine the erosion of our souls while we [gap in recording] abomination does not exist. When will we have a truly just society? The selection of our next police chief will speak volumes about whether we will continue our racist past or bring about true changes." That's a piece from a book that my mother wrote. She passed away last year in December, at nearly 97 years old, and there's many others of those kind, written accounts of racism. And the ten-year-old boy described in the story, of course, was me. So, I read your 48-page report, and I want to thank Reverend Smith and I believe it was Valerie – and I'm forgetting your last name – that put that together, but I thought it was extremely well-done. Lots of markers, even going back to KKK rallies here in Palo Alto. I hope that you continue to work...and I'm going to, when we get to the election of the president and vice president, or the commissioner and vice commissioner, I'm going to suggest that we extend Reverend Smith's leadership for an additional year. This is too critical of a time. I've disagreed with him in the past, but boy, did I see some extraordinary leadership in 2020, and I think we need his leadership another year on this critical issue. Okay, I'm going to be speaking on each of the other items tonight, and I appreciate your time so far. Thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you. The next speaker is Rebecca Eisenburg. Go ahead, please.

Ms. Rebecca Eisenburg: Commission, thank you so much. I was thinking today about the lack of progress that isn't entirely your fault, but in the Palo Alto Police Department and what I consider to be an extremely problematic and really depressing meeting last fall, when the City Council caved to police demands that there was a justifiable reason to shoot their guns into a moving car, and using tasers on unarmed individuals, or tasers on anybody. It was really maddening, and I thought to myself, "Why is it that Palo Alto's leadership is getting this so wrong? I've been doing so much research today, and I think that a lot of dominant caste people, myself being a member of a dominant caste, often have a misunderstanding of the extent of the problem of police brutality, especially the use of deadly force against people of color, and especially against African American men who are young. The average age at which an African American man is

murdered by the police is 30, while for white people it is closer to 50. That's a problem, but an even bigger problem is that as many, literally every single day, or virtually every single day, a black person is killed by a police officer. That's approximately 325, according to *Washington Post*. Black people were killed by the police last year. The number of Latinx people is not that much lower. This is not just a problem in Palo Alto. It's a problem everywhere, but the difference is that other communities are responding, and we are not. We are not responding. Some of the very well-accepted and proven successful means of reducing this killing are things such as not allowing police to shoot guns at moving vehicles. Things like not having police officers do traffic stops, since an unbelievably large amount of African Americans are killed in traffic stops. And by the way, more than half of African Americans who are killed by the police are not brandishing a gun. That is the case even though virtually all of the 46 – forty-six – police officers killed by suspects in the year 2019, according to the FBI, out of those, they all were killed by gunshot. And only 46 of them were killed, compared with the 325 African American people who were, for the most part, not carrying a gun. We can do better in Palo Alto. Please be stronger. Thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you.

Chair Smith: Thank you to the public for your comments.

Ms. van der Zwaag: There are no more speakers, sir.

IV. BUSINESS

1. HRC Chair and Vice Chair elections

Chair Smith: I know. Staff, can you go through the election process, and then we will open up to public comments?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes. Let me just get it in front of me. So, here is the election process. The outgoing Chair explains the general duties and responsibilities of the Chair, including the monthly time commitment necessary to facilitate meetings. The Chair opens the floor to nominate for the position of Chair. Commissioners may nominate one commissioner at a time. The person nominated must be present at the meeting. A commission may enter their own name in nomination. The person offering the nomination can explain why they have nominated the person, or why they would be appropriate for the position. The Chair asks the nominated person if they would be willing to accept the nomination. Commissioners continue to nominate additional candidates. With each nomination, the Chair asks the person nominated if they would be willing to accept the nomination. When there are no further nominations from the floor, the Chair asks for, or a Commissioner offers, a motion to close the nominations. The motion is seconded. The Commission votes verbally to close the nominations. The Chair will then call on each member to announce their vote. Staff counts the votes and announces the number of votes for each candidate if there are more than one. The elected Chair assumes responsibility for chairing the meeting from that point forward. The new Chair thanks the outgoing Chair for their service. The process is then repeated for the position of Vice Chair, as outlined above, that I just mentioned for the job of Chair. That is the process, Chair Smith.

Commissioner Regehr: Commissioners, can I just ask protocol? Not about this, but I was going to say if before, when chats happen, are we supposed to respond? Because this just happened.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I understand, and it was my understanding regarding...I am not responding to chat during the meeting. My job is mainly to facilitate and assist the Commissioners and the speakers who raise their hands during the Oral Communication time, so I will not be communicating back and forth with the public in that means.

Commissioner Regehr: But it seems to me, too, just as protocol, it just seems to me that if Oral Communications means oral communications and someone speaks, we need to be clear that we don't respond to oral...I mean, I don't want the chatting to be...I don't know what the rules are.

Chair Smith: To clarify for everybody, we run our meetings by a specific set of rules and specific places when specific people speak. Although we're in a virtual environment, we try to stay to great fidelity to what has been the rules of our own space, so in the same way, in person, we would not allow crosstalk, the same way we will not acknowledge chat here, because it does not fall in the guidelines that we run our meetings by. Does that answer it?

Commissioner Regehr: Perfect. Thank you.

Chair Smith: Okay, thank you. Role of the Chair of the Commission.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Do you want to do Oral Communications, Chair?

Chair Smith: Yes, thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Sorry. You had called for that, so I just wanted to make sure. So, I see one name, and that is Aram James. Mary, could you get the clock up, please?

Chair Smith: And Rebecca.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Oh, I see that as well. Thank you. [preparing for comments] The first speaker is Aram James, to be followed by Rebecca Eisenburg. Your three minutes starts right now. Go ahead, please.

Mr. James: Thank you. Maybe one of you could give me an idea whether it would be appropriate to have, under your rules, Reverend Smith for second straight year. He's lived the life about the things that we're talking about. He's renown in Palo Alto, both for his preaching at his church but also for his leadership this last year. I think it's way too early to remove him now. On the other hand, Reverend Smith, I don't want to foist upon you something that you don't want to do, because you're busy in lots of other domains. But I really think that leadership is critical. You and I, I think, first met maybe five or seven years ago, Minka, when you all set up the circle of racial conversations back then. That's when I first met you, and we were in a small group together. We had some profound discussions even that night. But I just think that it takes an African American this year with the kind of leadership skills, and you've lived the life. You know the experiences. There's no doubt about that, and we need to be able to speak truth to justice to folks like me, white folks, that sometimes just don't get it. In Palo Alto, honestly, I'm 72. I've lived the great preponderance of my life here, and I don't want to demean white people, and I don't mean to by this conversation, but as a general rule, we don't get our white supremacy. We don't get how ingrained it is in our DNA, how our police department had a long and vile history of racism, and there are people on this Commission that take great chagrin to those comments. But I believe, based on my experience and then working 25 years in the mass incarceration system in Santa Clara County and Los Angeles that we just have to wake up, that it's systemic. It's ingrained, and we've got a lot more than just talking to do. I know that you

guys are going to be commissioned, probably, by the City Council to have these further talking...But when does the talking stop, and when does the action start? I think that the leader that will, more likely than anyone else here, take us in that direction is Reverend Smith. That's why I would like to, whatever the rules are, ask that you all make him – if he wants it, of course – the Chair for an additional year.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you. The next speaker is Rebecca Eisenburg. Rebecca, go ahead please.

Ms. Eisenburg: Thank you for letting me speak. It's very hard to opine on the nominations without knowing who is actually being nominated, although I think that is a bit of an imperfect process here, that arguably is in the grey area of the Brown Act, because you're not supposed to have deliberations on material matters that occur outside of the public view. And, I have never been to one of the how many thousands of Palo Alto meetings and Commission meetings and City Council meetings where it hadn't been decided in advance who was going to be nominated for each role. That said, during the 20, 25 years or so that I served as a hiring manager at various companies, such as PayPal and others, Trulia, others, I always had the people/applicants fill out a survey, showing me how they think. In my mind, it was how they think about negotiation, how they think about listening. And of course, their level of sensitivity to racial and gender disability minorities in our workplace. All of these are things that are valid to consider. While I absolutely agree with Aram that the leadership of the City and its Commissions, especially the Human Relations Commission, should genuinely reflect our residents here, and we are so profoundly far from that. Although, that's an open topic. Regardless, we should have a more diverse inclusive leadership in our city that should include the leadership on each and every commission, and so far the City Council, the Planning Commission, have both really went for white people, in particular, white men, in leadership. I know that you all don't have a white man, which is great, but enough with this white people thing, especially for the Human Relations Commission. That said, I think that it's possible for a dominant caste person, meaning in our culture, both white and male, to be sensitive and enlightened. Maybe, I really hope that you all will speak about whether or not you read, fundamentally and hugely essentially, books, including *Caste*, by Isabel Wilkerson; How to Be an Antiracist, by Kendi Ibram; and White Fragility. Those, in my mind, are the three most applicable...Sorry for the screaming in the background. Sorry. I'm a mom of teenagers. Anyway, those in my mind, are three essential books that every single person in the world has no excuse not to read, and in particular, I think that before any of you should be able to be allowed to serve on this Commission, you all should be required to read these extremely wellwritten, awarding-winning and, in my mind,

Ms. van der Zwaag: Three minutes.

Ms. Eisenburg: ...interesting books. So, will you [inaudible]. Thank you so much.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much, Ms. Eisenburg. Staff, next person.

Ms. van der Zwaag: The next speaker is Jethroe Moore. Go ahead, please. You have three minutes.

Mr. Jethroe Moore II: Hello. I am President of the San Jose Silicon Valley NAACP, and as we go into this celebration of the 92^{nd} birthday of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, he said in his *I Have a Dream* speech, "We've also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the

furious urgency of now. This is not a time to engage in the luxury of cooling off, or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children." Here recently, Palo Alto took a step in that direction by opening up the Foothills Park. To continue down this path of racial reconciliation and change, I am hopeful that the Reverend Kaloma Smith would retain his position as Chair, and continue to lead this body forward, and that the members that are here present would support him. There is much work that we have to do with your police department. There is even much more, greater work that we have to do with our City Council. We need someone who has the spiritual gift, the momentum, to carry us into the next phase that this county and this city, in particular, Palo Alto, must move into to recognize its roles it's done to the communities of color that so many times are neglected and forgotten. So again, Pastor Smith, I am hopeful, I am prayerful, I am believing, that if you have the opportunity, that God has called you. He talks to you by yourself. He has called you to do this once more again. I stand ready to support you and look forward to supporting this committee as we move this ball forward for the betterment of this county. Thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you, Mr. Moore.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much. Staff, I believe next we describe the position.

Ms. van der Zwaag: That's what you do, Chair Smith. You describe what you have been doing in general.

Chair Smith: I don't know if I can give an accurate description of the job of Chair, because this year has been very unusual. It has been significant challenge, particularly as we started dealing with police reform, as we started dealing with the needs of the pandemic, as we've started dealing with so many issues. What I will tell you is this. Whoever becomes Chair, you will have to face a year where you will face significant and unexpected challenge. This is not a job where you can say, "I'm going to give it ten hours a month." Some months it might be 20, 25 hours. Like in July, we met three times. There was a lot of preparation back and forth. And then some months, there's five hours, but what you have to be is ever vigilant to meet the challenge as it comes. Thank you much.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you, Chair. You may now open the floor for nominations.

Chair Smith: I open the floor for nominations.

Commissioner de Tourreil: Can I ask a question?

Chair Smith: Yes, Sunita. Yes.

Commissioner de Tourreil: I don't understand...I understand that folks would like Chair Smith to stay Chair. Is this against the rules? Is this something that is possible?

Chair Smith: No, it's just affirmation.

Commissioner de Tourreil: Okay, great. Thank you.

Chair Smith: We have Vice Chair Stinger with hand raised.

Vice Chair Stinger: I would like to nominate Chair Smith for the following year. May I speak to my nomination, or should I wait?

Chair Smith: You can speak to your nomination, please.

Vice Chair Stinger: Thank you. This has been a strange and difficult year, the year just passed, and Chair Smith led us successfully through the conduct of at least two key forums – the Eight Can't Wait and the Brown Lives Lived Experience. And in the coming year, this Commission is going to confront equally difficult issues – racism, affordable housing, vehicle dwellers, foreclosures, economic hardship coming out of COVID, hate crimes. The Chair has an outstanding understanding of these issues intellectually and passionately, academically and personally. He has connected to thought leaders who have given us good counsel, and we can access in the future. That is all very useful to us as we move forward as a Commission this coming year. But I knew all of that going into this past year of leadership. I was pleased with the strengths exhibited, but I was not surprised. What I did not realize was that Chair Smith is also a very strong leader. He has a very strong command of rules and procedures. Our meetings are efficient and focused. At the same time, they are inclusive. Everyone speaks, and everyone is heard. So, I nominate Chair Smith for an additional term, because I believe he will serve us on mission and mechanics.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much. Are there any other nominations, please?

Commissioner de Tourreil: Yes. I nominate Chair Smith as well. I've served for a very short period on the HRC, but I think that as last year has shown and as well, the beginning of this year has shown, I believe that one of the biggest issues that we're dealing with right now will continue to be issues around white supremacy and how it plays out in our system and in our institutions, and I think that having Chair Smith chair the HRC for another year will bring strong leadership as well as a perspective of what is going on in this community, given his other work that he does, and I believe that this year more than ever that will be incredibly important.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much, Commissioner. Staff, can I close nominations?

Ms. van der Zwaag: First you need to say if you accept your nomination or not.

Chair Smith: Oh, thank you. I do accept my nomination. I believe that last year was just the beginning, and I believe that we have so much work to do. I'm hopeful and prayerful that the Council will continue for a second session for me, because I think the work that we have started for the HRC has really been amazing, and the HRC can really be a change agent in our community, so I'm just grateful to be on this body. Thank you. Staff, can we close?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, you may close, and you may do the roll call.

Chair Smith: Okay. We will do the vote by roll call. If you're in favor of the nomination, you can say aye.

THE VOTE IS UNANIMOUS

Chair Smith: At this time, we will open up the nominations for Vice Chair. I would like to open up with a nomination. I would like to nominate Vice Chair Stinger to continue her role in the Commission. My first work with this Commission was working with the Vice Chair on community-based activities. She actually recruited me to the HRC Commission, believe it or not,

but what I admire about her and what makes her so invaluable to the work that we do is her tenaciousness to add the detail, the meat, and the intellectuality to what we are doing. In a culture that is anti-truth, a culture where people make stuff up, in a culture where people are emotional, her dedication to the truth, to the data, to the research, to make sure that we are in the right stead is admirable and needed more than ever before.

Commissioner Savage: I would also like to nominate Valerie Stinger. My reasons are, she is smart, thoughtful, and respectful. She continually goes the extra mile to make sure everyone is treated fairly. She is a true leader with a gentle soul and has remarkable compassion. I've been continually impressed by her kindness and her courage. This leadership team this past year, of Chair Smith and Vice Chair Stinger, has been strong and with conviction. Each of them has brought their own set of knowledge and expertise to the table, and as a result, the HRC has thrived and done really meaningful work in the community, and this team needs to continue. Valerie is a remarkable woman. I am proud and honored to have served with her on the HRC, and in order to continue our work, I proudly nominate Valerie Stinger for Vice Chair.

Chair Smith: Thank you, Commission Savage. Do we have any other nominations? Having no others, staff, I'll do the roll call.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Chair Smith, if you could ask Vice Chair Stinger if she accepts the nomination, please.

Chair Smith: Vice Chair, do you accept the nomination?

Vice Chair Stinger: I do, thank you, and thank you both for your kind words.

Chair Smith: You're very welcome. I will do the roll call now.

THE VOTE IS UNANIMOUS

Chair Smith: Thank you all for this election.

2. HRC confirmation of letter to Council regarding the response to the current pattern of incidents of hate in Palo Alto.

Chair Smith: We move on to our next item, which I think is the most pressing topic of the evening. We as a Commission over the past few months have noted and taken note of incidents in our community. In our September meeting we brought up some challenges around Black Lives Matter signs being moved and messed up. Also, as we got into November and December, I indicated my desire to go directly to writing a letter to the newspaper in an op ed. But, as a Commission, the Commission said, "Let us all go into this together." Tonight, I would like to present the letter that I have crafted. I will read it for you, and then we can have a conversation about it. Staff, can we put the letter onscreen, please? All right. [reading] One of the Human Relation's leading roles is listening to the community concerns, and then taking action. Over the past few months, the people of Palo Alto brought to our attention several hate-based crimes, which have targeted churches, minorities and those supporting the Black Lives Matter movement. This year, our community experienced the desecration and vandalization of the University African Methodist Episcopal Church, the oldest black church in Palo Alto; the unauthorized removal of First Congregational Church of Palo Alto's Black Lives Matter sign; the posting of a "Wuhan virus" sign in front of a popular coffee shop; the posting of derogatory

signs at three school properties this spring, referring to COVID-19 as – I was corrected by somebody today – they did write "Wuhan virus," not Chinese virus; the verbal assault of a Palo Alto Council Member because of his Asian ethnicity; the defacement of a campaign poster of the only black candidate for council with a White Lives Matter Sign; the distribution of "White Matters" letters at private homes (see attached photo); the defacement of a student art Black Lives Matter project by an assailant wearing MAGA paraphernalia; the vandalism and removal of at least ten BLM signs (see attached sheet). These incidents in 2020, along with other incidents in recent years, including unauthorized leaving of anti-LGBTQ materials at the Library and anti-Semitic materials at Gunn High School, shows a disturbing trend. As a community, we need to address this problem at the root. We can no longer excuse these events as one-off incidents or pranks where kids are just being kids. We see a repeated pattern of hate, and it's time for us to stand and actively address these issues. In Washington last week, lawmakers, grandmothers, CEO's, and others stormed the Capitol. Several people from our area attended this insurrection and participated in violent activity. We need our council to state that we are a city that doesn't accept this. We need our city to arrest and prosecute individuals involved in hate crimes to the maximum extent of the law. We ask the Council to direct staff to create programs that educate on hate crimes in our city. In this critical time, we need the City Council as the highest elected officials in our city to lead and come out emphatically against the surge of hate in our community. Human Relations Commission, from Kaloma A. Smith, Chair; Valerie Stinger, Vice Chair, and with approval...I have the rest. Can we please scroll a little bit more? As you can see, we have the White Matters sign on here. We have the Wuhan virus sign in front of a coffee shop, also placed at three different high schools, at three different schools in our school system. As you can see, this letter, White Lives Matter, has been left at several different peoples' homes in our community. You can see here, over the summer – and I want to thank former Commission Steven Lee; he helped me gather all of these – these are several different reports from several different individuals about their Black Life Matter signs being ripped from their property. One of the things I often say is oftentimes people get excited about instances, but I become very disturbed about patterns, and as we look at our community, and we've taken the time to lay it out and look at the pattern, there's something happening here that is deeply and profoundly disturbing. It is not normal for two churches to be vandalized. It is not normal for private residences to have stuff wrecked. It's not normal for the black candidate to have "White Lives Matter." It is not normal for a community that is 34 percent Asian to have signs at a coffeeshop and high schools that describe a pandemic virus as the Wuhan virus. This is not normal, and we as a city, we need to address this emphatically and now. Right now, I am going to open for public comment, and then we will have our panel discussion with the Commissioners. If you are in the public and would like to make a comment, please raise you hand. Staff, turn over to you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, thank you. Our first speaker is Rebecca Eisenburg, to be followed by Aram James. Rebecca, go ahead, please.

Ms. Eisenburg: Thank you. I'm very grateful to newly, appropriately, newly re-elected Chair Smith in this letter, which I think is a great letter. I would like the letter to be stronger. I think that we saw what happened with City Council when this Commission compromised with its utterly reasonable expectations about all of the Eight Can't Wait, which everyone who has

researched the issue knows that Eight Can't Wait is not nearly enough in itself. But, this Commission, even despite its amazing intentions and integrity, compromised even before getting to the City Council, and then the City Council forced even more compromises. Now is the time to start stronger. If we're going to weed this out at the source, we need to be honest about what the source is. These actions do represent our commission. They do represent our country. I urge all of you – I know I keep directing you all to reading, but reading is so important. Reading is how, it's really for people in dominant caste like myself, it is the best way to understand alternate and silenced perspectives. The Atlantic magazine has this wonderful article by, again, my hero, Ibram X. Kendi, "Denial is the Heartbeat of America." I urge you to look at that. In that article, Mr. Kendi makes an eloquent and indisputable argument that our country is truly based on principles of genocide, in terms of the 400 years of slavery; and there haven't been any reparations, which is just yet more perpetuation of this injustice that people of Palo Alto do not seem to understand, yet it is so clear. So, why not be stronger? If you're going to start out, get this at the source. Start out with reparations in Palo Alto. A state law, as Aram has explained often, makes room for that. Palo Alto needs to be, and used to be, a model for other cities. Now we're just falling behind. In so many ways, we are going to get those same white supremacists, and we may already have them. They may already be here, the ones wearing the Camp Auschwitz t-shirts and that "six million isn't enough," and carrying the confederate flag and having nooses. It is disgusting, and it is horrifying, and it will come home here. It may be here already if we don't take a firm stand. Please strengthen your letter. Let's now be what America is. Let's be better. Thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you. The next speaker is Aram James. Go ahead, please.

Mr. James: So Reverend Smith, the letter is outstanding. I told you, though. I spoke to the Commission last month and said, "We just can't be silent on Zach Perron." The papers have said that. I've spoken out, and I know that you all don't want to lose your jobs to the City Council, but this is a really critical, sort of a Martin Luther King issue from the Birmingham jail kind of thing, where we have to talk from the bottom of our souls. How is it that now over five years we've allowed Zach Perron's matter to fester? A racist police officer...And I know that you talked about in the 48-page report that's going in front of the City Council on the 19th, talks about the KKK history in this town. We have requested – Rebecca and I both, she filed, wrote it up and I joined – we made a public records request to see if any of the Palo Alto police officers were in D.C., not simply because they wanted to see the President. They have the right to associate with whoever they want. If they engage in going into the Capitol and committing crimes...I don't know if anyone in the Palo Alto Police Department did that, but we sure have an obligation to find out about that. So, we've got the Perron matter that's going to fester, and I'm not going to let it go. I've been on it for quite some time now, letters to the editor, et cetera, et cetera. On the reparations issue, I had a talk on the 5th of January with Lorraine Brown from Castilleja. She agrees that maybe we should have a Frederick Douglass educational and cultural center in Palo Alto, but we disagreed when I said I think it should be Castilleja. This has a long history of being a white supremacist school for women. And that's great, and they're teaching their kids anti-racism. It used to be when I was taught about racism, you had proactivity built into that word, but now I guess they had to make a special word to remind people that you've got to be proactive. So now, the terminology antiracism. So, we discussed that, and I said, "Wouldn't

it be wonderful for the young women to address, by way of part of reparations that either Palo Alto buys Castilleja and converts it to an all-black educational culture center in the tradition of historical black universities. I was fortunate enough to spend one-half of my law school in a historically black college law school. Wouldn't have been a lawyer but for the generosity of the African Americans to let me into that school. But, any event, we have that opportunity, and yes AB-3121, written by the brilliant Shirley Weber, who is now going to be the first black Secretary of State in the State of California, gives that opportunity for us to at least discuss it. So, I'm hopeful that reparations will be an issue –

Chair Smith: Thank you so much, Mr. James.

Mr. James: By the way, I think we skipped Oral Communications. We just let that go by.

Chair Smith: No, we actually did it.

Mr. James: We did it?

Chair Smith: Yes, we did it.

[crosstalk]

Mr. James: Did we?

Chair Smith: Yeah, I went back.

Mr. James: I don't think so.

Chair Smith: Yeah, we did. You can watch the tape.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Yes, we did, and you spoke, Mr. James.

Mr. James: I thought I spoke on the election issue first. I don't think we ever did oral communications.

Ms. van der Zwaag: We did, sir. You spoke on Oral Communications as well, but thank you.

Mr. James: Okay, I stand corrected.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much for your passion, Mr. James. Mr. Moore? Reverend Moore.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Our first speaker is Jethroe Moore. Go ahead, please, sir.

Mr. Jethroe Moore: Okay, again, I just want to say congratulations to Reverend Smith. I wanted to remind Palo Alto that police brutality is just a surface manifestation of a deeper systemic racism that is more than likely in your city, as well as our county. Racism affects black Americans on the job, in the marketplace and polling booth, and all up and down Palo Alto. I would challenge you guys to even go better than just as Aram James has mentioned, the Center. I

often, when I come to Stanford's campus and I'm just awed at the money that Stanford and Palo Alto has, but yet the King Center is in trailers. So, when we start dealing with racial issues are and what real race problems are, is how can we be a billionaire city and treat the King, who we say we celebrate and we respect and we adore, and they not have a building erected on their own. They hold some of the most gifted work that we have. So, when we begin to look at the signs and the symptoms of racism of signs being posted at coffeeshops, and people's signs being whited out, that is just the beginning of a cold that is in you, a sickness that is in you that is starting to surface itself, and unless we crush that out and begin to manifest it and deal with it head-on, this problem is only going to grow, and we've seen here this past Wednesday. It's all of us who are good people of good conscience, who are Americans, who love this country, and want it to live out the true meaning for which we all come together, so that we can be a United States and a united county to all of our citizens. So, people that have the means, that have the opportunities, to make sure that they're reaching out to get people who don't look like them to bring in more people into Palo Alto. I used to work in Palo Alto on the other side, East Palo Alto, as a driver, a trainer, for UPS. So, I've driven the streets of Palo Alto very well. All I'm asking is for you who have the opportunity and the ability to speak out about the King Center, speak out about the center James is talking about. There is a way that there is Black History in Palo Alto and not just a football team where you allow black players to play, or on your basketball team, where you allow them to play, but stay on campus. Develop some housing that they can come back, people can live with a moderate income. Those of us who have been given the gift and the opportunity to help and to spread and to share what we have, it's time for us to share and look at other ways we can do it. Again, thank you for this moment, and I wish you well. Pray for America as we go into next week that it will be calm and it will be a safe transition of power. Thank you.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Thank you, sir. There are no more speakers, sir.

Chair Smith: All right, let us open this up to Commission. We will do this in alphabetical order, starting with Commissioner de Tourreil. Do you have any comments, ideas or reflections on the letter, or changes you would like to see?

Commissioner Regehr: Sorry. Kaloma, since we have never been able to talk as a group because of this letter, I would rather have you two talk about the letter and the formation of it, because you stated stuff, and then maybe go reverse so that...Because we haven't been able to talk as a group about the formation about the letter from you guys. I don't know. You can go, whatever you want, but I just think it's important that we hear from two of you, your perspective first, before we...and hear from you before we start asking.

Chair Smith: I'll be honest. The genesis of this started when my church was desecrated or vandalized last January, and I became more attuned to what was happening in our community around it. As we started dealing with the summer protests and those things, more people, because of the role of the HRC and the role of the leadership, I took in some of the marches and some of the peaceful protests that happened in the area, more people came to me with these issues. As we started jotting them down, Commissioner Lee was really helpful in the genesis of this, because he brought a lot of this to me earlier, and then by the time we got to November, we noticed a pattern. That's when I brought it to the Commission originally. It was November or December. At that point, I think the Commission asked me to give a listing, provide evidence, provide

details, so that people would be able to see that this is not just us pulling stuff in and just saying this. We pulled this all together from what we'd collected through the year. What stunned me, to be honest, was the volume of it. It wasn't one or two things. It's almost two dozen different incidences, and these are the ones that were either reported to the police or reported on social medial. We don't know what has not been reported. So, there is a challenge around that. So that's how we got to this context. Of course, a lot of the language is my language, speaking where we are and where the Commission is, and as the Chair, I took lead in writing it. If there's issues with the tone and language, that's all me, so there we go. Does that answer what you were looking for, Commissioner Regehr?

Commissioner Regehr: Thank you. I just more...and I want to hear from Stinger, since we haven't been able to talk about what...I mean it does. I just thought that we needed to hear from you two since you wrote the letter. That's all I was saying.

Chair Smith: For this one, I did the majority of writing. Commission Stinger looked it over. She liked what was there. She gave some edits. We did some work on it, but since I did the body of the writing on this, I think it's appropriate for me to do the body of the explanation. All right. I would love to hear comments from each Commissioner – questions, thoughts, changes, ideas. I will start with Commissioner de Tourreil.

Commissioner de Tourreil: I was going to offer and suggest, because it sounded like Commissioner Regehr was also interested in potentially doing the flip order in terms of alphabetical. Is that right?

Commissioner Regehr: Yeah, I just think that we're always the first.

Commissioner de Tourreil: Yeah, I really don't mind not being the first, believe me.

Chair Smith: Either way, because the problem at the end of the alphabet, there is the two authors of it. So, I've already said my peace. Commissioner Stinger?

Vice Chair Stinger: Yeah, I would like to speak to it. First, I want to just thank you a lot for taking this on and for giving us a framework that we can respond to. When we first talked about this, it was a big issue, and then you brought it down to something of evidence, suggestion, and something we can respond to. It's more manageable to get our hands around it. When you first introduced this to the HRC, you said, "The HRC should be the canary in the coal mine," and I think this letter does that very well. I do have, as I've reexamined it, a concern. I think we need to source the fourth paragraph, "several people from our area attended the insurrection." I think if we do that, we would have a strong letter. If we choose to stop there, I think we have a strong letter that says, "This is what happens, and this is what we would like." But since the letter was distributed and I had some time to think about it, I did some more thinking, and my proposal is that we add some areas of focus for the Council in general, and for the committees looking at the PD reform and the diversity, equity and inclusion. So, I guess the Commission first has to decide whether we have a letter of communication of awareness to Council, or whether we include some specifics. I guess if we choose the latter, I was thinking of suggesting a paragraph something like this. I'll read this, and I know that's not the easiest way. "I think there are a variety of responses

to hate crimes that go beyond counting and punishing. The HRC will explore these and pursue them and we also ask the Council to explore these. What is the status of the hate crime unit in the PAPD? What law enforcement training on hate crime exists for PAPD? What thought has been given to a county task force devoted to investigating hate crime in the county?"

Chair Smith: Commission Stinger?

Vice Chair Stinger: Yes?

Chair Smith: The Sheriff just announced today –

Vice Chair Stinger: I did see.

Chair Smith: Announced today. And I know Supervisor Chavez and Supervisor Simitian were on process to do a hate crime commission. I know it is not our practice, but I know Reverend Moore in his role with the NAACP, might have some insight on the County Commission on Hate, so after the Commissioners speak, I might ask him to speak on that if he doesn't mind.

Vice Chair Stinger: I would appreciate that. I didn't have time to really look at how much attention that would give to North County. I would hate for us to be underrepresented in the attention. But I do think that it is worth looking at a county task force, investigating that with the County. I also think that we could explore what opportunity there is to collaborate with just Mountain View and maybe and/or Los Altos and North County, a focus on hate crimes. And then, what school and community-based prevention programs are being considered? These are five ideas that I think just add some specificity, but I hope to keep with the tone, and I will certainly bring these questions to our march meeting with PAPD. Ideally, we would have had the answers before we wrote to Council and then we would have a proper study and a thoughtful recommendation, but then it would be July and we would have a new Commission, starting all over again. I think we really need to bring this awareness of our concerns and our questions to the Council now. I guess I would like to hear what other people think, but that was my response.

Chair Smith: I really, I love the five points. I think they definitely should be engaged in this and as we get some more input, maybe we can start putting all of this together. Commissioner Savage?

Commissioner Savage: First of all, thank you for writing this letter. I can tell you've put a lot of effort into it. As Vice Chair Stinger pointed out, I also have a problem with the second-to-last paragraph, where you say, "Several people from our area attended this and participated in violent activity." I don't know if you know something that others don't, but I think we have to be very careful with our language, and I don't think this can be attributed. I don't know if this is true. It's possible, but I don't know if it's fact. So, I would like at least that sentence removed. Second point is, in the first paragraph, you talk about hate-based crimes, and later you're saying hate crimes. Are you using those two terms interchangeably, or are these different?

Chair Smith: I'm using them interchangeably.

Commissioner Savage: Okay, and the third point is Vice Chair Stinger's idea for a regional focus on this issue, I think, is a great idea, and I'd like to get moving on that as well. Those are my comments.

Chair Smith: All right. I will say this. I do not have factual evidence of people participating in violent activity. That is a valid point, but we do have factual evidence from news and broadcasts of people in our area that actually attended the event. So, would you be amicable to "several people from our area attended?"

Commissioner Savage: No, I wouldn't. Several people. Is that three? Is that 30? Is that 30? I don't know what several people means.

Chair Smith: Currently, certain news sources have identified it's about 10 to 15.

Commissioner Savage: Yes. And you know this? The 10 to 15 people in our area refers to Palo Alto, or the Bay Area, or what?

Chair Smith: I would say the Bay Area.

Commissioner Savage: Okay, well let's put that in, then, if it's the Bay Area.

Chair Smith: Okay.

Commissioner Savage: Again, several. If it's 10 or 15, let's say that.

Chair Smith: Okay, I'll get an exact number and put it in.

Commissioner Savage: Okay.

Chair Smith: Thank you. Commissioner Regehr?

Commissioner Regehr: I wanted to say that I think we need to look at our own soul, and it's very difficult when there's only five of us. When I first became, when I applied, I watched all the videos and all of meetings, and I want to thank, once again, Kaloma Smith and Steve Singer when they were bringing up mediations about how they weren't reaching out to the communities, and I wanted to say that I think we as a group, the next time when the mediation came, they did reach out. They really were really good, but how two of you were treated within the staff and City Council being told that you made a person cry, and people hadn't even seen the video to see what you guys were working towards. I could give another example. I think that it's very important that we look at...You guys did something really right and you still got flack for it. You got treated like no one wanted to watch the videos to see how you were really trying to get them to...and you were being, "You made this person cry," and it's happened a couple of times, and I think the City Council, before they start accusing people of things, we need to say that...I don't know how to put it, but we all have to look at ourselves. A City Council member accused a running mate that they were a socialist, they were red baiting, and all of this has to do with our own behavior. And I don't know how to say. Of course, I want to protect police brutality and racism, but I find it's ironic that we had a horrific thing, that something happened 2,000 miles

away, and we reacted to that, but something happened horrible in the trailer park and at the donut place and we had someone come, and I think that we need to put some responsibility that...A letter is good, and I agree that racial justice is important, but I feel that we need to put something in. One thing, and I know I've been pushing this hard, but how can we as a body of five of us, when we're trying to get to the root of the problem, and there's only five of us? That says something about the City Council that they think that we...We can't even talk with them. We can't even be imaginative because we can't meet except at meetings. We can't talk, and I would like to once again, put something like that. Like, "If you really want to push diversity, then let's show it." And I'm not saying that the City Council, when they ruled that were being racist, but it is a part of systematic, when you don't understand that what rules you make and what you do attributes to not getting to the problems and helping it. And I would like to put that, once again, that we want the City Council to make us whole again. That benefits the community because we can have more communication. And then, back to the other part, the last paragraph, in the Washington last week, I think people do have the right...I mean, we're getting violent activities...If they committed a crime, if they went into the Capitol, that is a federal crime. If they attended the rally, that is not a crime. They have the right to do that, and I think that if we have...I don't even care if there are several people in other parts of the community. We need to look at what we can do as a city. We can't arrest people and prosecute people. The police can't do that. It's a federal crime. Our local police can't arrest someone for something that they did somewhere else. I'm flipping it. I mean, I think that if they participated in the insertion, then they should be found, and the police should cooperate. I think they would. But I don't know how to phrase it.

Chair Smith: I agree with you on this, that the right to gather is a constitutionally protected right. So that statement is on a level of shaming. If I take out the violent, because I don't have evidence, then people have the right to march if they don't do anything else. Okay. Do I think there should be a sentence to say, as we look at this, we also need to look at our systematic principles, or something to that extent? To your first point, yes. Second point, one of the things that the community has expressed to me is they've felt that the police department did a great job of meeting them at the site, comforting them, taking care of them, but they felt like – and I don't know how investigations go – but they just felt like there wasn't any prosecution or arrest afterwards. And I don't control that, and that's why we have the police coming in March, the representatives, to talk to us about that. But there is a sentiment, rightly or wrongly so, and that's why we'll talk to the police department in March, that they feel like there isn't an action or a response. Or, there is a response, but they don't feel there is like an action where there is somebody being held accountable for what's happening. Now, with all these different instances, they're like, we need to do something. That's where that statement comes from. Does that clarify it for you?

Commissioner Regehr: Sort of, but you put it in Washington. You put it all in one paragraph.

Chair Smith: Yeah.

Commissioner Regehr: I would like, I guess could we ask the Council to direct staff to create programs that educate on hate crimes?

Chair Smith: I could put "our city on local hate crimes," because you make a good point. Palo Alto police can't arrest somebody for what they did in New York. You know what I mean? So, I see what you're saying, and we'll address that. Is there anything else Commissioner Regehr?

Commissioner Regehr: I'll just keep the rest for...Well, I also said about the HRC directing the City Council to. I think that's very important. If they're asking us to do all this stuff, and we're seeing it's very important, then we need more people. That was the argument for the Parks. "We can't do all this work," and they kept it at seven. And you know, I wrongly made it seem like the City Council – and I'm not saying the City Council is racist at all, because I'm not saying that. I'm just saying that if you're wanting to have an anti-racist program and really push anti-racism, we need more help. We can't do it with five.

Chair Smith: You know what the great thing for us this year is that Council Liaison actually served as the chair of this Commission when it was seven people. So, I will ask him to continue to advocate highly for us.

Commissioner Regehr: I would like that in the letter. Because I'll tell you, how are we saying we want to get to the root of it? We want them to do something, but we're not?

Chair Smith: Unless the Council comes back and says they want to add to our workload –

Commissioner Regehr: Taking action...I'm sorry, Kaloma. Since one of the Relations Commission's leading roles is listening to the community concerns and taking action.

Chair Smith: I know.

Commissioner Regehr: We only have one...

Chair Smith: We only have one?

Commissioner Regehr: I'm just saying is that I think just alone all of this, if we're saying that we're really taking this seriously and we really want to get to the root of the problem, then the City Council has to realize that what they did is lack of diversity, that they're not reaching out. We need more people for different imagination stuff. We need to take some responsibility what we're going to do. But if you don't want to put that in...

Chair Smith: One of the things – I think your points are valid – but one of the things I find very challenging is I want to be laser-focused particularly, because we're delivering information that's contrary to the community image of itself, so I really want to stay laser-focused on that part, and I think if you bring in a valid issue but an issue that they have already discussed a few times, they shut down on the main point. That's my worry about adding that.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay, so we have five women.

Chair Smith: We're at four women. Four women, one man.

Commissioner Regehr: Mostly white. That in itself says something to the community, how the City Council...I mean, if you want to get that way, this is laser. This is laser. If we're really trying to say we want something done, then we need more.

Chair Smith: Okay.

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

Chair Smith: Let's spin it around a little bit more. I have a list of changes that have been requested, and then I'll have a motion for the changes, so I can make the changes so we can deliver it to Council. Commissioner Regehr?

Commissioner Regehr: I also wanted to put something about, we're directing the staff to do things, and we put some of the year of our community's experience. I have experienced a couple of things with the school district with systematic racism. I mean, I think we need to look at the school, do something how all the people from the Tinsley program weren't consulted when the school's busses, some of them are going to go to different schools, because they want to consolidate the busses. How the busses, they leave before some of the kids can even participate in the afterschool activities. When principals don't want to change their program, like announcements, and they don't wait for the school busses to arrive. I don't know how to put that in, but that is what some of our communities have experienced. Children not being able to participate because of the busses. I don't know –

Chair Smith: I'll tell you, I will bring that up. Because I think that's an important issue to bring up, but I'll bring that up as part of my commentary to Council on Tuesday about the lives experience of black and brown folks in the city of Palo Alto, because that's a significant part of the lived experience. But again, I'm trying to keep it laser-focused on the hate.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay. That's fine.

Chair Smith: Commissioner de Tourreil?

Commissioner de Tourreil: Yes, thank you. Given that our responsibility is really to ensure that all of our community members are being heard, and that they feel safe in this community, I agree with many of the things that Vice Chair Stinger was saying about having a hate crimes commission, getting involved with a county task force, or suggesting to City Council that that should be something that is pushed forward so that our community has a way, or knows who they can reach out to, that sort of thing. To the point of the letter that says, "several people from our area attended" and that we want to make sure that if anyone was involved in any of these, for example, storming the Capitol, that there would be consequences. If somebody knows. How do people know that their neighbors are doing these things? They're on Facebook, or they know that their neighbor went? If I were to have a neighbor like that, what would I do with that information? I'm assuming a hate crimes commission or unit would have a way for people to put that information forth. I think that seems important. I think that that paragraph, that is kind of contentious with some of the folks, with some of the commissioners, maybe there's a way to point to what happened in Washington as something that we really want to make sure is not

going to happen here in Palo Alto and in this area. Because several people from our area went and that it turned violent, which is true. We don't know, necessarily, if folks participated in a violent way, but it definitely turned violent. Would that be a way to rephrase it and then encourage that our Council get ahead of this and not be caught the way the state was, not ready at all for the kind of activity that occurred on that day. Would that be a way to encourage us to be proactive and to, on the tail of all of these documented events that you're putting in the letter, be prepared and be proactive so that this doesn't happen in our neighborhood, something that extreme. I also think that that paragraph might be stronger when we say something like, "We need our Council to state that we want to be proactive and make sure something like this doesn't happen." Is there a way for us to, you make a list here of, we would want our city to fully participate, police department fully participate if the FBI is prosecuting certain individuals, I don't know if we want to call that out, but I think that making those points almost like bullet points as things that we are asking them to do, as opposed to having them as separate sentences in the paragraph might be stronger and really call out the types of action that we're asking for.

Chair Smith: Okay. I like that. I really do. To expedite this process, Mary, can you put a blank sheet up and what I'm going to do is I'm going to take each person's suggestions. Yes, Commissioner Savage?

Commissioner Savage: Sorry to interrupt, but can we go to Council Member Stone, and see if he has any comments on the letter?

Chair Smith: Thank you for that. Council Member Stone?

Council Member Stone: Sure. Thank you, Chair Smith and Commissioner Savage. Just a few. I'll pull up my notes from when I read this. Yeah, I think definitely you and Commissioner Savage have brought up the seriousness of the letter and the topics that we're talking about. I think that we all agree that one hate crime is far too many, but I think one of the ways in which it might be a little more effective, you named 18 specific incidents, and I think it would be nice to be able to have some context around that. You spoke of that being a pattern. It might be. I'm not sure, but it would be nice to have some data to be able to provide context around that, so knowing how that compares to hate crimes in the past several years within Palo Alto; how that compares to neighboring jurisdictions during this same time period. That would be helpful for me if I were reading this report and wanting to know. Okay, 18 incidents, that is a lot, but is it a pattern?

Chair Smith: But this is the question. As we create a society, we don't create order out of relative standards. We create them out of absolute standards, right? So, one of the things is, as a community that is caring for people, and being the Human Relations Commission, if one person feels marginalized, or we have attacks that impact 34 percent of our population with the Asian community, we are the canary in the coal mine. That's something that I think the City and the City Council needs to say is super important, and we need PAPD to provide us statistics, and we need to have everybody else report it, and that's why I'm being very specific about it. Because at this point, I don't want to live in a city where I can point to 18 different incidences that attack somebody's ethnicity and be like, we need to do more research. That's something we need to ask PAPD to come up with, and that's why we're inviting PAPD to have a conversation. But we just saw, we are watching extremism in our country on national levels and in the state of California

we have a significant amount of hate groups. We are watching that now, and I think us saying we need to do more...that's like saying if we had 18 DWIs, that's a problem. Or, if we had 18 accidents at a corner, that would be a problem, anywhere we lead to. That's just my thinking.

Council Member Stone: Chair Smith, you don't have to convince me on the seriousness on what's happened. I prefaced my remark saying one is too many. I'm just trying to offer feedback as far as how I think the letter could be strengthened and I think having that additional data would be able to strengthen it and be able to provide context. My background really is in human relations and human rights work, so I would definitely read this and be immediately moved by it. I don't know about my colleagues. I mean, I would like to think that they would be, but I just don't know, so I think additional data and evidence there is always going to be able to be helpful, but it's your prerogative and what this Commission would like to do. I think it would be helpful to provide captions before each of the photos that you provide. The photos are very moving, but when I first read through it, I didn't really have any context around it, so that would be helpful. It wasn't really clear to me – and listening to the conversation has helped – but when I first read through this it wasn't really clear to me what it is that the Commission is asking the Council to do. You talk about prosecuting crime. The City itself does not prosecute crimes. I wasn't sure. Is the report alleging that the police are not actively investigating and arresting individuals for hate crimes? I just wasn't very clear there, so it would be nice to just have more specifics with regard to the recommendation, when you say that City Council should direct staff to create programs that educate on hate crimes in our city. It would be nice, I think, to have some more specifics. I remember – and I'm sure Vice Chair Stinger and Commissioner Savage will remember this – but when I was on the Commission we did a series of events where we focused and highlighted these hidden issues within the community. One event I remember in particular, I remember Commissioner Savage was there, and I'm pretty sure Vice Chair Stinger was there, was a focus on domestic violence. It might be powerful for the HRC to hold a public forum on this issue and maybe from that get those stories to draft a report to the Council, rather than setting this report, if it's kind of limited in this way, as far as just that recommendation. My last couple points, I agree with Commission Stinger on the avoiding of the speculation, but it looks like we're already kind of getting to that point. I really liked the suggestion on partnering with Santa Clara County on the Hate Crimes Task Force. I just stepped down as the Vice Chair of the Santa Clara County Human Rights Commission. One thing I always hoped for was to have a closer partnership at the County and the City level, and I think it presents a really good opportunity for the Commission, maybe to reach out to them, and I'd be happy to reach out to their Chair on your behalf and start those conversations. I think that would be a good way to go. That's just kind of my feedback on how to improve the letter.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much Council Member. I think one of my significant challenges around this is, as Rebecca Eisenburg so sagaciously suggested, reading is critical. One of the things that we need to do is to understand that as we read, it is oftentimes the ability of those in power to put things in study, to put things and defer and delay things, and what that does is those that don't belong feel marginalized and put to the side. Now, I don't have a problem with doing the secondary pieces, and we can include that in the letter, but I would be profoundly disturbed if our elected officials heard 18 incidences and then say, "We need to do something. Maybe we need to give the HRC a piece. Maybe we need to talk to PAPD about something." We'll have to

work with the language we're going to put with stuff, but the one thing that was profoundly challenging to me was when you said, "I don't know if this would move my fellow Council Members." I know you can't speak for them, but this is profoundly challenging. One of the things that we do in Human Relations is that reports and events don't make people feel like they belong. A report or event just makes people feel like they've been delayed. What is it for a city to state, "We don't tolerate hate." What is it for us to start making moves and going ahead...? You know, one of the amazing things – and then I'm done – is that we live in this valley. We claim innovation. These companies are always talking about iteration, but anytime we talk about the issues around hate and around people, we want to do studies instead of iterating policies that help the people through the community. I'm so profoundly challenged by that tonight. I thank everybody for their share. What I'd like to do is ask Mary to pull up on the screen, and what I want to do is I will ask – we'll start with Commission Stinger. Commission Stinger, before you go, Council Member Stone?

Council Member Stone: I just want to clarify my remarks, because of the way I interpreted the way, Chair Smith, you kind of mentioned how...If I implied that I think that my colleagues are not going to be moved by 18 incidents of hate crimes, simply what I'm trying to convey, just to improve the letter, is I always think having context around any data makes it more powerful. So, my remarks are purely meant to say, "Here's how I think we can improve the letter for City Council." I totally agree with you – 18 incidents is a lot and is deeply troubling, but my simple suggestion on how it can be improved.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much. I want to do this in two parts. I know Commission Stinger and Commissioner de Tourreil had some points on the points, so if we can have Commission Stinger lay out the five points, and let us discuss those as recommendations to add. We'll make that one motion. We'll talk about the subtraction of the pieces and make that a second motion. And then, we'll see where we're at, as far as the modification of the letter after that point. So, I think Commission Stinger gave us a great starting point on her five points and what she wanted to add to the letter, and then we'll go from there.

Vice Chair Stinger: Okay. I can't pull the letter up right now. We can just have one sheet of paper.

Chair Smith: Yes.

Vice Chair Stinger: Okay. I think there is an action sentence in your paragraph, and I would like to add to that specifically a hate crime unit within PAPD. The question there would be, what consideration has there been to a hate crime unit in PAPD? Or is there a hate crime unit in PAPD? Then, what law enforcement training on hate crime exists for PAPD? The participation in a county task force devoted to investigating hate crimes.

Chair Smith: Law enforcement training on hate crimes?

Vice Chair Stinger: Yes. Maybe the first word should be consideration of a hate crime unit within PAPD. Law enforcement training on hate crimes; participation in a county task force devoted to investigating hate crimes; collaboration with Mountain View and/or Los Altos.

Number five is school and community-based prevention programs. I think I would add a sixth one, with your permission, with the Commission's, and that would be to address Council Member Stone's comment, and that would be to acknowledge that data is important, and we want to look at collecting data across the individual incidents. The little bit that I've read these past few days has been that this is a huge problem. Data collection is one of the limitations of understanding the volume of hate crimes.

Chair Smith: Okay, so that we can sort of noodle this around, can you put Commission Savage next on the screen? We have the removal of sentence, which I am just going to do. What were your other suggestions, Commissioner Savage?

Commissioner Savage: Okay, so you're going to remove that second sentence?

Chair Smith: Yes. That makes sense.

Commissioner Savage: Okay, very good. I feel much better now. Okay. You're using hate crimes and hate-based crimes interchangeably, so just so it looks better, just pick one and use that throughout.

Chair Smith: Given your law enforcement background, which do you think would be the proper terminology, or better suit this?

Commissioner Savage: Well, a hate crime is its own special classification, and it's just not the active defacing a sign, but you have to prove intent. I don't know the law. I don't know all the rules, but there is quite a bit to it. When you say hate-based crimes, that is kind of a nebulous term, and possibly that be better in this case, since we don't know exactly the absolute definition of hate crimes.

Chair Smith: I'll agree with that, so let's switch the language to hate-based crimes for the entire letter.

Commissioner Savage: All right. The other point I made was, it shows in number three of Vice Chair Stinger's comments – participation in a county task force, which is a great idea. Actually, I'm looking at the screen now, number one and number two, what does that mean? We are asking the Palo Alto Police Department to consider a hate crime unit.

Chair Smith: Vice Chair Stinger?

Vice Chair Stinger: What I would like to say is the consideration or exploration of, should be above number one. Number one is just a hate crime within PAPD.

Commissioner Savage: Okay, and then point number two, you're asking how officers are trained to recognize hate crimes?

Chair Smith: Yes.

Vice Chair Stinger: Yes.

Commissioner Savage: In other words, we're asking the police department to let us know how their officers are trained on this issue?

Vice Chair Stinger: Yes.

Commissioner Savage: Okay, that's all I've got.

Chair Smith: Okay. Let's get Commissioner Regehr.

Commissioner Regehr: I want to apologize if I seem...I was arrested because of apartheid in 1977, and it took 20, almost 30 years, for that to end. I think that I agree that racial justice is extremely important, but I think that we're just, we've spent four months almost on this issue, just how to put this letter together. I think that it's paying lip service to this. The Black Lives Matter, celebrating the accomplishments of our black and brown neighbors, it doesn't even move the needle. I think that we're having people say that the police are problems, but we're asking them to have their own hate crime unit? I think that this is not getting to...I don't know how to say it, but I think that we need to look at, the City Council directed us to do these things, and it took away from a lot of other issues. It took away from the needs. It took away from homelessness. It took away from hunger and poverty. Those are the real issues of...And that's what as a Human Relations Commission. I guess I'm just trying to figure out...I'm getting impatient about spending so much time on a letter, and being told that now we have to say, to let the City Council know, we have to give them more data, we have to start a new...I mean, it doesn't seem like it's getting to the root of the problem. We're saying that we're going to take action, and I don't know how to put that in the letter, but I'm a 65-year-old woman, and I'm angry that is how slow we're doing. We don't need... I don't know. I'm sorry.

Chair Smith: I feel you. I'm with you.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm just really frustrated at this, and I'm sorry. I'm not taking it out on, I'm just saying that...

Chair Smith: No, no, no.

Commissioner Regehr: Investigate hate crimes? Preventive programs? I'm just saying it's like, is that really what's going to work? And that's the part that I'm saying is that we need to be innovative, and I think that we should just leave the letter as it is and take some of the stuff out and just go from there and discuss these things at our retreat.

Chair Smith: Okay, fair enough. Commissioner Regehr, I share your frustration that I even have to write this letter again. I have to write this letter after we had thousands of people protesting in our city, and we had hours and hours of us and PAUSD talking about race in our city, and somehow we still end up with 18 incidents. What I profoundly agree with, first of all, it is all right to express your opinion and have emotion about it. I think it is fair to be passionate. We don't want commissioners that are impassionate about people on the Human Relations Commission, and I agree with you. We've got some hard issues to face around homelessness – and we'll talk a little bit about that later. We have something coming next month, because we

needed to get on housing insecurity, because that's a big issue now. But I agree with you – it is frustrating, it is super frustrating that after Foothills and all of that, we're still dealing with this, so I agree with you.

Commissioner Regehr: I guess my point is that it's very intertwined. I think that asking the City Council, I think that we should more say it to the community.

Chair Smith: We will.

Commissioner Regehr: Because I think it's a community issue, and we don't want the police to be the regulating hate crimes. We want our community to embrace that this is not what we do. We don't want to focus on, I don't want to focus on the police enforcing hate crimes. I want to focus on what's causing it.

Chair Smith: I do too. And that's why we need the City Council to commissioners out emphatically and say, "This is not what our community is about." That's a starting point. I think, to your point, as the highest elected officials with the loudest bullhorn, the need to say, "We are a community." We'll say it. I say it every Sunday. I have hundreds of hours of videos on our YouTube channel of me saying that this is unacceptable, but I only have a small constituency of my church and those I have influence on. Those that get elected to office, they need to say it, too.

Commissioner Regehr: I guess in that letter, then, instead of saying that we want a study, is that when the City Council hears hate crime is happening, they need to denounce it right then. You know, these things happened months ago, and we're writing a letter now?

Chair Smith: Yes, you're right.

Commissioner Regehr: And I don't know how to put it in this letter, when a leader hears something, it needs to be discussed right then, and we need to denounce it.

Chair Smith: I agree.

Commissioner Regehr: I don't know how we would say. You're better with –

Chair Smith: I think that we need to denounce before we ask for studies and other things.

Commissioner Regehr: Right.

Chair Smith: First of all, I say that the behavior is unacceptable for our community, and then if we want to study or do anything else, but it has to happen after we denounce it and say that doesn't meet our community standards.

Commissioner Regehr: Yeah, when a hate crime happens, we denounce it.

Chair Smith: Exactly.

Commissioner Regehr: You're better with words, but...

Chair Smith: No, but thank you. Your passion for this is really helpful because I think we have to be passionate about these issues.

Commissioner Regehr: It's not only passion. I've been going to a lot of...When I hear that I should re-caste, I was reading, *Soul on Ice*, when I was in fifth grade. I mean, I've lived this.

Chair Smith: That's a good book, too. But I don't think that comment is for you. I don't think the reading comment, that comment wasn't for you.

Commissioner Regehr: No, but my point is that I'm skilled at this. This is my training. I worked for unions. I know that...I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm just going on. I said denouncing hate crime. So how do we finish this, Kaloma?

Chair Smith: We said, "denounce hate crime" before we add. "When we see a hate crime, we denounce it." If we want to do research and some other stuff afterwards, but we need to denounce hate crimes when they happen, and emphatically.

Commissioner Regehr: And who are we asking that? Are we asking the...?

Chair Smith: The City Council, City Manager. Because at the end of the day, we're a Commission. We have a smaller sphere of influence, but they're the ones that the city elected.

Commissioner Regehr: So, we're asking the City Council members, when they hear hate, they denounce it.

Chair Smith: Yes.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay. So, the City Council denounces hate crime.

Chair Smith: Yes. We can denounce it, and I'll denounce it every Sunday, but –

Commissioner Regehr: No, but I'm just saying it says, "denounce a hate crime when they happen." Who are we directing that to?

Chair Smith: To our City Council.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay.

Chair Smith: Hated-based incident. Hate-based incident, to stick with the language that we just agreed on.

Commissioner Regehr: So "denounce hate-based incidences."

Chair Smith: Yes. Hate-based incidents. Hate-based crimes, yes. All right.

Commissioner Regehr: Crimes? It says crimes. Do you want incidents?

Chair Smith: Incidents, yes. Hate-based incidents. I heard from several people in the Asian community, that they were not happy when somebody of their ethnicity looked at the sign that was at the coffee shop and said, "That's not racist. I can tell it's racist if I saw it," and they were not happy about that at all. At all. Commissioner de Tourreil?

Commissioner de Tourreil: Well, just a question about that last thing. When these hate-based incidences occur, or incidents occur, how is City Council learning about these? Is this something that the police learn about, and the police then, their duty is to inform the City Council? Is there any sort of chain of communication that exists?

Chair Smith: That's a great question. Should we ask PAPD to inform the Council when they have hate-based incidents?

Commissioner Regehr: Wait a minute. I'm sorry. I guess I'm trying to say, if some of the incidences happened in the police department, occurrences, so...and that becomes a legal thing within, so I don't think that the police should be the ones letting City Council know what hatebased incidences are.

Chair Smith: So, whether they hear from the public, the community. Does that make sense, Sunita?

Commissioner de Tourreil: Yeah, I guess I was just wondering, what is the process by which they are finding out about these incidences? These different things that we've listed in the letter, these are things that we've collected the information, right? The Commissioners? And unless there's been some articles written about it, how is City Council supposed to denounce things? I guess I just don't understand how they are supposed to find out about these things, or what the process is, and I'm not suggesting that the police are the right mouthpiece to be passing it on to City Council. I'm just trying to understand how we document these things.

Chair Smith: I wonder if we could have a way for people, like email, an address, something that people can speak directly to Council when they experience this, because my email has been put on social media, a lot of people send me emails and photos and those kind of things, so if there was a place or a way for Council to set up an email box or something that they would receive this kind of information.

Commissioner Regehr: Is this a question for Greer?

Council Member Stone: I think that's something reasonable that the City could set up.

Commissioner Regehr: Yeah, that actually would be a good...because then it could also be anonymous.

Chair Smith: It could anonymous. Well, it can't be anonymous by email, but at least the City set up some sort of email, some sort of communication way.

Commissioner Regehr: Like a hotline. Like a hate crime hotline or something.

Chair Smith: Yeah, email address, hate crime hotline, however they do it, but in some form. Does that help? So, it's third party. It's the public straight to the City Council. There is nobody in between that.

Commissioner de Tourreil: Yeah, and then just the fact that it exists shows that this is something that we want to hear about as a City, and there's a place that people can go and report this, whether it's an online platform or an email or a call line, or whatever. I think that is kind of powerful. I mean, you can report it some formal way that isn't the police.

Chair Smith: It'll go straight to Council. I like that. That's great work, both of you. Great work. You had some other suggestions, Commissioner de Tourreil?

Commissioner de Tourreil: Mostly they were supportive of the idea of some kind of a unit that Vice Chair Stinger was mentioning, and then the point of being very clear about – which you've already done above – laying out, so in the letter when we're talking about what we want our Council to do and that our city does not accept, or we want to be preemptive or thoughtful before we have something like what happened at the Capitol happening here. Just sort of laying those out, sort of pulling them out of the paragraph format and having them clear. It's maybe nitpicking, but I feel that that's stronger.

Chair Smith: No, I think that's valid. My thing that will change – and I think Commissioner Regehr mentioned this earlier – I want to clarify the language around the police enforcement piece that I listed before, because she said the language sounded like D.C., sounded like I was asking us to arrest people that did stuff in D.C. Okay, Commissioners, these are the modifications I feel comfortable making.

MOTION

Chair Smith: I want to make a motion that the Chair will re-write the letter with the following modifications as presented by the Commission. Then I will send you a copy, and we will do an email vote based on accepting or not accepting, based on these changes as given by the Commission. We will rewrite the letter based on the changes above, and we will do an email vote on the final letter. And that will be run through staff.

Commissioner de Tourreil: Can I add one more thing as well?

Chair Smith: Yes, Commissioner.

Commissioner de Tourreil: I was saying that I think there is value in pointing out that – and I know that maybe we need to be careful with the word "several people," – but the notion that people from this area attended this protest, and that turned violent. So, you're not saying that they necessarily were part of that, because we don't know that. And then, sort of using that to link into the fact that what we're trying to think about here is to be very proactive. So, I think it's strong to mention and tie together that we have this pattern of hate-based crimes. This happened last week. We don't want this to continue to foment and happen, which is very possible.

Chair Smith: So, I would say this. I do agree – and who has their hand up? Okay, Commissioner Stinger, I'll get right to you. – I do agree with Commissioner Savage. I want to get a number, and I also want to define the area clearly, so that people, when they read it...and I also reference some news articles to show that. So, let's not use the word "several." Let's just say "people," and I'll be very specific and have actual reference points on news articles, so that I think Commissioner Savage is a hundred percent correct in that, that you want to be precise on, because you don't want to be inflammatory and not have the back-up. I forgot one thing. I think Council Member Stone said one other thing that was critical – we need to put context and titles under the different pieces that we have, so people reading it will understand where we're coming from.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm sorry. I still don't understand this paragraph, the "in Washington last week, lawmakers, grandmothers, CEOs..." I don't know. "Several people attended this insurrection and..." How is that going to be dealt with? I think it's an important thing for the community to hear.

Chair Smith: That's what we're going to do. We're going to –

Commissioner Regehr: But they're not going to hear it if it's just you re-write it and then we agree over email.

Chair Smith: No, what I'm going to do is, per what Commissioner de Tourreil said, was we're going to – and Commissioner Savage – we're going to give a number of amount of people that have been reported in the newspaper, reference the article, so that there is solid context to the people that are there, and then we will tie it in. It says, "Several people from the area attended the protest, and it turned violent." So, we're using that, and we just want to be proactive in our area.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay, I guess my point of all that is...and I'm not saying that that rally was the same...Because I've been accused of saying well, it's different. But just because those people that went there and it turned violent, it doesn't mean that those people necessarily went there to make violence. I really would not like it if we had, all of a sudden, a right-wing constituency and they were saying, "Well, look to see who went to the Black Lives Matter movement, because it turned violent. We need to stop this down." And I guess that's my concern, that just because we don't agree with that activity, and that it turned violent, we can't assume that people went there...Do you know what I'm saying? I guess that's my concern.

Chair Smith: So, Commissioner de Tourreil, what's your thoughts on that?

Commissioner de Tourreil: I understand what you're saying, Commissioner Regehr, and I appreciate the idea of not wanting that to get thrown back at us. It seems to me that it's a pretty different situation. I understand what you're saying, but it seems to me that the scale of it and what actually happened was pretty severe, and the response to it was very troubling, or the lack of response, or the potential – what's the word? – collaboration or inside involvement within law enforcement, potentially. That's very troubling.

Commissioner Regehr: We're not addressing that, though.

Commissioner de Tourreil: No, I agree, but I guess my feeling is, yes, I understand not wanting to get that thrown back at us, but I guess my feeling is that it's such a different situation. And there is a perception, I think, we have a collective perception of assumption around what different-colored skin people are going to do and that there's an assumption of violence or an assumption of innocence based on that. But I get your point, and I think that there must be some way to include the fact that this big thing happened. We were not expecting it, and we should maybe be prepared in our community and not assume that there isn't something...to be thoughtful about, it's linking the hate crimes and what we're seeing happening at a national level, I guess.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, I totally understand that, but I'm just saying that this doesn't address that at all. It says, "several people from the area attended the protest, and it turned violent," and that is what's being said about Black Lives...I'm still hearing it, that Black Lives Matter, "Remember the fires." It was a totally different thing, and I'm thinking that we have to be sensitive to distinguish the two.

Chair Smith: So, this is the thing that I think, particularly in the black community, we are extremely sensitive about, is the fact that...Let's be clear, Black Lives Matter, when people march in their community, because they feel pressure, or left out or marginalized in their community, is very different than paying \$800 in the middle of a pandemic to go stand in another city to argue that the government is not functioning. It's two very different things, and I think even the sense of that...There's a difference between arguing about somebody having their neck kneeled on for eight minutes and then somebody that keeps saying that the vote was stolen, with no evidence, after 60 court cases. I think one of the things I'm willing to... I understand what you're saying, but sometimes I need to call a spade a spade. And it's not right-wing. It's more...I will talk to somebody in the right wing. I have members of my church that are in the right wing. I think the challenge becomes when people organize actions that end up in violence that are premeditated, and it's a dangerous precedent, and I think we, as an African American community, you could say BLM was bad, but at this point that's not the facts. It's the same way somebody says, "The elections were stolen," that's not the facts. The fact of the matter is that there are people, that the main reason for their protest was that they felt like the government stole an election, and there was no evidence of that.

Commissioner Regehr: And I'm saying I totally agree with you, but I'm just saying that some people went probably because they just wanted to see President Trump. And I'm not making excuses for them. I'm just saying we cannot assume that people go to listen to the President – and I know...I've gotten into many arguments with people, but I just don't feel comfortable with saying that several people went...we don't know who these people. And I don't feel comfortable saying that at all.

Chair Smith: Commissioner Regehr, one of the...and I'm going to think about how we can get to a compromise, but one of the interesting things, particularly that I remember growing up was that my parents said, "Don't get in the car with people you don't know." Any they would say to me, "Why don't you get into the car with people you don't know? Because when the police pull you over, if they've got something in the car, you are now an accomplice to that." If I sit in the car with somebody and they have an illegal substance or an illegal weapon in the car, I instantly

become an accomplice to that crime. That's the interesting thing about American law. We ask for grace for some, but like if you put two African American youth in a car and one of them has a gun, and they both get pulled over, they're both going to jail for years.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, but if someone goes to a rally and someone else is there, that's a totally different. People left. Do you know what I'm saying? You can't...I don't know how to say it. I have gone to demonstrations, and I left. I was going for one reason, and the organizers had a different reason. And we're in an area that gets a lot of information. But some people really did just go – and I'm sorry, I'm not trying to make excuses for them – but I think we need to ask ourselves, why did people around here go? And, instead of shaming them or making them...if they did something wrong and they did something illegal, they're going to be arrested. If they participated in violent activity, is what we had, they are going to be, you know...So, I really don't even understand the point of...I guess we don't want any type of violence in our city.

Chair Smith: We don't.

Commissioner Regehr: And is that what we're saying? If that's what we're saying, then we can't...Sunita, I'm trying to figure out what you mean, "We don't want that to happen here." What don't we want to happen here?

Commissioner de Tourreil: In the same way that we make a connection that if somebody is part of, someone went to a Black Lives Matter protest, we make some assumptions. I'm sorry, I'm not clear with what I'm saying. Let me just think for a second. I don't know that I'm fully wed to...I think people know, because there's been reporting and stories about local people in the community who've gone, and there's been some repercussions in terms of peoples' choice of whether or not they want to frequent their businesses or whatever, right?

Commissioner Regehr: Right.

Commissioner de Tourreil: But I think that the main point – and I defer to Chair Smith as to whether we want to really point out, and he's already saying we would point out that some people went to this rally – I think the main point is that the folks who were in D.C. are from all over, and there are a lot of people who are feeling, rightly or wrongly – well, not rightly or wrongly – that believe that, they themselves believe that something very fraudulent has gone on and there's just no convincing them, and this is happening as a phenomenon in our country right now, and it could very well happen here as well, and given this list of hate-based incidences that we've had, we want to be thoughtful and preemptive and careful about stamping this stuff out, not allowing but calling it out, denouncing it, raising awareness in the community so that we're all aware of what's going on and we're not just pretending it's not happening here, because we're so progressive in Palo Alto. I think that's the point, is to say there's this national phenomenon, and we know that – isn't it 20 to 25 percent of the county voted for Trump? We have Trump supporters here, and they may be perfectly reasonable Trump supporters and accept that he lost, but there may be other folks who are very angry and that we want to be thoughtful about not letting that spark happen here.

Chair Smith: Commissioner Regehr, this is my proposed compromise. I would say this. I think Commissioner de Tourreil said it perfectly there. We want to be proactive, and we want to denounce this early, so that we do not have an issue or anything like what happened in Washington, D.C. It becomes non-judgmental. It sticks to the topic, but it also admits that there is a greater impetus at this time because of what happened in D.C. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Regehr: I'm not going to argue over this, because I think that...we want to be proactive, but who is the "we" and who is the "proactive" to denounce? I mean, I heard some people on...it's been an incredible thing. I think it's more important to find out why these...to embrace our community and figure out why these things are happening. And denounce it. I don't care that somebody went to the rally. I mean, I do care, but I'm just saying, just it seems like a very... "We want to be proactive and denounce this early." What are we...?

Chair Smith: This is the thing that we're denouncing early. Those that would specifically...your policies and your beliefs are one thing. And you can believe whatever you want to believe in your house. I can't control you. But the second you start going into the public square and marginalizing others, and you start doing things like defacing property, you start doing things like leaving manifestos and calling people out, that's the stuff we want to denounce. And we want to denounce it early, because you need to set the standard in the community that you can be a conservative, you can believe in lower taxes, smaller government. You can believe in all of those things that drive that, and that is your absolute right. That is your absolute right, but what is not your right is not to come into the public square and write signs and rip up people's property and spray paint churches and do those things, and we sit by and not say this is wrong.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, which has nothing to do with Washington, D.C. But it does. I understand what you're saying. But –

Chair Smith: Because Washington D.C. is the playing out of not calling a spade a spade, and not denouncing certain behaviors. Commission Stinger, you're next.

Vice Chair Stinger: I just have two really small points, particularly paling in comparison to the conversation we just had. I heard two things that I really like in our discussion. One was the comment that it is different than the community image of itself, and I think that that's a starting comment that I would like to have, to suggest to you, and it was your words. So, a goal is that the community is heard, and people feel safe, is another reason why we are bringing this matter to Council and asking for them...

Chair Smith: And I think, besides safe, they feel like they belong.

Vice Chair Stinger: Yeah, I just don't want them left out. I really thought that resonated with me.

Commissioner Regehr: I'm sorry. So, when you say you don't want "them" to feel they're left out, who are the people that we're saying we don't want them to be left out?

Chair Smith: That would be black, Asian, LGBTQ, Jewish. Because they've all had something in this community that's happened within the past few years that has put them on the other side of

"other." Somebody has attacked their ethnicity in this city, which leads you not to feel like you belong here. It gives a sense of discomfort.

Commissioner Regehr: I totally understand that point. It's also Muslim, not just Jewish.

Chair Smith: Muslim. I'm only talking about the data that I collected.

Commissioner Regehr: There's been Muslim. I should've...I didn't know we were going religiously. How about just religious persecution?

Chair Smith: Religious, yeah, and so my thing is at the end of the day, one incident makes people feel uncomfortable. As you start hearing more, even if it doesn't impact your group, you start feeling more uncomfortable. Commission Stinger, your hand was up.

Vice Chair Stinger: Oh, I'm sorry. I just didn't take it down.

Chair Smith: Okay. Mary, can you remove the paragraph, go down, top of the second page where it says "several." That whole section "several people" and be precise. We'll remove that. All right, after robust debate, I want to make a motion that these changes...I already wrote the motion. The Chair will re-write the letter based on the changes above, and we'll do an email vote on the final letter and run it through staff. When I run it through staff, staff will take the vote, so they'll email it to everybody, so we do not get caught in a Brown Act issue. All right. I will start with votes. Commissioner de Tourreil?

Commissioner de Tourreil: In approving the motion?

Chair Smith: Well, I need a second on the motion. I'm sorry. Can I get a second on the motion?

Vice Chair Stinger: I'll second it.

Chair Smith: The Vice Chair seconded. The first vote is Commissioner de Tourreil?

Commissioner de Tourreil: Aye.

Chair Smith: Commissioner Regehr?

Commissioner Regehr: I just have one clarification. What is the timeframe?

Chair Smith: I don't have a timeframe.

Commissioner Regehr: When were you going to present this to the City Council?

Chair Smith: I know it's not going to stretch out to next month, but it'll probably be sometime late next week, early the week after. I'm just basing on my currently schedule.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay, aye.

Chair Smith: Okay, Commissioner Savage?

Commissioner Savage: Aye.

Chair Smith: Thank you. Vice Chair Stinger?

Vice Chair Stinger: Aye.

Chair Smith: Chair Smith, aye.

MOTION PASSES, 5-0

Commissioners, I am grateful, and Council Member, I am so grateful for the robust discussion and the exchange of ideas, because I believe we will end up with a lot better and more focused letter that represents this Commission, so I'm grateful for each of you for your perspective. Thank you so much.

3. Planning and timing of the Human Relations Commission Retreat.

Chair Smith: Staff, can you please give us some information on where we stand with the retreat, please?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Sure. The retreat is now set for Friday, February 5th, from 9:00 to 1:30 p.m., at your favorite Zoom channel. That's where we stand.

Chair Smith: Okay. Council Member Stone, will you be able to make that?

Council Member Stone: Friday, February 5th?

Chair Smith: Yes, sir.

Council Member Stone: I don't believe I'll be able to make that. I'm pretty sure I'm in a kind of, some sort of seminar for training for new council members that date. I'm trying to pull it up. Yeah, I'm pretty sure it's that Friday, but if anything changes, of course, the training is on Zoom, so, I might be able to jump in and out throughout the day.

Chair Smith: Okay, the date work for the rest of the Commissioners? Thank you. I and the Vice Chair will work staff to generate an agenda and really focus on focus for this upcoming year. I will reference back. Okay. Do we have any public comment on the retreat for the HRC?

Ms. van der Zwaag: I believe there is one speaker. Mary, if you can get the clock up, please.

Chair Smith: Who is that speaker?

Ms. van der Zwaag: It's Aram James. Hold on just one second. Okay, go ahead, Aram.

Mr. James: Reading from page 43 of the report that you're going to be presenting to the City Council on Monday. Good afternoon, everybody, it's a Palo Alto grad of '87. The last paragraph that I'm reading here is that, in all seriousness, one of the reasons why it was important for me, my mom, to leave the state of West Virginia was because of the deep-rooted systemic racism that she experienced there. She does not swim. She has a fear of water, but she was never given the opportunity to overcome that because where she lived, blacks were only permitted to swim in the pool the day before it was closed for the season. I'm telling you; Zach Perron went after a black officer who had saved a black suspect –

Chair Smith: Mr. James. Mr. James.

Mr. James: I'm just saying, I want this to be a priority for next year.

Chair Smith: But, Mr. James, at this point, this is only comment on our retreat at this point.

Mr. James: Yes, and I'm saying I think should be a priority. The Perron matter, at the retreat, okay?

Chair Smith: Okay.

Mr. James: I also believe...Listen, I interviewed about five members of the City Council that were running for Council. I could not get one of them to say the "R" word – reparations. It's like they don't even want to accept that we now have a reparations commission in the State of California. I would like you, Reverend Smith, to make certain that we know that that Commission is at the state level and that push. Because I'm serious about making a principled argument that it's time to close the Castilleja School down and convert it to an African American equivalent, and we will leave it at six acres. We won't be expanding things. I want to have that discussion as a priority. I also want to have a priority discussion about the Palo Alto police. If any of them went to this march – and we've got a public record requested – and did violence, then we have to act on that, but we've got to get the knowledge first. Simply them going there to express their political support for Trump, that's one thing. But stepping into the Capitol – and by the way, a police officer was killed. That was a very serious incident. Four other people died. The Palo Alto police have all long vile history of acting out in a racist manner. So, if they have people that went there and they sent emails about their sympathy with white supremacy, that's pieces of circumstantial evidence that would suggest at least an investigation on that matter. Those are matters that are critical to me that I hope that at least you will consider making those priority items. Reparations. The Parron matter, and our Palo Alto Police Department, and when you do have them in March, you've got to have somebody from the ACLU Police Crimes Team to cross examine the officers. We can't just rely on their version of reality in Palo Alto. Thank you very much.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much. Commissioners, at this point, I will ask that you will please send staff any topics that you want to discuss at the retreat. Myself and Vice Chair Stinger will work on the agenda and plan with staff. Is the date all right with everybody else? All right. Do I need to take a vote on this, staff?

Ms. van der Zwaag: No. Not to my knowledge of any action that has specifically been taken, sir.

Chair Smith: Okay. Thank you so much. That item over.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Smith: Let us go to the minutes from our December 17, 2020, special HRC minutes. I will ask, are there any changes or anything that anybody needs to see changed in the minutes?

Commissioner Regehr: I just have a question, Chair Smith. In the November, you had said that it would be on the agenda as an action item. You said for me to draft a letter for directing the City Council to up back to seven, because of workloads, etcetera, and then I brought it up and it wasn't brought up in December. So, I haven't bothered writing the letter, because you said that it would become an action item on the agenda. I'm just wondering when that is going to happen.

Ms. van der Zwaag: May I interject, Commissioner Regehr?

Commissioner Regehr: Sure.

Ms. van der Zwaag: When the Council discussed the changes to the Commission Handbook, one of the Council Members did bring up the idea of bringing the HRC back up to seven, and they had a discussion about it, and they took a vote, and the vote failed. At that point, there was a comment made that they would be interested in looking at it again in a year's time. That was the comment made by a couple Council Members, but there was a discussion. The letter was the request a request for a discussion and a vote on it, and that did take place on November 30th.

Commissioner Regehr: I heard that. It was the old City Council.

Chair Smith: That is true. This is a new Council. I'm willing to co-sign the letter.

Commissioner Regehr: I was wondering if it could be put back on the agenda..

Chair Smith: I will put it on the retreat agenda, and when I talk about what we're doing for our next meeting, it will make more sense, but we'll put it on the retreat agenda, and I'll sign the letter with you.

Commissioner Regehr: Okay.

Chair Smith: Because, given what we're talking about in the report we're presenting this week, what we're talking about in this letter and what we're going to talk about with housing insecurity next month, and we haven't even gotten to some other critical issues, we're already at capacity. The City staff – and I'll talk about it when I do my Commission Report – wants us to work with the Palo Alto Unified on some stuff for Black History Month. We have like four major projects. We're more busy with five than we were with seven.

Commissioner Regehr: Exactly. So, we'll just discuss it, because I'm just saying that it just seems like a lot of the load is going onto you two, and we cannot, because of the Brown Act, have a discussion much...Nobody else can work on anything.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I'm also concerned that we're having a discussion on this [inaudible, crosstalk]

Chair Smith: We're going to have everybody work on something come [inaudible, crosstalk]

Commissioner Regehr: So, about the agenda. Because he said that he would put it on the agenda, and I was wondering when.

Ms. van der Zwaag: Right, but at this point we are talking about approving the minutes, so this conversation is off-topic, and that's my concern right now. We are not doing agenda planning. We are talking about approval of the December 17th minutes.

Commissioner Regehr: Right, and my point is we approved the minutes of November without following through with an action item, is all I'm saying, so we could just [inaudible, crosstalk].

Chair Smith: Okay, I will put it...I received from another Commissioner, talking about how we schedule our meetings and the timing, so I will also...There's some procedural stuff that I want to do with the Commission, so we will have it at the retreat, February 5th. We'll have that discussion. Can I get a motion on the minutes, please?

MOTION

Commissioner Regehr: I make the motion that we accept the minutes.

Chair Smith: Can I have a second?

Vice Chair Stinger: Second.

Chair Smith: We have second from Commissioner Stinger. We'll do a roll call vote.

MOTION PASSES, 5-0.

VI. REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS

1. Commissioner Reports

Chair Smith: I want to do this in reverse, because I need to form a subcommittee on something we received from the City, to actually partner with PAUSD, but I would like, Minka, since you were at the meeting with them talking about this, or do you want me to talk about it?

Ms. van der Zwaag: To take an action to form a subcommittee, you can just assign people to a subcommittee, but if you're specifically going to take an action or a vote on it, then it needs to be [inaudible, crosstalk]

Chair Smith: I'm not going to take a vote. I'm going to do a hand raise, and if they want to do it, they want to do it, if they don't, they don't. Okay, so Palo Alto Unified has reached out to the City Manager, Chantal in the City office, and what they're doing is Palo Alto 21, which is a group of 21 activities that they want to share with the community, the schools, and the City at large, to talk about race and equity in the city. Lana, who is the Director of Equity at the school side of our city, PAUSD, is leading this effort. I would need two people to volunteer to partner with them. Because I think this is a great thing for the HRC to get engaged with, and I think it's part and parcel for our work. So, I'm looking for two volunteers. Anybody want to volunteer? Thank you. I've got two volunteers – Commissioner Regehr and Commissioner de Tourreil. Look at that. That went real easy. Do we have any Commission reports? I hope you all had a good holiday and a safe one. Yes, Commission Stinger?

Vice Chair Stinger: I'll just mention that Martin Luther King Day is Monday, and AYS -

Chair Smith: YCS.

Vice Chair Stinger: My acronyms confused. I meant YCS, Youth Community Services, put together an excellent program from 11:00 to 1:00. I've been watching some of the videos that Downtown Streets team has done. Palo Alto Humane Society has a video you're going to die for. It is so good. It really is.

Chair Smith: I'll be giving the closing remarks at that, so I would like some home team support. Thank you.

2. Council Liaison Report

Chair Smith: Council Liaison, do we have any reports from you, sir?

Council Member Stone: There's a lot of issues coming up to Council in the next few weeks that will be relevant, I'm sure, to the Human Rights Commission. Not only your report this coming Monday, but issues with Foothill Park and a few other issues. I'd have to pull up my notes. Another thing that I just thought I'd share real quick, since the issue has come up with regard to Palo Alto police and whether the City is investigating, if any of our City personnel went to Washington, D.C. last Wednesday. The City has released a statement that they have done some preliminary investigations and that they are...I'll quote it exactly. "At this time, we do not have any evidence or specific allegation that any member of the Palo Alto Police Department participated in the January 6th assault on the Capitol, nor are we aware that any of our personnel were in Washington D.C. at that time." They were going to continue, and if any evidence does arise, they are promising that they will quickly investigate it and take action.

Chair Smith: Thank you so much, Council Member.

3. Staff Liaison Report

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, Thursday, February 11, 2021

Chair Smith: We spent a lot of time around race in Palo Alto, which I think it needed to be spent, but to Commissioner Regehr's point, we are not a single focus board. We have a lot of other challenges and issues in our city. So, our tentative agenda, I want to share a little bit with you. We sat with staff, and they have the whole invite list. We are going to talk about housing and security from those in the rent, who could possibly lose their place, all the way through what we're doing with the parking and the program. We have invited a round robin table discussion of experts and people that are actually providing services in our community, so we can get a clearer picture of what services are being provided, who is providing what, and where the gaps are, so we can have a serious discussion and really move forward with that. Minka, if you could help me out with the list of people that we have coming in.

Commissioner Regehr: Could I just say something, Kaloma, Chair Smith? It's not that I say that we're one single...I'm just saying that race and hatred are all intertwined. It's not that I'm just saying, I don't want to make it seem like I'm saying let's just put the race on the side. It's one issue. It think it's very intertwined, so I'm grateful that you're doing this housing.

Chair Smith: Yeah, and we're doing it in a very significant and serious way, so I think once Minka shares what our plans are I think you will be –

Commissioner Regehr: I just want to make clear to the public that I'm not saying that I'm not putting race as an issue. It's very important, but I just feel like it's intertwined with everything. That's all.

Chair Smith: I agree. Thank you so much.

Ms. van der Zwaag: I would say I prefer not to share names of people that I haven't heard confirmations from yet, but at this point we will be hearing an update on the Safe Parking program in Palo Alto. It looks like that will be from our Assistant Planning Director, Rachael Tanner. We'll be hearing about the work that a Special Fellow in the Planning Department is doing on renter protections, and that she gave a similar presentation to the Planning and Transportation Commission. We have also reached out to those that work more on the personal level on renter protections, those that work with our renters in our community when they have questions or concerns or mediation. So, Palo Alto Mediation, I will be reaching out to them. And then, those who help with rental assistance. So, that's what I am working on, so that is my update.

Chair Smith: Thank you. What we wanted to do was, instead of piecemealing the discussion on housing insecurity, we wanted to bring everybody from renters, all the way through those that are vehicle dwellers and all of those that have issues around housing insecurity, and view the whole pipeline and have discussions around it and figure out where we'll have gaps and where we need to move forward. I'm really excited about this meeting. And then, in March, we've invited PAPD to continue our discussion on some of the topics that we discussed tonight. So, they will have a letter, and if we will say, "Hey, these are the questions we have." I think we want to hear from them and where they stand on this, and what's the different between a hate crime and a hate-based crime, and what are the criteria, and what are they equipped with in training? We'll get quick answers on that, so I feel like we've got a robust...And then we have

our CDBG and our HSRAP work that we still have to do, so we have a very busy, busy winter and spring session, but I'm excited about where we're going. Thank you, everybody. Did we cover everything?

Ms. van der Zwaag: Let me double check. I believe so.

Chair Smith: Everybody, please be safe. Please shelter in place. We want to have you here for next month, so please stay away from everybody else. Thank you. Have a good week. Bye.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT