

Virtual Community Meeting #1 on the Community Advisory Committee for the Community Stabilization and Opportunity Pathways Fund

Meeting Overview

Date: May 2, 2022

Time: 6:00-7:30 PM

Purpose:

- Provide an update on the Fund and Committee set-up process
- Get feedback on draft ordinance –fill in gaps from Exhibit H of the Downtown West Development Agreement (Fund/Committee Framework)

Community Members in attendance: 15

City staff in attendance:

- Project team:
 - Lori Severino, Assistant to the City Manager
 - Nanci Klein, Director of Economic Development and Cultural Affairs
 - Rosalynn Hughey, Deputy City Manager
- Support:
 - Jennifer Provedor, Planning Division
 - Elizabeth Guzman, Housing
 - Karla Alvarez, Library
 - Aurelia Bailey, City Manager’s Office
 - Adolfo Ruelas, Office of Economic Development
 - Nguyen Pham, Office of Economic Development
 - Nathan Donato-Weinstein, Office of Economic Development

Agenda:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. Welcome, meeting logistics, poll | 6:00 |
| 2. Background presentation | 6:10 |
| 3. Breakout discussions | 6:25 |
| a. Terms, stipend, member selection process, roles/other | |
| 4. Wrap up, next steps | 7:15 |

Materials: slides in [English](#) and [Spanish](#) were posted on the Downtown West Development Agreement webpage (<https://www.diridonsj.org/downtownwestda>)

Meeting Summary

Lori Severino opened the meeting, introduced the interpreters, and reviewed other meeting logistics.

Next, the participants completed a poll to answer demographic questions and share their level of familiarity with the meeting topic. Eight out of 12 respondents indicated that they were somewhat familiar, three said very familiar, and 1 said unfamiliar.

Lori then provided a background presentation and instructions for the small group breakout discussions. The group divided into two breakout rooms for approximately one hour. The following section summarizes the input received during the breakouts (see Appendix A for the full notes).

After the small group discussions, Lori provided a brief summary of next steps and wrapped the meeting at 7:25.

Thanks to all of the community members that attended the meeting and to the staff team that supported it!

Summary of Community Input

Topic 1: Terms (How long should terms be? How to achieve staggering with the initial membership?)

There was general consensus that 4-year terms is a reasonable baseline. The groups generated several ideas about how to achieve staggering with the initial terms, with most suggesting 2-4 years with the option for a second term. There was discussion about how staggering and term limits should be tied to the process (e.g., the timing of preparing the Strategic Plan and grant-making over the life of the Fund).

There was general agreement that committee members should have enough time to build up their knowledge, and that the ability to serve a second term would help with the learning curve and enable significant contribution. The reappointment option would be particularly important for the initial members with shorter terms. There was some discussion about potentially allowing a third term for members that initially have a two-year term. There was the suggestion that Lived Experience members should start with longer terms, because it may take longer for them to ramp up.

Topic 2: Stipend (Should some or all Committee members receive one? If so, how much?)

There was no consensus on whether committee members should receive a stipend and if so, how much. The groups discussed the rationale of considering a stipend, such as: to compensate the Committee Members for their time, to reflect the value of their contributions, and to help overcome participation barriers that some may face such as transportation and childcare costs.

The majority of participants felt that providing a stipend would be an important feature of the committee framework, given the equity-oriented nature of the Fund and process. There was recognition that some members could be getting paid by their employer to attend meetings, while others would be doing this work on the side. There was general agreement that a stipend would be most helpful for the Lived Experience or lower-income committee members. Recognizing the potential barriers, there were the suggestions to provide food at meetings and to consider reimbursements of costs to attend the meetings (such as transit pass or childcare) in addition to providing a stipend.

There was the suggestion to make the stipend optional, by allowing members to either opt in or opt out. However, there was concern that tying the ability to get a stipend to income or allowing members to opt out could have the unintended consequence of stigmatizing those who opted in.

One group discussed making the stipend tied to meeting attendance, which would have the benefit of encouraging regular attendance.

A couple participants said they are leaning toward not providing a stipend. A concern is the amount required to provide the stipends and the trade-off with using the funds for grant-making instead.

With respect to stipend amount, it should be “reasonable” and commensurate with the intensity of the work. One participant suggested looking at the Planning Commission as a similar body, while another felt like we should look outside the City for examples that set a higher bar on this issue. Another suggested making it \$100 per meeting (not per month).

Topic 3: Selection process (Who should determine the slate for City Council appointment? Other suggestions?)

There was extensive discussion about the application process. There is desire for the application forms to be clear, simple, and accessible, and for the process to be easy to

navigate and equitable. There were suggestions about having local organizations assist people with completing the application and providing not just the form but supportive resources in other languages. Participants encouraged thinking outside of the box and reduce bureaucratic hurdles as much as possible, such as by creating a special application for this purpose. The process should be promoted heavily, with help from community-based organizations.

There was also the acknowledgment that the “conflict of interest” rules are important in order to ensure committee members do not abuse their power and steer money to friends and family.

There were two specific suggestions about who should recommend the initial slate of members to the City Council for appointment:

- 1) The City Manager’s Office (CMO) should review applications for who meets the criteria and recommend a slate, but provide all qualified applications to the Council for consideration.
- 2) An ad hoc group created specifically for this purpose should review the applications and recommend the slate. It should have about 5 people, not including anyone from City Council, but maybe a staff person. Supportive of the Office of Racial Equity’s involvement.

Examples of other specific suggestions include:

- that all applicants for all 13 seats would complete, and
- have a clear process for filling vacancies as members term out and as members choose to end their service before their term is complete.

Topic 4: Roles (Do you have ideas for additional details that would be helpful? Other suggestions/final thoughts on the process?)

One participant raised the question about how the slate will be presented to Council, and the concern about calling out the members filling the Lived Experience seats.

Another suggested making sure the roles of the Fund Manager, Committee, and City are clearly defined.

Appendix A: Breakout Room Notes

Each of the two breakout rooms had two note-takers. The notes were synthesized for each group. Any staff response was noted below the question in *italics*. The notes do not make attributions to the specific person making the comment. The notes are intended to capture the intent of the comments and questions and may be paraphrased (not exact quotes).

Group 1

Facilitator: Aurelia Bailey

Other City Staff: Nanci Klein, Rosalynn Hughey, Deputy City Manager, Karla Alvarez, Nathan Donato-Weinstein

Participants: 7

Topic 1: Terms (How long should terms be? How to achieve staggering with the initial membership?)

- Given Google's announcement (put \$15M forward as they start first phases of office – which should be in ~2 years), a four-year term – but ensure you stagger the people rolling off.
 - Half start in a 2-year staggered term.
 - Longer terms for Lived Experience Members, because it may take longer for them to ramp up. Leave those to full 4-year terms.
- 3 of the 5 members should be staggered (you probably won't have all 13 members right away, so start with a smaller number while you recruit)
- 2-year terms, and they should be paid.
- What is the expected duration of this committee?
 - *Exhibit H doesn't state how long the committee will continue.*
- What does Lived Experience mean in this context?
 - *Read definition from Exhibit H. Personal knowledge of root causes of displacement gained through direct involvement. First-hand experience of*

displacement. At least 2 from East San Jose, 1 from Downtown. Includes small business owners.

- Have a couple different terms. Thinking between 2 and 4 years. Perhaps some members rotate after 2, others after 3 years. Is there an opportunity for renewal? Do we want that? How many terms would we want? What would be the term limit?
 - *Almost all city committees have a four-year term with option of reappointment for another four-year term. (For example, Planning Commission, HCD.)*
- How do you stagger for the initial cohort? Do some only get six years?
- Two four-year terms, but it should be staggered. They should get two full terms after the initial two year mini-term. (So, 10 years.) Vacancy midway, gets appointment replacement (+/- 2 years) and then up for renewal rules.
- People will naturally have to leave the committee and that will create a staggered pattern.
- I would hope that appointed members could serve an additional term if re-appointed. I'd think someone serving 6 years would likely have significant amount of input on the first roughly \$30M+ in fees from the first phase of commercial development, lots of grantmaking.
- What size will the committee be?
 - *13 members.*

Topic 2: Stipend (Should some or all Committee members receive one? If so, how much?)

- What is the commitment in terms of time and intensity? Work outside of meeting?
 - *They will set their own pace. We will hire a Fund Manager who will work with Committees and assist to establish 5-year strategy plan, rhythm to review and determine application status.*
- All members should be eligible for a stipend of some amount to recognize the seriousness of the work they're asked to do. Receipt is connected to fulfilling the

meeting obligations (or are excused for good reason). Members should be allowed to decline the stipend.

- Agree with declining stipend. But how would it work that some get a stipend and others don't? Why would we pay some and not all?
 - *Perhaps only some of the members actually need the money (such as the lived experience folks).*
 - Make it so that just Lived Experience get that stipend, and pay for dinner for all.
- Across the board makes sense. Stipend across the board is good to avoid having to navigate the threshold. Something similar to Planning Commission - commitment/expectations may be analogous, amount of work would be similar.
- Clarity of earning stipend by attendance to meetings and good participation would encourage quorums.
- HOW MUCH?
 - Make it \$100 per meeting (not per month) – so if you have more meetings per month, you get more money for that. Will there be standards for attendance? Criteria for removal?
- Reiterates pegging to Planning Commission. Supportive of that.

Topic 3: Selection process (Who should determine the slate for City Council appointment? Other suggestions?)

- You also want to have a process for filling vacancies. Is this similar to other City committees – just based on volunteers – or will there be someone recruiting (strategy)? Out of the 8 (non-lived experience), is there a particular mix of backgrounds you're looking for (i.e., a construction rep, a XYZ rep, etc.)? Or is it whoever expresses interest?
 - *People who are working in the field of addressing societal challenges. Exhibit H explains: Significant experience in certain fields (such as affordable housing, tenant advocacy, homelessness, STEAM education, employment development/labor, minority owned, disadvantaged or microbusinesses, neighborhood/leadership development, philanthropy, nonprofit management, legal/finance, academic research).*

- Application process – make sure it is fair, equitable, accessible, enough time. Have it go out and be publicly promoted. CMO should review applications for who meets the criteria and what seems like a good slate. But send on to Council all the applications that are completed and credible.
 - Also: Make the application not overwhelming. Simplify and make it accessible.

Topic 4: Roles (Do you have ideas for additional details that would be helpful? Other suggestions/final thoughts on the process?)

- How would we designate the members, and which spaces they fill, when it goes to council? I recommend providing some level of confidentiality on that. I'm not sure I'm comfortable saying, "These five people are the lived experience people."
- Make sure roles are clearly defined on fund manager and committee roles.
 - *There is guidance to build on for each of the roles from other Committees.*

Group 2

Facilitator: Elizabeth Guzman

Other City Staff: Lori Severino, Adolfo Ruelas

Participants: 8

Topic 1: Terms (How long should terms be? How to achieve staggering with the initial membership?)

- 2-4 year terms, solicit feedback, and reassess. Staggering is determined by the length of the process.
- At least 2 years initially – aligned with how much work needs to happen, tied to process – be able to build up knowledge and make contributions
- Initial terms of 1-2 years. Allow for four additional years so that committee members do not finish their terms before becoming acquainted with the process.
- First few members with shorter terms – could be allowed to have additional terms after that (not just one).

- The four-year term is consistent with that of other committees – makes a lot of sense.
 - Begin with two-year terms for some and allow for possible extension.
 - Be strategic to encourage public participation.
 - Reappointments for 2-year seats important.
- Learning curve steep initially
- Hate to see it get political. How do you guard against it?
 - *Intent is to be open and fair. City will solicit applications through normal RFP/public process. Not envisioning that each Council member would make one individual appointments.*
 - Would want longer terms if political appointments – 4 is reasonable with the envisioned selection process.

Topic 2: Stipend (Should some or all Committee members receive one? If so, how much?)

- Money should not be a reason to get involved. Stipend should be based on income level. Focus on Lived Experience seats.
 - Qualify for a stipend if below a certain income level.
 - Recognize trade-off using funds for this.
- Can we do it without stating it as “if you’re lower income” – want to avoid singling people out. Instead, could it be voluntary to opt out?
- Paying a stipend could cost about \$39,000 per year! A lot can be done w/ stipend amount for 13 members. That is a small grant.
 - Agree not to single out based on income – would be embarrassing to them.
 - Leaning towards no stipend.
 - Where would the money come from?
- A reasonable stipend would be appropriate – a good commitment.

- Income is a complex criteria.
- Could ALSO consider transit reimbursement, in addition to parking validation – and other expenses such as childcare. Enables the meetings to be accessible and supports participation.
- Don't want to downplay commitment that this Committee would take
 - Recognize the different levels of access and experience among the committee members.
 - Avoid the "opt out" model – could lead to shame for those that choose to take it
- Thinking about the community leader experience. People deserve to get a stipend.
 - Agree that it should be a "reasonable" amount
 - Should have opportunity to reimburse for Uber – may be only transportation option for some members
 - Need to provide good resources for people to be able to commit
- Agrees with previous comments: suggesting no stipends. There are better ways to spend the money.
- I'm curious if there's anything else to look at in order to establish a baseline for a stipend. Stipends are especially important for people who have to pay for childcare.
- What time of the day will the meetings be help?
 - Some members will be salaried – on the job while at these meetings. Different context for people who would do this on the side.
 - Should avoid criteria that could be stigmatizing – instead, we want to dignify their voices.
 - Are there other baselines to consider? This is a unique project – not very comparable to existing commissions. This is a new way to engage. The stipend is a very important piece. Hope we can find a creative, innovative way to make this work.

- Childcare is probably the main cost to consider.

Topic 3: Selection process (Who should determine the slate for City Council appointment? Other suggestions?)

- Concerned about the potential for using the same process as other City commissions. Feels no different than applying for other commission – hadn't understood that. Could be too bureaucratic.
 - Is the "standard form" user friendly for lived experience seats?
 - Suggest creating a special application with the list of interest areas/topics this is Fund is supposed to address.
 - Would there be one application? I think all members should complete the same form.
 - Some people may require assistance in obtaining an application; local organizations should be able to help.
 - Offer virtual and in-person options to get help.
- Appreciate that it would NOT be Council appointing individuals.
 - Supportive of ORE's assessment of who will be more effective in roles. Recognizes ORE's commitments to reach most impacted, get representation.
 - Never questioned that Council approval would be needed.
 - Pleased to see that immigration status will not be a criteria.
 - Form 700 seems so bureaucratic.
 - Who creates the slate? Shouldn't be people who want to get appointed. Maybe staff?
- *We are looking to have one application and make it user friendly.*
- Agree with previous concerns about application process. Forms are often confusing – try to simplify, make it fun and inviting.

- Could the City Council break up the “review” and “approval” steps of the slate at different public meetings?
 - *That wasn't the assumption, but maybe.*
- I'm not sure who would be a good body to make recommendations about committee selection. I have less than 100% faith in staff to figure out.
 - In terms of forms required, I have had to sign so many over the years. Agree that someone should help fill out forms in a fair way.
 - This Fund will have a lot of money – have to make sure the members don't have financial interests in steering money to friends and family. Supportive of Form 700.
- Offer the application in multiple languages – this is important.
 - Who is designated to provide support in filling out forms?
 - Ask about experience, ability to talk about vision, share their thoughts on opportunity, and support the Fund's intent to protect, empower, and invest in communities
- Will there be translation help for those that don't speak English?
- Offer resources for application help
 - Provide a specific, clear amount of time for application process. Amount of time application will be open needs to be reasonable to allow people to apply.
- I suggest putting together an ad hoc group to review the applications and do the work of recommending a slate.
 - Should not have anyone from city council, but maybe a staff person.
 - Should have 5 people or another uneven amount).
 - Should not be an existing, standard group.
- Supportive of idea for an ad hoc group.

Topic 4: Roles (Do you have ideas for additional details that would be helpful? Other suggestions/final thoughts on the process?)

- Appreciate the daylight in the selection process. The [Station Area Advisory Group] (SAAG) selection was too political. The process needs transparency with the public.
- Thanks for bringing us together – all pieces discussed are important to invite and maximize participation, to be accessible and inclusive.
- Would you consider having a general townhall or mock meetings so potential committee members could experience how it would work? Could help them get a good feel for the dynamics and set expectations.

Wrap-up with the full group

- Please fix the time on the Zoom invite to match the publicized start time of the next meeting on May 23 (6:00).