

**Human Rights Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
October 27, 2011**

**Commission President Michael Sweet:**

**Opening Remarks: Executive Director is under the weather, not in attendance tonight.  
Linda Janourova acting as Secretary.**

**Call to Order and Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:**

**Commission Chair Michael Sweet, Vice Chair Douglas Chan, Cecelia Chung, Sheryl Evans-Davis, Mark Kelleher, Faye Woo Lee, Mavis, Todd Mavis, Nazly Mohajer, and Thomas Pier**

**NOTE: Commissioner Pappas is on Commission business with Mayor Lee; he is marked as “here” and will join later although not present at time of roll call.**

**Quorum called.**

**AGENDA ITEM 1: Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**

Commission Sweet: Call for anyone to address the commission in public comment.

No one wished to make public comment.

**AGENDA ITEM 2 & 3: Approval of the Minutes for 9-16-11 and 9-22-11**

**Minutes for 9-16-11:** Commissioner Sweet asks for comments; no comments; asks for motion:

Mohajer: Motion to approve

Woo Lee: Second

Roll read: Motion Passes

**Minutes for 9-22-11: Special Commission Meeting at the Eureka Valley Recreation Center**

Commissioner Sweet thanks Commissioner Mavis for great event.

Commissioner Mavis: Heard from Supervisor Weiner’s office and Senator Leno’s office: all comments positive; thanks staff for their work; also thought it was excellent event; thanks Commission.

Problem: Minutes have been copied on only one side. Commissioner Sweet suggests that this is put over to next meeting for new copies to be presented with both front and back sides; pass on this item to be put on future agenda.

**ITEM 4: CHAIR’S REPORT: Commissioners Activities in the Community**

Stop:

Commissioner Mohajer: What happened to the Minutes from 9-16-11? Had thought vote was for the 9-22-11. Wants to comment on the 9-16-11; Commissioner Sweet reopens comments on 9-16-11:

Commissioner Mohajer comments re: 9-16-11 Minutes: Apologizes for the confusion.

Comments on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page basically talks about her comments; after a long discussion how disappointed all were that Cowhey did not regard the LBE Ordinance which clearly recognized that if a company wins a contract, they are supposed to participate and not pass it along to another contractor. The minutes only show that a motion was made to accept the settlement agreement and concern is that the previous discussion is not represented in the minutes; has concern and wants comments made prior to vote to be added to minutes so readers have the opportunity to have more clear idea of the mind of the Commission before accepting the Settlement Agreement. She also wants to be sure the public knows the Commission is not going to tolerate any contractor winning a contract with a 10% discount

and then pass it along to another contractor; her future approval of the minutes is based on the incorporation of the discussion prior to the settlement vote to the minutes.

Move made to augment the 9-16-11 Minutes;

Motion to reconsider: Commissioner Chan states that majority required. Simple majority – Not debatable; Motion to reconsider to incorporate request of Commissioner Mohajer to edit 9-16-11 Minutes.

Roll Called: 8 yes; 1 no

Move to approve to have the 9-16-11 Minutes amended and voted on at next meeting.

Commissioner Sweet asks for Motion to Approve:

Commissioner Doug Chan makes Motion.

Commissioner Keller seconds.

Chair Comment: Put this over; have staff incorporate what Commissioner Mohajer has suggested and put it over for the next meeting. Wants to make sure there is time for more pressing matters and to allow time for people to speak.

Commissioner Kelleher: Comments re: Minute taking: Noticed an issue in the past; understands the challenges of recent months with temporary secretaries, but hopefully, in future wants to see more detailed commentary; wants more substantive note-taking; would like to see more detail in the commentary including notes with names identified.

Commissioner Pier: Point of Order: Are we taking the Chair's motion to approve?

Point of Order: Commissioner Chan: Motion non-debatable; simple majority needed.

Commissioner Sweet: Asks people to pay attention to motions on the floor to avoid confusion.

Commissioner Chang: Minutes are sent 2-days in advance, this could have been solved if we took the time to read it; agrees that this was a simple confusion with hard copy Minutes being out of order. Regarding Commissioner Kelleher's comments: Reminds Commissioners that meetings are uploaded with all the detail in audio recordings posted on the HRC web site ([www.sf-hrc.org](http://www.sf-hrc.org)) so the public has access to all the detailed discussions.

Commissioner Mohajer: Thanks everyone; appreciates Commissioner Kelleher's comments; all commissioners appreciate receiving minutes prior to the meeting.

Note to Secretary: Please put the minutes in order: older dates first please.

HRC Staff Linda Janourova will pass on what was discussed to Commission Secretary.

**Continued:**

**ITEM 4 Chair's Report and**

**Opportunity for Commissioners to speak about Events in Community:**

**Commissioner Douglas Chan:** Had opportunity to sit with to sit w/PUC Advisory Committee to exchange views; they are interested in LBE AC and as well as staff work regarding amendments to provide for and allow local businesses to participate in projects beyond the waste water improvement project (Hetch Hetchy waste water build-out) beyond 70 mile radius of City, expressed an interest in joining the LBE Advisory Committee and is interested in SF LBS to compete and participate in Hetch Hetchy project.

**Commissioner Chung;** Just returned from meeting in DC; all day retreat called HIV Equality Retreat; met with key officials of Obama administration; asked to discuss how factors create disparities in HIV and AIDS treatment; purpose of the meeting held at the Center of American Progress is to create a report to inform the key departments in Obama administration to look at how to allocate resources to address the epidemic; NOTE: Epidemic is now moving south (United States) and disproportionately affects communities of color especially African American and Hispanic communities; they are looking at decriminalization, criminalization, poverty, looking at high impact strategies to address these kinds of structural issues; 1<sup>st</sup> Draft expected to be completed in January, 2012; Final Report July, 2012.

Clarification: "South" as in deep American South- i.e. Mississippi, Florida - not south of San Francisco.

Commissioner Sweet "Thank you " and asks for other commissioner items of interest? None

#### **ITEM 5 - Director's Report**

Commissioner Sweet not sure if Director left notes, but he met with Director and foreign delegation who were here from EU countries who took interest in HRC on a number of topics; impressed that State Department brings dignitaries – foreign state delegates, former members of parliament and former cabinet secretaries – to HRC as a worthwhile stop. Sometimes notices come, sometimes little notice is given, however effort will be made to notify other commissioners if they are able to attend.

Asks for other items from Director?: Secretary: Not that she is aware at this time.

#### **ITEM 6 - Relates to Advisory Committees in form of staff reports**

Following discussions with Director and other Commissioners. Wants reports to include how committees are staffed; how membership is recruited, etc.; thought it useful to get reports about each committee and then discuss the direction of committees; NOTE: there isn't uniformity in recruitment and criteria for membership; maybe Commission feels as a body this is okay but sees no reason not to have discussion whether there should be uniformity, whether there should work plans or just continue as the committees work now.

Package includes Bylaws which talk about how Advisory Committees are formed, reports prepared by staff for each committee that address membership, work plans, and basically what's been going on. The Director added a sheet "Factors to Consider in Uniformity for HRC Advisory Committees" Commissioner Sweet said some of the issues came up after discussions with Director.

Advisory Committee (AC) staff will present, and then Commission will discuss changes etc.  
NOTE: Will ask staff to incorporate comments and come back with action items for another meeting.

#### **Item 6A: HRC Staff David Miree presents Equity Advisory Committee (EAC)**

One of three HRC Advisory Committees. Since 2009, the committee tackled issues of equity such as human trafficking, homelessness, environmental justice, immigration, healthcare and housing access and since 2007 they have been working on issues of worker rights and decades of population of color decline. Shares e-mail to current members of EAC to see how they are looking forward as members. In effort to create uniformity in committees, commission is reviewing bylaws. Time issue has been a problem for membership and thinks this is perfect opportunity to review member time commitment and ask them to re-apply.

Presentation slides included with Minutes.

EAC Accomplishments – Active in the endorsement process of the Workers' Bill of Rights;

Very much involved w/out migration of African American population and youth, education and mentorship ongoing programs – anticipates follow-up needed in other meetings on these subjects. Working on HRC Hero Recognition Awards to acknowledge individuals and volunteers; to be presented at commission meeting in future. EAC is currently considering nomination and award process. Tasks in 2012: ongoing effort to implement findings of Out Migration Report.

Commissioner Sweet – Refers to timeline in presentation – Are all appointments January 1, 2012?

Answer: Trying to select new members by December to have members for Jan-Dec year.

Commissioner Sweet: re: membership: Assumes this is to try to get dates between January-December? Is everyone new as of March 1, 2011? David Miree: That March 1 date is the date of official letter.

Commissioner Sweet: How many of these people have been sitting over 5-years?

Answer: None; there's 5-year term limit.

Call for questions re: EQAC:

What are asterisks beside names on list? Answer: Inactive members due to missed meetings;

Are you replacing them? Answer: No, everyone is reassessing time commitment and reapplying.

Commissioner Pier – Does EAC deal with physical disability and accessibility issues?

Answer: They could – quality issues of life not covered by other committees could be covered – if someone has concern about public accessibility, and EAC adopts that as work project, they would implement whatever they could to have that issue addressed.

Commissioner Chung – Offers history while she was Commission Chair:

There were originally 4 committees: LBE, Employment, Issues and LGBT; “Issues” was used to be “catch all” committee – used when issue didn't fit into other committees. Due to limited staff resources, it was decided to consolidate “Employment” and “Issues” Committees into “Equity Committee”; now trying to look at some other specific issues and other emerging issues that the City is dealing with and which may eventually come up in Equity Committee.

Commissioner Kelleher (sits on EAC Committee): Compliments HRC Staff David Miree for consistent staffing and thorough e-mails to EAC members. Also, mentioned that Commissioner Pappas thought he was appointed to EAC. Staff notes that he has not been given any notice at this time; Sweet confirms Commissioner Pappas will be at next EAC meeting

Commissioner Kelleher: Suggestion to strengthen committee membership: when someone has reached a high level of absence, it would be proactive to remove name tags and place holders at vacant spaces at meetings to avoid demoralizing others who are taking their time to attend.

He asks how others feel about this?

David: gives credit to current dynamic, amazing group, EAC had a slow start, but now looking forward to some exciting thing in year to come.

Commissioner Evans-Davis: What about working groups?

Answer: As result of retreat, several work projects came up that group can vote on and then work on top 3. Determined that committee does best service with only 1 project which they concluded was to finish in the area of helping domestic workers and then move on to African American Out Migration (from the City). Now this is full status work project with whole committee working on it; everyone welcome to attend.

Commissioner Chung: Thanks HRC Staff David Miree. Comments that the process of retreat and work group sounds like LGBT Committee; Answer: EAC modeled LGBT; done purposefully.

Commissioner Chung: From her experience LGBT AC got a lot of things done and understands why reducing number of work projects is good strategy to get quality work done.

Commissioner Mohajer and she looked at mission statement: Question: Have you thought of revising your mission statement? Now may be time to think about what EAC is really good at doing and come up with new identity. David Miree: agrees and anticipates good things for coming year

Commissioner Woo Lee: Thanks David Miree for doing great job and agrees they should remove names of people who have not shown up for months, noticed that one member has moved to New Mexico.

David using this as opportunity for members to reassess their time commitments for group; one thing is that there are no excused absences and EAC now going into configuration asking all members to re-apply. This allows opportunity for members to re-assess time commitments.

Commissioner Mavis: Thanks staff for presentation.

Question: What percentage of time do you spend on committee work?

Answer: 20-25% May be different moving forward; at first, he was challenged in task to do a lot of background work and thinks committee member had different perspective on responsibilities; individuals are now picking up the ball and setting the agenda themselves; they better understand their roll as membership driven committee and not having staff doing all.

Commissioner Mavis: Are there any backgrounds or skill sets missing? Are you looking in new interview process for new skill sets in new members? Are you targeting these skills in new members?

Answer: Knows now what works and doesn't work; Work w/African American out Migration will not be germane to entire committee; will explain to new members what they are doing and the time commitment; keep in mind only 12-13 members; it has been a challenge to committee efficiency when people are absent. Will be able to bring this up in the new interview process.

Commissioner Kelleher: Wants to discuss Commissioner Chung's comment regarding a new mission statement at the next meeting; also would like a thematic statement about what the group does.

Commissioner Mohajer: How many sitting members?

Answer: Asking for members to reapply, applications due back next week so new information not available until next week. Difficult because moving forward with working on out migration; if 2-3 people absent, committee doesn't have quorum, so it is difficult to move forward with business and this has been an issue in past.

Commissioner Mohajer: Suppose people approach commissioners to be on the committee, should information be forwarded to you? Answer: Yes, and now all information is online too.

Commissioner Sweet: Wants to hold these discussions after all 3 committees have presented.

Commissioner Mohajer: LBE AC is unique to this City

Basically the HRC Advisory Committees are carrying the load of all human rights issues especially in SF, where there are so many ethnicities and combinations of race; Commission wants to be sure that the Advisory Committee memberships are representative of the communities.

Wants to be sure that LBE mission statement is reviewed. This is the only Commission that discusses all the human rights issues, but there are other outside committees that follow the same issues.

Example: Immigration Commission and she sees other commissions regarding issues of youth and

education. Since there are other commissions following same issues, is there communication between these commissions and HRC committees to make sure work effort isn't duplicated?

Answer: Speaker series: They identify experts in different fields, who may be members of these other committees/commissions or other HRC staff members, to update committee and see how they can help each other. They do have people coming from the outside to address the group and help them focus on how to move forward with projects effectively.

Also there is forum which allows members to present to their perspective on other outside projects they are involved in to give committee wider perspective of those on other committees.

Commissioner Evans-Davis: In the realm of duplication, wants to be sure that EAC is looking for injustices in deliverance those services; wants to be sure that the Advisory Committees are aware when we talk about youth or education that there are a lot of things not happening for some populations to get same quality or same services; her expectation is that even if another agency is charged with that particular service, it is the EAC mission to be sure these underserved sections of population, who may not be receiving same levels of service, have a place to go to address that inequity.

Answer: Staff definitely agrees.

**Item 6B:** Romulus Asenloo presents on **Local Business Enterprise Advisory Committee (LBE AC)**  
Current membership at 11; HRC staff includes he and Ed Campos;  
Commissioner Representatives: Douglas Chan, Michael Pier and Sheryl Evans-Davis  
Committee meets every 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday

Refer to attached presentation slides for mission; makes note that the creation of committee is part of legislation creating Human Rights Commission itself (12A);

Actual Mission: LBE AC formed to improve contract opportunities for local businesses to bid on city-funded projects as well as to overcome barriers to bonding and raising capital.

Current membership list presented; based on Commissioner Sweets' direction, they did go out to recruit for new members. Yielded:

Mr. Rueben Santana, Rubicon Construction and Alexis Chu (sp?) from Legal Services

Current work plan presented 2010-2011 (see slides attached).

Accomplishments: Reviewed and responded to LBE data provided by HRC staff.

Example: the breakdown of LBE data by ethnicity and gender.

Provided the Commission with input regarding 2011 and 2010 changes to Chapter 14b, as well as Rules and Regulations including PUC region change to include more regional projects and changes to "good faith" outreach including how outreach is accounted for.

2 Task Forces created: #1 to look at changes to LBE certification program and #2 to look at the effects of the proposed mandatory local hiring ordinances.

Department heads from other city agencies have come to speak to the committee, such as:

Mr. Ed Reiskin then Director of DPW, Mr. Harlan-Kelly Deputy General Manager of PUC,

Ms. Monique Moyer and senior staff of Port of San Francisco, Mr. John Martin, General Manager of the Airport and Mr. Phil Ginsburg of Park and Recreation.

Staff has sought guidance regarding large projects on city land; including Giants, and Pier 70 (which the developer is Forrest City, co-owner Westfield Mall) and the America's Cup Event Authority.

Base plan for recruiting is within the presentation. Outreach for new members included asking current Commissioners for suggestions. By January 31, 2012, deadline for new membership applications and final membership selection by March 1, 2012.

HRC did Outreach Event: w/Supervisor Malia Cohen at Southeast Community Center on 11/2/11 to bring together prime managers of projects and LBE's interested in participating in these projects (Flyer attached.)

Special Guest: Mr. Bijan Sartipi, Director of Caltrans District spoke on job creation project at CalTrans.

Commissioner invited to attend.

Commissioner Sweet calls for specific LBE AC questions: None.

He encourages an accelerated time line for LBE AC membership, strongly suggests that staff compacts time line to shoot for full contingent of members by January 1, 2012. Also notes year on presentation should be 2011-2012 not 2010-2011.

NOTE: Commissioner Pappas joins after meeting with Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

**Item 6C:** HRC Staff Nadia Babella presents **LGBT Advisory Committee (LGBT AC )**

20 Members, term limit 5-years. Ms. Babella staffs committee.

Commissioner Chung and Commissioner Mavis chair the meetings.

The LGBT Advisory Committee is codified in the Administrative Code Chapter 12A. HRC is mandated to have this committee. The LGBT Advisory Committee was created shortly after the assassination of Harvey Milk. At that time the Lesbian Gay community went to then Mayor Feinstein and asked to form a Lesbian Gay Commission. Mayor Feinstein declined to have Lesbian Gay Commission, but instead the created the LGBT advisory committee as part of the HRC and it was added to the Administrative Code within HRC. It started as the Lesbian Gay Committee and the title was later changed to be LGBT, to include bisexual and transgender in the title.

The purpose of the LGBTAC is to look at ongoing and emerging human rights issues affecting the LGBT communities in San Francisco. In 2011, the LGBTAC picked 3 topics to work on; each topic looked at the intersection of homophobia and transphobia with another form of discrimination. The 3 workgroups which were formed include the LGBT senior work group, which looks at the intersection of sexual identity, gender identity discrimination plus another discrimination, in this case aging. Accomplishments of the LGBT senior workgroup include meeting with the Aging and Adult Services Commission to form a permanent LGBT advisory committee to the Aging and Adult Services Commission. In addition, there workgroup is hosting a forum with Commonwealth Club in 2012 and has placed op-ed pieces on this topic in local papers.

The second workgroup is the Beyond Castro work group, It looks at expanding LGBT services outside the Castro. A series of meetings have been held and one more meeting with stake holders will be held in November.

The third workgroup is the Asylum work group. We are working with SF Asylum Office to review national training materials for officers and looking at legislation which affects people seeking asylum.

Recruitment timeline, the LGBTAC is looking to get new appointments for January 1, 2012.

Commissioner Sweet: Question re work groups: Do they change over time with what people are interested in – how does work groups evolve?

Annual retreat: each member brings topic and then they vote; members evaluate about what they want to work on during the year and it varies depending on who is in the room. These work groups are created and continued after the retreat.

Questions to this specific group? None.

Commissioner Sweet: Wants to continue discussion based on Director's sheet of topics to discuss regarding Advisory Committees.

Interested in input re: LBE AC

Should we say that we want to have x number of LBE's or other groups? Large companies that aren't LBE's or really big construction companies who bring along the LBEs in the room?

Some committees have larger number of members too.

How do people feel about Jan-Dec year rather than March to march?

Do we expect retreats or do we expect committees to do this organically?

➤ Not action item today; have staff come back with report.

Topic: Discuss the need for some amendments in Bylaws (page 6); this is opportunity to suggest amendments for example: Member absence issue: add amendment to give committee chair ability to drop members.

Commissioner Chang: LGBT AC has actually had some attrition; at one point, there were actually 25 members not including commissioners; some committee meetings filled rooms; largest was 28 members in one year, but attrition always happens. Because of other issues term limits were added, people love committees but members also don't leave, so term limits added to encourage new membership bringing new ideas thus rejuvenating committees.

Re Work Groups and Retreats: There was need for some structure; based on experience on LGBT working committee, members put in a lot of hours; they write the reports ex: Family Structure Report was written by committee members therefore it is important for them to have consensus during the retreat due to large time commitment.

Recruitment time changed based on membership recommendations, i.e.:

Part of reason to change recruitment time line changed because they ran into holiday time which interfered with work. Wasn't enough continuity to get work done. Based on member suggestions, they based membership based on calendar year (January to December as work year); this gave them more time to really plan the work plan and get it done before taking break for bigger holidays.

Commissioner Mohajer – re: Wants to make sure Bylaws stay pretty general to avoid being “boxed.”

Re: Term limits: Each committee should have term limits.

Re: Creating Guidelines for all the committees Guidelines for all committees may not be the same; may not be good idea. One size doesn't fit all. Each committee is so different by nature of each committee Each requires members to be for the purpose of that committee. Ex: LBE AC requires the members to be LBE certified but there is need to make sure majority of trades are represented along with the related organizations, since LBE was generated to create a level playing field for smaller business to participate in city contracts, if there are larger contractors, it defeats the purpose of LBE AC. It may not be appropriate to have guidelines requiring members from larger companies. Purpose of committee to have the issues of smaller companies heard and addressed. Only committee that comes up with ideas and suggestions that turn into law/ordinance it is important that members of committee that the members are the people affected by the ordinances are not have to compete in committee.

Keeping the number of LBE AC to manageable number, sometimes a larger group may not be able to get to bottom of ordinance that is being discussed; very technical committee and you have to have the ability and knowledge to discuss the issues; other committees don't have this; she was looking at LGBT affiliation of members was impressive; basically see all kinds of businesses represented. It is good to have every aspect of community represented in committees so they can be productive. As far as background, the Equity AC holds heart and sole HRC, so members should be balanced and representative of community.

Commissioner Mavis: Number of members? Suggested 20

Staff time: 1 day a week = 20%

Maximum number of working groups: Leave it to the committees.

Recruiting time line: Start recruiting in March, processed in Jan-Feb and term starts in March.

Recruiting: Should be based on what skill set or backgrounds are needed for work plan and then target what is missing by doing outreach in that area.

Selection of new members: Interview process is probably fine.

Term limits: 5-years reasonable, members should be encouraged to come back year after year because they have that prior experience and know what is going on

Appeals: Not sure what the means in terms of the sheet of questions. Let's discuss later.

Criteria for selecting new projects: They can decide on their own.

Annual work plan presentations: Chair can decide.

How frequently should committees report to Commission?

Regular work project reports should have timelines attached with reports back to commission listed.

Timelines can be adjusted as time goes, but feedback from the Commission needs to be used during year. Having regular feedback loop helps; feels that this is what is missing for committees; need more input from commission and staff members back to committees, we should make use of the members background, but at same time, more input from commission should be given. For example, discrimination complaints: Can AC review and categorize complaints and then come up with a plan to address that area(s) to help reduce complaints. Also, work groups and work plans are fluid process; should be adjusted as things come up.

Commissioner Chung: Numbers: doesn't disagree with Commissioner Mavis; 20 people as standard number, wouldn't allow for new members, most are active and no reason not to accept people as they reapply. Also, agrees with Commissioner Mohajer re guidelines for membership in terms of qualifications, application process can be used for committees to follow.

In terms of appeal process: we don't really have an appeal process currently, not sure one is needed, no one ever promised that they are guaranteed a membership or interview; not sure this is necessary.

Re: attendance: This is really about empowering the chairs, right now, 3 absences and member is off committee, this is very clear; application is quite clear

Commissioner Kelleher: re: Term Limits: Is the 5- year term limit a lifetime term limit?

No: 5 in and 1 out.

Like to be more informed on this, served on lots of boards, mostly has seen 3-year terms, then option for 2<sup>nd</sup> term, is that of interest? Perhaps 3 years in, 1 year out, 3 years in again.

Seems that after 3-years people's energy wanes. Wants Commission to consider this.

Recruitment process: Has noticed in presentations, seems like schedules are moving towards the fall, and that recruitment is moving towards that; is this new? Where did that come from?

Commissioner Sweet: Nothing formal; Bylaws provide a March 1 term; he and Director have encouraged staff to begin recruitment now on notion that it is better to shift closer to calendar year for members to serve which parallels leadership terms of Commission.

Commissioner Kelleher: Agrees strongly, not only to parallel the business calendar of Commission would be wise, but when you recruit later, it runs into events and into summer when people are distracted with their own activities; most people take summer off and there is less energy and focus for committee. Strongly encourages all committees to move in this direction.

Commission Pappas: If looking to make amendments to Bylaws, highly recommends staggering the terms, so that initially every 3-years/2-years/1-year to start out and beyond that you have 3-year terms afterward to ensure institutional memory.

Commissioner Sweet: That's a new concept. On his experience, without terms there isn't a revolving improvement process.

Commissioner Mavis: Notes that typically, just like Commission, committees frequently don't meet in summer.

Commissioner Chang: 2 concerns: Recently, it seems like all current members have been asked to re-apply on arbitrary deadline, but traditionally we do not ask current members to fill out applications again, we just ask for an e-mail of their interest to stay on, the e-mail that was sent out caught people off guard, not sure how many people were able to turn in on time. Concern if they do not fill out application, are we at risk of not having enough people if deadline is passed? Notes that every single piece of legislation has grace period before coming into law, if we decide to adopt new process, there should be provision to begin process; so we don't have current members who are not informed of new process.

Commissioner Sweet: Sensitive to the fact that this should not be a disruptive process; to the extent that there are changes, it should be for the improvement of Commission, committees and working groups, doesn't want to put form over substance and defeat the purpose of getting community involved. Absolutely receptive to "grandfathering" members in.

Commissioner Kelleher: Seems like this process had jumped the gun; seems like putting cart before the horse; let's put process on hold; would rather like to see formal application only at end of someone's term, if member wants to renew for 2<sup>nd</sup> eligible term, then you reapply. When someone is in the term, they shouldn't have to reapply.

Commissioner Chang: Not sure why there is annual renewal process.

Commissioner Kelleher: Process was conceived and possibly put before the horse.

Commissioner Sweet; LBE specifically, Commissioner Mohajer spoken to these issues a bit.

Does Commission feel there should be caps to memberships? LBE AC seems a bit lean. How does staff propose a target number and then how do we categorize members particularly in LBE AC?

Do we have graduated LBE committee members? Could we have them as non-voting members?

Do we want larger companies in group for their input? Taking aside the LBE question, do we do this for other committees to target community members. Not sure the committee will organically represent community.

Commissioner Mohajer: All meetings open to the public; if graduated members want to attend, they can. Some don't want to be members but they attend meetings religiously because meetings are open.

Re: Sending invitations to attend to other groups: staff as it is overwhelmed for LBE work, let alone reaching out to large contractors. They are welcome, however as participating members, it defeats

purpose because they are competing with LBEs, not SBA so much (SBA much larger \$25 million v. \$7 million revenue) defeats purpose of aiding smaller businesses, 70% of city economy depends on smaller businesses.

Commissioner Evans-Davis: Concerns are not so much membership but rather of other people attending meeting; doesn't want to operate in a "silo of the membership"; wants to create and develop policies where everyone in meeting is in agreement; however this is discussed, feels need for some dissenting opinions so committees are prepared for what any fight might be when they leave the committee meeting.

Is the wisdom thought that the graduated LBEs, who are no longer getting the bid discount, but they are still not huge, be involved to help new LBEs? Was the intent is to have them offer best practices and offer new people strategies to help new LBEs?

Yes, that was idea.

Do we need to decide all issues tonight. Based on comments, can staff put comments together and organize a fact sheet and then go through sheet and try to decide on each point; come back and see proposals and then vote on each item about how to organize committees

Commissioner Sweet: staff is taking notes, idea was to have useful discussion and then continue it.

Commissioner Mohajer: Commissioner Evans-Davis has valid point, only opposition in meetings is sometimes only the large contractor; often invited to LBE meetings so they can ask them questions. We were working on 5 major issues which became ordinances, and they reached out to see how to work together better; committee welcomes their participation. Points are very valid.

Commissioner Lee: Thinks that committees are so different that maybe there shouldn't be a membership cap; sounds like LBE perhaps would be better to have more members, on other hand, the Equity doesn't need 20 members.

Term limits: Advantages to 1-year term, sometimes people come in late, don't participate, the only chance there is exchange for a more active member is with term limits. Need to keep this in mind.

Commissioner Chung We tried 1-year limits w/LGBT, the year that we had 28 members the room was just packed. 28 is the maximum that you could have if still held at HRC meeting room.

Commissioner Sweet – Anything else on this subject? Would staff that is present want to comment? Afterwards, some assembly of Commissioners and staff will come back with proposal.

David Miree: Appreciates the reassessment of membership etc., for EAC this is really helping. Do you think that there should be 1-year term? It does help with attendance issues.

Romulus Asenloo: For LBE AC, after working there for several years, with this committee you need specific knowledge of 14b as well as previous 12a, 12d - Almost 20-years of work and legislative history and past practices (which did or did not work), so this type of institutional knowledge is absolutely key for this committee, and we must take time to educate new staff members of history. With LBE there must be historic knowledge.

Re: Terms: 5- year term has been mentioned, with the ability to come back would work for LBE AC. As far as size: 15 was mentioned and that is what they are working on, more than that, is there enough interest. Also, staff must manage that many people. Finally re: diversity of opinion, LBE graduates

tend to be SBAs but in terms of asking larger companies, he humbly reminds Commission that asking larger firms may have negative effect, these larger firms hire LBEs and they may not want to speak out and be open in front of larger firms. Feels that it would inhibit free flow of advice.

Linda Janourova: What is prompting this discussion now? Is there something triggering this reassessment? In order to compile a proposal, but what should staff try to keep in mind?

Commissioner Sweet: A number of issues were raised with the initial questions asked when coming onto Chair and with the coincidental coming online of applications; maybe some committees have different energies and people; maybe answer is not to change anything but with the lack of continuity between committees, and loss of institutional memory, it seemed like good time to discuss.

Nadia Babella: Current structure for LGBT AC works really well; thinks changes might not help.

Re: Terms: If you look at members, there is a natural, self-selecting 3-year term. Most members leave after 2-3 years, Commissioner Kelleher is correct about 2-3 years being the natural span of people's energy. 5-years might be too long; 2 years may be too short, it seems 3-years is natural.

Commissioner Sweet: Everyone could do 2 or 3 terms, but then have to take year off.

Commissioner Kelleher: Didn't realize we were requiring annual re-application currently. Perhaps have more aggressive absence policy or a more strong e-mail statement of recommitment

Nadia Babella: The strict attendance policy is made clear at beginning at each year.

Commissioner Pappas: Appreciates input of staff and chairs; can you provide strengths and weakness of each committee, and if there were to be changes, what would they be?

Commissioner Sweet: Yes, that's where we are. Thanks everyone for engaging in this useful discussion. Reminds everyone it is important to continue to evaluate and improve where we are.

#### **ITEM 7: Matters of Interest for Possible Inclusion on Future Agendas**

None stated other than those added during the meeting: Edit of Minutes 9/16/11 and Staff proposal re: Advisory Committee procedures.

**Meeting Adjourned.** Meeting length: 2 hours, 9 minutes.