



CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FULL COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, December 10, 2019
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, Room 5080
San Francisco, CA 94103
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order at 5:10 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Marc Vogl, Clinton Loftman (by phone), Irene Riley, Aileen Hernandez, Emma Kelsey, and Azalea Renfield.

City Staff Attendance: Brian Cheu (MOHCD), Mike King (MOHCD), David Taylor (OEWD) and Glenn Eagleson (OEWD).

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. **Meeting minutes from October 15, 2019 were motioned by Azalea Renfield, seconded by Irene Riley, and approved unanimously by the Committee.**

3. Director's Report (*Discussion Item*)

- a. Brian shared that the Mayor is still identifying the next department head for MOHCD. The initial job posting period did not produce qualified candidates. The City increased the salary range and re-opened the application again. CCCD members should share the opportunity with their networks if they have candidates in mind.
- b. Brian shared that MOHCD is working on how to deploy the \$600 million Housing Bond that San Franciscans recently voted to approve.

4. Committee Members' Report (*Discussion Item*)

- a. None.

5. 2020-2025 Community Development RFP Update

Members commented on the RFP review process to-date.

- Marc asked about the goals of the tiered phases of the RFP process, if not to reduce the number of proposals to review in subsequent phases. Brian explained that the process was designed to be inclusive and to encourage groups from under-represented neighborhoods or

populations to apply. The goal of Phase One Scoring was not to “screen out” proposals, but to ensure a broad range of proposals would receive additional attention from MOHCD staff in Phase Two. Marc wondered why we would not just remove Phase One of the process. Brian explained that it was important to have a wide range of community perspectives in the review process. Marc said that if MOHCD values community input, then we should consider flipping the order of the process so that MOHCD weeds out ineligible proposals first and then the community weighs trade-offs between proposals last.

- Azalea said that it was hard, as a community scorer, to give scores for program design and equity without more background knowledge of the organizations. Brian said that it would be difficult, at present, to provide data on past performance and other factors for community scorers to incorporate into their review. Irene said that she looks at what she sees on paper, especially because she does not have the background knowledge of each organization. She acknowledged that it would take a long time to research and gather that level of information.
- Clint said that past performance is not necessarily an indicator of future performance. He recommended that we think through additional ways of getting information about the proposals, beyond what is written on paper. This may include interviews and/or site visits and would help us to overcome internal staff bias.
- Brian explained how we prioritized getting proposals from certain under-resourced groups, including organizations serving and led by African Americans and American Indians, and then gave internal staff who knew those organizations well the opportunity to lead the discussion about those proposals. We believe this was an effective strategy for reducing implicit bias in Phase Two Scoring. Brian explained that currently, as part of the Full Slate Review, MOHCD staff are weighing trade-offs between quality citywide-serving programs versus quality population- and/or neighborhood-specific programs.
- Azalea recommended that it could be useful to share the hard-copy notes from reviewers to help applicants see how they can improve in the future.
- Marc asked what our objectives were for the RFP process and be clearer about those objectives in the RFP and in how we design the review process. Being clear about those objectives from the beginning can make it easier to make and communicate the tough decisions at the end.

Brian provided an overview of the RFP review process to-date. He explained that MOHCD staff recently completed Phase Two Scoring and were currently conducting a Full Slate Review of the eligible proposals. The Full Slate Review considers closing gaps within the portfolio, whether gaps in population and/or geographic coverage, the capacity of funded organizations, or the distribution of resources.

Brian described the timeline for approving funding recommendations. The CCCD will meet next on January 14, 2020 to review MOHCD’s funding recommendations. The Committee must also identify a date for a public hearing, as well as a back-up date for approving the recommendations. Brian said that after the public hearing, he often asks the Committee members to describe their impressions of what they heard and work together to create a list of high-level priorities. MOHCD staff would then use those priorities to explore scenarios for potentially

funding additional proposals, and bring those scenarios for discussion and approval at the subsequent meeting.

Brian asked the Committee how MOHCD should share the funding recommendations on January 14, 2020:

- Irene requested a “big picture” presentation and then provide an opportunity for questions. She described a presentation of the whole budget with highlights of the impact to each strategy area. She said it would be helpful to see changes over the history of the investment strategies.
- Azalea recommended a SWOT analysis of each neighborhood.
- Marc said that it is most helpful to hear how these funding recommendations will accomplish our strategic plan, versus looking at the past. This is the most defensible way to support the funding recommendations. For example, “we think to address _____, this is the best way to achieve that goal.” Aileen agreed. She said that it is important to link the consolidated planning process with these funding recommendations. MOHCD has spent so much time planning and engaging with the community, these investments should honor that time and the conclusions generated from that process. She would like us to explain why we are moving forward with certain grantees, and not others.
- Clint recommended that we show where grantees are located, who is being served, and how that relates to our planning goals.
- Aileen said that if we could see the number of clients served visually (i.e., a spatial map), that would be useful to see why we funded certain organizations in certain neighborhoods versus others.

Brian summarized the need to link funding recommendations to consolidated plan goals, as well as provide a summary of overall impact (through numbers served and neighborhood/population) and a link to outreach conducted (both community engagement and targeted outreach to specific populations).

Brian shared that MOHCD was successful in receiving more proposals serving the African American, American Indian, and Transgender communities. It was not as successful getting new proposals from the Southeast Asian community. It received more proposals from the Western Addition, Bayview, and Treasure Island neighborhoods. Brian explained that MOHCD did not receive a great deal more Latinx- and/or Asian Pacific Islander-serving proposals, largely because it did not do targeted outreach in those communities. Brian explained that building equity for certain groups will necessarily mean less resources for other, previously well-resourced groups.

- Emma asked what our philosophy is around the Convening and Collaboration strategy. Did we want to prioritize community building for certain populations/geographies, or prioritize a particular mode of community building? Brian answered that within this particular strategy area, it is important that we be good stewards of public funds and ensure that the deliverables are impactful for the community.

- Azalea said this Committee is not a public-facing body. She said that members advocate/champion for their own causes/interests. She wonders why there is not a Commission for community development issues. It could be a monthly forum to understand what is happening in neighborhoods and communities. Brian explained that at one time voters decided not to pass a proposal to create such a Commission.
- Marc said that we should err on the side of transparency. There were a lot of community meetings last year. Reflecting back the data and the stories from that process is extremely important to build confidence in the funding recommendations. Aileen reiterated that, regardless of the limitations of the community engagement process, it is important to use that community input to articulate why MOHCD made its fund recommendations. There is a huge gap between what is communicated through the proposal and true impact in the community. The onus is on MOHCD to provide better outreach and training for potential applicants. And when it makes awards, it needs to provide good training for organizations to give them the best chance to succeed. Brian agreed. MOHCD is actively trying to reduce its administrative burden to free up time for evaluation and capacity building services. Clint asked if we can be more proactive with current grantees to get them to serve under-served populations/geographies. Brian said that capacity building resources are typically only effective if the organization wants to engage.
- Irene asked if MOHCD provides technical assistance for organizations that are not familiar with the RFP. Brian said that MOHCD staff did targeted outreach and would consider doing grant-writing workshops next time. Aileen said we should consider doing a “top ten reasons your proposal was not funded” webinar to reach a large audience of interested applicants.

6. Public Comment

- a. Y’Anad Burrell and Kathleen D. Hicks attended. Y’Anad commended the thoughtfulness of the Committee. She said she found that, during an RFP process, giving additional points to collaborative proposals has been really effective within the arts community. Those extra points went a long way to building community among and between providers.

7. Adjournment at 6:53 p.m.