



CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FULL COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, March 2, 2020
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, Room 5080
San Francisco, CA 94103
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order at 5:40 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Marc Vogl, Irene Riley, Clint Loftman, Emma Kelsey, Azalea Renfield, and Aileen Hernandez (arrived at 5:51 p.m.).

City Staff Attendance: Brian Cheu (MOHCD), Pierre Stroud (MOHCD), Mike King (MOHCD), David Taylor (OEWD), and Angel Cardoz (OEWD).

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. **Meeting minutes from January 14, 2020 and from February 4, 2020 were motioned by Irene Riley, seconded by Azalea Renfield, and approved unanimously by the Committee.**

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

- a. Brian Cheu shared that MOHCD is still searching for a permanent Director. The Mayor recently visited MOHCD staff and thanked them for their hard work.

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

- a. Marc Vogl announced that this will be his last meeting as a CCCD member. He thanked the Committee for the good memories and friendships, and the Committee thanked him for his service. Marc's announcement prompted a brief discussion about how, after his absence, the Committee will have exactly enough members for quorum (5) and the increasingly urgent need for the Board of Supervisors and Mayor to appoint new members and/or extend the terms of current members.
- b. Irene Riley announced that she was recently appointed to the Human Rights Commission.

5. Discuss Public Comment on the Preliminary Funding Recommendations

Brian thanked Committee members for their participation in the public hearing on February 4, 2020. Brian provided an overview of the conversations that took place within the City after the

hearing, including conversations with the Mayor. These conversations addressed the concerns raised at the hearing about under-investment in Black-led organizations that applied through MOHCD's recent RFP. Through those conversations, a solution was proposed to dedicate \$2 million to Black-led organizations that were not recommended for funding through the RFP. Organizations that were funded through the RFP would not be eligible to apply for these additional grant dollars. Of the \$2 million, half would be allocated as direct services grants in MOHCD's program areas of Access to Opportunity and Community Building, and half would be allocated as capacity building support. MOHCD was asked to find this additional \$2 million funding from its budget.

Brian provided an overview of the budget options considered. Ultimately, MOHCD decided 1) not to fund any new projects through its Capital Projects program in FY 2020-21 and 2) use unspent CDBG funds to reach the needed \$2 million. After FY 2020-21 and ongoing, these investments would likely be funded through increases to the Housing Trust Fund. Clint asked if the \$2 million could come from CDBG program income instead. Brian responded that CDBG program income is already allocated to existing projects and purposes.

Brian talked about the need to define "Black-led organization" for the purposes of releasing an RFP for the \$2 million in services. He said the community is currently wrestling with the appropriate definition. Emma asked, "Who is the community?" Brian said that the community, in this case, is the coalition of Black-led organizations that wrote the original advocacy letter to the Mayor at the start of the RFP public comment period.

Marc asked if the Committee has any flexibility to pursue additional funding for other organizations that advocated through the public comment period. Brian said that the Community Development management team has discussed this question, and given the difficulty finding the \$2 million for the Black-led organization initiative, he recommends not making changes to the existing funding recommendations. Brian provided an overview of MOHCD's current funding commitments, including roughly \$10 million each for eviction and immigration defense, and how those commitments limit the funds available to Black-led organizations.

Marc said that he left the hearing having been moved by many of the speakers, but believing that it is more of a political problem that MOHCD only has administrative tools to solve. Marc talked about how the administrative capacity of applicants was used as a reason not to fund or only to partially fund certain organizations. He encouraged us to analyze where applicants were challenged by the RFP process and to make changes to the process to be more equitable. Brian talked about how MOHCD may need to do a better job of encouraging collaborative proposals so that organizations who may not be able to effectively manage City funds have a fiscal sponsor to handle those liabilities.

Azalea said she remembers most of the organizations at the public hearing were already funded but needed more support, but it sounds like MOHCD and the Committee are not able to help those organizations. Brian said that organizations recommended for funding will likely be able to receive additional dollars in the form of capacity building support, but not additional direct services dollars. Clint said that MOHCD might want to consider when we provide feedback on proposals, such as scores and comments, so that it is most useful for applicants. He suggested that prioritizing more points towards program impact would help grassroots organizations that may not have strong grant writers. Aileen recommended setting clear goals through MOHCD's future

strategic planning processes, including numeric targets within service areas and specific communities.

Azalea recommended that the Human Rights Commission could help incorporate a community-based review process into future RFPs. Pierre Stroud shared that this type of political advocacy is similar to what the API Council and Latino Parity & Equity Coalition (LPEC) do each year, but the timing is different.

Marc asked if the Committee felt strongly about advocating against political interference in these funding decisions. He mentioned that advocacy could take the form of a SF Chronicle letter, or a letter to the Mayor. Brian talked about how he sees an opportunity to change our RFP process to incorporate more representation from the community. Marc recommended asking the Mayor to appoint four new CCCD members that more closely represent specific populations and communities in the city. Brian agreed that this type of representation on the Committee would be useful.

Marc echoed a call from one of the speakers at the public hearing to “be bold!” He stressed the need to push forward solutions that, in five years, result in the process feeling a bit more like all of us in it together, instead of us (government) versus them (the community). Aileen liked the suggestion of writing a letter to the Mayor expressing the Committee’s concerns about this process. The letter could include a recommendation to appoint four new members in a strategic way. Aileen recommended more community representation on the Committee.

Members were conflicted about whether to approve the HUD funding recommendations, given their concerns about the process. After discussing, members agreed that they could approve the HUD recommendations *and* advocate for solutions to the concerns expressed. Marc said that he is conscious of applicants’ need to know whether they have been funded or not, and to not hold up that part of the process. Aileen wants some way to document what the Committee’s role has been in the RFP process. She said that we need to validate the process and call for greater representation on the Committee.

Brian provided an overview of the HUD funding recommendations for FY 2020-21.

The HUD funding recommendations for FY 2020-21 were motioned by Clint Loftman, seconded by Irene Riley, and approved unanimously by the Committee.

Marc offered to write a first draft of a letter to the Mayor. Clint reiterated his concerns about limiting who can apply to the \$1 million in services grants to Black-led organizations.

Members decided that the next CCCD meeting will be on Tuesday, May 12, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

6. Public Comment

- a. None.

7. Adjournment at 7:28 p.m.