



CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FULL COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, September 17, 2020
Zoom Meeting
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order at 5:07 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Irene Riley, Clint Loftman, Emma Kelsey, Azalea Renfield, and Aileen Hernandez.

City Staff Attendance: Mike King (MOHCD) and David Taylor (OEWD).

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. **Meeting minutes from August 18, 2020 were motioned, with corrections requested, by Clinton Loftman, seconded by Irene Riley, and approved unanimously by the Committee.**

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

- a. None.

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

- a. Irene Riley shared that the Human Rights Commission has been asked to redirect a portion of police funding to African American communities in San Francisco. The Commission is facilitating planning meetings with community leaders to determine how they should procure services, evaluate impact of these investments, and other considerations. Irene asked if MOHCD will work with the Commission on their procurement plan. David Taylor mentioned that the Commission would like to be in contract with vendors by January 2021. OEWD will be working to meet the ambitious timeline.

5. Planning a More Equitable RFP Process (*Discussion Item*)

- a. Mike King provided an overview of MOHCD's last RFP process, with perceived strengths and areas for improvement. Members discussed the areas they would prioritize for improvement:

- We need to do a better job of incorporating community members into the scoring and review process. How do we properly incentivize participation? Who are ideal participants? There has been an over-reliance on City staff when evaluating proposals in the past.
- We prioritized Program Design too much in our scoring rubric. This implicitly favors larger, more sophisticated nonprofit organizations. We need to prioritize Program Impact, Target Population and Past Performance more, and Program Design less.
- In order to serve the community, rather than the nonprofit organizations, we should conduct client surveys each year. We need confidential client feedback about the impact and quality of grantee services. Another possibility is to collect feedback from 'suggestion boxes' at the nonprofit service centers. Whatever the approach, it is extremely important to assess the experience of residents we are trying to serve.
- When we conduct programmatic monitoring visits each year, we should make sure to talk with program staff separate from the Executive Director. This will help collect more honest, transparent feedback.
- We should develop a rubric for assessing the capacity of the nonprofit organization. If an applicant is not ready to manage a City grant, there should be other options for supporting the organization, instead of just a services grant. For instance, smaller (e.g., \$15,000) capacity building or general operating grants. We need a plan for building a nonprofit organization's capacity over time until they are ready to receive full funding from the City.
- The City has a lot more influence and ownership/accountability over a grantee's performance if it is only funded by one department. If that is not possible, we need to coordinate much better with other City funders. We need to continue to try to align City procurement release dates. We could also implement something similar to a 'participating public jurisdictions agreement' in which public funders of a particular agency designate one department to manage the grant(s) and reporting. This would reduce the administrative burden for the City and the grantee.
- We need one reporting system across all City grant-making departments. With such a system, we could implement a 'clipper card' for services, which residents' swipe at nonprofit service centers.
- We needed to do a better job of telling our story at the public hearing. For instance, CCCD members are not the sole people making these funding decisions. The public hearing will be more productive if attendees have been engaged throughout the procurement process. How do we give the CCCD more of a platform with the community? Do we need a budget for outreach? Should CCCD members more explicitly represent certain San Francisco neighborhoods and/or constituents? Is it possible for the CCCD to meet with applicants prior to the public hearing?
- The frustrations expressed at the public hearing were not necessarily aimed at MOHCD or the CCCD. It was an expression of general anger. In that light, we should have provided opportunities for continuing the conversation after the public hearing. We can still invite public hearing participants to attend CCCD meetings.

6. Public Comment

- a. Hans How is an impact investor. He is looking for ways to raise more funding for nonprofits. Hans observed that the City is too focused on process. Instead, the City needs to go above and beyond to engage the community, especially now during the pandemic.

Community members need the City and the CCD to reach out and guide them through the procurement and/or contracting process. CCD members should play more of an active role in reaching out to community members and getting them involved in the process. Hans is curious whether the distribution of funding by program strategy is based on historical levels, or other indicators. He suggested that shorter-term community needs should be prioritized over funding consistency. An overall community-centric approach is important now, if our intention is to help the most needy people in San Francisco.

7. Adjournment at 7:10 p.m.