

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE  
COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION  
Wednesday, February 15, 2023  
Village Hall Rm 215 @ 7:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Comms. Rodriguez, Quinn, Sakiyama, Terreta

**ABSENT:** Comms. Bencola, and Puentes

**STAFF:** Cassandra Adediran, Dr. Danielle Walker

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:16 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Initially there was no quorum so Chairwoman Rodriguez opened the meeting with discussion on the CRC Mini Grant application and follow-up process. The discussion was to focus on things before the grant goes out, things once the grant is given, and things to follow-up on.

Things before grants go out:

Comm. Sakiyama suggested that information be made publicly available as it pertains to the criteria, size and overall amount of funds available. He also suggested that the CRC fund more organizations with smaller amounts.

Dr. Walker commented that Sakiyama's suggested was good in that it provides for a community information session to go over the grant, background, and information for applying.

Comm. Sakiyama reminded the CRC that the goal from the previous grant session was to fund start-ups or community grassroots organizations that have an impact and that it was the risk that was being taken to work with such groups. Chair Rodriguez related that the first year there was a smaller amount of money and it was easier to give it out.

A quorum was established by 7:25 p.m. with the arrival of Comm. Terretta.

Board Liaison Trustee Enyia offered that for the next go around with grants, the Board wants to know:

- How grants were used?
- How much?
- What happens if the granted does not use the funds?
- Is there a deadline [for performance of the grant]?
- Is there a reporting structure?

Upon hearing the Board's concerns, the CRC made numerous suggestions throughout the meeting. Initial suggestions included:

- updating the application;
- maybe having two tiers of funding: \$500 to \$1000 and then over \$1000;
- adding questions to ask if [the grantee] is still able to execute their program with less funds; and
- [asking if the grantees are] seeking alternative funding.

Comm. Terretta asked for clarity on what the Board is trying to solve as there is no end to how it can be [unclear verbiage] and traditionally the CRC has given this amount...

Chairperson Rodriguez related that the method used to determine the amounts given was good and she agreed that having a clear message beforehand, via a sheet or FAQ, workshop for grants, etc., would help. In terms of solving the issue of follow-up Chair Rodriguez posed the question of what if the grantee received funds which cannot fund their entire project.

Comm. Sakiyama offered that there be questions of the grantee which ask if the amount granted fully funds its project and if not, what is the grantee going to do to fund its project.

Comm. Terretta shared the idea of giving a window of time if a grantee is not able to scale down the project or get funding in three months' time. Perhaps invite the grantee in to discuss if need be.

Comm. Sakiyama suggested that at the beginning, set the expectation of a maximum amount.

Staff offered that the CRC sets a percentage of funding based on the amount that the grantee is requesting. Staff also offered that if a grantee cannot meet their deadline, then perhaps grant an extension of time and if it is still not completed in the time given, then resort back to the "risk" that was taken and have the grantee to report out.

Comm. Quinn offered that the CRC looks at the groups who have done things in the past and see if they will do something similar.

Chair Rodriguez suggested adding the alternative line asking the grantee if they cannot do what the grant was given for then what else would they do with the funds. Comm. Sakiyama stated that the CRC needs to be prepared for what comes up because traditionally, not using a grant for its intended purpose is unacceptable.

Comm. Terretta asked if the CRC should do a write-up to the Board on how traditional principals are enshrined in white supremacy and how using the racial equity approach is what the CRC is doing with the entrusted funds. Chair Rodriguez related that she does not think that the problem is the grant but why the CRC is doing it its way. Maybe the CRC should work on something which explains it better.

Dr. Walker mentioned having a conversation around the CRC's grant process vs. traditional process. If the current process still has things like not informing people that they are not getting the full amount, then reaching equity goals is still not being met.

Chair Rodriguez asked how can the CRC improve.

Comm. Sakiyama informed members that he is struggling with idea of best practices, some of which are problematic. Chair Rodriguez suggested that they bullet the strengths and weaknesses.

Tr. Enyia asked, not suggested, if anyone makes recommendations to other grant -making/grant-giving organizations or to other programs offering the same thing where the grantees can collaborate/combine forces. Comm. Terretta asked if this would be during the application or afterwards? Comm. Terretta also asked how can the CRC support the entities beyond dollars ad afterwards, e.g., giving them public acknowledgement and not just for program completion.

Dr. Walker thought it a good idea to deviate from tradition by asking the questions like:

- Who was impacted?
- Who participated?
- What was the outcome?
- How is it further progressing the equity goals of the CRC?

The CRC tabled the conversation about grants in order to vote on the agenda and acceptance of the work plan. Motion to approve the agenda was made by Comm. Sakiyama and seconded by Comm. Terretta. CRC members were in favor. Chair Rodriguez thanked Dr. Walker and Cassandra Adediran for their assistance with the 2023 Work Plan and thanked and the CRC members for trusting the process. Motion to accept the 2023 Work Plan was made by Comm. Terretta and seconded by Comm. Sakiyama. CRC Members were in favor. Per Dr. Walker, approval of all 2023 work plans would take place at the Board meeting on 2/21/2023.

The CRC continued with pros and cons of the grant program.

Comm. Sakiyama related that he interpreted the scoring to be in line with the CRC's ideas [in a different manner] as he referenced a program which had a good project but he scored them low. He suggested that maybe the guidelines should be discussed. There are some things that could be interpreted and redetermined by CRC members.

Chair Rodriguez believed that the way things were worded [in the grant applications] played a role in the decision-making.

From an equity standpoint, Dr. Walker saw an opportunity for growth.

In focusing on follow-up, Comm. Terretta posed the question about whether or not follow-up is determined by who got funded and how far the tax dollars went, citing that the Board did not understand what the CRC was moving towards. Comm. Sakiyama mentioned that R.O.Y.A.L. was the organization that was named in the communications about the grant program. Comm. Terretta felt that the opportunity for growth for the CRC is to make sure that the Board is sharing the CRC's view of equity and growth.

Chair Rodriguez added that it goes back to explaining why the CRC has taken its approach. It has not been explained to the Board. The follow-up does not need to be strenuous. There has to be accountability. Comms. Terretta and Quinn volunteered to follow-up with reports from the

grantees after their projects are complete. It was suggested that a community share be created as part of the follow-up. Tr. Enyia offered that a request to report back to the Board and the Wednesday Journal be made. Comm. Terretta offered that the information gathered then be put back out in the community - by maybe spotlighting one grantee a month as an outcome from the grant program.

Per Chair Rodriguez, the CRC will keep follow-up on the process to make sure that grantees perform and give feedback so that there is information for the Board. The CRC will self-evaluate as it moves on so that it maintains all things being equitable whether it is work plan to work plan or project to project. It will show that the CRC is being intentional.

Staff asked if all of the questions from the Board were addressed. Per Chair Rodriguez, the CRC is aware that adjustments are needed and CRC is working on them.

Tr. Enyia wanted to know if the CRC will ask for more funds. Per Chair Rodriguez, it seemed best not to ask for more funds this year, but instead to defend the current funds and the grant process. Once the CRC has more to offer with follow-up and results, then the CRC can revisit asking for more funds.

Dr. Walker suggested an equitable best practice for follow-up could be a quick survey from the grant applicants (those that received funding and those that didn't) on how the process went and present the data to the Board. Chair Rodriguez agreed to do the survey and get it out to the grant applicants next week.

CRC Chairperson Rodriguez asked that the commission members for ideas to add to support her presentation to the Board. The next regular meeting is scheduled for 3/15/2023.

Motion to adjourn was made by Comm. Quinn and seconded by Comm. Terretta. Meeting adjourned at 8:40p.m.