

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Councilmember Campos: And at this time I'd ask for a roll call. [ Roll call ]

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. And at this time, I'm going to call on Norberto Duenas to ask -- state which items need to be pulled from consent.

>> Norberto Dueñas: Madam Chair, members of the committee, Norberto Dueñas, Deputy City Manager. We would like to pull both items that are on the consent calendar. Item 3.1A, review of citywide sports, and 3.1B, update on library partners and reading literacy program, for presentations by staff.

>> Councilmember Campos: Can I get a motion to accept those two? All in favor? That passes. So we'll go ahead and turn it over to Albert Balagso.

>> Albert Balagso: Thank you, Madam Chair. Very quickly, we are doing a progress report to you on the sports field studies of what we've accomplished in the period leading up to this time. I'm going to hand over that presentation to Suzanne Wolf, our recreation superintendent, who will lead that.

>> Good afternoon. On December 2nd the council unanimously approved the community sports field study. We've had an amazing amount of support in the community. There's been a stronger relationship between the city and its customer user groups, and as a result of the ongoing dialogue we've seen some better practices and more efficient services in our sports field users. We are excited about some of the changes that have taken place this past year including a new reservation process. As you know, before we had people standing in line 48 hours waiting for a first come first served and in January we completed our first negotiations process with the community and had had a lot more reservations take place from the negotiation process which was very successful. We are also recognize that partnerships are really critical to everything that we do and look forward to in the future. We have recently codified our fields as either premier, high use or standard fields and as we move towards that programming we'll see a lot more efficient use of our services out in the community. And finally, we are excited about the opportunity next Wednesday that we're going to be working with the community to identify a home-based field criteria in which the community comes to us and tells us what's important in thinking about the number of fields, the type of fields, what's the regional balance, maximum number of hours, just things we should think about before we come forward with the home based proposal and that way over the next year we'll be able to implement that more effectively.

>> Albert Balagso: We're available for any questions you may have.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you for that presentation. Are there any questions from my colleagues? Councilmember Chu.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you, Madam Chair. The question is in regarding to the online registration services. Have you received any complaint?

>> From our sports field study, we are getting ready to put that module into the online system, so that will actually be coming online this next season.

>> Councilmember Chu: Okay, I thought it started March 7th, 2009.

>> Albert Balagso: The actual online system for class registration and certain components came online. It is a kind of graduated implementation, so this registration system before the sports field will be the next wave coming in. One of the other things, just to highlight what Suzanne had said, what we did in the last year was actually sat down the users and had them negotiate times. Because what a group would normally do is do a block registration and just monopolize the time. And didn't necessarily need it, but they had it. So we had them sit down and work through them, and we were able to get more people in to get greater use.

>> And I should say there's sports classes, so tennis classes, things that are class in nature, did start on March 7th, and that has been moving quite well.

>> Councilmember Chu: Okay. No complaints?

>> It's been a wonderful system in that people are really excited about being able to register from home and they're also able to look at so many more options just they would normally look just at their own community center, so people have been very pleased with knowing of the options that are available to them.

>> Councilmember Chu: Those that don't have computer access, do we receive any complaint?

>> Well, we have our regular walk-in system, our fax registration, the system that we've always had in place for people to come in. And so we have a similar system that people are used to, but we are also allowing more availability of resources by having the online system.

>> Albert Balagso: Councilmember Chu, of the reservations that we took last season, over 40% were through online registration.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Any other questions from my colleagues? I just have a couple questions regarding, I guess, the proper name would be, what, adopt a park or adopt a field or --

>> The home base field criteria.

>> Councilmember Campos: Yes.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Councilmember Campos: Is it called home base?

>> Home base, uh-huh.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay. Home base. What I want to understand is what will the process look likely for outreaching? I think you covered some points but how are you going to get that information figure out from your perspective of what are the best uses of that particular home base?

>> So we're looking at three different access points. One to do our research with other cities and how they've been able to be successful, or some of their issues that they've encountered with the home based field. Two is, again, the community meeting next week where we start to inquire from our community end users what's important to them and what are some key aspects that we need to take into consideration before we develop the policy. And so again, we're right now in that beginning phase where we're seeking input, gathering input and then we'll be able to come back and outline what the criteria will look like.

>> Councilmember Campos: So then, Suzanne, are you outreaching 500 feet, are you just talking to community groups? How are you outreaching, is what I want to understand a little bit more.

>> So we have an extensive use -- an extensive list of our sports field users that are currently using our sports fields. We also have an extensive e-mail listing that we've been doing outreaching through, as well, and then the neighborhood associations have been able to do outreach for us, as well. Trying to think if there's anything else at this point.

>> Councilmember Campos: So I guess what I'm trying to get to is I know there are probably different needs from the people who use the sports field versus maybe just the neighborhood associations and maybe this is a little too soon to be asking this question. But have you thought about how you're going to balance it so that one particular group doesn't overpower it and the other group feel that they don't have access to it so that it does really stay open to everyone and we don't have one particular group dominating the home base?

>> Again, I think those are things we'll get to down the road. I think those are really good comments that we will incorporate as we move further along.

>> Councilmember Campos: So you'll be reporting back to us to let us know in a progress report, then.

>> Sure. And we also need to -- once we develop which fields will be home based fields, we'll want to work with those neighborhood associations in particular to do outreach in those neighborhoods.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay, that's good, thank you. Any other questions? With that, can we get a motion to accept the report?

>> Councilmember Chirco: Move to accept.

>> Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: All those in favor? Opposed? That passes. Jane, I guess you are next.

>> Jane Light: Yes, and I am delighted to introduce to you Judy Klikun. Judy has been with us a little over six months, I guess, as the director of our library partners in reading literacy program, which will be celebrating its 20th anniversary next week at Mayfair. I hope that some of you will be able to join us. Judy, in just the short time she's been here, has really begun to revitalize our program, which is appropriate as we turn 20. And I'm very pleased to have her give you a kind of a status report. It's been some time since this committee has heard from us about this.

>> Thank you very much. We're really happy to be here and share this information. And today what I'm going to do is just take a few minutes, and I will be brief -- I know you have a very tight agenda -- to update you on partners in reading, as well as to share some information on the status of literacy in San JosÉ and the impact of literacy. Now, partners in reading, as Jane mentioned, is 20 years old. And we are going to be celebrating our 20th event next week, and you've all received an invitation to that. So we -- as Jane mentioned we'd love to see you there. During that period of time we've served over 4,000 adults, providing adult and family literacy services, and these services are free. And we've trained over 3100 volunteer tutors. Now, one of the things that is unique about partners in reading is that the approach we use to working with adults is contextual learning. So that literacy skills are taught within the context of everyday life. One of the things that the national government sponsored was an assessment of adults nationally to find out just how functional they are in utilizing these literacy skills within everyday life associations. And that assessment was called the national assessment on adult literacy. What we found here in San JosÉ about 16% of the adults, that's about 153,000 adults, are functioning below a basic level, which means they may be able to write their name, but they -- they couldn't decipher a jury notice that they received in the mail, or they couldn't tell you the time of an appointment on an appointment slip. And then another 29% are in the basic level. The basic level basically can read a simple selection, but they can't interpret a map, cannot very often fill out a job application. And so the challenge is that about 45% of our city population has literacy challenges and literacy difficulties. And what we felt on a national basis and what we're feeling locally is both challenges as far as quality of life for many of these individuals, huge gaps between the haves and have nots as well as a real economic impact. Health wise, we spend about between 106 and 238 billion additional dollars a year on health care cost directly associated with low literacy. About 40% of those employed were identified by their employers as not having basic skills to function on the job. Another 51% of the adults that fell into the below-literacy category of the NAL testing are unemployed. About 60% of those that are incarcerated are nonliterate. And about 70% of those who are on welfare. So there's a very high correlation, and we're spending a good deal of money on additional services and the result of low literacy in our society. So what partners in reading has done is tried to respond by expanding our capacity. And we've done this by providing greater access, increasing hours, increasing services, expanding services to provide them in different locations, and really, expanding our partnership, so that we can reach more people and train more people. We're providing more tutor training, we are open evenings, as well as Saturdays. We are reaching and reaching out to a broader base of tutors and learners, and we are providing classes, as well as individual instruction, as well as train the trainer, and a whole number of other types of delivery. We have partnerships established with Parkway Preschool, for example, where we are providing literacy services for teacher's aides. We are providing tutoring at Alum Rock branch specifically for preschools in that area and the parents of the preschoolers. Teaching parenting in conjunction with ESL. We are collaborating with Work2Future in a workplace literacy program where we're teaching English language and literacy skills relating to job and workplace. And we're also working with a number

of community agencies, providing services onsite, as well as just expanding our recruiting base, and our outreach. In the past couple of years, we've seen some impact as a result of these efforts. And as you can see, the number of adult learners is increasing. The number of tutors we're serving and the instructional hours. This year we anticipate a 30% increase in participants, 50% increase in tutors and 30% increase in instructional hours. And we're also looking at expanding services and securing funding through sources such as the Silicon Valley community foundation, looking at ESL opportunities and collaborating with other literacy programs, as well as we just received an earmark on workplace literacy. We're going to be providing onsite literacy training with various employers. So that we can increase the skills of incumbent workers particularly in basic skills and that will go into effect this coming fiscal year. One of the things that's really interesting, just looking at partners in reading is that with the -- the -- if you look at the number of hours that volunteers are investing in our program, in-kind alone this year will realize over \$250,000 of in-kind, in-kind contributions by our volunteer tutors. And when we look at the other in-kind services we're receiving about 75 cents per dollar that's invested in the program. And one of the things we did put at your various places was a book that was written by and has selections from our various adult learners. We publish this book every year and thought you might enjoy getting to know some of your constituents. And if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you, Judy. There are any questions from my colleagues? Well, first of all thank you and congratulations for celebrating 20 years. That's very exciting. I know this is a particular program that is embraced not only by the council but I know by the residents of the City of San JosÉ so we appreciate all the work that you do and want you to send a thank you to all the individuals that volunteer their time to make sure that other people learn how to read. So we appreciate that. If there are no other questions can I get a motion to accept the report?

>> Councilmember Chu: So moved.

>> Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: All those in favor, that passes unanimously. Thank you. And Norberto, that was very informative, so I'm glad we pulled them. So the next one -- you're staying in the same place -- is a report on the 2009-14 early care and education strategic plan.

>> Jane Light: Well, Dawn Perry, the manager of the early care unit, is here to report on the efforts that she and the early care commission and her staff have been working on for this whole fiscal year, to bring an updated strategic plan for early care to you today. So Dawn has a brief presentation.

>> Thank you. Good afternoon. Thank you, members of the committee for the opportunity to bring to you for approval the 2009-2014, early care and education strategic work plan, entitled investment in the future. First, I'd like to acknowledge the early care and education commissioners for their guidance on this project, and we have a couple in the audience today that may want to speak later on. I'd especially like to thank commissioners Myra Cruz and Elaine Curran, who is here today, because they specifically focused many hours on this process, and their leadership was just amazing. As the previous work plan was expiring last year, the commission and staff began gathering current information on childcare and early education within the City of San JosÉ. We were fortunate that the Santa Clara County early education local planning council had just completed or was just completing their childcare needs assessment and provided us with a childcare supply and demand data for the city on a zip code by zip code basis and I have that document with me today. Also, the Santa Clara County partnership for school readiness provided current local data on children's readiness for kindergarten as well. So in addition to these pieces of data, the commission, with staff support, conducted three public input sessions, including one targeted at stakeholders, and an online survey to gather community members' perspective on early education and childcare within the city. From this information we found that the goal areas from the previous strategic work plan were still pretty much in alignment with what the community needed and wanted. There's still a need for additional affordable high quality childcare and early education spaces within the city. The local planning council report suggests there's a current gap of nearly 30,000 spaces, and nearly half of that number is for infants through preschool age children. The retention of highly trained early educators and paraprofessionals has a directly impact on the quality of those early experiences for young children, so that still seems to be an area of need, as well. Parents and caregivers still have difficulty accessing current and local information on what they need to make decisions on childcare and early education options for their young children. And lastly the

community wants the work plans, goals and outcomes to be a part of or to lead the current and future local and state early care and education initiative so that funds in services can be leveraged to ensure cost effectiveness and program quality. The goals and outcomes of the document you have in your hands are flexible enough to respond to the changing economic and social trends, and the strategic work plan forms the basis for annual work plans for the early care and education commission and for the staff of the early care and education services unit. I know you all have received a copy of the document so I'd be happy to take any questions you have.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you for the presentation. Are there any questions by my colleagues on this? I thought Vice Mayor would have questions. I know that she has been very passionate about this particular area. Vice Mayor.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Well, I don't know that it is -- it is not a question, it is a comment and an observation. I see the representatives from the early care and education commission out here, and I know how diligently they worked to come up with the five year plan, and I just wanted to compliment and commend Dawn, as well as the commission, for all the hard work they've done on coming up with a five-year plan. I know the previous one had been two years. And that goes by way too quickly, so compliments on that. And also, they held public input. Now, I know you didn't get the kind of numbers you would like, but the fact that you went out and spoke to the community I think says volumes about the commitment, the committee, and Dawn have had to this project, and I want to thank you. And it makes a difference for all of these children to get an opportunity to access one of these smart-start centers.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Okay, we have a couple of public speakers. Tim Kirby and Elaine Curran. You have two minutes. Thank you very much for being here.

>> Am I on? Good afternoon, I'm Tim Kirby, I'm the chair of the early care and education commission. Thank you for giving me an opportunity. I also want to recognize Dawn and the library staff for the hard work they did. Elaine is going to speak in a minute. For those of you who have a chance, this weekend the city is graduating more than 50.

>> 72.

>> 72 people from the childcare -- family childcare training program, that's at the library. This is a direct output of this program and the work that goes into it. So I just want to encourage you to approve this, more importantly I want to encourage you to read it and I want to encourage you to ask us questions, if you have any, and lastly I want to thank Judy who's just been a tireless advocate for this and we couldn't have gotten this far without her so thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you.

>> Good afternoon. I'm not sure I need this in a room this size. I'm Elaine Curran. I'm one of the commissioners, and also have worked hand in hand with Dawn as they worked very, very hard to put together all the public hearings, and online surveys and everything else I really took to gather up the information we needed to do a quality product. The city is not the primary childcare provider but has a tremendous amount of resources they leverage to make sure that the people in our community have high-quality care and really does a tremendous job in that one making parents better consumers, two, providing training for providers so they have access to quality services and things like the books for little hands and for the small family childcare providers. Also for the gathering together the resources, tremendous amount of training. One of the things I think we're most proud of that we participated in doing was really to look at the landscape of services that provide -- that city provides that may not be childcare but are care, education for young children, and how can we leverage the resources and the training so that they have better care. And that would be things like library books, book time, and parks and recreation. The more we can expand those services, so that our staff is getting better training on what the best things are to do, and taking that smart start model and other quality standards and encouraging childcare providers in the city to meet those, is really important. And then last thing we're really excited about is the burgeoning partnership with the gang prevention task force. And we're starting to get -- work hand in hand with them. And I think they're really appreciating if we start at the younger years and have children well educated their

chances of going into gang are minimized. Thank you for the support the city provides. I think it goes a long way towards improving the lives of our children. And welcome back, Judy.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you for all the work that you do in taking on an area that is very crucial to the future of the City of San José. It's very important. Are there any other questions? Councilmember Chu.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you Madam Chair. First of all I'd like to congratulate you for a very successful program. As a former school board member I know how important it is for this early childcare and education to those young minds. I just have a question. Probably after more than 20 hours of study of the budget I probably have to answer myself. But where is the funding source for this program? Is it secured for the next year?

>> We actually are funded about 75% grant-funded through CDBG, Healthy Neighborhood Venture Fund pays for some of our programs. We actually have two federal grants this year, and we've had also foundation and corporate brands in the past. I think we leveraged somewhere around \$1 million this year.

>> Jane Light: And so consequently the fairly small amount of General Fund dollars in this program we did not cut because that would affect the ability to leverage these other activities. So I think there's three FTE in the General Fund. Two, two and a half, something like that. And all the other staff that we have are working on different grant activities. And so that's how we make all this happen.

>> Councilmember Chu: Great, thank you very much for this little bit of good news.

>> Councilmember Campos: Any other questions? Vice Mayor?

>> Councilmember Chirco: I would just like to make a motion to accept the report and five-year plan and thanks for those who did all the hard work.

>> Councilmember Chu: Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: Could we in that motion have it cross referenced for the city council in the motion, please?

>> Councilmember Chirco: Absolutely.

>> Councilmember Campos: Without any further comments can we get everyone to approve this? [ ayes ]

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. The next item we have is item 3.3, report on the draft volunteer policy.

>> Albert Balagso: Again, good afternoon. This is a policy that we've been working on for some time. And I think it's going to give us a lot more latitude on how to use volunteers and will piggyback on even the success that we've had with the rose garden and even go farther than that. So I'm going to pass this on to Neil Rufino to provide a presentation.

>> Good afternoon again. I'm here today to present for approval and cross reference to full council a revision to council policy 3.1 which is entitled volunteer help for park improvements. Before I get into the presentation, I would like to introduce key staff members who are sitting in our audience today. This is Fernando Casares and Molly Tobias, who we hired as the volunteer management team for park and rec, and they've been doing an amazing job towards our efforts in terms of coordinating volunteers. Just an example of some of the things they've been doing, they've been really focusing this year on organizing a lot of one time events with partners. They've had over 30 one-time events since the fall, 3000-some hours just on those events. The adopt-a-park program, which they manage, has also an additional 9,000 hours, and that doesn't include all the other hours of senior volunteers that we have in our community centers and litter and pickup. But our system and their work is going to help us coordinate all of those those data and statistics. So I just want to congratulate them on that. I also want to share the effort that they did. We received a letter or e-mail from Terry Reilly on May 2nd regarding their friends of rose garden effort, and it was written about one of their part-time staff. And so it said, "Fernando, I cannot let this go without saying that your staff member Nicole Fadren did a fantastic job at our

recent rediscover the rose garden. As a primary organizer of this even I had a lot on my shoulders, but she read my mind and knew exactly what had to be done. I would have been lost without her assistance from the adopt-a-park program. Nicole was plugged in to what needed to be done and enabled me to handle all the other items that comes with events like this." For us, that type of e-mail or that type of statement was not about kind of the systems and the process that we're going to talk to you about today, but it's the work that Fernando and Molly do in terms of developing staff and in terms of interacting with the community. So I just wanted to make sure they got thanks for that. But one of the first tasks that they were tasked to do this year was update this policy. The original policy 3.1 was adopted in 1970. And so it's quite a number of years old, and it was -- it's in attachment A, and it's a very brief statement. We did feel that we needed to provide a little bit more parameters around it. The policy itself, the new policy will stand as a base for us to develop operational procedures for all our volunteers across our department. And you can see just an example of some of the areas that we have volunteers for. Staff took a three-step approach in terms of developing the proposal that's in front of you. To update the existing policy they researched a lot of local best practices. You know, in particular Santa Clara County has a successful volunteer program. They looked at other cities like Sunnyvale and Sacramento. They did a great job with talking with our internal customers, our parks maintain staff, our parks maintenance supervisors, for us to get an understanding of what is it that they need out there and how do we manage their day-to-day job expectations with the community's expectations. And sometimes that doesn't always match up, but we need to understand from every side of that. And of course we also went out and got feedback from neighborhood leaders, from the SNI NACs and other neighborhood groups, and we presented this and was approved by the park and rec commission last week. So the information that we gathered and with the feedback we received we developed the proposal to collect a standardized and flexible program for park and rec. Definitely key to this effort was to balance the bureaucracy's risk and management with a welcoming and resonant friendly operation. And as such, we have a number of new elements or elements we brought out a little bit clearer in the proposal. Part of it is including a varying level of volunteer agreements. Depending on the scope, complexity of a one-day long-term commitment of volunteers, we need to ensure that there's the right paperwork that goes along with that. We are ensuring that the fingerprinting and TB testing are required for volunteers who work with children or are serving food. We state specifically again and we reiterate that official volunteers for the city are covered by workers' compensation. We want to uphold that safety and training are very important and we will be working on certification on use of power tools, certification of other activities such as possible use of driving city vehicles for volunteers. Santa Clara County does that, and they've had pretty successful operations with that. We are stating, you know, volunteers shall not be tasked to provide security or law enforcement efforts. And volunteers will be asked to read and sign the City's volunteer code of ethics, as well as park and rec's code of conduct. One thing I would like to pay -- have the group or council pay attention to is that we included a section on age and parent signature. We would like to make a revision in the policy that is actually in front of you today. So if you could see attachment B, page 2. On that section, around the age, it currently reads the minimum wage of a city volunteer is 13, unless specified otherwise. In talking with more and more of our staff in a lot of our volunteer programs, we have a lot of families who bring up younger kids under 13, and we would just like to strike that statement out of the policy when it goes to full council. And basically the policy at the beginning would just state, starting from the second line, volunteers under the age of 15 must be accompanied by a parent or legal guardian, and ongoing for the rest of the policy. Like for myself, I have two young children. If I'm going to go out to volunteer at Bequesto park, in my neighborhood, you know, my children would be official volunteers. That's kind of one thing I do want to call attention to in terms of a change in that. The next steps are for us to finalize the development of the staff and volunteer operation manual that we're working through with the attorney's office, office of employee relations, and a lot of other groups, risk management, to -- and orient our staff on the new forms and procedures. And with your support we are requesting that this item also be cross-referenced and heard by the full council with that elimination of that first sentence on the age requirements on page 2 of the policy. And with that, we are open and welcome for any comments and questions.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you for the presentation.

>> Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Are there any comments or questions from my colleagues? I'll let Vice Mayor go first.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Well, I notice this has been an area of concern for the council for quite a while, as well as the community. So it's nice to see something coming forward that really captures what the community wants, and it's kind of the goal for the council. Thank you very much.

>> Councilmember Campos: Councilmember Oliverio.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you very much, Councilmember Campos. On page 2 of the policy under definition for qualification of a volunteer, the last sentence says, "Without receiving financial or material compensation." I just want to -- would that exclude a company that has a community day where its employees are encouraged to go do community service?

>> No, that wouldn't, that would be, you know, we can't -- we're not paying.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Understood. So that's for city compensation. Thank you. I'd make a motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: We need to have this cross referenced as well.

>> Absolutely.

>> Councilmember Campos: So if there are no other questions or comments, thank you for the report. Our volunteers are very valuable to the City of San José. So if you can just send that message back with that, all those in favor? That passes unanimously. Thank you. So the next one we have is 3.4, report of the neighborhood of distinction program.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Hadassa Lev, and I've been assigned as a distinctive neighborhood program planner from the Department of Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement. The city council approved funding for the development of this program for the 2008-2009 fiscal year to address a wave of public concerns that have come up in the past two years. These include demolition of older homes that have gone through without any kind of design review, replacement homes that are perceived as out of scale and out of character with the existing neighborhood and insensitive additions. The goal of the distinctive neighborhood program is to provide further protection and enhancement to San José's unique residential neighborhoods. For the past ten months planning staff have been conducting extensive outreach and has been developing and analyzing various policy options to address the concerns that we've heard. The purpose of today's presentation is to highlight the policy options that we've come up with. It is important to note that most of San José's lands are comprised of single family neighborhoods. In 2000, the city adopted a single family house permit process to regulate single family development in San José. And currently a single family house permit is required for any new construction that exceeds 30 feet or two stories in height. Any new construction where the floor area ratio exceeds 0.45, or in cases where the house is listed on the historic resources inventory. However, if the house does not pass those thresholds, the applicant would proceed directly to the building division and would not go through planning or any kind of design review. So in cases where a house is being demolished where the replacement house does not pass the thresholds, that demolition would occur without any kind of review, and we wouldn't know how significant that resource is. And with this process we're losing a lot of significant resources in San José. Additionally, this citywide process that we currently have is not addressing the unique characteristics of the diverse neighborhoods that we have in the city. The first round of outreach was conducted at the end of last year. And the outreach results were presented to the full council on February 3rd of this year. We found that there was a general difference between what residents of older neighborhoods felt about their neighborhood and -- as opposed to residents of newer neighborhoods. Residents of older neighborhoods were a lot more protective of the architectural style and design of their neighborhood and were concerned with any new construction that threatened the existing style and any loss of fabric. Residents of newer neighborhoods were more concerned with the loss of open space through the loss of park land and paving and fencing of their front yards. But residents of older and newer neighborhoods alike were all concerned or protective of the bulk and scale of their existing neighborhood and were concerned with new construction that threatened the existing bulk and scale. These points are the main points that came out of the first round of outreach. There are a few points in black that are

related to the scope of the program but are not completely within the scope. However, those are addressed through other processes and programs in the city. The points in red are the ones that we are addressing through the policy options proposed. And they include demolition of homes, loss of architectural elements and details such as changing wood framing to vinyl framing or removing wood siding and replacing that with stucco. Design of new construction that's perceived as incompatible, attached garages on streets that have primarily detached garages, and inconsistent setbacks with the existing setback patterns. We also found that all residents there are concerned with large homes that don't fit in with the neighborhood, second stories on streets that have primarily single story developments and generally loss of privacy. Staff is proposing four policy options to address the diverse concerns that we've heard from the community. We're proposing a combined approach that includes citywide policy and a neighborhood-specific policy. However, the program is more focused on the neighborhood-specific level, because we feel that it would balance the existing policy that we currently have in place that's a citywide policy, and would address the unique characteristics of the neighborhoods in San José. We are proposing one citywide policy option that would address the issue of demolition. The neighborhood specific policy options that we're proposing are proposed as a tool kit of overlays that would be available to the community if they wanted to initiate a certain overlay in their neighborhood. It is important to note that implementation of any of these policy options would require revisions to the municipal code, and currently there are no resources available for that process. So staff is proposing that if resources are paid available, we would first implement the citywide policy option referring to demolitions and the first policy option in the neighborhood-specific category, the conservation study area, because those two policy options address some urgent concerns by the community, they're more achievable in the short term and would require a minimal amount resources to implement. The zoning overlay and the design guidelines overlay could be implemented as implementation measures for the general plan update a few years down the line. So the first policy option is a citywide option to address the issue of demolition of older homes. And what we're proposing is to add either demolition of homes over a certain age or demolition of homes built before a certain date as a threshold for requiring a single family house permit. So that in cases where somebody is proposing to demolish an older home, they would be submitting a single family house permit to the Department of Housing and we would be reviewing how significant that house is. The determination of whether we choose option A or option B above would be figured out as part of the writing of the ordinance and we would come back to the city council for approval of that motion. If we choose the set age, if we choose a certain age, option B, the age would probably be 50 years old, as that aligns with the national and California register for acquiring enough perspective to determine if a house is significant. If we choose option B the date would probably be 1945 as that is the end of the second world war after which time the style of architecture and the growth rate in the city changed significantly. When presenting this to the community, the community was more aligned with option A as that would include more houses for review and would include unique neighborhood like Eichler neighborhoods and certain ranch sometime neighborhoods that were built after 1945. However, it would also include a number of other homes, lots of tracts that were built after that date, where the city grew very quickly and where we would not necessarily want to be reviewing every demolition proposal in those areas. I will move on to the neighborhood-specific policy options. The first one of which is the conservation study area. The conservation study area is a variation on what we currently have in place which is the conservation area. And what we're proposing is that the idea of the conservation study area is to streamline the survey process, which is a big roadblock for residents to be able to get the additional protection that they would get in becoming a conservation area. And what we're proposing is that the designation process be the same for both, except for one important point. Typically for a conservation area we require a comprehensive survey which consists of two parts. A context statement which talks about the general patterns of development in the area, the history and the people and significant events that have occurred in that area. But it also requires individual historic evaluations of every single building in that area. And what we're proposing for the conservation study area is we would require the context statement only and individual evaluations would only be required as developments come in for review and only if they don't meet the historic guidelines. So we would be separating those two points making it easier for neighborhoods to become conservation study areas which is really a temporary solution for neighborhoods while they're gathering information, and the individual evaluations, in the meantime they would be getting the same degree of protection as conservation areas. The second tool kit option is the zoning overlay. This neighborhood-specific policy option would give neighborhoods the opportunity to have distinct development standards in their neighborhoods in a certain area. And here are three examples of what a zoning overlay could look like. It could be a single-story district where second stories would not be permitted. Single story districts exist in other communities such as Sunnyvale, Palo Alto and Fremont. And the second example would be is having distinct setbacks in a certain neighborhood. For example, what you see here is the neighborhood between the gates. It is a small neighborhood in south Willow Glen that has very large lots and the houses are setback quite significantly from the

curb. About 40 to 60 feet. However, the zoning designation would allow for a setback of 25 feet. So if somebody came in and built a new house here, they would be able to be setback 25 feet from the curb. Where that would not really fit in with the pattern of developments on that street. The third example is how we would do attached garages on streets that have primarily detached garages. What we're proposing is that the detached garage be setback from the house a certain number of feet or be side loaded or simply be detached. And these are just examples. The neighborhoods could come up with their own proposals for what development standards they felt would be appropriate in their neighborhood if they met certain criteria. And these are the criteria that we're proposing. The first one would be that at least two-thirds of property owners would agree to this development. We want to make sure that there's overwhelming agreement, so that we're not providing additional regulations in areas where neighborhoods don't want it. The second criteria that the neighborhood should be clearly delineated by streets, roadways or natural courses such as creeks. The neighborhood must consist of a minimum number of homes, and this could be based on the original tracts of the development. And the characteristic in question must be present in at least 75% of the homes. And we'd be working these details out in the second phase when we'd be writing the ordinance at which time again, it would come back to council for approval. When presenting this to the community, the community was concerned with the two-thirds majority requirement and felt that that was too high a bar to reach. We did some research and found that other communities, when they have special districts in place, typically have at least a two-thirds requirement. However there are some communities that have changed that such as Sunnyvale. They started with a two-thirds majority for requiring a single story district and changed it to 55%. So we'd be working those details out in the second phase. The third tool kit option is the design guidelines overlay which would provide communities with an extra layer of protection through the single family house permit where we would be reviewing alterations additions and new construction according to neighborhood specific guidelines. And we would be drafting those guidelines in coordination with a consultant. The criteria for designation would be the same as the zoning overlay however, communities would have to be able to pay for the consultant's work to draft the guidelines and staff work that would be involved. The process would be costly and would take at least a year. However, the result would be more flexible than the zoning overlay proposal. Because for example, in an Eichler neighborhood, the neighborhood could decide that they want to do a second story, as long as it was sensitive to the surrounding houses in the existing neighborhood. And so that would be reviewed according to Eichler-specific design guidelines. I would like to conclude with a reiteration of the fact that for any of these policy options involved, we would have to revise the municipal code, and there are no resources currently in place for that process. We're proposing that the citywide option for demolitions and the conservation study area, if there are any resources available, would be implemented first, as those are easier to achieve and address the more urgent concerns, and the zoning and design guidelines overlay would be implemented as measures of the general plan update a few years down the line. We would like to recommend that this go to the full council for their actions. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you for your presentation. Are there any questions or comments from my colleagues? Councilmember Oliverio.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, Councilmember Campos. I wanted to thank Planning staff that have been working on this for the past ten months and the entire council that unanimously passed this last year to go forward to provide some measure of protection to residential neighborhoods. We're going to grow as a city, and we want to be able to provide some new tools to allow residents to protect their neighborhoods and the character of those neighborhoods. There's four broad ideas that would come to council and then we would then decide you know what to fund to actually go implement certainly demolitions go a long way in not losing character of a home, as will happen often. The others take more time and more ownership from the individuals, as it's noted, it's very private property rights oriented. With that I would just want to say thank you and I would certainly at the proper time make the motion to have this go to the entire council for its discussion and to see what we decide to fund what portion of it.

>> Councilmember Campos: I will call on you for the motion after my colleagues have had a chance. Is there anyone -- Vice Mayor Chirco.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I just had a question. You talked about 1945 as being a cutoff point, because it was after World War II, versus 50 years. How would you -- because with 50 years, that would be a rolling number, and five years down the road we now have houses that would qualify that hadn't previously. Now, how would you handle that, if people who previously didn't fall under this now fall under it?

>> Well, that is the --

>> Councilmember Chirco: That was just one of the possibilities outlined.

>> Right, thank you. That is really the idea of the rolling date, that it would take into account houses as -- as the date rolls forward. That is one of the advantages but also possibly disadvantage of choosing that option. In San José, really, we're trying to target the older homes, what's happened since the 19 '50s is that the city grew tremendously and very quickly. And there are lots of tracts out there that could qualify relatively soon to be under that 50 year category. And if we choose that rolling date we may not really want to review every single proposal for demolition. So that's one of the issues we've taken into account. If you choose a set date, it has the disadvantage that it's not rolling over. But we would really be more focused on those areas where we would want to preserve houses. And we would be able to revive that date, let's say in five years if we felt that now there are additional homes that are significant that we think that could potentially be significant, we'd want to look at those.

>> Councilmember Chirco: And then one last question. If a house did qualify as significant, I can understand not ceding a demolition. But what if something is of interest, but not significant? What would be the requirements or the varying degrees of significance?

>> Well, what we're proposing currently is that as they come in with a single family house permit, they come in with a lower level single family house permit that didn't require public hearing, and we would require a historic evaluation with that submittal. So we are looking at more of the historic significance of the house. What you're asking is, if the house was not necessarily historically significant but might have architectural elements that could potentially be significant. And we would look at those in the review process, that house, if it's an older house, it would come in, and we would review that. But we couldn't stop the applicant from actually demolishing it if it didn't have any historic significance. But we could look at possibly including that in our considerations. Yeah, and, well, if the house was determined to be historically significant, that would bump the application to a category 2 single-family house permit, which requires a public hearing. So it would be a more transparent process to the public.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Yeah, I know, one of our staff had been attending the outreach meetings, and the question had come up about, if the house qualified as a structure of merit, but it didn't qualify as historically significant, what would be the requirements?

>> Okay, so a structure of merit does fall within the historically significant character, it's just less -- less historically significant than a city landmark. And both those cases, if it's a structure of merit or a city landmark, we're proposing that it bump up to a category 2 single family house permit that would require public hearing. If it's a structure of merit we would work with the applicant to try and see if there are other alternatives to demolishing the home, and see if we can come to some compromise. But in any case, the public would be able to weigh, in as well. If it's a city landmark that is a much stricter process.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Are there any other questions, comments? I have two speakers and you have two minutes. It is Kevin R. Fish. Come to the microphone.

>> Thank you, members of the committee. I looked at this plan, and I --

>> Councilmember Campos: Kevin, if you get right in front of the microphone so we can hear you. Well, they're recording it, so the people that are watching can hear you, as well.

>> Thank you. I endorsed this plan. It's a pretty good plan. There are a couple of points I want to focus on. I like the idea for a citywide permit for demolition of older homes. So that kind of demolition kind of bothers me, especially if they're historic buildings with historical significance. And I like the idea of this preserving physical characteristics of the neighborhood, in terms of historical significance. But to me, and to historians in general, historical significance is not just putting a plaque on a building that says Dr. Bascom lived here or something. We're talking about the causes and the consequences not just in the local area but in any state wide

implications or national obligations or even international. So talk about historical significance, it's not just trivial pursuits. That's what I'm trying to say here and it's a pretty good plan. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. Next one is Brian Grayson.

>> Hi, thank you. Just a couple of quick comments. I'm representing preservation action council. We're supportive of the plan. We appreciate all the efforts that have gone into this and all the public outreach. A couple of concerns that we do have, though, in order to see this program succeed. And we do think the two-thirds requirement could well prevent that from succeeding, that reaching that threshold of two-thirds for anything, as most of you are aware, is close to impossible to achieve. And also, with the 75% characteristic of the neighborhood we'd like some review of that, too. While understanding the need to ensure there's buy-in from the neighborhood but having those kinds of requirements just seem very likely to be unreachable. And we also would be supportive of the rolling 50-year time line, because for some of the reasons that have been raised here that you'll lose too many buildings and too many structures with the 1945 date. I understand the concern about some of the other neighborhoods, that were built that fall into that 50-year category, I think that certain requirements can be put into place so that the neighborhoods that clearly are not significant would not necessarily have to be -- require those kinds of demolition reviews. But without having the 50-year plan I think you would lose too many structures. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. At this point, if there is no other public comments, I'm going to call on Councilmember Oliverio, and in the motion, if you could also cross-reference for council.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, Councilmember Campos. So I'd move to move Planning's recommendation to the entire city council, and staff, thank you.

>> Councilmember Chirco: I'll second that.

>> Councilmember Campos: Good, so all those in favor? [ ayes ]

>> Councilmember Kalra: That passes unanimously. Thank you for your presentation. At this point we are moving to 3.5, which is neighborhood commission.

>> Leslye Krutko: Good afternoon, I'm Leslye Krutko, director of housing, I have with me Lee Price, the City Clerk, and Laura Lam, who heads up the strong neighborhoods initiative program. Also across the way from me I need to note another team member, Norberto Dueñas. We have all been working on the followup to boards and commission. It was in September of 2007 that the council first took action with respect to the neighborhood commissions, approving the establishment of the commission and then asking that the city staff, in setting up that commission, do a few things. One of them is to make sure that the commission did not duplicate the efforts of other commissions and that the work was defined in a way that would be additive to the work much the city and its departments and the city council itself. Also that the neighborhoods commission not be involved in land use decisions, which would conflict with the Planning Commission. And until an annual work plan was completed and approved by the council, no decisions would be made about city staffing or budget requirements. One of the big pieces that the council asked for was that staff return with an analysis of all boards and commissions to look at what they did, if there was any duplication, if there was any opportunity for consolidation or elimination. So with that direction, it is actually a fairly large assignment. We went back, and we've divided it into three pieces. Went back and did a lot of work looking at the existing boards and commissions, found that there wasn't a lot of structure, not a lot of continuity between the boards and commissions on what their structure was, what they required, whether they did an annual report, whether they had bylaws, all of those things. And that -- we do have a report attached to our memo, that does go through some of the information that we collected, that helps put in one place what the authority of the boards and commissions are, what their mission is, how many members, and one of the things that had been a concern is what is the cost? With that, part of that piece became work that Lee took on. And that was to try to develop some standards for boards and commissions. And that work has made a lot of progress and she can speak specifically to that if you have questions. The third part is that the part of actually coming back with a recommendation to council on any consolidations or eliminations. That part is not ready yet. We do want to spend time, we have some initial ideas, but we need to do the outreach to the boards and commissions themselves which has not been done. But the second part we think really needs to move

forward, which is the neighborhood commissions piece. We don't want to hold back anymore on starting the neighborhoods commission while we finish this other work. We think we're at a point where we can develop a work plan that's not going to be duplicative, now that we know what all the other boards and commissions do, and what their scopes are, and we're worried that it's taken this amount of time to get started. We have people who are ready to start work. So with that, just as an introduction, I'm going to hand it over to Laura to have her tell you more about the neighborhoods commission plan. And then if you have questions on part 1 or part 3, Lee and Norberto and I are there to talk about that.

>> Thank you, Leslye, good afternoon. I think following council's approval in September 2007, staff went to work with creating caucuses in each of the districts to be able to have neighborhood groups select or to nominate neighborhood commissioners and alternates. We also looked to see what measure of support can be provided internal to the strong neighborhoods team, what internal capacity we had to actually support the neighborhoods commission. As you see here in the report here, we are recommending that the neighborhoods commission itself be supported with existing root personnel within the strong neighborhoods and development center team. In terms of the issue of scope of work and work plan what you have before you is really a three month work plan that allows us to start the work of establishing this commission. It allows us to go through a training process well informed by the work of Lee and Leslye about how we want to set up boards and commissions the right way, learning with what we've learned from actual boards and commissions analysis. As you'll see, sort of month one, month two, month three, we really see those first three months to be very critical as to how are staff going to work together, how are we going to support the commission, what are the critical skills and tools that the neighborhood commissioners will need to be a successful pilot, and how to be a successful commission. What we also want to be able to do is build in some time for staff to work with the neighborhood commissioners to put together a draft proposal that we can then share and discuss with this committee in terms of finalizing that actual scope of the work that will be the work of the commission. So as Leslye indicated we are really looking for an opportunity to get this neighborhood commission underway, have specific guidelines for how we establish the working staff, and then be able to good thinking in terms of staff neighborhood commissioners, senior staff, about how we think this commission can be value-added to the city, and then come back to this entity for discussion and the ultimate approval of the work plan going forward.

>> Councilmember Campos: Is that the end of the presentation? Thank you. Are there any questions or comments from my colleagues? Vice Mayor Chirco.

>> Councilmember Chirco: In this rather lengthy process I know our district has lost one of our neighborhood commissioners that had been selected by the caucus process. And there was no alternative selected. What do we do now?

>>> You had to ask that question. When we were going through the records we had afternoon alternate listed for district 9. We were checking up with this recently, we were going to follow in with the alternate to see if she was still interested.

>> Councilmember Chirco: She was not voted in.

>> Ernest, do you want to address that?

>> Yeah, we went through the ballots and she was selected in the second round. The first round went ahead and elected the first three commissioner nominees. So we're rechecking to make sure, since it's been about a year now, whether or not she's still available as an alternate, and we're going through the notes to make sure that she either was selected or wasn't. So we'll clarify that in about a day or so.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Do you have minutes of those meetings? Because the community had indicated they wish not to select an alternative.

>> Right, that's why we want to check it, because there were a couple of caucuses that said that. And we just want to make sure that we give you the most accurate information. The league was taking minutes at each of the meetings, so when we got this question this morning, we decided to go back and look at the ballots and then look at the minutes. So we can give you a definitive answer in about a day or so then.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Okay, I appreciate that.

>> Councilmember Campos: I want to ask a follow-up question on that. If -- and I'm not just addressing this to district 9, but if there was no one selected, do you go back and contact everybody and do a re-vote or what would be the process, the fall-back process?

>> At this point I think our hope would be to bring before council the list of the nominee then the alternate. When have you an instance where you don't have a slot or you don't have a person ready to fill a slot, we were actually hoping to establish a protocol with the neighborhoods commission that would be approved with this actual council committee. I think the preliminary discussion with the neighborhood leaders that were helping to put the framework around the neighborhoods commission concept was to do an ad hoc neighborhood caucus to try to keep in the spirit of having neighborhood groups themselves select nominees for council consideration. What we'd like to be able to do is certainly set up as much structure as possible but then build in opportunity to get the good input of the neighborhood commissioners and the help of this committee to put something else formal in place.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. Any other questions? Councilmember Chu.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm just really happy to see that we finally have a work plan to move forward. And also want to take this opportunity to thank one of my constituents, Gail Suichi here. She was very, very involved in the neighborhood caucus to help District 4 to select our neighborhood commissioners.

>> Councilmember Campos: Any other questions? Norberto.

>> Norberto Dueñas: I just want to acknowledge the good work of staff, Lee and her office. Leslye and Maria Haas, who is in the audience on this analysis, and Laura and Ernest, and also, all the departments. We really had to reach out to almost every single department in the city that work with boards and commissions to be able to gather this information. And we want to thank them all, and last but not least we really want to thank the council for their patients, as we move forward on this analysis and certainly all the neighborhood commissioners that are out there and anxious to get to work, we thank them also.

>> Councilmember Campos: And I will add to those thanks. We thank the commissioners for being patient, and still being part of the process, and still being eager to serve the City of San José. And I'm excited about this. I didn't realize that two years went by so fast. So to the staff and to the future commissioners, thank you, and we look forward to the work that will come out of this particular commission that will be able to assist the council as we move forward. So with that I need to get a motion as well as a cross-reference to the full council.

>> Councilmember Chu: So move.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: Councilmember Oliverio, before we approve.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, Councilmember Campos. I'll be supporting this, of course. And just a quick question, I've asked this before, but no one really had an answer. In Portland and in Honolulu, cities that have neighborhoods commissions, what are the topics they're dealing with?

>> One of the primary topics that comes to mind is actually the shaping of civic engagement. So when you have cities that have an interest in involving their residents in shaping policies, programs, et cetera is using neighborhood commissioners themselves to figure out what is an effective way to reach out to the community on whatever particular project is coming their way.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Great, and any others, or simply --

>> That to me strikes me as the common theme. I think beyond that, it probably varies. I mean, certainly a municipality may have stipulations similar to San José which may preclude or suggest they focus on certain items, but that seems to be more the general theme.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Okay, thank you.

>> Councilmember Campos: All those in favor. [ ayes ]

>> Councilmember Campos: That passes unanimously. Thank you. This time we're going to have an update on the CAP grant program, and we just need to accept this report.

>> Madam Chair, councilmembers, Ernest Guzman, community services supervisor, neighborhood development center, which oversees the CAP grant. We are giving you a report today. In the budget message that Mayor Reed issued last year, he requested an annual report to this committee. I don't know if you had a report before, but certainly we're going to keep doing this as long as the CAP grant is in existence. So this is really talking about this year's cycle. These are the definitions of what the CAP grant program is about. Most of you have constituents that apply for the CAP grant, and really, they're about developing neighborhood groups, and their ability to go ahead and provide services to themselves and to their communities. So as a result, we have a process where we have about \$200,000 per year that are available for this program. I wanted to put this in context in relation to going into cycle 23's discussion. We normally have \$190,000 available. Although it's \$200,000 available total for the program, we give \$10,000 per year to a fiscal agent to manage the money, disburse the checks, and actually help to monitor the contracts. So \$190,000 is available on an annual basis. In Cycle 22, which was last year, 72 applications were received, for a total of 735,173. As you can see, if we only have \$190,000 available to give out, the demand is tremendous, and so the competition becomes fairly fierce to be able to get any kind of award. The CAP review committee awarded in its first go-round, \$173,964 to 58 groups. Last year, I put together a reserve fund for appeals, because there are groups that are denied getting any funding initially and then there's a second category where we allow groups that feel if they need more money and can make a case to the committee they can compete for additional moneys that we have in the -- in this case, \$15,460 that were available for the appeals. And we actually gave out all that money, except for about \$500. So the money was begin out almost in total. And there was a period where this program went through a series of ask discussions about what's the best way to serve the community. So last year, what I instituted in relation to this program were focus groups afterwards. In order to develop a better way to go ahead and do business with the community. There were four focus groups that were held, one in September over at the Cambrian branch library with the community at large and which we received about 40 people that showed up. There was a second one with the actual CAP review committee. Because we wanted to have an opportunity to go ahead and have them tell us what they felt needed to be improved. The second -- the third focus group was with the mayor and council staff. We felt -- because we felt it was important that in a lot of cases the constituents were going directly to the mayor's staff, the council's staff and saying we're having problems with the CAP grant, we don't know, you know, you can help us out? And so we felt, you know, what are you folks hearing? What is it request we do to improve the process. The final one was in the East San José, importantly to have it in the neighborhood development center but also to go out to an area that has been traditionally underserved and provide translation services to get more folks and that was about 35 people that attended that one. So we had a good reference point in which to start making changes. And these are the changes that came out as a result of those four focus groups. We actually updated and got our Web page up and running. It had been static for about two years. And now people can actually look at online FAQs that can give them preliminary answers. And then we have an ability to answer those fairly quickly. We also did something different. We found that a lot of folks were giving us applications, and they were missing basic elements, like their budget sheet, their board of directors, and things like that. So we offered a service to folks that said we're going to do a preliminary screening, not on the narratives, not on the merit of your proposals, but whether or not you have everything that you need to move forward. And so we actually got a good response, and people sent us their applications. You know, if they were missing a budget sheet, if they were missing a board of directors, listing whatever it was just to get through the first screening, we had that as an added service, and it actually helped people put together their proposals much more efficiently this year. Things that were missing in the past was, because we didn't have enough money to give out, were a sense of what people felt were their number one priorities. If you could only get one aspect of your project funded, why don't you rate it for us. Because otherwise, the committee had to make guesses as to what was most important. So we put down a 1, 2, 3, 4, let us know what your top priority is if you only could get one thing funded. And this actually helped people put together better

proposals. It focused them on the reality that there wasn't as much money, so you really had to figure out from your perspective as a community group what was it that you wanted to provide to the community. Then the other thing was, there seemed to be a lot of confusion over the years about what -- what the grant intent. What was it that people were competing for? We had groups that kept applying over and over and over again and they kept getting money but as a result there were new groups that were emerging because of the fact that the city is asking for new groups to represent neighborhoods. And we wanted to be clear that the groups knew what the intent was. And so we went back into the history of what the CAP grants were all about. And in our training sessions, this year we had five training sessions. We went through and very carefully explained to people, this is why you should be applying, and this are the parameters of what you should be putting in your proposals. And that actually helped focus folks in their thinking about what they were asking for. We got the traditional amount of National Night Outs and other activities that are always being asked for, but we also got some creative endeavors that were coming through on emergency preparedness and other things that groups hadn't thought about in relation to applying for moneys. Then they also had another idea that said, you know what, as we go forward and we apply for moneys, sometimes we don't know what we're asking for or how we should put together our proposals. And so what we suggested was, and it actually came out of a focus group in Cambrian is they wanted to talk to themselves. So we had a community cafe over at the neighborhood development center. I facilitated the discussion but it was them talking to themselves about what had worked in the past. And this was interesting because we had a variety of new groups apply and they were interested in what they could do to be successful in applying for limited money. So this was a first-time endeavor to get them to talk to themselves and get them to develop good proposals based on a mentoring process of what had worked in the past and what could work for them. This is what we ended up this year. There were \$190,000 available. We received 68 applications for a total amount requested of \$572,399. You see that's down from the \$735,000 the year before. Part of that came from the training, where we asked people, because the range is from 300 to 15,000, a lot of people were asking for the top limit. And so we said, listen, if you're going to be applying be realistic. And just don't simply apply because you think you can get all of the money. Really focus on what you can ask for and you can actually do. Because we've had instances in the past where people overpromise what they can do, and then if they don't do it, they have to give the money back to us. So I think the training emphasizes the plan that there were limited funds, they were in a competitive pool, and we wanted them to be realistic about what they could manage in their actual processes. So it brought it down significantly, and that didn't mean that people weren't competitive. It just simply meant that they were more realistic about what they were doing. So we were initially awarded \$179,240 to 15 groups. And nine groups were ruled ineligible. We set aside again \$15,000 which actually went to six, almost 17,000 because one group decided they couldn't manage their grant amount and returned the money and actually just refused to receive the money. We had our appeal on May 2nd. At that time, we gave out the balance of the dollars. Of the four groups that applied that were originally ruled ineligible one received a provisional grant award and pretty much everybody else that applied and asked for additional money and they have to come and do a walk-through as to why they should receive money, not just simply say we want more money, but actually justify why this amount that we could potentially give to them would be beneficial in doing what they need to do in the community. The group awarded all moneys except for about \$700. So we're pretty much where we are, in relation to last year. Our goal is to give out all the money that we possibly can, and to improve the process as we move forward. So that's a snapshot of where we are with the process to date. And I'll be happy to answer any specific questions you may have.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. Are there any questions? No questions. Just one question. Regarding the nine groups that were ineligible, what were some of the things that made them not able to move forward in the process?

>> There's a definition that's actually put in the RFP that defines a group's eligibility in terms of a neighborhood group. These groups that applied, as a rule, were new groups. They -- they didn't meet the eligibility to be a neighborhood group, whether they're a business association, or they're a group that maybe not open to the public as a rule, so we're very specific in answering them, saying you do not meet the definition, we attach the definition, and most of those groups did not appeal the -- their not being able to participate. Of the groups that did appeal, one group did not provide its bylaws, and its financials, even though they were asked before the decision. They provided them afterwards, but the committee said, you know, it's too late. It's not fair to everybody else that had the opportunity to do it. And the other groups that applied were for very specific examples that didn't fall into the definition of not being able to be -- apply, but for instance they were delinquent in some of their past grants that

they hadn't finalized, and that automatically eliminates them. And we had told that to them beforehand, but they wanted to come in and make their case.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. First of all do you remember what year the CAP grants started? I want to say was it 15 years, 16 years?

>> I think it's anywhere from 15 to 17 years. I've been trying to track it down quite a while. Obviously, when it's cycle 23, it's going into cycle 24, it's been a while.

>> Councilmember Campos: It has, but it has been successful, and we've actually gotten a lot of community groups to participate. It's been a great resource. I hope it stays around for a while.

>> Yeah, to that effect, one of the things that we noticed last year was that this is the only city that has any kind of fund for this type of neighborhood activity. I think there's a smaller pot of money in I think it's Mountain View, on a much smaller scale. And actually, the only other groups funding this types of activities was community foundation Silicon Valley, and they have stopped doing that. So for San JosÉ residents this is the only pot of money around.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you for that information. If there are no other questions, we just need to get a motion to accept the report.

>> Councilmember Chu: So moved.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Second.

>> Councilmember Campos: All those in favor? [ Ayes ]

>> Councilmember Campos: That passes unanimously. So it looks like we just have the schools city collaborative, monthly update, and that's a verbal report.

>> Norberto Dueñas: No formal report today, members of the committee. Just a reminder that the next collaborative is on Wednesday, June the 10th.

>> Councilmember Campos: You know what, I apologize. I'm sorry. We have Marie Arnold, who would like to speak on this item. Who is neighborhood commission. Okay, so why don't you come up. Go ahead, I just saw it right now, and that's what threw me off. Please go ahead.

>> Hi. I'm one of your neighborhood commissioners. And I just wanted you to know what I was doing to get ready, when we're on. And one thing is to -- I've gone to all the meetings in our neighborhood, or most of them. I've -- just to learn who the -- well, to tell them who I was and to learn the leaders in that group. And what their culture was and what their problems were. Because we're in district 2, and we have a wide range of people. Different kinds of people. And their problems are a lot different, depending on what neighborhood association you are. For instance, the Hayes people meet at the Hayes mansion. I mean, it was like we were at the White House or something, it was so gorgeous. And anyhow, the other thing we've done is that due to Ernest Guzman and Laura Lam, Dottie Barney gave us three wonderful Saturday afternoons of neighbors in the chambers where you walk through, how you approach the city, you know, how do you break into the City Hall, you know, which way, in the argument, you know, you get there. And so that was very beneficial. And Ash Kalra has had three sessions already at our new Edenvale library. One was some guy talking about the bullet train that is going to happen. And the other was Mayor Reed's budget guy, Armando spoke to us on another instance. So I'm trying to bone up, so that you know, I can jump in when it's time to be ready.

>> Councilmember Campos: Well, thank you. I'm glad that we were able to hear your comments. Norberto, anything else?

>> Norberto Dueñas: And that's it. Again the reminder was that the school-cities collaborative next meeting is on Wednesday, June 10th and we'll be reporting out the results of that meeting at our next NSC.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. At this point, anyone that would like to address the committee, has an opportunity to do at this time. There is no one so meeting adjourned. Thank you.