



**Wednesday December 7, 2022**

11:00 am – 1:00 pm

Webex

**Board Members Present:** Cesar Garcia, Willard Brown, Jamie Madden, Kaleb Germinaro, Mark R. Jones, Lindsay Goes Behind, Diana Paredes, Evelyn Allen, and Quanlin Hu

**Absent:** Maria-Jose “Cote” Soerens, Abdi Yusuf, and Sophia Benalfew

**Welcome & Public Comment**

**Approve Board Minutes:**

Bana Abera, EDI AB Facilitator

*Minutes revised as necessary and approved by Board Members*

- Meeting minutes affirmed by Cesar Garcia and move to approve November minutes, Willard Brown seconds.

Call for additional edits/comments

- All in favor as is – all
- No - Nay or abstain 0
- Abstain 0

**2023 EDI Fund Demonstrative Walk Through**

Michael Blumson: We need a check on the timeline. Staff needs to send an email to get updates from applicants/projects on their application and projects to ensure information is up to date.

Over the last month, since the last meeting, staff went through the criteria and priorities you all set and figure out if we can actually put projects through this screening and come out with something on the other side.

**Presentation attached**

Tier 1 for

Capital Funding include: Immediate risk of displacement, near-miss, and target under-represented communities

Land Acquisition include: immediate risk of displacement, received previous EDI funds, and near-miss

Capacity Building includes: We’re looking at if projects are awarded 2023 capital funds they would not receive capacity-building under the theory that if they are that ready to go, they should have the same need for building back-end systems., awarded 2023 Land Acq.-automatic award since there’s an assumption that due diligence and closing costs would need to be covered somehow, Some new projects based on the near-miss criteria.



If we need additional input on policy questions going through this process with the board we need to be mindful of conflict of interests and potential schedule an ad hoc meeting to accommodate conflict of interest. If staff can't make these decisions and need guidance from the Board we'll need an ad-hoc meeting to walk through the sticking points..

Staff started allocated based on tiers. Tier 1 is immediate risk of displacement and this includes already displaced communities and there is some thinking through to do here because what's the length of time the community has been displaced for. For example, does an organization that was displaced 20 years ago but has stably settled into a different neighborhood still have the same risks as one that was displaced 5 years ago.

Near-miss is projects that haven't gotten funded previous although they were rated high and if they have a project idea and need capacity building support. This one is more complicated because capacity building is wide and various—feasibility study and due diligence and scoping to sustaining technical support or hire consultant for technical assistance.

Land Acquisitions awards often require the capacity building funds as well to hire technical support for due diligence, etc.

Board member: with regards to the capacity building, it seems there will be a lot of players, what is the role of the consultants they hire and are they involved on this kind of level?

Michael: When EDI first started, we made an intentional decision to not hire intermediaries by EDI, and this means EDI is hands off with what projects do in terms of hiring a consultant and get to decide themselves.

Part of the question for the Board is, do we pull money from EDI to hire intermediaries and does this align with our values and is this part of a bigger Board strategy?

Here are the numbers and how we draw funds down and what's remaining. We go by tiers and draw down based on that.

Tier 4 is where we start noticing under-invested communities and identify the gaps.

Capacity Building is where we start getting into challenges because there's many good projects and needs and staff would need to align the priorities and urgency and filling for projects that meets EDI's gaps, ex: like organization serving youth.

Looking at the pool overall, so far it looks like there is a good distribution of neighbors and project types and align it with the balance of the program and being equitable as much as we can be until we develop better tools and criteria. The total project to fund looks like:

- 10 Capital Funding
- 10 Land Acquisition
- 32 Capacity Building (including new and renewing for existing projects)



There is concerns for staff around the number of capacity building staff would be taking on in 2023 and the capacity to support this number of capacity projects.

Board member: what would it looks like to serve the two-fers? What are the overall with projects that may have synergy within communities?

Michael B: we haven't had a lot of success in suggesting projects work together, on the surface it makes sense, but as the City it comes with baggage the Institution telling community to partner and we've been careful not to do this because it suggests a directive from the City rather than an innocent suggestion, but this may be something for community to do for itself.

Board member: how do support community coming together to decide for themselves.

Board member: how do we support community to make decisions for themselves because how can they make the right decision on a consultant if they don't know. What info/knowledge do they need to make the appropriate decisions.

Board member: For project type, can we make it more defined and clearer? For capacity building, we call out feasibility studies and not the other types?

Michael B: the interest we have in doing this is more to balance the criteria and the outcome of our process and distributing the intention of the EDI project. Historically, EDI aims to fund shovel ready projects, but from a capacity building perspective how do projects get to being shovel ready and construction? This also leads to leaving certain communities behind and certain projects behind and doesn't align with the intention and goals of EDI.

Board member: which capacity awards are automatically awarded because the applicant is getting land acq. funds and which ones are basically just capacity/new projects

Michael B: I can't do that because of the concept. But in the Summary of Funding graph, there are 10 Land Acquisition projects. In theory, the intention was, to prioritize clearly the projects that are moving through the development stage and didn't receive capital funding and if the scope of the feasibility is well thought out or is it not fully fleshed out. Plus, you shouldn't get a bonus because you have good relationship with City staff. We're intending to ask questions about the feasibility and our goal is to move projects along and get them closer in a tangible way. If we start to see that these are not the outcomes we want to see, then we need to do an ad hoc meeting to address this.

Bana: The preliminary analysis suggests that about 10 projects would receive capital funding, 10 would receive land acquisition funding, and there would be about 32 capacity-building awards. Of the capacity-building awards, 11 would be renewals and the remaining applications would be new organizations.

Board member: in re to capacity building, the point around having more contracts in comparison to what staff is able to do because of capacity is important. What I have seen and potentially doing is prioritizing communities that haven't been included and emerging organizations and magnitude of their work. If we do decrease the number of capacity building funds, we don't want to deter energy orgs and smaller grants have a big role in support organizations and not only focusing on the bigger funding.



Michael: it may be important to revisit if the \$75k capacity building cap is still appropriate or needs to change.

Board members: Can you please remind me again the timeline on deciding 2023 EDI Criteria

Michael B: sending this with short notice to community and expecting quick return would be challenging, but there are urgencies for some of the applicants. This isn't how we would normally what we would like to do, but asking if this is still the timeline we want to go with and get a gut check from the Board. Is having an end of month deadline and end of January decision sufficient based on all the factors and constraints. Also noting

Board member: I vote to move it forward given the closing dates and urgencies.

Board member: I think we have to move forward with this timeline given the updates and information needed.

Board member: agree with Jamie, also feel like folks haven't heard from EDI, so that communication is helpful

Board member: agreed.

Michael B: another process question is putting a calendar hold on your calendars for January after data/information is collected and if staff has questions or concerns to address it with Board and get Board's decision.

## **EDI 2.0 Strategy & Subcommittees Report Back**

### **Executive Committee:**

How to support Michael's work and provide feedback and what the overall need of the Board would be. Also discussed, the EDI Division Manager position and getting the job description in front of those fit the role and the difficult OPCD is having getting the right people to applied.

### **Policy Committee:**

Deep dive on how EDI considers Public Benefits and contracting process. Through covenants—this is the policy area this committee has decided to focus on. Since EDI's inception, this has been a critical concern and question on how the City values Public Benefits and if it's alignment with EDI's values and goals.

### **Storytelling/Data/Evaluation Committee:**

The work we focused on moving forward is how we will engage the community is through a website landing page—bios, project descriptions, how we accept input and questions from



community. Different platforms and ways this can be done. Not sure if this will be stand alone or within the OPCD website and what community would be receptive to.  
Information sharing amongst community and getting back to the EDI Convenings.

### **Youth & Community Engagement Committee:**

Discussed how to move processed forward and how to engage youth and how to go about doing that. Discussed engaging orgs where they are and Kaleb provided us with a flow chart on how to support moving orgs through different stages. Will convene and work on this and bring it back to the overall board.

Flow chart is to track projects and to support grantees to understand where they're at in the process and as a tool for accountability and also support staff. This can also be a tools for other committees.

Discussed potentially organizing a convening at the end of 2023.

### **Ad hoc Comprehensive Plan:**

The Comp Plan is doing in community presentation and solicit input and feedback. The week of 12/5—there is a meeting happening in Delridge.

#### **Additional Subcommittee Questions:**

Board member: I thought we hired a consultant for the community engagement, and they were supposed to come to a board meeting to provide updates?

Staff: Will track down the notes from the Comp Plan Ad Hoc meeting and will send it out. And we can invite BDS and consultant to a future meeting to provide updates.

### **EDI Division Manager Hiring Update**

General hiring update is resume review on 10 applicants that met the criteria is today. And we are currently on schedule for hiring in Jan. First round interview is happening the week of December 12<sup>th</sup>.

Board member: Last update was that those 10 applicants were being reviewed. Are those applicants moving forward?

Staff: HR has gone through the applicants that meet minimum qualifications.

### **Announcements & Adjourn**