City of Eugene
Human Rights Commission

Human Rights Commission Meeting 5/17/16
Packet Contents

Draft Agenda	Page 1
Minutes from 3/15/16	Page 3 - 15
Budget Update	Page 16
Public Passenger Vehicles ADA email update	Page 17
Housing First Resolution (Passed 5/9/16)	Page 18 - 19
Work Group Updates and Supporting Document	
Anti-Discrimination Work Group Update	Page 20

City of Eugene
Human Rights Commission

The mission of the Human Rights Commission is to promote implementation of universal human rights values and principles in all City of Eugene programs and throughout the wider community.

To carry out this mission the commission shall affirm, encourage and initiate programs and services within the City of Eugene and in the wider community designed to place priority upon protecting, respecting, and fulfilling the full range of universal human rights as enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To support and promote human rights, the commission will: provide human rights education, be proactive in human rights efforts, address human rights violations, ensure active public participation, be transparent and open, and be publicly accountable for human rights progress.

Human Rights Commissioners: Chris Nunes (Chair), Jennifer Frenzer (Vice Chair), Andrew Thomson, Ken Neubeck, Edward Goehring, Philip Carrasco, Edward McGlone, Arun Toke, Debra Merskin, Bonnie Souza, Councilor Chris Pryor

Staff: Mike Kinnison

The Human Rights Commission typically meets on the third Tuesday of each month.

Tuesday, May 17th, 2016

5:30 – 7:30 PM Meeting

Atrium Building, Sloat Room, 99 W. 10th Avenue, Eugene

Contact: Jennifer Lleras Van Der Haeghen, 541-682-5619, jennifer.e.vanderhaeghen@ci.eugene.or.us

ITEM	ACTION	TIME
1. Agenda/Minutes Review and Approval (Chair)	Discuss/Vote	5:30 - 5:40 (10 min)
2. Public Comment (Chair)		5:40 - 5:50 (10 min)
3. Support Request (Chair)	Discuss/Vote	5:50 – 5:55 (5 min)
4. Healthy Downtown and Public Passenger Vehicle Ordinance		5:55 – 6:20 (25min)
5. Faye Stewart and Immigration Letter		6:20 – 6:30 (10 min)
6. Housing First Update		6:30 – 6:35 (5 min)
7. Council Update		6:35 – 6:50 (15 min)
8. Commission Liaison Updates		6:50 – 7:00 (10 min)
9. Work Group Funding Requests		7:00 – 7:10 (10 min)
10. Work Group Lead Updates		7:10 – 7:20 (10 min)

DRAFT

11. Staff Update 7:20 – 7:25 (5 min)

12. Announcements 7:2 5 – 7:30 (5 min)

Upcoming events, activities or meetings the HRC needs to be aware of:

June 3rd, 4:30 – 8:00pm, Off the Waffle and Bascom-Tykeson Room, Downtown Youth Event: Youth Resources, Music, Art and Free Waffles! Human Rights Commission, CALC and Off the Waffle

June 9th, 5:30 – 8:30pm, EPD Headquarters, Eugene Police Commission and Human Rights Commission Joint meeting

June 14th, 7:00pm, Unitarian Universalist Church, Documentary film "50 feet from Syria", UU Church

June 26th, 4:00 – 7:00pm, Northwest Youth Corps, Social Justice Summer Party, McKenzie River Gathering Foundation

DRAFT

The Eugene Human Rights Commission welcomes your interest in these agenda items. This meeting location is wheelchair accessible. For the hearing impaired, FM-assistive listening devices are available or an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hours' notice. To arrange for these services, contact staff at (541) 682-5177.

La Comisión de Derechos Humanos agradece su interés por participar en los asuntos de esta agenda. El local de la reunión tiene acceso para personas en silla de ruedas. Para las personas con dificultades auditivas ofrecemos sistemas FM para ayudarlo a escuchar, o intérpretes de lenguaje de señas. También ofrecemos intérpretes de español. Si necesita cualquiera de estos servicios por favor solicítelos con 48 horas de anticipación, llamando al (541) 682-5177.

MINUTES
Tuesday, April 19, 2016
5:30 – 7:30 PM Meeting
Atrium Building, Sloat Room, 99 W. 10th Avenue, Eugene

Present:
Human Rights Commissioners: Andrew Thomson, Ken Neubeck, Jennifer Frenzer, Chris Nunes, Bonnie Souza, Arun Toke, Edward McGlone, Councilor Chris Pryor
Staff: Jennifer Lleras Van Der Haeghen and Mia Cariaga
EPD Liaison: Lt. Jennifer Bills
CRB Liaison: Heather Marek

1. **Agenda/Minutes Review and Approval**

Motion: Amend to add the Nightingale proposal to the agenda. Ken moves to approve as amended.
Moved By: K. Neubeck
Second: B. Souza
Vote: Unanimous

C. Nunes: What do you all think about extending the meeting time? There is an expectation that we will be done at 7:30. Is this a realistic expectation?

A. Toke – Maybe we can discuss that next meeting.

Motion: Move to approve minutes from March 15, 2016.
Moved By: K. Neubeck
Second: A. Toke
Vote: Unanimous

2. **Public Comment**

Mary Brandhurst–
The Nightingale Public Advocacy collective is a 501C3. We've adopted model program. NPACs support people who live on sites. Looking to train about 45 people in a 40 hour training program. At the end they receive the opportunity to become certified by passing a test. The goal is to get people certified who can support people who live on site. This could lead to jobs including with the community court. Most programs like this in the nation have community support programs. Currently the first training is scheduled in June over a 2-week timeframe with 30 applicants so far. Looking to fill a void and provide training and ongoing support after that. State mandates what needs to be covered in these types of trainings. This request is to have access to a training room that we can use with white boards, accessible to transportation, with kitchen or allowed to eat.
K. Neubeck – Are you asking for money?
Mary – Not specifically though it would help. Fundraising is going slowly right now.

Councilor Pryor – How many people?
Mary – 15 plus two trainers.

Majeska Seese-Green –
Realized that Councilor Pryor is going to be talking about the community court and you'll talk about the peer support training. I'd like you to support that and give them a room. In a program like that could have real connections to the Community Court. As for the Community Court, I've been trying to follow that as best I can. I'm glad that the City got the grant. I have concerns for the people involved who don't have a legal place to sleep, usually on a diversion program you can't get the same charge again or you'll get kicked out of the diversion program. What will people who have nowhere to legally sleep do? As it develops I hope there is a community advisory body to support them. Hoping to have impacted people involved as well as the people who provide services. To this point has seemed like it is not very transparent at all.

3. Support Request
C. Nunes – We've had a lot of conversations to discuss commission guidelines for support requests. Staff is reminding us that there is a filter that we should be looking at requests through. Did we want to set up a subgroup to set up these guidelines?
J. Frenzer – There have been people who were interested in working on this. Edward Goehring for example.
C. Nunes – This keeps coming up and I'm wondering if we want to nail down a small group subcommittee?
K. Neubeck – I suggest sending out an email to see if anyone is interested?
J. Frenzer – The part we're wresting with the most is whether or not someone who gets $200 or more should expect HRC members to be at the event and wrestling with the role of the commissioners at the event. Maybe we need to narrow the focus.
C. Nunes – If we have a good cause but none of us are available I don't think that should be a good enough reason that we can't support. We can toss that question to the subcommittee.
J. Frenzer – We'll name people to this subcommittee until the next meeting.

HIV Alliance
B. Souza – Have there been any commissioners involved?
C. Nunes – I don't believe so but they're not applying for a level that stipulates that.
K. Neubeck – I don't recall them applying for anything before at least not for this event.

Motion: Move to approve the request for $100.
Made by: J. Frenzer
Second: K. Neubeck
Vote: Unanimous.

Peer Support Specialist Training
P. Carrasco – What would the funds that you'd be requesting pay for?
Mary – We're looking to pay the presenters.
K. Neubeck - Is the 21k for all three trainings?
Mary - Yes and then we're looking for additional money for future support work.
Councilor Pryor – I support the passage of this and can help secure a facility.
Motion: Move to approve support of city facility for the coming three trainings the request and $100 towards training expenses.
Made by: P. Carrasco
Second: K. Neubeck
Vote: Unanimous

Human Rights City Gathering DC
K. Neubeck – Asking for money for the Human Rights City Gathering in DC, it's something I'm personally interested in and that supports the HRC. The purpose of the gathering is to discuss Human Rights Cities in the US: lessons learned, challenges and things that we can bring back. Washington DC is a human rights city. I've got someone with the National Law Center who can put me up while I'm there. Faced with $600 in airplane costs. I can take care of part of that. If the commission could come up with part of that I would appreciate some sort of support in carrying what we're doing here out to Washington. I've been asked to plan and run a workshop as part of the conference.
J. Frenzer – Thanks for doing that.
P. Carrasco – I almost want to say that $200 isn't enough. I have a question about the budget. The budget is good through the end of June. I would suggest that we raise this to $500 in support of the trip.
K. Neubeck – Total for flight is about $600 round trip, lodging covered.
C. Nunes – Do you have other funding sources?
K. Neubeck – No.
Councilor Pryor – If you're going to spend this much of the tax payers money. How will the tax payers benefit?
K. Neubeck – I do give talks to civic groups, UO, LCC and more broadly Eugene is really on the map with regard to this concept. While we have lots of challenges and a long way to go. When people find out what's going on in the City organization they're really impressed. Because lots of times the proclamations get passed but then nothing happens. I know that here in Eugene people are doing things. The challenges lie outside of what is easily controlled in the community. A lot of cities of similar size and wealth we're doing a lot of positive things and have more to do. Recognized nationally if not internationally. The recognition would not happen without us going to events like this and sharing what we do.
Councilor Pryor – Do you think you'll be able to bring back tools that will benefit our organization?
K. Neubeck – Yes, and share what we're doing here. Mt. View California is looking to become a human rights city and they're most interested in. I would prefer $300 instead of $500.

Motion: Move to approve funding for $300 for this trip.
Made by: A. Toke
Second: P. Carrasco
Vote: unanimous

4. Housing First Resolution
C. Nunes – I understand Mia is here to give us an update, Mia will you join us?
Mia – First I want to express my thanks for taking the time for reviewing the resolution. The city attorney is now putting the resolution in a format presentable to council. This will incorporate your revisions, anything that is not integrated will be added to the AIS as revisions you'd like to see so that they can choose to add it.
K. Neubeck – Will we have an opportunity to talk to council?
Mia – This item is scheduled at the end of the 7:30 meeting, boards and commission always reserve the right to go first if you're speaking on behalf of the full committee. Not sure that council will take up in work session.
J. Frenzer – Procedural question, the work group worked very hard on the wording, what we were hoping we could do is see a draft after the city attorney raised any red flags. So that if there were major revisions we could take a look at it again. This body hasn't taken a stance on it. What we were trying to avoid was a bunch of debate and have a lot of support before the hearing happened. If there is something that can be more dissected let's take a look now. Instead of it going to council and having it weigh into the final decision.
Mia – The direction from council was for staff to develop a resolution. The staff chose to engage the HRC.

Councilor Pryor – Where is the source of the resolution coming from? It is the City Council that has asked for it. I think it's great if the HRC wants to provide recommendations and instructions on the draft. The draft that is being currently reviewed was drafted by staff.
J. Frenzer – The recommendations that we forwarded are being reviewed by the city attorney. We don't know what the revisions are. It would be great for the work group to weigh in before it ends up at council.
Councilor Pryor – If the work group wants to review and make recommendations on the draft.
J. Frenzer – That would be preferable to none at all.
Councilor Pryor – If the work group can review it and get recommendations back to the Council that could work. Endorsement would be nice but not necessary based on the procedural process.
C. Nunes - What Chris is talking about is two versions of the document. I'm worried that the language doesn't match the intention and there were revisions that come from that. What if the attorney comes back and misses the intention. If we were to go back and forth there is a mutually acceptable middle ground there with time. Without going through that what does council do when they get a draft that is attorney approved?
Councilor Pryor – My preference is not to have two versions. What would be best is if the city attorney's version is significantly different than the recommendations that we move forward one draft that is amicable to both.
J. Frenzer – We were hoping to look at it before the meeting. It's an important tool and I don't want public debate about a tool that everyone feels good about.
Councilor Pryor – This resolution is useful as it gives direction how that plays out in operation will be worked out later. Want to be sure the policy is clear on the intention. I would recommend that as soon as it's done the work group review it and the councilor can try to reconcile as quickly as possible.
C. Nunes – The City Attorney may agree and then this could be a moot point. If the draft that we're presenting is agreeable.
Councilor Pryor – Not really two versions is making comments on the version. Happy to help in whatever way I can to get you to that point.
J. Frenzer – Mia since you're already here would you want to stay and talk about the update on the outreach to experts regarding Criminalization?
C. Nunes - Do we have a motion to amend the agenda?
J. Frenzer – moved
C. Nunes – second
Approved
Mia – As you know we sent an email out to experts. Many of you were part of that, suggested experts etc. Responses are back and we're reviewing those. Our intention is to send the results to the council along with next steps. I imagine we'll be back at an HRC meeting after that is sent to council to discuss these with you.
K. Neubeck – Are you saying that what the Council will get is what we'll get. A summary of what you found?
Mia – Not a summary, all of it.
J. Frenzer – With the next steps conversation is it possible that we could be included in identifying what those are?
Mia – One of the next steps could be having this info come back to this group so that the body can weigh in.
C. Nunes – When you say 'we' do you mean staff? The other thing we could discuss is to feel out if it's worth doing another work session to digest that information.
Mia – I mean me.

Councilor Pryor – It's always a possibility that there could be another work session, I'm fine with it. It's just a potential scheduling issue.
Mia – Another thing we're balancing is moving this forward in addition to the other things that we were already moving forward. Would like to bring the information back the full HRC.

Councilor Pryor – That would be important for transparency.

5. Public Passenger Vehicle Ordinance

P. Carrasco – There has been a lot of conversation about Uber coming to town and operating and proposed ordinance language. We know that the ball is in their court to see if they'd want to go with this ordinance. I noticed that among other issues there is one specific piece of language is not part of the ordinance. I'd like to see that there be a percentage that some of these passenger vehicles could be ADA accessible. As of right now there are no rules around this and from what I understand even existing taxis don't have a percentage.

Councilor Pryor – I don't know for sure, I'd have to find that out.

P. Carrasco – This is a broader issue for us to address. We may need to go to other taxi companies to do this. A lot of people have suggested that ride share and assisted living centers have accessible buses. These are primarily for aging folks and folks that are alter-abled and this is not enough. These are folks that we need to make a case for that we're expecting our local business to have ADA accessible vehicles. There was talk about making a working group or just writing language that we could just propose to city council. If we find that language and embed it into the ordinance maybe Councilor Pryor could help guide us on moving this forward.

Councilor Pryor – It raises an interesting procedural question. Uber has caused us to open up this document and make changes to it. Even before Uber we needed to think about ADA. What is the degree of ADA accessibility that is provided by all public passenger vehicle providers? That's the larger question. If you make this dependent on Uber it becomes confusing about who is in and out. If you're disabled a traditional cab company cannot help you. There is likely a need for a taskforce to address this.

J. Van Der Haeghen – Laura Hammond is willing to come and speak with you all about ADA language for Public Passenger Vehicles. I know that she's already well aware of existing requirements and could speak to some of these questions.

P. Carrasco – I know it's not Uber specific and it would be good for this to be operating in general. I will be the lead on this task force. I'm hoping that we can do some research before we meet. We'll bring ideas back to the body.

C. Nunes – When we're talking about research not just asking these questions we'd also want to compare to other cities.

P. Carrasco – Yes I want to produce something that is manageable and are best practices in other cities.

J. Frenzer – I wondered if anyone had given any thought to seeing what Uber might do. They may do more than the City might request.

P. Carrasco – Just as a reference how long as the ball been in their court?

Councilor Pryor – My experience with Uber is that they're a 'our way or no way' company. They're looking at selling the company for the most dollars they can get.

A. Toke – I know that the city collects tax on travel, will the city be getting any tax from these services?

Councilor Pryor – I don't know what the taxi surcharges or fees are collected or where they go.

A. Thomson – I'd like to work on this with you. Keep me in the loop.

P. Carrasco – I'd like a clear go ahead to research, find model language and bring other people into this process. Then we'll see how we can make sure this reaches its destination. I am seeing agreement for this.

6. City Council Legislative Priorities and Use of Funds

Councilor Pryor – This whole issue boils down to what the authority is of the City Council. The only body that can set policy for the city of Eugene is the City Council. These then serve as the intention and the priorities of the city. We have operational policies, legislative policies and political policies that we discuss and set. Once a policy is passed everyone who works within the city is required to follow that direction. What governs all of our boards and commissions is that they have the ability to operate under the policy set by the City Council. That is particularly true of legislative intent. We look at all policies that impact our community locally, statewide and federally. What any City Councilor, staff or board member can do is to

understand if the city council has set a policy and then you can speak so long as it's in support of that policy. If the HRC said there is a piece of legislation at a local, state or federal level that we want to act on counter to the decision of the City Council or that we've intentionally been silent on then by spending money, hosting and event or advocating you're setting a policy which you're not allowed to do. The sustainability commission has to be very careful that if it wants to advocate for an environmental issue they cannot unless it's been endorsed by the city council. Particularly if it's a piece of legislation, this makes it doubly important to be careful. The Inter-Governmental Relations committee has positions on all issues in front of the legislature.
This came up because the HRC was interested in supporting an event that was in support of a legislative position. If this was in alignment to a stated city policy then could do it. There are steps to take if there was legislation that you wanted to be supportive of, I would recommend that you ask the City Council to take a position on it so that you can act.
Souza – We can go to the council and discuss these issues?
Councilor Pryor – Yes, that's your job.
J. Frenzer – I would like for the HRC to consider taking the correct steps to take the Right to Rest bill to the City Council. This gives legal meat to the matter. Criminalization is hard to move forward and it's an issue that stays vague. This could be something that we follow up on from the joint work session.
P. Carrasco – If I feel that there is a piece of legislation up in Salem or there is a ballot measure up in November. I could make the case here that the ballot measure is against our human rights framework and see if Council would take a stance on that.
Councilor Pryor – The IGR gets together to review all of the bills before each session. You can likely find your answers there if a stance has already been taken. You're welcome to attend the meetings as well. There is a meeting next Wednesday after the council meeting at 1:30pm.
P. Carrasco – If it's not being brought up would I have to come to the HRC?
Councilor – You could talk to staff, a Councilor or council.
B. Souza – If the IGR takes a stand on a piece of legislation and it's not a stand that he'd take. Is it a done deal or could the HRC possibly shift that stance.
Councilor Pryor - The City Council can shift their stance at any time. An example is when a bill is altered in amendments and the City might change its stance. The HRC could come and persuade the City Council on these issues.
Thomson – How does all of this relate to funding requests?
Councilor Pryor – Money is also part of the City of Eugene the allocation of money is representative of the City's positions and policies. If I send a check to the KKK, by association we're endorsing the KKK because we're sending money. Money is a form of speech.
Souza – That gets back to the event in that hosting and spending money on would be supporting it?
J. Frenzer – What if it's a 360 forum?
Councilor Pryor - If it's a neutral forum where all points of view were being expressed and not advocating as a core point of view. That does fall within your purview.
K. Neubeck – What if some group comes in and makes a request on an issue?
Councilor Pryor – If we have a supportive stance you can vote yes, if no or neutral the HRC cannot.
Souza - If the city hasn't taken a position and the HRC feels like it's a worthy effort is the process that we go to the City Council?
Councilor Pryor – Absolutely. You could approach indivdual councilors to introduce a motion or you could bring it to the IGR or the formal recommendation.
Thomson – Maybe this is a thing we can add to the request form to include a question about this.

7. Council Update

Councilor Pryor – The main thing I want to talk about is I just got back from 4 days in Chicago. Eugene is in the process of establishing a community court. Overall an alternative to the traditional court system. Judge enacts a penalty in traditional process. What the justice community has discovered is that

incarceration creates more problems than it solves. The judicial community is realizing that the traditional system of justice is not working. In a Community Court model if someone is cited they go to the court and they're given an assessment talking about their housing, food, employment situation so that we can understand needs and services. When they go before the judge they are given direction to speak with service providers. Rather than jail time the human service providers help by working with you to get networked into shelter, food, drug rehab etc. In addition to that Spokane provides everyone who goes through court gets a free meal. You can get services in the moment. In addition to community courts people are trying: Mental health court, drug court, veteran's court etc.
City of Eugene already has been experimenting with Mental Health Court this court is to observe people with mental health problems and line them up with services. If you sentence someone to treatment they will take their meds, see councilor and come back every week. If someone needs shelter they work to provide that. One of the ways these work is when they're administered well and have good case management. City of Eugene received a grant to bring in a case worker, build the process and make sure that people do not end up back on the street with no substantial help. Part of the conversation that does need to occur is identifying the needs in term of oversite and advising and informing. Very exciting to have the grant to create court that might be able to pay off. I will work with them to get it established on the front end and because of my past work I will work to help the judges to connect with service providers.
A. Toke – Do they also incorporate restorative justice?
Councilor Pryor – Yes and Eugene is already experimenting with Restorative Justice.
B. Souza – Won't people become aware of the court by being pulled into the process?
Councilor Pryor - For offenders they'll get to know quickly but we also want the community to know about it. Part of it works because they have community support. Community Court recidivism rate is far lower.
B. Souza – How does this effect people's record? Rather than going to jail or doing the traditional does this keep them out of the system?
Councilor Pryor – It is a way keep people from developing records. It's geared toward helping people get back to the community.
K. Neubeck – Does this include felonies and misdemeanors?
Councilor Pryor – This has been interesting discussion some cities have been working at the Felony level, most are working at the misdemeanor level.
J. Frenzer – Follow up on Majeska's idea some of these models you've looked at like Spokane and Red Hook, do they have a component where they have an advisory group that oversees this?
Councilor Pryor – I think in terms of having something that provides oversite that could be hard to set up but an advisory body could more readily be set up.
J. Frenzer – Do the models have advisory groups?
Councilor Pryor – The judges have this information I'll need to look into that. We're working with the Library to use the Bascom-Tykeson room and they're supportive.
Heather Marek – Has there been any discussion about whether there would be any advocates with them as they go through the process.
Councilor Pryor – Yes, they're not really case workers and we need to determine who they are and how they work. One thing we'll want to know is what exactly they do in other communities is what we're looking at.
Heather – Will there be people who will help to look after the rights of the people as they navigate the court?
Councilor Pryor – Procedural justice is important. Need to make courts clear and understandable. Explain things in plain language. Second thing is that were ensured that the court operated with integrity. Respect everybody including the offender at all times. 36 states and many countries attended the summit.

8. Hate and Bias Reporting Update

J. Van Der Haeghen – What you have is a quarterly report from January to March of 2016. There are only three cases that have been reported for that timeframe. This is a decrease from years past. At this point what you'll see is that race is still a leading factor and we've seen an uptick of graffiti in schools.

Lt. Bills – The challenge with schools is figuring out intent versus being jerks by pushing people's buttons with things they know will be effective. These children have been dealt with directly. In 2015 in the first quarter we had 18 reported incidents and in 2014 11 reported incidents, by contrast. You might be wondering why, my answer is I don't know. Maybe people are being nicer and maybe people are not reporting the crime. Many of these communities tend to under report violence. Were constantly working to make sure that more people feel comfortable reporting. We had seen uptick in bias against the LGBTQ community but are not seeing it right now. With warmer weather and people being out and about I wonder if this will go up. I am curious if that will be the case.
P. Carrasco – Where did these incidents occur? I'm concerned that the national rhetoric is feeding the fire of what people are doing and also maybe keeping people from reporting.
J. Frenzer – My great concern is that with the national rhetoric is that people are afraid to report. How can we help with making sure that people know that they can report and that it's safe and ok. When you talked about how you really want to encourage that reporting, what is done?
Lt. Bills – One of our greatest assets is the HRC and HRNI, some people go there first to figure out what their options are and choose not to report. I see the HRNI as one of the best outreach points and point of contact to help people access reporting options. If you're a victim of crime we'll treat you with the same of compassion no matter who you are. Do I think we can continue to do outreach to other communities absolutely. I'd gladly take suggestions.
B. Souza – This is one of the questions that the Anti-Discrimination work group is doing in focus groups. In some cases people are not aware that there is a process. The outreach is necessary. Also providing information about the LECC that's looking at profiling and the opportunity that people have to file a complaint anonymously.
K. Neubeck – We are hearing a lot of stories. Including police harassment at the UO and LCC campuses of people of color. It's interesting that they don't recognize any authority outside of their campus. How are those folks being protected?
Lt. Bills – If people are victims are crimes at UO they can choose to report to us. If it's at LCC that's in Lane county and could go to them or Oregon State Police. One thing we noted by the end of last year was a challenge in capturing data on violence against people in the trans community. This has been fixed and we are correctly tracking these cases now. I think it will make a difference as we transition this will be apples to oranges.
K. Neubeck – I should clarify that the complaints are also about the police themselves.

9. EPD Update (Lt. Bills)

Lt. Bills - Hiring update we started with 400 applicants, offered 63 to interview and 12 will go to background check process from those. Out of background we get about half and from there we get about half make it all the way through. It's ok to be picky to work to get quality people to serve as police officers. I'd like it if we had 60 great candidates we could do backgrounds on but we don't.

C. Nunes – Do we have demographic information on those applicants?

Lt. Bills – that's something that HR keeps very close.
A. Thomson – How many positions are you looking to hire?
Lt. Bills – We have up to 7 FTE we can fill. For the authorized number we have a high level of FTE available. Some are detectives and some are patrol. I do not believe we'll over hire this time but we have to anticipate retirements.
P. Carrasco – Do you know how many people may retire?
Lt. Bills – I have 2 retiring in investigations this year, 2 patrol officers in June. We're an hour glass shaped agency right now. I'll end with today I was able to sit in at the swearing in with 7 new police officers they will graduate in mid-September. From what I've heard this is an outstanding group of students.
A. Toke – demographics for those?
Lt. Bills – One woman, two people of color and the rest are men. That fits standard for EPD for percentages. Women are at 9% of police department right now.

10. Commission Liaison Updates

B. Souza – I put together an update with an attachment. All speaks for itself, there was one more go around related to the resumption of recording the CRB meetings. Does anyone have any questions? One thing I will say is that I've spoken with Chris and Jen some about the HRC recommendation about the letter we signed on to a few months ago.

J. Frenzer – It feels like we had a meeting where we brought everyone up to speed on the events that have happened. Having the recordings of this board, we wrote a letter recommending that because of transparency to the process. It's important that they be recorded and that it is possible to go back to look at the transcript. The board was looking at different types of recording because its charter recommends recording. An alternative has been to do minutes to be able to find where it occurs on the recording. I strongly support that. I'm not sure how to move forward on recording. There is a sense that our letter touched a nerve, I'm not sure why. There may have been some confusion about why the HRC weighed in. Maybe it's an unfair assessment that there is an issue. It's a pretty important issue because if there is something high profile the community will come looking for this information.

Councilor Pryor - I had a chance to read the letter, I think there is something to think about which is what you do and how you do it. What you did in terms of making a recommendation to the CRB was not a bad thing. How did you do it that touched a nerve is what you'll want to explore. When I looked at the letter it didn't feel like a friendly letter from one equal to another. It sounded like the letter was directive to the CRB. This was not your intent but could be interpreted that way. There is absolutely a way to repair the relationship. You'll just need to think about what is the best way to communicate that is mutually supportive. I don't have the answers right now about how to approach issues like this. Good for commissions and boards to connect. I sat down with the Auditor to chat about it. I suggested that they do summary minutes and a recording. They have to work out what they want. I don't think there is any desire on the CRB to close out transparency. I think there is room.

B. Souza – It was not the whole board who was put off and there were a few people that didn't like it and they also ended up being the people who decided not to record. I don't recall anybody wanting a transcript.

Heather – There was concern on the part of the auditor if there was a recording there would be a need for a verbatim transcript.

Majeska – I think the issue is that the Auditor is raising lots of potential problems from having a recording. He does not want to have a recording because there are various ways that if things went wrong that they could get sued. He states lots of concerns with having a recording.

Councilor Pryor – My recommendation to him was that he record and provide limited minutes.

P. Carrasco – First there seemed to be a problem about confidentiality. There was also a note about the strong officer bill of rights. This is rife with a ton of potential problems. One very important thing I wanted to mention here is that I don't think that we could have worded the letter any other way. I think people who were going to have an issue were going to have an issue.

Councilor Pryor – I think everything could be made cool easily.

K. Neubeck – My experience at the Police Commission was similar. I asked that they jointly endorse with us that people who are homeless would be added as a protected class. It was clear to me that many people had not read the criminal code in preparation. Because it was an ordinance they didn't want to take it up. I was blindsided because the chair had said it would sail through.

J. Frenzer – It was a rapport building strategy.

Councilor Pryor – How the relationship works between commissions is an important question.

K. Neubeck – We've worked with the Sustainability Committee without any incidents. It seems that these two groups are caught up in their own culture.

B. Souza – Since the CRB was formed the meetings have been recorded. It was last spring when they recordings stopped. It was the Auditor who made that decision. It may have been because someone ordered a copy and had a conversation with him. It's not as though we're asking for something that is new.

C. Nunes – In the interest of time, what is the objective of this conversation? We've discussed this matter, sent a letter, what would you like to see as next steps for the HRC?

Councilor Pryor – Might be worthwhile for a City Council work session in order to see if there is a unified set of policies that the council could set. I don't want to put too many controls on the commissions. But it is an option.
K. Neubeck – Option to have a summit meeting to address some of these concerns. Want to mention that John Ruiz took one time training money to have a onetime training on Human Rights. Should also have the boards and commissions prepared to discuss these issues.
Councilor Pryor – We need to figure out how we can make sure that we all think everything is important.
B . Souza – I think that the CRB stands alone in its importance to the community and having faith.
Councilor Pryor – It is unique because it was established by charter.
J. Frenzer – There are next steps, we need to meet again to talk about what are logical next steps. It's too important to the community.
Councilor Pryor – I would like to get there but in the best way.

11. Work Group Lead Updates
K. Neubeck – There are possibilities of signing onto the letter in the packets as a commission, individuals or the chair could write a letter to the editor referencing Faye Stewarts comments and others that are creating an unsafe environment. I think that the community wants a response out of us. Not to respond is to pretend none of this is going on. I think that the API community is furious and have voiced their concerns to the County Commission.
C. Nunes – Two things that I wanted to bring to the group. One, I have a back ground in creative writing and the letter was so well written I feel that I might end up borrowing pieces of it rather than writing something completely new. I like that Ken added about how Eugene wants to be a welcoming community. I'm a little nervous about meeting the quality of the letter. Two with respect to the conversation earlier Chris this is specific to Lane County. I think it's entirely appropriate for the commission to speak about the growing language that is part of the national discussion. I would probably keep the name of a person out who is running for office. If you don't mention their name but speak to what happens that is fine.
P. Carrasco – I have a problem with that because in calling out racism we have to try very hard to be anti-racist. In doing so it's extremely important that we name names. If we completely avoid the fact that we're talking about a Lane County commissioner and name him by name. One of the biggest points to be made. All of Springfield, Thurston and part of Eugene are in his district. His constituency is in our city.
Councilor Pryor – He didn't say this as a Lane County commissioner he said it as a candidate for Senate. He was at a candidate presentation running for office. He was not in a meeting for the Commission. To have an agent of the City express an opinion on a candidate for office is concerning. As much as I agree with you, we can't go there. We can call out the behavior forcefully. I don't think we'd be on safe ground taking on a candidate as the City of Eugene. I could see members of my own City Council for being upset with this Commission for an action like that.
P. Carrasco – We've had excellent conversations about the benefits of being overly cautious. This person was clearly not interested in what rules were surrounding him. I don't know why we need to being overly cautious here. I think we need to call it out with his name.
K. Neubeck – I'm feeling increasingly constrained in supporting what the ordinance mandates that we supports which is human rights in the city. It seems that there is a conflict in what we can do if we cannot speak out against these things.
Councilor Pryor – You can, we're talking about one element. Just naming the name of a candidate for office is the problem. I don't think you can call out a candidate for office that has not been endorsed or opposed by the City of Eugene.
B. Souza – I don't see this as an issue we can sit out. The community is asking us to take action on this.
Councilor Pryor - I don't want to get this group and the City Council to get cross ways. If you run a fowl of what they're comfortable with you can get in trouble. If you want to have total freedom go outside of the City of Eugene and set up a human rights board. As long as you're part of this organization you have to abide by the policies. I'm willing to get a legal opinion. If the City attorney says I'm being overly cautious I'll back off.

C. Nunes – This is why we asked Chris to tell us more about the alignment.
Councilor Pryor – Personally I agree with everything that Phil said I just want us to find the correct path forward.
P. Carrasco – One main thing is that you don't want us to get in trouble with City Council. When does he get in trouble with his boss?
C. Nunes – This is what Chris was saying earlier. The same way we can comment on the legislation. The city Council could say that Eugene is part of Lane County and we don't support hat.
Councilor Pryor – You could certainly ask the Council to make an opinion on this issue.
J. Frenzer – I think that we need to take action about a racist statement that was said by an elected official. I don't think that we can dance around this. I'm not concerned about getting in trouble. It is precisely where the public meets the road. That is how you dismantle systemic racism. Not by being cautious or reckless. Pushing the envelope is how you get rid of systemic racism.
Councilor Pryor – No one said to do nothing.
J. Frenzer – I think we do need to say that this is the person who said these things.
Councilor Pryor – Is it the purpose to go after the behavior or person?
P. Carrasco – Especially as a public figure I think both. As a human rights city.
Councilor Pryor – I'm not comfortable with it.
C. Nunes – That's why I hesitated. I wanted to bring it to the group and see what other people thought. I don't want to act as chair without your consent. I did bring up the concern because of the political angle. A misstep could be detrimental for the Eugene Human Rights Commission. I'm with Chris on this aspect of it. It could be construed as a political move which is not our intent
P. Carrasco – One thing is very clear, people that are part of our community that identify as Asian or pacific islander they are asking us to back them up.
C. Nunes –This is really not within our constituency based on our organization. Our job is to advise City Council.
Councilor Pryor – You could say what was said was unacceptable and reprehensible.
P. Carrasco – I do want to ask, are we saying that the City Council is having to endorsed or not Faye Stewart then can take a stance?
Councilor Pryor - I would go to the City Council and ask that they say it. It bypasses the whole problem. Go to City Council and present your request that they take a stance on what was said.
C. Nunes – It's not that if they're an elected official that they can't say anything bad. It's that the City of Eugene HRC cannot say it without following the direction of council.
B. Souza – I wonder if the HRC can bring this issue to the city council through a letter asking them to censure and when we do this our letter is as public as anything else. That's what we do to make it public.
Councilor Pryor - I think that's a fine way to go.
K. Neubeck – If they don't censure, the letter is still in the public.
B. Souza – This letter can refer to his statement and back out to dangerous dialogue.
K. Neubeck – He's a perfect example of the political climate that is being exploited nationally. Especially in the rural parts of the country.
P. Carrasco – It would be nice to use the language from the letter.
B. Souza – The next focus group is with the API community I imagine this issue is going to come up. I'd like to be able to say something to them. On April 28th.
P. Carrasco – I want to point out that we're having to behave while he was allowed to say this.
J. Frenzer – What I'm hearing that people would like a letter written to the City Council. What is a realistic timeline?
Councilor Pryor – Doing something like this sooner than later while it's fresh is good.
K. Neubeck – I'd be happy to partner with Chris to write this letter.
C. Nunes - I'd love some help.
P. Carrasco – I'll pitch in as well. Let's make it a google doc.
Councilor Pryor – Next City Council meeting is next Monday.

Motion: Move that the committee drafts a letter to the City Council's attention about Faye Stewart's comments.
Moved by: J. Frenzer
Second: P. Carrasco
Vote: Unanimous

K. Neubeck – North Carolina and Mississippi are the most blatant on what they say about LGBTQ communities. In North Carolina localities are not allowed to prohibit discrimination against the LGBTQ community. Big one is the bathroom part of the bill that says each person will use the bathroom based on the sex assigned at birth. A lot of corporations in and outside of the US have begun disinvestment in North Carolina. Portland, Multnomah county, NY state, San Francisco have all sent letters saying that they're banning non-essential travel. Mississippi's law hides behind religious freedom saying that people who provide services do not need to serve them. We're asking that the City of Eugene take a position asking the City Manager ban unnecessary travel to these states.
Councilor Pryor – We've done this before and have banned travel to Arizona. The ironic thing is that the effect on these bans will be on Charlotte, the people who will suffer are the most liberal elements of the state and the rural people are not impacted.
K. Neubeck – The people are being hurt by the policy.
Councilor Pryor – It's just sad that when you try to do something to respond you wind up hurting the people who are most supportive. We likely don't travel to North Carolina very often.
P. Carrasco – We could look into what the City buys from North Carolina.
Councilor Pryor – The people who deserve to feel the consequence are not going to feel it. Do it, I don't think there is any problem with it being passed.
J. Van Der Haeghen – Is the best method a request to council?
Councilor Pryor – Yes in the form of a letter.

Motion: Move that we send a letter to council recommending that all non-essential travel to North Carolina and Mississippi.
Made by: J. Frenzer
Second: P. Carrasci
Vote: Unanimous

J. Frenzer –I'm following up on the budget requests, there are three events that we're organizing. These events will be listed in the art walk brochure. This invoice is for May a series of films and photos at the library as part of the art walk. The videographer does interviews with people who are homeless. She was funded by the Wayne Morse Center on Law and Politics to share what is happening here with other communities. We have invited photographers including Robert Hill Long who is a poet as well. Another event next month during art walk is a June 3rd gathering for youth. Off the Waffle said they would give us free waffles if we made the restaurant the venue. We have the Bascom Tykeson room at the library and were thinking we'll have Walk Away Burritos there, music and information booths. It's a good thing we have both venues because everyone I've asked has said they would table.We will need to pay for this to be added to the Art Walk posting as well. We are getting art supplies donated. Still need food money to get the burritos made.
Looking for this invoice to be paid for May 6th and another for June 3rd and about $130 for printing. What we're printing are in color. A youth artists has created spray paint artwork. I think we'll need $450 for the May 6th event. Last film event hasn't been scheduled yet. I was going to ask you for money for the fee for showing it but other folks stepped forward to cover that. We're looking for $50 for refreshments for that event.
K. Neubeck – Where will it be shown?
J. Frenzer - South Eugene High School in collaboration with Community Supported Shelters and First Christian Church. For the June 3rd event we are going to approach the Oregon Country Fair to pay the

musicians and artists. Will need to understand process from the HRNI. I think the total budget will be close to $620 for all three events. This will leave the HRC with $380.

Motion: Move that we support up to $620 for the Homelessness Work Group Events.
Made by: P. Carrasco
Second: K. Neubeck
Vote: Unanimous.

12. Staff Update
J. Van Der Haeghen - Laura Hammond is willing to come to your next meeting to talk about Healthy Downtown and Uber.

Human Rights Commission Budget

Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16)

DATE	REQUESTING GROUP	EVENT OR DESCRIPTION	SPONSORSHIP	OTHER	TOTAL CHARGES	TOTAL SPENT TD	BALANCE
7/1/15							$4,500.00
10/13/15	TransJustice Eug/Spngf	Transgender Day of Awareness	$200.00		$200.00	$200.00	$4,300.00
10/13/15	Network Charter School	Youth Empowerment Symposium (YES!)	$200.00		$200.00	$400.00	$4,100.00
10/13/15	SURJ	Vocabularly of Change film and discussion	$100.00		$100.00	$500.00	$4,000.00
11/23/15	THRIVEugene	YIMBY (Yes In My Backyard)	$200.00		$200.00	$700.00	$3,800.00
11/23/15	IHRD	Facility Rental	$410.00		$410.00	$1,110.00	$3,390.00
12/10/15	IHRD	Promotion		$135.00	$135.00	$1,245.00	$3,255.00
12/10/15	IHRD	Event Food & Supplies		$308.95	$308.95	$1,553.95	$2,946.05
1/18/16	HRC	MLK Awards (2)		$100.00	$100.00	$1,653.95	$2,846.05
1/18/16	BIG	Blacks in Gov't Annual Banquet		$150.00	$150.00	$1,803.95	$2,696.05
1/18/16	NAACP	Freedom Fund Dinner		$320.00	$320.00	$2,123.95	$2,376.05
1/18/16	SURJ	Stand Up for Racial Justice Event	$250.00		$250.00	$2,373.95	$2,126.05
3/15/16	Archaeology Channel	TAC Film Festival	$200.00		$200.00	$2,573.95	$1,926.05
3/15/16	DisOrient	DisOrient Film Festival	$200.00		$200.00	$2,773.95	$1,726.05
3/15/16	Churchill Youth Summit	Youth Summit, May Event	$300.00		$300.00	$3,073.95	$1,426.05
4/19/16	Ken Neubeck	airfare for HRC travel		$300.00	$300.00	$3,373.95	$1,126.05
4/16/16	HIV Alliance		$100.00				
4/16/16	Nightingale Collective	Peer Support Training	$100.00				
TOTALS			**$2,260.00**	**$1,313.95**	**$3,373.95**	**$3,373.95**	**$1,126.05**

011-0730-####-612022

** Not included AntiDiscrimination Food budget and Homelessness Events Budget that has been approved**

VANDERHAEGHEN Jennifer E

From: HAMMOND Laura A
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 4:28 PM
To: VANDERHAEGHEN Jennifer E
Cc: NICHOLAS Rachelle D
Subject: ADA and PPV rules

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Jennifer,

In February of last year the City Council approved an ordinance allowing smartphones to calculate and charge fares. They also indicated support to update the City's Public Passenger Vehicle (PPV) administrative rules to accommodate new transportation models while maintaining community safety standards.

City staff met with community members, existing taxi companies, Uber and Lyft representatives, local agencies and interested parties to collect input on the updates. Based on those conversations and public input, changes to PPV rules were proposed and put out for public comment earlier this year (March 13-28). Comments were submitted questioning whether a specific number of vehicles must be ADA accessible. There are no specific State or Federal laws that require a specific number of accessible vehicles. We recognize, however, that this is an important issue. Our plan is to work on addressing accessible public passenger vehicles as soon as possible, through a specific process that focuses on these issues and works with key stakeholders.

Thanks!
Laura

Laura A. Hammond
Communication & Policy Analyst
City of Eugene Planning & Development Department
99 West 10th Ave
Eugene, OR 97401

Phone: 541-682-6021
www.eugene-or.gov/pdd

RESOLUTION NO. 5153

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE CITY OF EUGENE'S COMMITMENT TO THE HOUSING FIRST MODEL AS A KEY STRATEGY TO ADDRESSING THE HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS CRISIS.

The City Council of the City of Eugene finds that:

A. The nation generally, and the City of Eugene and surrounding metro area specifically, are facing a housing crisis. According to a recent one night homeless census, Lane County's homeless population exceeds 1,450 people on any given night.

B. Housing and homelessness is not an isolated issue facing Eugene. With the recent passage of Resolution No. 5142, the City of Eugene asserts that we are indeed in a statewide crisis that requires immediate attention and action by the state.

C. The Poverty and Homelessness Board, of which the City of Eugene is a member, are working to create an interagency Housing First strategy for Lane County to address the growing crisis of homelessness in our community.

D. Many of the most effective outcomes of permanent supported housing studied utilize the Housing First approach which is generally distinguished by its emphasis on moving people into stable housing first and then working to provide robust wrap-around services that address the medical, mental, or behavioral conditions and other needs of residents.

E. Permanent supportive housing models that use a Housing First approach have been proven to be highly effective for people experiencing chronic homelessness who have higher service needs. Studies have shown that Housing First models result in long-term housing stability, improved physical and behavioral health outcomes, and achieve the greatest cost avoidance to taxpayers by reducing use of crisis services such as emergency departments, hospitals, and jails.

F. On June 22, 2010, the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness released the nation's first comprehensive strategy for ending chronic homelessness entitled *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, which endorsed Housing First as a best practice.

G. On December 9, 2015, the City Council and the Human Rights Commission held a joint work session on homelessness that produced a motion directing that the City Manager prepare for Council consideration a resolution declaring the City of Eugene's commitment to a Housing First model.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EUGENE, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Oregon, as follows:

Section 1. The City of Eugene is committed to addressing the long term, low-cost housing crisis in Lane County. To that end, the City of Eugene is committed to a Housing First approach as a core strategy to address the need for adequate low-cost housing. A Housing First approach features a supported housing model where chronically homeless persons and families, and the people who are homeless who face barriers to conventional housing programs, have access to permanent housing without preconditions, and that they have access to a menu of supportive services that meet individual needs. The Housing First approach is HUD supported, widely recognized, and an effective means to reduce chronic homelessness.

Section 2. The City Council has supported a number of innovative, short-term, pilot strategies that have made positive contributions to address the need for legal, safe places to sleep for the homeless (Rest Stop Program, Dusk to Dawn Program, car camping, etc.). The Housing First approach is not intended to be a substitute for the current programs or future program expansion and innovations of the City that address those emergency shelter needs.

Section 3. Implementation of the Housing First approach requires a multi-governmental strategy that includes investing in new and existing housing units and also funding ongoing supportive services and case management.

Section 4. The City of Eugene is committed to working in partnership with other jurisdictions to identify the resources needed to implement the Housing First approach. Supporting innovations, inviting new participants, and continuing current partnerships will be necessary to secure resources from federal, state and local agencies as called for in City Council Resolution No. 5142 on the urgency of the housing and homelessness crisis.

Section 5. The City Council directs the City Manager to use this Resolution as guidance in administering future work.

Section 6. This Resolution is effective immediately upon its passage by the City Council.

The foregoing Resolution adopted the 9th day of May, 2016.

Chuck Corbett

Deputy City Recorder

Human Rights Commission Work Group Updates

Date: May 12, 2016
Work Group: Anti-Discrimination Work Group
Prepared by: Bonnie Souza

Focus Groups:

We have now completed four focus groups:
Latino (youth, business owner, activists)
Latino families (parents with children in the school system)
Trans
Asian American

We currently have four additional groups in the planning stages between now and mid-June:
Native American
Pacific Islander
LGBQ
African American

Response to Faye Stewart comments:

Ken Neubeck and Jennifer Frenzer met with Matthew Yook to discuss how the HRC might respond to Faye Stewart's recent comments against refugees.

Do you have a proposal for the HRC to consider or any issues you need the HRC's feedback on during the next meeting?

If yes, please provide any supporting documents to be included in the packet by the Thursday before the meeting.

- The Anti-Discrimination Work Group would like to request $60 from the budget to cover food for an additional focus group that has been added since our original budget request for focus group expenses.