

**City of Alameda, California**  
**SOCIAL SERVICE HUMAN RELATIONS BOARD**  
**THURSDAY, February 24, 2022**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

President Sarah Lewis called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

President Sarah Lewis shared background information on the Season for Nonviolence, and the Word of the Day: "Friendliness."

"Friendship that insists upon agreement on all matters is not worth the name. Friendship to be real must ever sustain the weight of honest differences, however sharp they be." - Mahatma Gandhi

**2. ROLL CALL**

Present: President Sarah Lewis, Board members Dianne Yamashiro-Omi, Priya Jagannathan, Samantha Green, Scott Means.

Absent: Vice President Kristin Furuichi Fong (Excused).

City staff: Veronika Cole, Walker Toma, and Danielle Sullivan.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**3-A Review and Approve November 13, 2021 Draft Minutes**

A motion to approve the minutes of November 13, 2021 was made by Board member Means and seconded by Board member Jagannathan. Ayes: President S. Lewis, Board members Yamashiro-Omi, Jagannathan, Green, and Means. Nays: none. Note: Vice President Furuichi Fong abstained due to absence from meeting. Motion passed 5-0.

**3-B Review and Approve January 27, 2022 Draft Minutes**

A motion to approve the minutes of January 27, 2022 was made by Board member Jagannathan and seconded by Board member Green. Ayes: President S. Lewis, Board members Yamashiro-Omi, Jagannathan, Green, and Means. Nays: none. Note: Vice President Furuichi Fong abstained due to absence from meeting. Motion passed 5-0.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Staff member Cole read into the public record the email received on February 23 from Jay Garfinkle. **(Email Attached)**

President Lewis then opened the floor for additional public comment.

Public member, Jay Garfinkle, stated his appreciation for the Board, and all the work being done. However, Mr. Garfinkle was upset with the limited access to current SSHRB activities/information. He suggested additional information be provided prior to each meeting, e.g. a copy of the Alameda Wellness Center presentation, which would allow for members of the public to review before each meeting as well as comment on items at the end of the meeting.

President Lewis thanked Mr. Garfinkle for his comments.

## **5. AGENDA ITEMS**

### **5-A Presentation on Status of Alameda Wellness Campus – Doug Biggs, Executive Director of the Alameda Point Collaborative (APC)**

Mr. Biggs presented the Status of the Alameda Wellness Campus. The following is a summary of the key segments:

- Alameda County has a critical need to assist older adults who are at risk of, or are already experiencing homelessness, require high-acuity care, or hospice
- Wellness Center is focused on a new standard of care, with permanent supportive housing for seniors; medical respite program; co-located health clinic with medical and behavioral health care; homeless prevention/housing placement program; and end-of-life care in one location
- APC will be collaborating with Mercy Housing, Lifelong Medical Care and Alameda County Health Care Services Agency on this project.
- Restorative Waterfront Location – supports health restoration and improved quality of life
- Welcoming Community – City of Alameda residents affirm serving the most vulnerable in Alameda County
- Social Justice & Racial Equity – promotes health equity & repairs historic harm
- Campus site (3.65 acres) is located near Crab Cove, and will be a “Build-to-Suit” facility
- Secured initial funding awards and partnerships (Kaiser, Alameda County, CA Health Care Foundation, Anthem Foundation, Sutter Health, CA Wellness Foundation) with a recent invitation to apply for \$3 million from The California Endowment
- Awarded \$15 million in state funding for one-time capital costs to build the medical respite building
- Senior Housing will have 100 units for unhoused Alameda County residents 55 years and up
- Respite Center will have 50 beds, serving an estimate of 400 patients per year
- APC has an established oversight/outreach committee that meets on a monthly basis. They are holding their next community meeting in March.
- APC is seeking input on how to name the building.
- Provided the following build forecast for the Wellness Center:

Alameda Wellness Campus Schedule				
PHASE	MEDICAL RESPITE		SENIOR HOUSING	
	Start	End	Start	End
Schematic Design		05/05/20	08/02/21	10/02/21
Design Review	10/6/20	09/30/21	09/20/21	12/06/21
Design Development	05/06/20	12/04/20	06/01/21	04/01/22
Construction Documents	08/16/21	12/27/21	07/01/22	09/01/22
Building Permits	01/03/22	05/31/22	09/15/22	03/15/23
GC Bid	01/03/22	03/02/22	12/15/22	03/15/23
Acquisition/Construction Close		06/20/22		07/01/23
Construction	07/01/22	09/15/23	07/01/23	10/31/24

President Lewis opened the floor for clarifying questions and public comment.

Public member, Jay Garfinkle asked for clarification on the following questions:

- Why housing for homeless was partially modified to housing for homeless, 55 years and up?
- Does APC own the Wellness Center land/property?
- Will preference be given to City of Alameda residents?

Mr. Biggs confirmed the following:

- The only change to the 2017 application, and reason for additional information regarding individuals 55 years and up, is the new building, specifically for Senior Housing (noted, all of APC's applications are available on their website)
- APC has signed a 20-year lease on the land, with options to extend
- Alameda residents have access to the resource center, where staff assists with housing applications/placement

Board members expressed their appreciation for the work being done by APC, thanked Mr. Biggs for his presentation, and asked clarifying questions. Board member Jagannathan asked if APC would be willing to share information that may assist with the 2022 Community Needs Assessment (CNA). President Lewis asked if APC has established outcome metrics to determine successes/failures. Mr. Biggs offered to share information which would be helpful for the CNA as well as past, present and future metrics.

**5-B Continuation of Discussion for SSHRB 2022 Work Plan and Ad Hoc Committee reports:**

Sub-committee members provided updates on individual work plans and revised completion dates, as needed. Board members discussed the updated information, and open action items. The following is a summary of the discussion items:

- Thinking about the goals we have identified as SSHRB members, what information do we need to inform our work?
  - Utilization of city services – who is using it, are tutorials available?
  - The biggest strengths of our community
  - Feeling potential to be active participants, belonging and contributing
  - Citizens feeling safety and security
  - Transparency about what is happening, what is going on in the city, staff bringing data to our attention, events or changes and trends that are affecting the Community
  - How they want SSHRB to represent them, City Council to connect with them; how they want to interact with us (websites, emails, apps); addressing the gap between what is being done and what people are seeing and hearing
- Thinking about your specific subcommittee, what information do you need to be effective?
  - Acts of racism/discrimination by police/city staff
  - Coordinate with consultants who have done work with communities before
  - Sharing of positive/healing experiences that have brought people together
  - Identify funding streams and possible gaps
  - How is funding being spent and what is the community's perception of how it is being spent
  - The CNA should be brief, how and what can we effectively ask through a survey
  - Reporting back to the community
  - Do people know what services are available, how to access them, and are they what they need
  - What are the parameters of SSHRB, who can we talk to, what can we do, can we get funding from other sources and what can we do with it
  - Central location for previous meetings, reports and presentations (website?)
- The CNA has primarily been used for CDBG. Thinking about the December meeting when we discussed CDBG funding, did you feel like you had enough information to make recommendations? What information would have been helpful? Where would that information come from? E.g. does it need to come from a community survey, community experts, people with lived experience, etc.
  - Prevention – what are activities that the City is engaging in to prevent domestic violence, homelessness, etc.
  - Call for assistance – 211 data with trend
  - Additional community needs calls, emails
  - Ensuring we are truly representative of the community in whatever data we collect
  - City specific goals around different activity areas, what are they and where do applicants or un-met needs fit
  - Recommendation from staff on what to focus on, insight into what areas we focus on, what is that process, can we be included

- Felt that we are working out of context
- CDBG application review, funding streams and funding narratives, more information to assist review process
- Can the group make use of other surveys?

## **5-C Workgroup Reports**

- Domestic Violence (Veronika Cole): Ms. Cole reported that the quarterly meeting occurred on February 17. Sgt. Mountain with the Alameda Police Department presented Alameda's domestic violence statistics. Highlighting the following:
  - Misdemeanor offenses are lower than 2019, but higher than 2020
  - Felony offenses and total offenses have significantly risen
  - Numbers are typically higher during the summer
  - APD has seen a high number of repeat offenders as well of incidents where children are present
  - Committee discussed the need for additional outreach options (posters with resource options)
  - Katherine Schwartz plans to coordinate a follow-up meeting to discuss next steps

Board member Yamashiro-Omi asked if the City has shelter beds/rooms set aside for domestic violence victims. Staff member Cole stated that she will gather this information and provide an update at the next SSHRB meeting.

## **6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

### **6-A Review of CDBG Public Service Applications due by Monday, February 28, 9 a.m.**

Staff member Cole reminded SSHRB members of the application review deadline. Board member Jagannathan asked how much funding was available, and if all proposals submitted will be funded? Staff member Cole stated she will follow-up with City staff and provide an update once available.

### **6-B Status Report on Homeless Services**

Staff member Cole provided the following update:

- The Point in Time Count was successfully completed. The total count has not been finalized, however over 100 individuals were counted
- City staff will be presenting a proposal for Emergency Supportive Housing to City Council on March 15. The proposal includes 3 vacant properties at Alameda Point (1 for homeless individuals, and the other 2 for families that are homeless)
- The Village of Love was recently informed that they will need to relocate due to construction impacted Alameda Point. Timeline is currently unknown.

## **7. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA**

None.

#### **8. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Carmen Reed requested to speak (by raising her hand virtually). Staff member Cole was unsure if public could comment unless it is an agenda item. She requested Ms. Reed to email her with any questions and she would be happy to help with a response.

#### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

President Lewis adjourned the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Veronika Cole, Acting Board Secretary