

Julie Enea

From: FLASHFG@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 11:50 AM
To: Julie Enea
Cc: tracylward@msn.com; irishtwong@gmail.com; ladysmith94801@gmail.com; flashfg@aol.com
Subject: Re: Pending Recommendation by the Internal Operations Committee Concerni...
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Julie,
FYI.....please include with the Commission response I sent you earlier.

Thanks,
Phyllis Gordon

In a message dated 5/17/2016 12:32:28 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, ladysmith94801@gmail.com writes:

Hello Phyllis,
Thank you for forwarding this information to me.

Please bear with my need for clarity on some points. I am curious what current "staff support" is being referenced for which there would be the "additional" that we requested. The closest incidents of staff support that I recall are the meetings in Martinez and El Cerrito, when we ask to have the Sups share Commission information via their usual mode of communication with each's constituents, and when we ask them to participate in honoring the HOF inductees. I sincerely ask if I missed some significant efforts required by the BOS for this Commission to function?

Regarding the number and configuration of the members of the Women's Commission, initially reducing the number of Commissioners by five in 2015 and now manipulating the the configuration from one appointee to two appointees per District does nothing to "achieve a more balanced geographical representation". Although, I am not opposed to increasing the appointees to two per District, I am wondering how the Sups who allow their one appointee slot to remain vacant for extended periods of time intend to solicit candidates. During the past year when the Women's Commission outreached to the women of the County in the style of a campaign or engagement "tour" we held a regular meeting in the each of the Districts. This provided much exposure to our Commission and piqued much interest in the Commission resulting in an increase of our membership. Our Commission has been working to achieve a level of visibility and recognition that can attract desirable candidates for active Commissioner positions and hopefully will create a waiting list.

If the BOS have specific concerns that they wish our Commission to review and "advise" we are certainly willing. In the meantime we have provided tangible evidence of our efforts and opportunities for the BOS to claim that they contribute to their respective constituents through our Commission's events; and we do this with a zero budget allotted from the County.

As much as I appreciate the BOS interest in a more balanced geographical representation, I'd really like the "under represented" District Supervisors to meet with our Commission to share ideas of how to successfully outreach to their respective constituents and be more organically involved in the growth and development of the Women's Commission instead of mandating proposals from a distance.

Earnestly,
Ms. Joey D. Smith, Commissioner
ONE LOVE

On May 16, 2016, at 8:03 PM, FLASHFG@aol.com wrote:

click on info below.

P.

From: Julie.Enea@cao.cccounty.us
To: flashfg@aol.com
Sent: 5/12/2016 2:00:23 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
Subj: FW: Pending Recommendation by the Internal Operations Committee Concerning the Commission for Women

From: Julie Enea
Sent: Friday, April 01, 2016 1:47 PM
To: 'info@womenscommission.com'
Cc: Julie DiMaggio Enea
Subject: Pending Recommendation by the Internal Operations Committee Concerning the Commission for Women

At its March 28, 2016 meeting, in the context of the BOS Triennial Advisory Body Review, the Board's Internal Operations Committee (IOC) decided to propose to the Board of Supervisors that the seat configuration of the Commission for Women be modified from "5 District seats + 15 At Large seats and 1 Alternate" to "10 District seats + 10 At Large seats and 1 Alternate". The IOC's objective for this change is to achieve a more balanced geographical representation on the Commission. The IOC proposes that this change be achieved through attrition of current members so that current members would serve out their complete terms and would not be impacted by the change.

The IOC asked me to solicit comments from the Commission on this proposed change prior to making its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Commission may submit comments to me, as staff to the IOC. Comments are requested by April 22. Please place this matter on the Commission's April 19 meeting agenda for consideration.

Here is a link to the March 28, 2016 IOC report on this matter: http://64.166.146.245/agenda_publish.cfm?id=&mt=ALL&get_month=3&get_year=2016&dsp=agm&seq=25132&rev=0&min=716&ln=37641#ReturnTo37641

Here is a link to the meeting minutes on this matter (Scroll down to Item 7): http://64.166.146.245/agenda_publish.cfm?id=&mt=ALL&get_month=3&get_year=2016&dsp=min&min=716&ln=37641#ReturnTo37641

Julie DiMaggio Enea

Senior Deputy County Administrator

Contra Costa County Administrator's Office

651 Pine Street, 10th Floor

Martinez, CA 94553

(925) 335-1077

=